NRC-038-E

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Informal Information-Gathering

Meeting Pertaining to Dewey-Burdock, Crow Butte North Trend, & Crow Butte License Renewal, In-Situ Uranium Recovery Projects

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Pine Ridge, South Dakota

Date: Wednesday, June 8, 2011

Work Order No.: NRC-904 Pages 1-195

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 234-4433

	1
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	INFORMAL INFORMATION-GATHERING
5	MEETING PERTAINING TO DEWEY-BURDOCK,
6	CROW BUTTE NORTH TREND, & CROW BUTTE
7	LICENSE RENEWAL, IN-SITU URANIUM
8	RECOVERY PROJECTS
9	+ + + +
10	MEETING
11	+ + + +
12	WEDNESDAY,
13	JUNE 8, 2011
14	+ + + +
15	The meeting was convened in the conference
16	room of the Prairie Wind Hotel & Restaurant, Highway
17	18 North, Pine Ridge, SD, at 10:00 a.m., Kevin Hsueh,
18	Moderator, presiding.
19	PRESENT:
20	PAULA ANTOINE
21	MARIAN ATKINS
22	RODNEY BAILEY
23	DOCTOR BEADS
24	GERALD BIG CROW
25	JACKIE BIG CROW
	NEAL R. GROSS

		2
1	ROBERT BIG PALM	
2	SARA BUCKMAN	
3	MICHAEL CATCHES ENEMY	
4	TERRY CLOUTHIER	
5	KATHRYN CONVERSE	
6	GREG FESKO	
7	BRYCE IN THE WOODS	
8	KATHY JANIS	
9	HANNAN LAGARRY	
10	WILMER MESTETH	
11	PAIGE OLSON	
12	DON RAGONA	
13	ANDREW RED CLOUD	
14	OLIVER RED CLOUD	
15	LANCE ROM	
16	EDWARD STAM	
17	STEVE VANCE	
18	JAMES WESTON	
19	SCOTT WESTON	
20	DEBRA WHITE PLUM	
21	JOYCE WHITING	
22	JIM WHITTED	
23	DENNIS YELLOW THUNDER	
24	MARTIN YOUNG BUCK BER YOUNG DOG	
25		

			3
1	STAFF	PRESENT:	
2		KEVIN HSUEH, Moderator, FSME	
3		ANNE BROPHY, Contractor	
4		MIKE CLARK, OGC	
5		POLLY CLARK, CNWRA	
6		NATHAN GOODMAN	
7		KELLEE JAMERSON, FSME	
8		PATTY JEHLE, OGC	
9		BRETT KLUKAN, OGF	
10		JIM PRIKRYL, CNWRA	
11		MICHELLE RYAN, FSME	
12		BILL VON TILL, FSME	
13		HAIMANOT YILMA, FSME	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
- 1	•		

NEAL R. GROSS

24

PROCEEDINGS

(9:58 a.m.)

MODERATOR HSUEH: Good morning. My name is Kevin Hsueh. I'm the Chief of the Environmental Review Branch with NRC. I want to welcome you to participate in Section 106 process. We had three-day activities here, and we have scientists from the technical review on site and today will be Information-Gathering.

I'd like to welcome each and every one of you here. We would like to start with a prayer session, so I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Mesteth.

(Prayer in native language.)

MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you, Mr. Mesteth.

Our next item is for Ms. Whiting to give us Words of Encouragement.

MS. WHITING: Good morning. I'm just very thankful for our meeting here today. I just want to - I'm very thankful to our relatives from the Oceti Sakohowin who are here to help support our efforts as Lakota Nation.

Today I just want to encourage all of us to have an open mind. We, as the Oglala Lakota people and from the Civil Council have a lot of major concerns regarding the Crow Butte, and all the other

NEAL R. GROSS

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

uranium mines, the permits, the permitting process. And this is a start of the consultation process. And I'm glad that you've called us to the table to be -- start from the beginning so that we can continue to have a good working relationship. Those are my Words of Encouragement.

(Native language.)

MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you, Ms. Whiting.

We have some microphones over there, so we will try
to figure it out. But in the meantime, I will
continue. I will try to speak louder so everyone can
hear from me. So, if you don't hear from me, just let
me know so I can try to increase my voice.

The next item is for Mr. Michael Catches Enemy. He's the Master of Ceremonies, say a few words.

MR. CATCHES ENEMY: (Native language.) thank all of you for coming here, and I greet all of you with a good handshake, and a good heart. My name is Michael Catches Enemy. I'm the Natural Resource Director and Tribal Historic Preservation Office Director. And I welcome all of you this morning to be here. I welcome our Council representatives, Scott Weston, Kathy Janis, our Fifth Members Office representative, Jackie Big Crow, the other tribal

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

representatives from Flandreau, Cheyenne River, Standing Rock, Sisseton-Wahpeton, and anybody else I may have forgotten.

I'm glad that most of my staff is here. We have also our archeologist, Lance Rom. My staff consists of, so everybody else knows, Sara Buckman, she's our Outreach Coordinator, our tribal attorney, Don Ragona for the Oglala Sioux Tribe, Lance Rom, He's with Oglala Lakota College of Hannan LaGarry. and Science. He's our tribal Math geologistpaleontologist. We have Kathryn Converse, who is our hydrologist. Dennis Yellow Thunder, who is natural resource technician, and I'll say good morning to the rest of you.

Hopefully, we'll have other people here. Maybe they'll be voicing concerns. There's a lot to talk about in these next hours that we have for today, at least, to talk about this. And as Joyce said, this is the beginning, because we're talking about two different mining operations here. And I really hope that we can try to get the points across on having some meaningful dialogue as part of this consultation process to allow not only tribal members, but tribal representatives to speak their concerns. And, hopefully, these concerns can go to another level

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

where there's cooperation or collaboration on some of these aspects that are important to tribes.

understand that some of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission hearings that were held, I wasn't present at a lot of these, but two of the newest things that the tribes can be a part of, as far as I understand, is either following the NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act guidelines to become a cooperating agency, or through the National Historic Preservation Act under this Section 106 process. So, the Section 106 process that we're engaging in today, we're focusing cultural resources, historic on preservation items.

But, of course, there's still the health concerns that come up, the environmental concerns. And I don't think that we should be restricted from speaking on those parts, as well.

And I'm just really glad the Nuclear Regulatory Commission took it upon themselves to go ahead and initiate this process, because we wrote some letters back in 2010 and earlier this year to set up this meeting. It took some coordination, and putting names to faces now, so I'm glad to meet Nathan and Haimanot.

We had sent some emails, and then after we

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

had tried to talk about a draft agenda, the invitations were sent out to all the tribes. And, as you can see, there's a long list of tribes that were invited by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to be here, and I'm just extremely thankful that we do have the tribes that are here present with us.

There's a lot more to be said, but I think what Kevin and I have discussed is to try to have more of the input and less presentations where we can get people's concerns, use this time efficiently to obtain those concerns and issues that people want to bring forth. So, if we want, we can go around and start out with the introductions from everybody, and then at that time I think we can go ahead and discuss our opening remarks. So, however you want to start, if you want to go around this way, make our way around.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you. I will suggest that we start from the Council from Oglala Sioux, start from there, if it's okay with you.

MR. CATCHES ENEMY: That's fine.

MODERATOR HSUEH: All right. Thank you.

MS. JANIS: Good morning, everyone. My name is Kathy Janis. I am from the Wounded Knee District. I am a Council Representative for the

NEAL R. GROSS

Oglala Sioux Tribe, and I was really excited to be invited by the staff to attend this meeting so I can, like Mike, put faces to the names that we hear.

I had been on the Council prior to this term, and we did work on some of this, but have to say I wasn't really involved. So, again, I thank everybody for coming, and welcome. Thank you.

MR. WESTON: Good morning, everyone. My name is Scott Weston. I am one of the Council Representatives for the Oglala Sioux Tribe in the Porcupine District.

I come here today with an open mind, but with questions. And like Mr. Catches Enemy, we have issues that we need clarified, we need representation, we need dialogue. We need to be able to understand what's going on so that we can convey this to our people. And in doing so, I think we can move forward. But there are a lot of issues that we talk about that never gets -- we talk about, but we never mention our treaty.

We have treaties with the United States Government that need to be talked about, that need to be discussed. So, that's where I come from today. And I also want to say good morning to my relatives from the other tribes from our Great Plains. Good morning

NEAL R. GROSS

	to you all, and I just want to say thank you and
2	welcome to everybody.
3	MS. BIG CROW: Good morning. My name is
4	Jackie Big Crow. (Native language.) Good morning. And
5	I am assistant to the Oglala Sioux Tribe, and we're a
6	liaison between the Council and the President's
7	Office, President, Vice-President, Secretary-
8	Treasurer. Thank you.
9	MS. JAMERSON: Good morning. I'm Kellee
10	Jamerson with the NRC.
11	MR. KLUKAN: Good morning. My name is
12	Brett Klukan. I'm an attorney with the United States
13	Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
14	MR. VON TILL: Good morning and welcome.
15	My name is Bill Von Till. I'm the Chief of the Uranium
16	Recovery Branch that oversees the operations of the
17	existing facilities that we have, the operation of
18	facilities, and all the licensing that occurs with the
19	new licenses that we have. So, I'm glad that
20	everybody showed up. We want to hear your concerns
21	today, that's the main objective. So, I'm also a
22	geologist, by the way.
23	MR. FESKO: Good morning. I'm Greg Fesko
24	with BLM, I'm a geologist and Project Manager.
25	MS. ATKINS: I'm Marian Atkins, Bureau of

Land Management here in South Dakota, and I'm the Field Manager, and we have a few acres involved in the 2 Dewey-Burdock Project. And hear what all the concerns are. So, thanks for coming, and I'm going to find out what's going on. MR. CLARK: Good morning. I'm Mike Clark. I'm an attorney with the NRC's Office of General Counsel. I'm advising the Staff in the review of the 8 Dewey-Burdock application. MS. JEHLE: Hello, I'm Patty Jehle. I'm also an attorney in the Office of the General Counsel 12 NRC, I'm working on the Dewey-Burdock and And I would like to thank all of the licensing. 14 tribes for welcoming me and all of the NRC to this meeting. Thank you. 15 MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you, Patty. 16 MR. BIG PALM: I'm Robert Big Palm. 17 on the Advisory Council. 18 MR. BAILEY: My name is Rodney Bailey. 19 MODERATOR HSUEH: Okay. All right. 20 MS. BEADS: I'm Doctor Beads. 22 MODERATOR HSUEH: All right. Because I think -- can I maybe have a five-minute break, because 23 24 I probably need to discuss with our -- All right. So, let's move on to the next introduction. 25

1

3

9

10

11

13

MR. WHITTED: My name is Jim Whitted. Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate Tribal Preservation Office, and I'm happy 3 to be here representing our great Sioux nation. MR. IN THE WOODS: (Native language.) I'm Tribal Bryce In The Woods. а Representative for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, and welcome the NRC to our great nation. Thank you. 8 MODERATOR HSUEH: 9 Thank you. MR. VANCE: (Native language.) 10 I'm Steve 11 Vance. I'm Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for 12 Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe. 13 MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you. 14 MR. WESTON: James Weston, Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe. 15 16 MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you. MR. RED CLOUD: Hello, my name is Chief 17 Red Cloud. I'm here, and I take care of the treaty 18 rights. And I want to object to this hearing. 19 want to know what's going on now today. 20 21 MODERATOR HSUEH: All right. Then I will 22 go to this row. Introduce yourself. 23 MS. OLSON: Paige Olson. I'm the Review 24 Compliance Coordinator for the South Dakota State 25 Historical Society, and thanks for having me here.

1	MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you.
2	MR. CLOUTHIER: Terry Clouthier, Sioux
3	Tribe, Tribal Archeologist.
4	MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you.
5	MR. YELLOW THUNDER: I'm Dennis Yellow
6	Thunder, a Natural Resources Technician for the Oglala
7	Sioux Tribe. And I'm just here today, I want to
8	welcome the NRC today, and all the other tribes that
9	are here. (Native language.)
10	MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you.
11	MS. CONVERSE: Good morning, everyone.
12	I'm Kat Converse, and I'm a hydrologist with natural
13	resources, the Oglala Sioux Tribe.
14	MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you.
15	MR. LAGARRY: Good morning. I'm Hannan
16	LaGarry. I'm a Professor of Geology and the Chair of
17	the Department of Math, Science and Technology at
18	Oglala Lakota College. Prior to coming to OLC a few
19	years ago, I was with the Nebraska Geological Survey
20	that mapped the archeological, paleontological, and
21	geological resources in western Nebraska.
22	MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you.
23	MR. ROM: I'm Lance Rom. I'm a consulting
24	archeologist with the Oglala Sioux Tribal Historic
25	Preservation Office.

MS. WHITING: Joyce Whiting, project officer for the Oglala Sioux Tribal Historic Preservation Office.

MR. MESTETH: (Native language.) I'm Wilmer Mesteth in the Tribal Historic Preservation Office. And I'm also a spiritual leader, and I'm an instructor at the Oglala Lakota College. And I'm a leader in my area, and I'm also from two fields on this reservation. (Native language.) Those are my fields from my mother and my father. Good to meet you all, and I hope we have some really positive and interesting discussions on yesterday, our trip over there to Crow Butte, and tomorrow we're going to be going over to Dewey-Burdock.

And yesterday we heard the State of Nebraska historical information, but that's Nebraska Historical Society. We haven't heard from our point of view, that land over there. That's my uncle Larry's great-grandfather, Chief Red Cloud. my great-grandfather's uncle, Chief Red Cloud. And we have a history that's passed down from generation to generation. And I was walking around that land looking over there yesterday, you haven't heard that part in these reports or anything. You haven't heard on behalf of our tribe.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We have a great history there, from there all the way -- talking about our aboriginal territory, extends way down to the -- they call it language.) That's Smoky Hill River down to the south. The White Mountain, Colorado, Wind River Valley, Big Horn Mountain, Tongue River all the way up to Canada. That's our aboriginal territory, and back eastward, Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, and up to the north above That's aboriginal territory, the the Great Lakes. Dakota, Lakota, Nakota people. And today we want to talk about our land, our historical lands and what took place on our lands. And why we don't want these nuclear companies coming in, especially these ones out of the country coming here onto our historical lands. have our graves of our ancestors here, We historical sites where things took place, and we have resources.

They were talking -- we were listening over there, I was observant about that, and they were talking about the Crawford people. Well, that company is entertaining the Crawford people. They never came over here on this side and talked to our people. And they never asked us our views. And that's what was missing there yesterday. They never consulted with our tribe, and that's what I want to talk about today.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, it's our water under here that's being affected by the mining. If you look at the health of our people, you need to research into the health situation here on Pine Ridge Reservation, and symptoms of diabetes, and pancreatic cancers that are springing up. We never had them before. Why is it?

The only thing that could be the main factor is the water, contaminated. Where? Where is that contamination coming from? It didn't come from our people and what we're doing with our land. So, that's what I want to talk about, because we have to speak in behalf of our land and our people here, and our livelihood.

Like my uncle was talking, we have a treaty, and there's treaty stipulations in there. We have treaty rights, our people, from this government, the United States of America, and our people. And those take precedence above anything else, nation to nation. So, speaking in behalf of our nation, and it would be good if we had a government official here to oversee this meeting, because it's nation to nation. So, I just want to mention that.

And I know my relatives come from up north. They have to be heard, too, because as a whole collectively, as a people, we're one people. We're

NEAL R. GROSS

not divided. So, today we're going to speak with one voice so that you can hear. So, I'm going to say about that much, and talk later.

MR. RAGONA: Good morning. My name is Don Ragona, I'm the Oglala Sioux Tribe Tribal Attorney. And, again, I want to join with everyone here thanking you for coming down. Thank you for recognizing this as a true government-to-government consultation, and that we are a nation. And that you're meeting us on common ground. I appreciate that.

But as Wilmer was saying, we really need to be very careful, and we need to be very concerned about the kind of activities that you're proposing happen, because we see what happens around the world. We see what happens with various accidents with uranium. We see what happens with -- even when there's not accidents. And we cannot afford, whether it's Pine Ridge, or Rosebud, or Flandreau, or any other part of our nation, we cannot afford that to happen, and so we're going to ask some questions. We're going to demand to see certain documents.

We also have to be cognizant of our treaty rights and making sure that whatever happens isn't in violation of those treaties, because those treaties are living and breathing documents. They're contracts

NEAL R. GROSS

between one nation to another, and they've alive, and they're still valid. So, we need to be careful with And that's why we need to take time to review documents, to review proposed activities before we can come to an informed decision, and before we can make recommendations. So, I think we just need to make sure that

you all know where we're coming from. We are here to listen, but we're also going to be asking questions. And then we need to all talk amongst ourselves, as well, both individually as tribes, and possibly collectively to see what is going to be the best for the people of South Dakota, because only in that way can we come to some sort of an agreement that we can all live with.

aqain, So, with that, thank you, appreciate you all coming down. And, again, for treating this government-to-government as а true meeting.

MS. BUCKMAN: My name is Sara Buckman, Outreach Coordinator for Natural Resources Regulatory Agency for the Oglala Sioux Tribe.

MS. BROPHY: My name is Anne Brophy. with Sanford Cohen & Associates. We're a contractor the NRC helping to prepare the environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I'm

2 particularly here to collect additional information 3 about historic resources. MS. YILMA: Good morning. My name is Haimanot Yilma. I am the Project Manager proposed Dewey-Burdock project. I work at NRC. I'd like to thank you for joining us today. she mentioned, we're here to collect information in these 8 early stages of our process. 9 10 My name is Polly Clark. MS. CLARK: I'm 11 working on review of the proposed Dewey-Burdock project. 12 Hello, PRIKRYL: my name Jim 13 MR. 14 Prikryl, and I work with Southwest Research Institute in San Antonio, Texas. And we're a contractor for the 15 And we're helping with development of 16 Environmental Impact Statement for Dewey-Burdock. 17 MR. GOODMAN: Good morning. I'm Nathan 18 I'm a biologist for the NRC, and I'm also 19 the Project Manager for the License Renewal 20 21 proposed north expansion on the two Crow Butte 22 facilities that we saw yesterday on our site tour. And I know it's been said before, but I 23 24 would just like to reiterate that I'm thankful to be 25 here on the reservation, and I'm honored to be here,

assessment of the Crow Butte II applications.

20 and happy to take any information and field questions that anybody may have. And I thank you all very, very much for coming. MS. RYAN: Good morning. My name is Michelle Ryan. I'm an Inter-governmental Liaison Project Manager at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. So, I don't work on specific projects, either on the uranium recovery site or on the nuclear reactor side, but we serve as Inter-governmental Liaisons who help technical project managers with their the

projects.

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, if you ever have general questions and you don't have a contact for a specific site, you can always come to our branch, the Inter-governmental Liaison Branch. I have cards, we'll have contact information for everyone at the end. But welcome. We're here to listen, and we hope that we can share information on both sides.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you. Did I miss anyone? Everybody has had opportunity to introduce yourself?

All right. The next item that I'd like to share with you, our original plan is this is a Section 106, NRC Section 106 process, and our original plan is to invite people, and SHPO, and also related personnel

NEAL R. GROSS

who were invited to come to this meeting. And this is the government officials. And I just want to make sure that all the tribes are comfortable, are okay with this kind of setting, so I know that there are several tribes here. First, Oglala Sioux, are you okay? Okay. Standing Rock Sioux is okay? Okay with you? All right. Okay. We also have Flandreau-Santee. Is okay with this format? Okay. Good. I'd also like to ask Sisseton-Wahpeton.

MR. WHITTED: Yes, it's okay with us.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Okay. So, it's okay with you. Okay, good. Thank you. Standing Rock Sioux?

MR. CLOUTHIER: Yes, it's fine.

MODERATOR HSUEH: It's fine with you? All right. Okay. So, all the tribes are okay with this kind of format. All right. So, we will proceed like that. Any comments or any concerns with that?

MR. KLUKAN: This is Brett Klukan. I'm going to point out one thing. There are members of the press here. We would ask that, it's general NRC policy that questions that come from the press go to our Office of Public Affairs, so you can speak with me or one of the other attorneys who can point to a representative from our Office of Public Affairs, if you have any questions after this meeting. So, just

NEAL R. GROSS

to let you know that the Office of Public Affairs.
Thanks.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you. Any comment or concern about this format? All right. It's good, so we are going to proceed.

The next item, I would like to ask Michelle Ryan from NRC, because we hand out a folder of information, and I'd like to ask her to kind of go through what's in that folder with you, so you are aware of what's in that folder.

MS. RYAN: Thank you, Kevin. Also, just if you can't hear us at one point or another, just remind us with a hand to sort of speak up. We're doing our best with a large facility, and we want to make sure that everyone who is making comments and sharing information is heard.

But in your folder you will find an agenda, a three-day agenda. Obviously, yesterday we toured the Crow Butte site, but we've got additional information in here about participants, and about the NRC presentation. The slides for NRC presentations are also on the lefthand side of the folder. If you don't have a folder, please raise your hand and I can get one to you.

Also, you'll find three CDs on the right-

NEAL R. GROSS

hand side. And I just want to go over is included in these. You'll find the General in-situ Environmental Impact Statement for leach uranium milling facilities. There's a list, so you don't need to write this down too quickly. I know it's a lot to take in. But this is a high-level generic Impact Statement for uranium recovery in the area, and includes South Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, and New And this was finalized in 2009, I believe Mexico. June of 2009.

The second thing you'll find is the Environmental Review Guidance for licensing actions. This is guidance to develop for uranium recovery environmental reviews. And then, finally, you'll find a CD labeled "Section 106 Process."

As you're all probably aware, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation provides a lot of good information, both for federal agencies and for tribal communities and tribal governments about the 106 consultation process. And what we've done is put some of the significant documents on this CD so that you don't just have to go to the link provided, but you've already got it here.

So, this has the regulations 36 CFR, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 800. And then this also

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

has guidance and a handbook from the ACHP, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. So, we find these to be really useful documents, and we thought this is something that you might want to check out already, if you have not.

Finally, you'll find an agenda for tomorrow's visit. What is our time tomorrow, Kevin?

MODERATOR HSUEH: Leave here around 9:30.

MS. RYAN: Okay, so 9:00 prayer tomorrow much like yesterday, and then, hopefully, we can all get on the bus by 9:30 to head out to the site.

I'm going to hand it back over to Kevin at this point. Kevin is going to go through the agenda, just give some reminders about today's program. Hopefully, we've all got our cell phones on silent or vibrate. We do want to make sure that nothing interferes with the comments, and we're all able to hear. So, thank you again. Welcome. And with that, I'll hand it back over to Kevin.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you, Michelle.

The next item, I want to go through a few ground rules for today's meeting. Michelle mentioned about the cell phones, your cell phones, that's first.

And second, try to talk to time everybody has a chance to be heard. And, also, please remember to

NEAL R. GROSS

identify yourselves before you speak, because this meeting is being recorded. And you can see our court reporter is there to record this meeting.

If for some reason you do not want to be recorded, let us know. I understand there's some information you do not want to be recorded, just let us know and then we will stop the recording process. So just be aware of that, that we are recording. So, please identify yourself before you speak.

Feel comfortable asking questions, or asking any explanation, so we are here to listen to you, and also try to help in any way we can to answer your questions.

The next item I would like to do is to go through the agenda with you. We thought we'd finish the introductions, and during the introductions I think that some member already offered opening remarks.

The next is the NRC presentations. would like to ask is to ask Mike to kind facilitate this part of the presentation, so Michael help with this part is going to me There are four NRC presentations. presentation. And we tried to -- a lot of the presentations is in the We do not plan to go through each slide in handout.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

detail, because we want to save as much time as possible to listen to your comments or your concerns. So, we may skip some of the slides, or some of the slides we just go through in very short period of time. But if you have questions, feel free to just let us know, and we will stop and answer your questions, because we do not plan to spend a lot of time on our presentations.

So, let's go next part. And after the presentation, hopefully, then we will start our -- the information gathering session. It's more formal information gathering session. We will basically just listen to your comments, concerns, and any information that you would like to provide to us so that will be most of the time that hopefully we would like to spend for the rest of the day.

So, with that, I would like to turn it over to Michael to facilitate NRC presentation. Any questions so far? Any comments? All right. I will turn it over to Michael.

MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Well, hello, again. Michael Catches Enemy. We kind of -- Kevin and I just briefly talked about this, and the reason that we were asked to kind of take the lead is just because it's hosted here on the Pine Ridge Reservation, being in

NEAL R. GROSS

close proximity to both of these uranium mines.

After talking to us, a few of the other Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, it seems like we're all in concurrence on a lot of things, there's a lot of similarities and whatnot, so I'm not presenting here as part of the NRC. I wanted to make that clear. We're just hosting, as Oglala Sioux Tribe we're here hosting, but Kevin asked me if I could kind of take the lead on introducing folks and get through these presentations.

So, this first one, as part of the Section have Kevin, 106 we'll who is the Chief Branch, Environmental Review Division Management and Environmental Protection. He'll go through his slides and his presentation. But like Kevin said, if you have questions or concerns during the presentation feel free to address those and bring those forward. Kevin.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you, Michael. Again, my name is Kevin Hsueh. I'm with NRC. I will talk about -- I'll just give you a summary about NRC, who we are, what we do, and also give you a summary about our current active Section 106 activities. And after my talk, Bill von Till who is the Chief of Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch, he's going to give

NEAL R. GROSS

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

you information about uranium recovery regulations and operations.

After that, Nate Goodman, he's the Project
Manager for the chemical Crow Butte projects, and so
he's going to talk about the project. And Haimanot
Yilma is the Project Manager for the site, so she's
going to talk about they are doing with the project.
Both Project Managers are from the Environmental
Review Branch, so they are the Environmental Project
Managers.

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission was created in 1974 by Congress. We are an independent regulatory agency. NRC is headed by five commissioners, and all nominated by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate.

We have about 4,000 employees, and our headquarters is located in Rockville, Maryland. Compare with EPA, DOE, we are relatively small agency. Our mission is to protect the public health and safety, promote a common defense, and security, and protect the environment.

We regulate nuclear reactors, nuclear materials, including uranium recovery, nuclear waste, nuclear security. What we don't do, we don't regulate nuclear weapons, military reactors, or space vehicle

NEAL R. GROSS

reactors. We don't clean up contaminated sites.

Other federal agencies like EPA, DOE, and others

manage that responsibility. We don't clean up the

contaminated sites.

We are neutral on nuclear power, so we don't argue about nuclear power. We do not build or operate uranium recovery facilities, or other nuclear facilities, nor do we manage like BLM, we do not. We are the regulatory agency, we review license applications and then we issue a license, so we don't manage the land.

We have a lot of intergovernmental relations with other governments and governmental organizations including DOE, EPA, Tribal Governments, IAEA, state governments.

review of uranium Our recovery applications is comprised of two review, one is the safety review, and then the other one is environmental And those reviews are conducted in parallel. Safety review is to evaluate the proposed facility operational procedures, design, and Radiation Protection Program to insure that the proposed action accomplished accordance with be in can regulations. And Bill von Till is going to provide more information about the safety review.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In terms of environmental review, it's conducted in accordance with our regulations, 10 CFR Part 51 which implements the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. NEPA requires federal agencies to consider environmental impacts before making a decision. The purpose of the NEPA is to inform the decision makers and the public of the proposed action, reasonable alternatives, and their environmental impacts.

In addition to NEPA, we also the Historic Preservation Act National also federal agencies to take into account the effects of our licensing actions on historic properties. are four steps. Step one is to initiate a Section 106 This has to do with setting consultation process. identify appropriate SHPO/THPO to consult The licensing action could during the process. affect the historic properties, we need to consult with consulting parties, and to proceed to identify historic properties.

If historical properties are present, then we need to consult with consulting parties to proceed to assess possible adverse effects. If there is an adverse effect, we need to consult with consulting parties to find ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

adverse effects.

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

During the consultation, as a result of this consultation what usually result, will end up with an MOA, а Memorandum of Agreement with applicants, SHPO, THPO, and NRC, and maybe BLM if the facility is located -- if the proposed facility is located in the BLM land, then there may be BLM. outlines three major the MOA factors avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse effects.

We have five active ongoing Section 106 projects. One is the Uranerz Nichols Ranch Project in Wyoming. The second one, two projects for build and license renewal, and Crow Butte North Trend that we visited yesterday, that's chemical in Nebraska. And then we also have Powertech the site that we are going to visit tomorrow in South Dakota. And that's what is the Strata Energy-Ross in Wyoming, so these are the five active Section 106 projects that we currently have.

We also follow the 36 CFR that encourage early coordination among Section 106 -- between Section 106 and the NEPA regarding the effects of historic properties. Our NEPA documents will have several sections to address impact on historic and cultural resources. So, our NEPA documents will be

NEAL R. GROSS

used to fulfill both NHPA and NEPA.

This review about the NHPA and the NEPA.

So, NHPA has four steps, and the NEPA we will have a draft and a final document. And our goal is that we are going to have MOA to resolve the adverse effects, our goal is to have the MOA in place before we issue the final documents.

Here are particular information. The first one is our website web page at NRC.gov. And the second link will give you all the uranium recovery-related information. Those are very helpful websites if you want to get additional information.

Thank you. Any questions, or comments?

MR. WESTON: Define adverse effects for me

within 10 CFR Part 50.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Adverse effects, for example we have one project and is very close to the Pumpkin Butte in Wyoming. And the adverse effect there is the adverse effect because the site -- the facility there, the future of the Pumpkin Butte has some visual impact as a result of the project. So, that would be one example that we use. And we have memorandums -- we are planning on working our a Memorandum of Agreement because of the effort we tried to -- in the Memorandum of Agreement we try to address

NEAL R. GROSS

33
or mitigate or minimize a visual impact. It has many
different kind of situations. I just wanted to give
you one example that could be a visual impact, because
the facility that may have some.
MR. WESTON: So, in your mitigation
process, when you start that process, is there the
thought process that say something does happen, say
something does get away, are we included in that

MODERATOR HSUEH: Yes. If there's adverse effect and that's -- as I mentioned is that Memorandum of Agreement. The Memorandum of Agreement will be signed for example, on the tribal lands. There will be five signatories, will include tribes, so -- and then also NRC would sign that MOA, so it's an agreement there.

MR. WESTON: Okay.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Okay.

MR. KLUKAN: Let me make one clarifying point. You mentioned 10 CFR Part 51, which is one of the volumes in the NRC's regulations. That is how we implement the National Environmental Policy, in which we look at significant or minor impacts.

The terminology "adverse effect" comes into play under 30 CFR, Code of Federal Regulations,

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

process?

under the National Historic Preservation Act. So, we don't use that particular language of NEPA. to clarify, Part 51 is regarding NEPA, not necessarily National Historic Preservation Act applies under Section 106, just to clarify.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you, Brett.

MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Other comments questions? We'll keep this rolling. Okay. Thank you, Kevin.

> Thank you, Mike. MODERATOR HSUEH:

MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Next up on the agenda is William Von Till. He's the Chief of the Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch, Division of Waste Management, Environmental Section.

MR. VON TILL: Thank you. I'm going to go through these slides kind of quick so we can get to hear your comments. I want to make one clarification.

The NRC is not for uranium, and it's not We're neutral. Our job is to make against uranium. sure that these operations are safe, and protective of public health and the environment. That's the NRC's So, I just wanted to make that clear.

I'm going to go through just a little bit of the regulations that we have that we implement our authority over these sites. What these facilities are

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

all about. Luckily, we had a site visit yesterday with most of you to see the Crow Butte facility, an operating facility we have in Crawford, Nebraska.

The process itself, our emphasis on safety at these facilities, and also our emphasis -- in-situ recovery is mainly about groundwater. It's different from conventional uranium mining and milling, and the emphasis that we have on safety is groundwater and protection of the resources. And, also, environmental monitoring.

Regulations in a nutshell for the NRC is under the Atomic Energy Act. Congress also enacted what's called the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 because of the massive tailing sites at conventional uranium mining and milling facilities. We also followed Part 51 in the National Environmental Policy Act.

What's regulated? What does the NRC regulate, and what do we not regulate? We regulate the milling of uranium. We don't regulate the mining.

A lot of people call these in-situ recovery facilities mines. We don't really call them mines, we call them uranium recovery facilities.

We don't regulate conventional mining. We don't regulate the exploration of sites in mining

NEAL R. GROSS

sites. What we do regulate is conventional heap leach and in-situ recovery uranium recovery operations like the one you saw in Crawford, Nebraska.

I'm just going to go through this kind of quickly here. This part I believe is in your Where are these facilities located? handouts. kind of experience do we have on operating facilities? The Crow Butte facility we saw yesterday has been in operation for about 20 years, and we've regulating that facility. We also have a number of other facilities that we regulate that are operating We have two in Wyoming, one of them is right now. Smith Ranch, I mean, Cameco's other facility. called the Smith Ranch Facility, kind of near Douglas, Wyoming at the Power River basin of Wyoming. That's a large facility. That's the largest facility of its kind in the United States, and they produce about two million pounds of uranium per year.

Also, we just allowed the restart of a facility that used to be called the Cogema Iragary and Christensen Ranch Facility. It's now owned by Uranium One, and it's located in the Powder River basin, as well. And they just started their operations back up in about January.

There is the Crow Butte facility, which is

NEAL R. GROSS

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	an operating facility. The Dewey-Burdock project is
2	just south of the Black Hills National Forest. And we
3	have a number of other operations here. These are
4	operating. These are a standby proposed facility, so
5	it's a good map just to illustrate where some of these
6	facilities are located.
7	What's the process all about, the in-situ
8	recovery process? That's what I want to kind of key
9	on, because that's the type of facilities that we're
10	dealing with, what you're concerned with, with the
11	Crawford, Nebraska facility, and the Dewey-Burdock
12	Project.
13	MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Was Dewey-Burdock on
14	that map?
15	MR. VON TILL: It's not on that map.
16	MR. CATCHES ENEMY: And is not the case in
17	process?
18	MR. VON TILL: What's that?
19	MR. CATCHES ENEMY: It's not on
20	MR. VON TILL: It's just we got this
21	map, and it wasn't updated.
22	MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Oh.
23	MR. VON TILL: So, we're going to update
24	this map. This map actually comes from another
25	source, but it's located right here. And we'll update

that, so that's located. Thanks, Mike.

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PARTICIPANT: Is Dewey-Burdock in Wyoming?

MR. VON TILL: No, Dewey-Burdock is just in South Dakota. It's up against the border as you'll see tomorrow, but it does not go into Wyoming.

What do these facilities look like? Most of you who were on the tour yesterday, you got to see what these facilities look like. Some of you did not. This is a typical example of the mill processing building, and this is the administrative offices. And that's what it looks like, basically. This is the Smith Ranch Facility in Wyoming, very similar to the facility you saw yesterday.

Here's the in-situ recovery process in a What they're doing is they're trying to nutshell. extract the uranium out of the sand, which is -- it's in the sandstones in these bold front deposits, which I'll get into in a second. They inject water fortified with carbon dioxide and oxygen to free up the uranium from the sand particles. They have injection wells, and recovery wells. the Once recovery fluid comes out of the ground, they run it through resins, and then run it through the process on to make yellowcake, which is the end product here.

The one thing I want to emphasize with

this picture is the extensive monitoring that we require as part of these operations to make sure that the recovery fluids in the aquifer are contained and do not damage the resources in the surrounding area. We have monitoring wells in the same aquifer where the recovery is going on, and we have monitoring wells above, sometimes below these confining layers to make sure that it's a safe operation.

there are amenable to this process. In order to conduct this kind of process, you have to have water within the aquifer. You have to have permeability, or water needs to move through the sandstone so that they can conduct the operations. And you need to have sufficient confining layers to trap in the recovery area so that you do not contaminate the waters above.

Here's another picture of this operation.

Again, this is the uranium right here in the sandstones. These are the confining units, and here is the monitoring wells to protect the water resources around the facility.

This is what the uranium looks like in the sandstone that they're trying to extract out of the ground. This is what it looks like in nature. This is a person's rock hammer, the uranium is right

NEAL R. GROSS

here. It's in a roll front deposit like a C.

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is a typical well field of what you saw yesterday, which consists of well patterns. have injector wells here, and pumping wells here all through this well field, and there's also monitoring The key thing I want to point out here is the extensive monitoring for these operations to make sure that the water resources are protected. monitoring well ring surveilling the well field, and we also have monitoring wells above and below like in the picture here. Monitoring wells above, and monitoring wells horizontally.

The way these operations start off as far as the construction is, first, they drill wells in the ground. As you heard yesterday, the Crow Butte Facility has about 5,500 wells that they've installed over a 20-year process. So, the first operation is well drilling. And here's an example of that up in Smith Ranch, Wyoming. They're installing all the wells associated with the well field, the injector wells, the pumping wells, and the monitoring wells.

Here is a picture up in Smith Ranch,
Wyoming of development of well fields. Up here is
where they drilled some wells. They just put these
wells in here. These wells are attached to these

header houses through pipes in the ground, and from 1 the header houses they run trunk lines back to the 2 facility to run the water over the resins. 3 So, this is a typical well. And, as you can see, they're re-seeding the area at this point in They do have to do some construction in Wyoming because it's cold. They need to put the lines under operations 8 the ground. There is in Texas, Kazakhstan and other countries with wells where the 9 10 piping might be above ground. In this climate up 11 here, it's always going to be below the ground. This is a picture of some trunk lines, and 12 also the lines going to the header houses. These 13 14 trunk lines go back to the facility or satellite facility. So, this is during the construction of the 15 well field itself. 16 Here, again, it's after that picture. 17 wells are in place, the header house is in place, and 18 all the piping is under the ground. 19 20 MR. ROM: Ι have a question about 21 construction. 22 MR. VON TILL: Sure. MR. ROM: Can you go back? 23 24 MR. VON TILL: Yes. 25 MR. ROM: Now, you see where the metal **NEAL R. GROSS**

door is on buildings and the vegetation. That whole area was disturbed during your --

MR. VON TILL: Yes, it was.

MR. ROM: Okay.

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VON TILL: This whole area is disturbed, and it's disturbed in this way right here. Do a lot of disturbance in the well field itself, but afterwards this is what it looks like. And then further on, this is what it looks like later after the grass has taken root, the pronghorn antelope come back in, and it gets more back into normal operations. But there is disturbance of the land in the development of well fields. I wanted to show you some of these pictures to show you what it looks like.

Here, again, is a typical well field. In Wyoming, the antelope are out there all the time, big population of antelope. So, after everything is in place, there's not much -- there's no exposure or anything above the ground to things like antelope or people in this area.

Again, here are the wells, and here is the header houses. Another picture of the well field. This is a picture of the Crow Butte facility that you saw yesterday. And here are the wells, and the header houses.

This is kind of a process as it comes into the central processing facility itself. Again, from the formation, the water comes out and goes through the ion exchange resins column. The resins pick up the uranium, then they take the resins to the central processing facility. They add some chemicals, and it goes through a chemical process. Eventually, the product that they're making is yellowcake uranium. From there, the yellowcake is shipped on to the fuel cycle, to the conversion facility, and to admission, and then to fuel fabrication. So, this is basically the process in a nutshell. Oh, sure.

MR. RAGONA: When that yellowcake is produced, how is it stored so it doesn't get into the atmosphere and the environment? How do you do that?

MR. VON TILL: That's a good question.

I'll show you a picture later on. When they're dealing with the yellowcake itself, the yellowcake dryer, that's all a contained process with a vacuum dryer. And people, the workers that go into that room have to have respirators on. That's one of the riskiest process for the workers themselves. And there's procedures in place so that they're not exposed, and so that the uranium doesn't come out of that confined space.

So, during that you have to have respirators on. They put the uranium in drums, they 3 seal the drums up before they come out of that area. And eventually they're put on trucks and shipped out. But they're contained in drums. MR. RAGONA: So, it's never live boost to vibrate or anything. MR. VON TILL: No, it is not. And that's 8 one of the key parts of the process that we make sure 9 it's contained in the yellowcake itself. And in the 10 11 yellowcake dryer the workers have to have respirators. That doesn't get outside that. 12 Here's kind of a look at the process, too, 13 14 from a more simplified process. Here's the production fluid, the uranium fortified water is run over resin 15 beads just like you would have water filtration. 16 add salt and soda ash through the process here, as it 17 goes through the process, you see it become yellow. 18 This is the filter press yellowcake material, and this 19 is the dried yellowcake here. 20 21 MR. VANCE: Excuse me? 22 MR. VON TILL: Yes? This is Steve Vance from Pine MR. VANCE: 23 24 You're saying that none of it ever leaks into

the air.

1	MR. VON TILL: You mean the yellowcake?
2	MR. VANCE: No, the contaminant, when they
3	go through the hydration process. During the whole
4	process, no contaminant goes into the area.
5	MR. VON TILL: There's some radon that
6	comes out of the whole facility, but the yellowcake
7	itself, the particulate with the yellowcake does not
8	come out. It's contained within a vacuum in the room
9	so that the yellowcake does not come out and come off
10	the property.
11	MR. VANCE: I guess what I'm going to, I
12	kind of asked the question earlier.
13	MR. VON TILL: There is not that
14	yellowcake. There are I'll show you here later.
15	We have environmental monitoring stations set up to
16	test for that. And they have very, very low levels of
17	things like radon, but not the yellowcake itself.
18	MR. VANCE: Well, how often is that
19	checked on?
20	MR. VON TILL: Continuously. I've got
21	some slides, later on I'll show you that.
22	MR. VANCE: Okay. And NRC is the one who
23	does that?
24	MR. VON TILL: No, we're the ones who make
25	the licensee do that. And we review the data they
	NEW D 0000

1	collect. And we inspect it, we inspect these
2	facilities the Smith Ranch facility twice a year.
3	MR. VANCE: So, they monitor it
4	themselves.
5	MR. VON TILL: They monitor it, but we
6	inspect the information, and we look at the
7	information.
8	MR. VANCE: Nebraska SHPO, those
9	monitor this?
10	MR. VON TILL: I'm sorry?
11	MR. VANCE: The SHPO from Nebraska doesn't
12	monitor
13	MR. VON TILL: No, once it gets to this
14	stage, this is purely safety. This isn't part of the
15	NEPA process. This is just oversight of the safety of
16	the operation.
17	MR. VANCE: Yes, we're talking about like
18	earlier you saw on the monitor wells on the outside.
19	MR. VON TILL: That's the groundwater
20	monitoring. We also
21	MR. VANCE: But what I'm asking about, if
22	the water contaminants coming from this facility for
23	water and for air, they self-monitor.
24	MR. VON TILL: Well, they collect the
25	information, but we inspect it, and we review it as an
1	

oversight.

MR. VANCE: So, you're just basically going on what they report to you.

MR. VON TILL: Yes.

MR. LaGARRY: I just want, before we move on past the actual process, I wanted to bring up the recurring issue of confinement.

In all those years working for the Nebraska Geological Survey and mapping the geology of western Nebraska, we recognized that the Black Hills uplift in South Dakota as it uplifted brittlely fractured the earth's crust in this region, and it's shot through with faults and joints. And in this context, joints are cracks in the earth's crust where there hasn't been movement. So, you don't necessarily have to have earthquakes to have joints.

And as a result of this mapping work that we did in Nebraska, the natural resource districts in Nebraska that regulate and monitor groundwater recognized connections between the underground waters, including the uranium ore that's mined in Nebraska is a local aquifer. It has its own water in it, and people on the Pine Ridge Reservation and the towns of Porcupine, Wounded Knee, Manderson, Kyle, Oglala, they tap into this water-bearing rock unit with uranium in

it for all kinds of purposes.

In Nebraska, efforts are made to minimize that, but yet it still goes on in the stock tanks and whatnot. But the natural resource districts recognize that all the aquifers in Nebraska, including the uriniferous one, and the surface water aquifers, the shallow alluvium that gets recharged by rainwater that some people get their water out of, that these things are all connected.

In the Scottsbluff area, irrigation canals along the Platte River accidently connected to the uranium ore deposit down there, and contaminated a lot of towns' drinking water. And with regards to whether or not the water is getting past the monitoring wells at these uranium mines, it's never been demonstrated that water is escaping the confinement through this -- what's called secondary porosity, water movement through these cracks.

However, you might have noticed from their drawing that the monitoring wells are evenly spaced. What I would like to see, and what would satisfy me on this issue of confining layers are efforts that -- on behalf of NRC, or in regulating the uranium mines to have them pay special attention to the secondary porosity. And rather than pump test in a standard

pattern like they do in these aquitards, to pay special emphasis to pump tests specifically on faults and joints that intersect the permit area. This is the only way that you're going to be able to get at whether or not confinement is breached through some of these cracks.

The standard pump test is to put evenly spaced injection wells around a center extraction well, and then pump water out of the center to make sure that there's suction, and then, I mean, if the amount of suction you get during your pump test matches your expectations about the porosity of the sediment, then you're fine. But I've maintained that if you don't have a pump test where you have one or both of either your injection or your well specifically extraction on one millimeter thick but very widespread, it's like a sheet of paper in thickness, but it goes for tens of miles, and thousands of feet.

You know, if you don't actually get one of your wells on one of these fractures, you'll never understand if there's transmission of fluids along it.

And to the best of my knowledge, that's never been done.

So, while the mines self-monitor and pump

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

test, and report that they have containment, in my review of -- I've been to Crow Butte, I've toured it many times. I've visited with the geologists there many times. In my view, the issue of containment is probably the weakest link environmentally in this entire process.

Once it's out of the ground and into the uranium mine's plant, from what I've seen, it's pretty well maintained. They do contain it. They take great pains to contain the yellowcake, the fluids. Occasionally, pipes do break, but these things are never that bad.

The issue that I think -- with regard to the milling process is the issue of containment. And this is an issue for Dewey-Burdock, it's an issue for Crow Butte. It's an issue for the North Platte River Valley, and the Southern Panhandle of Nebraska. That's how far this fracture pattern extends. So, it's a widespread issue. And before we moved on from containment, I just wanted to do that. And I'm Hanna LaGarry from OLC.

MR. VON TILL: Thank you for your comments. We do have a number of applications that we're reviewing right now. One of them is the Ur-Energy Lost Creek Project in the Great Divide basin of

NEAL R. GROSS

Wyoming. And that particular site does have a fault through some of the proposed well fields, and we required them to do some additional pump testing, and to have detection and monitoring wells on both sides of that fault, and also to model that situation to fully understand that particular fault. So, we do agree with you that secondary porosity, what he's talking about are things like faults, and frayed channels and all kinds of things where the water can move in certain directions, not just like a sandbox.

In the true environment, everything is not like a sandbox, and there is lots of secondary porosity and so forth. And we do look at that in the application. That's very good comments.

And then again here is the monitoring system that we have, what you're talking about, as far containment. When we have faults and things like that, like we do with the Lost Creek Project that we're working on right now, we do require additional pump testing with that kind of a situation. But that's a good comment.

Let's see here. So, that was the process.

This is a picture of a satellite building. Sometimes
the operations that they have are too far away from
the central processing plant, and what they do is they

NEAL R. GROSS

run the water to what's called a satellite building, which is just a building with a bunch of resin tanks. These tanks here contain those resins that I pointed out right here, these resins in these large tanks. Once these resin tanks are fully saturated, these trucks unload the resins and take it back to the central processing facility. Here is another picture. Here's a truck right here that takes the resins back to the central facility.

This is further in the process here with the yellowcake thickener, where you can see the yellow product there. Here is the yellow -- the filter press.

MR. CLOUTHIER: What do you guys monitor on these trucks in terms of the satellite in the central process area. I know there's been incidences over fracking. I know that's not an issue that you guys actually address. There's been issues with fracking fluid leaking from those trucks as they're traveling, taking them to their injection wells, leaving their injection wells. What process do you guys have to monitor that?

MR. VON TILL: Well, what these trucks are carrying is the resins, these mingled resins with water. They abide by the Department of Transportation

NEAL R. GROSS

regulations with the trucks as they move from the county limits and so forth. So, it's really under the Department of Transportation, but we inspect the trucks to make sure that they are sound, and so forth. We really haven't had that kind of issue with this particular type of operation with the trucks.

We've had issues more with the lines that I showed you breaking, and things like that. And we're more concerned with that. But that's a good question. Most of the time, like at the Wyoming facility, they're running about five miles or so on the dirt roads. One of the operations is going to be 110 miles away, but we do check out the trucks. And there's procedures that they have to check the trucks, they scan the trucks, they do all kinds of things to make sure the trucks are safe. Yes?

MR. RAGONA: I'm curious, what's the life span of one of these facilities like Smith Ranch?

MR. VON TILL: Well, the well fields itself is probably 10 years or so. What they do is they move from well field to well field, so some of the well fields that they did 20 years ago are played out in 10 years or so, but they're now recovering in the other areas.

MR. RAGONA: So, these buildings, and

NEAL R. GROSS

about how long do they stay up and operate with all the equipment inside?

MR. VON TILL: Approximately 20 years or so.

MR. RAGONA: Now, moving ahead 20 years, what do you do with the building, the equipment, houses, and what's the process? I know we're probably down the road from that, but what's the process of removing that and making sure that there's no contaminants left behind?

MR. VON TILL: That's a good question. At the end of the operations, they're required to fully decommission and declaim all the operations. Things like some of these tanks and so forth that might be contaminated, they're what we call solid waste material, 11(e)(2) byproduct material under the law. It's a definition under the law, that the byproduct material from the recovery of uranium, if it's solid, they have to take it and dispose of it in a facility that's licensed to take this kind of material.

For example, these two operations, they take that type of material to the White Mason building down in Utah, and put it into a contained tailings there, that kind of material. So, at the end of this, and what this is going to look like is just,

NEAL R. GROSS

basically, the land we're going to completely take
out the piping, abandon the wells, take out all those
buildings, and take them to facilities that take that
kind of material, and put it back the way it was.
MR. RAGONA: Are tests done on the ground,
anything to make sure that there's no contaminants
left in the dirt, as well?
MR. VON TILL: Yes, absolutely. And when
they have spills and things like that that do happen,
they're required to clean that up and to do testing to
make sure of the cleanup. That's a good question.
Again, here's the yellowcake filter press.
And you were asking earlier about the room where they
deal with the yellowcake. And this individual here
has a respirator on. This room is under a vacuum so
that the material does not get out. This is the
yellowcake here, and it's contained in these 55-gallon
drums.
MR. CATCHES ENEMY: So, when you say
vacuumed, where does it go? Where is the vacuum?
MR. VON TILL: It goes back into the
actual lubricant. It's a closed circuit.
MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Eventually, that has
to go somewhere. That building will be decommissioned
at some time. Where does that

MR. VON TILL: Well, the building then -if the building is contaminated, they break it down
and they take it to a place like White Mason. But
it's a vacuum -- it's a closed operation.

You're asking about environmental monitoring, as well. We have groundwater monitoring, which is a key component of these facilities, but also radiation is as far the concerned, environmental monitoring stations that are required at each facility. They take a lot of weather data in the beginning to figure out what the downwind directions are, and then they put these environmental monitoring stations downwind of a facility, and they collect a lot of things like air particulates, radon, and direct radiation to make sure that the facility is leaking radiation.

And what they look like, here's an environmental monitoring station right here. This is a MET Station, or a meteorological data gathering station. This is an environmental monitoring station, another look at environmental monitoring station which is set downwind of these facilities to collect air particulates, radon, and direct radiation. And they collect this data, and we inspect it, and review it. Yes, Mike?

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	MR. CATCHES ENEMY: In our site visit at
2	Crow Butte yesterday, I didn't see any of these. Are
3	these there at Crow Butte?
4	MR. VON TILL: They're there. If I would
5	have asked them to do it a little differently, I would
6	have had them show you some of those environmental
7	monitoring stations, but they're there. They have a
8	number of them.
9	MR. CATCHES ENEMY: So, Crow Butte does
10	this, or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission does this
11	part?
12	MR. VON TILL: The licensee implements it
13	under our oversight. So, they collect the data, we
14	review their labs, we review their procedures, and
15	then we review the data to make sure they're doing it
16	right.
17	MS. OLSON: So, one other question, and it
18	goes back to Steve's question earlier. Paige Olson.
19	So, what kind of contaminants are you looking for
20	aerial, so radon, what else?
21	MR. VON TILL: Air particulates. I'm not
22	a health physicist, so I have to get back to you on
23	that. But, basically, direct radiation, like gamma
24	radiation. They have a license that like people's
25	TLD badges that you saw all these people wearing

Т	yesterday. That collects direct gamma-type radiation,
2	they collect radon, and like air particulates, gross
3	alpha, things like that, different radionuclides that
4	you might expect to get.
5	MS. OLSON: So, I guess my question is
6	then, is what kind of air contaminants are you looking
7	for?
8	MR. VON TILL: Radon.
9	MS. OLSON: Just radon, that's it?
LO	MR. VON TILL: Radon and air particulates,
L1	such as things like gross alpha, which is a measure of
L2	radiation.
L3	MS. OLSON: Okay. So, you're looking for
L4	radon and radiation levels.
L5	MR. VON TILL: Yes.
L6	MS. OLSON: In the air. Anything else?
L 7	MR. VON TILL: As far as the air monitor?
L 8	MS. OLSON: Yes.
L 9	MR. VON TILL: No. Yes?
20	MR. WHITTED: Can you go back to where
21	that guy is sealing that yellowcake?
22	MR. VON TILL: Sure.
23	MR. WHITTED: What's the radioactivity
24	level at this point, that yellowcake got exposed. And
25	this suit don't look like it's very

MR. VON TILL: Yes, that's good For something like yellowcake, the biggest -- for radiation, you have all kinds of different ways of the radiation getting out. One is direct radiation you can't see, beta and gamma-type rays. facilities, though, the main culprit is what we call alpha radiation. And that, the main thing is It's not so much the direct radiation ingesting it. that you can't It's more getting see. yellowcake, ingesting it, getting it in your eyes, in your That's the biggest threat in this nose. radiation yellowcake. And it's called alpha And that's what he is specifically contamination. protecting himself from. He has gloves on him, he has a Tyvek suit, and he has a respirator to protect him from this particular type of radiation.

Now, in a nuclear power plant, that's a different story. You have a lot more gamma and betatype radiation. And this wouldn't quite cut it at that type of facility. But this facility here, the main thing is breathing and getting it in your eyes, and things like that. So it's more -- he's protected from that particular type of radiation hazard.

MS. RYAN: Bill, just to follow-up -- I know it was discussed yesterday.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. VON TILL: Okay. Also, when this guy goes into a room like this, he not only has a TLD badge that records direct radiation, but he also --sometimes they also use these things that pump in air and give direct radiation measurements as to what he's being exposed to, and then they evaluate that.

In the old days, back before the NRC regulated these facilities, they didn't use respirators, so that's been a change since 1978 to make this a more safe operation. They didn't do this kind of thing back in the `50s, and back in the Cold War era. It's an improvement.

MR. WHITTED: Did they go through a lot of these young men?

MR. VON TILL: No, as you saw with the graphs yesterday, the amount of radiation that these folks get is far lower than a typical radiation that you and I get just living on the earth. So, it's very low levels that these guys get.

Now, the people over at Fukushima, Japan going into that reactor and dealing with that, that's a different story. They're actually getting exposed to higher levels of radiation, and they might have to go in for five minutes, and come out. But these facilities here, these guys based on the bioassay

NEAL R. GROSS

results, and all of the monitoring that's done, very, very low levels at these facilities. Yes?

MR. IN THE WOODS: I have questions here. Bryce In The Woods, Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe. main concern would be the excursion of this product, you know, the end result goes into fuel rods that go into the nuclear plants, that NRC right now, they're spacing some infrastructure, not only NRC but this whole whole country here is based our infrastructure detail and degradation. And you have pipelines that are emitting titans, all byproducts that are very cancer-causing emitting from leaking pipelines underneath these plants. there's 65 nuclear plants, and this radiation that's end getting out into the streams, that's the byproduct, period. And radon, you can't control it. It's going to emanate, wherever it's at it's going to go into the air, the air quality. Nobody can tell what that's going to do, and what it has been doing for the last 50 years.

Twenty years ago standing here in South Dakota, 46th populated state in the 50 states, Wyoming is number 50. And Wyoming is probably the biggest exploited state in the Union because of the low population probably, but the main concern again is

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

this excursion of this product from -- where the main concern would be this bleed production.

When you as NRC only inspect twice a year and you see things happening now due to the infrastructure to date, that it's not -- you can't insure the safety and health of not only the two-leggers, but all life forms here on the planet. And this is a very deadly energy. Cleanest energy but the deadliest energy. And it's not getting any better.

It has to be probably a whole reevaluation that NRC has to do in order to deal with the safe -- one of the end byproducts, spent fuel rods. What is NRC going to do with spent fuel rods? When that question can be answered, maybe the public could breathe safe. That's one question that needs to be answered.

And now, I hate to say it, you mentioned Japan, you mentioned the gamma, beta rays, you know, there was three meltdowns over there, and those spent rods are exposed, so you get the Union of Scientists, you get as many people as you can to answer some of these tough questions that are coming up on this planet because of nuclear power.

I think some countries are looking at -in time, the time line they're going to stop using

NEAL R. GROSS

nuclear power. I think Germany is one, but then there's some food, E. coli over in Germany happening. You know, it seems like when you're doing and with -this has been going on, and we look at Cave Hills treaty territory, 1851 treaty territory is what we're talking about, a lot of our elders put that in our And we've been ignored for decades. the `50s, because of where this is located, they're starting a termination policy on the tribes. also, a lot of liquor into the reservations. And, at the same time, they started digging for uranium. So, get politically attacked, and then get attacked because you vocalize what our Chiefs sitting here, and our jobs with the Black Hills Treaty Council, and the ones before them. Their concerns with the land, and the air, and the water, and the next seven generations, that's never taken And we're still dealing with that in Cave concern. Hills up there.

Karen McGee, I believe one was a Senator.

We got Senators and House of Representatives that are

-- you look at, they're becoming millionaires. And
you look at the community, the district I represent up
on Cheyenne River, one of the poorest counties in
America. It's about economy, too. But we don't see

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that, that royalty like Wyoming, the State of Wyoming gets royalty, so does the United States Treasury. I believe it's \$1 billion that the state gets in Wyoming, \$1 billion in royalties, treaty territories. So, it is about economy, it is about equal and fair justice.

But the concern is NRC only inspects twice, and lets the companies -- you know, honesty is the best policy, but if they're getting fined, they're not so honest. And if we had a bleed in production that went up or down, that's insuring that the company is going to go bankrupt because they have to go in there and do reverse osmosis to that whole aquifer. And that's expensive. So, that's another thing, is how are you going to deal with contaminated water? Who is responsible for that cleanup? And you heard some words here about aquifers and contamination. Again, that's -- water is life. So, the groundwater, what we can't see, the water quality, the air quality, you know, NRC is not insuring that.

NRC has to play a bigger role in dealing with not only the license, issuing that permit, but you need to be responsible to the -- before and after of this whole nuclear process that you guys are facing now in this country. So, those are my concerns, is

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

who's going to clean up the contaminated water? You have technology now, NASA. We have that technology here, but when you have oil and gas companies that corner the market in patents, and then you have something that might be of value to our people's health and safety, but it can't be brought to the market because the oil companies, or whoever has got that patent and won't allow that to happen. That's another concern that needs to be out to the public. The public needs to know that.

There's a lot of things here that energy cornered you can't hold companies are SO them accountable. So, NRC cannot say that who's going to clean those contaminated waters up, who's going to clean up Cave Hills, Slim Buttes, who's going to clean those areas up that are going into the water, that are going into the Missouri? Who's going to clean that And the biggest concern is the aquifers. That's that whole cycle of life here on this planet, and it's being contaminated.

And 20 years ago, you could look to the east or the west, now you could see the smog, the pollution out here. We've got mercury in our dams, our fish. We've got 2.7, maybe more alpha emitters in our water that we drink, that kids drink.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I know some of that's natural, but some of
that's a direct result from 50 years of mining that's
affecting not only you, or me, it's affecting this
whole country. Now with Japan, wherever that
radiation drops, it's going to affect that area
because it comes down with rain. Big concern, who's
going to clean the contaminated waters? Thank you.
MR. VON TILL: Thank you for your
comments. I did want to stress that all the
information that they collect at these environmental
monitoring stations, and the groundwater monitoring
and so forth, that's put into semi-annual effluent
monitoring reports that comes to us, and it's publicly
available information.
Also, our inspection reports that we have
are also public information, as well. And for the
facility like Crow Butte, you can always see for
yourself some of the information that's collected at
this facility, as well. We try to make it an open
process. Very good comments.
I just want to get through this so I can
give more time for exactly those kinds of comments.
MR. RED CLOUD: Oh, one more.
MR. VON TILL: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

How do you define environmental effects?

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VON TILL: That's a good question. Your question is going back to Kevin's presentation on Slide 7. And I think your question was how do you define environmental effects? Kevin, if you can answer that question. Slide -- page 7. Okay. slide is that? 19, thanks. Okay. The question was, how do we define environmental impacts, I think. Right?

MR. RED CLOUD: Right.

MODERATOR HSUEH: We basically just -- we have a different cultural -- for example, the cultural resources, just talk about cultural resources, is one of the things that we used the National Historic Preservation Act. We consult with the consulting parties to get additional information from them. This is part of the information that we have with the consulting parties to gather information so that we can kind of use that information as the input, and to figure out, or to finalize our -- do our analysis, input to our report. And then we will analyze those input, and then do our environmental impact analysis.

So, I think the key is to interact with all the parties that are involved, and this is the -- one of the mechanisms that we use to get your input,

1	and to get your concerns and comments. And we put
2	those into our consideration, and we focus on those
3	area, and then to address those area.
4	MR. VON TILL: Okay. Let me just get
5	through a couple of more slides here. Again, where
6	are these facilities located? The operating
7	facilities we have right now, the Crow Butte
8	facilities, the Smith Ranch facility, the uranium
9	mine, Willow Creek project. I think there are some
10	sites in Texas.
11	MR. ROM: Question, Willow Creek, is that
12	over by the Pumpkin Buttes?
13	MR. VON TILL: Yes, it is.
14	MR. ROM: Okay. Can we get a map of where
15	these facilities are?
16	MR. VON TILL: One of those slides I
17	showed you was a map. It showed it was formerly the
18	Cogema Iragary and Christensen Ranch site.
19	MR. ROM: Yes, there are lots and lots of
20	different spots on that map. It's kind of hard to
21	tell what was what. But, okay, yes, you don't have to
22	go back. That's fine.
23	MR. VON TILL: The question was where are
24	these facilities? This is the Smith Ranch facility.
25	It's near Douglas, Wyoming. And this is now called

Uranium One at Willow Creek project which is operated
-- it's further up the Powder River basin. It is near
the Pumpkin Buttes, so that's where that -- that's it
right there. It was formerly called the Cogema
Iragary and Christensen Ranch site.

So, this -- we're going to pass This changes all the time, but this just this out. gives you a snapshot of the applications that we're estimating to get in the future. There's a lot of exploration projects there with the uranium out companies. We update this on our website monthly, and this is a snapshot that shows some of the potential projects looking in the future. Some of them are in places like New Mexico, Nevada, and so forth, but you can always access this on our website to see the changes, and if there's any projects that you're interested in, in Wyoming, or wherever.

I wanted to also mention one other thing here. There's different points in the process for public involvement, for the tribes to get involved. We do have in Tribe Outreach a strategy for uranium recovery, which can be found in this link right here that the Staff uses to go through the process. Basically, if we have something where tribes are interested in a project, we contact folks; like in New

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Mexico, we have some potential projects. If we have a
2	meeting with the potential applicant, we'll notify the
3	tribes, the Yakima, the Levina, the Navajo, of this
4	meeting. That's kind of how that works.
5	We have consultation meetings like this.
6	When we do the draft environmental impact statement,
7	there's an opportunity, of course, to comment on that,
8	and just contacting us with any concerns that you
9	have. This is a good format right here. Yes?
10	MR. ROM: Are you calling it a
11	supplemental EIS because it's supplemental to your
12	overall
13	MR. VON TILL: It's supplemental to a
14	generic environmental impact statement that is done by
15	the NRC
16	MR. ROM: Right. Okay.
17	MR. VON TILL: for in-situ recovery
18	survey.
19	MR. ROM: So, each of these facilities
20	you're looking at right now will have a separate
21	supplemental EIS.
22	MR. VON TILL: Yes, it will.
23	MR. ROM: Okay.
24	MR. GOODMAN: Currently, the two
25	facilities that we're doing for Crow Butte are
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	environmental assessments, they're not supplemental
2	environmental impact statements.
3	MR. VON TILL: The brand new facilities,
4	kind of brand new facilities by themselves, we do a
5	supplemental environmental impact statement. For
6	things like license renewal, and an expansion of the
7	Crow Butte facility, an environmental assessment is
8	prepared.
9	MR. ROM: Well, suppose there are
10	significant adverse effects?
11	MR. GOODMAN: If there's a significant
12	environmental impact, obviously, we would switch from
13	the environmental assessment to the environmental
14	impact statement.
15	MR. ROM: Okay. For the re-licensing of
16	Crow Butte, that's got significant adverse effects on
17	Crow Butte, which is a traditional cultural property
18	for the tribes.
19	MR. GOODMAN: Currently, we're looking at
20	an environmental assessment for the Crow Butte
21	license renewal. If we find significant effects, we
22	will switch to an environmental impact statement.
23	MR. KLUKAN: Let me just explain the
24	process. The way NEPA works, and the way NRC applies
25	it, the exception is a particular procedure which is

an automatic environmental impact statement. You do an EA. An EIS to determine whether there are potential significant impacts such that would require the production of an EIS, an environmental impact statement.

In Crow Butte, we're only at the EA stage.

We're more in the production for the EA. We haven't

made any conclusions yet as to whether there will be

any significant impacts, so that's what Nathan meant

by that. What -- the difference he was trying to

point out is that for those new facilities, like

Dewey-Burdock, Crow Butte was docketed prior to the

completion of the GEIS.

What the Staff is determining to do is, we're just going to, instead of producing EAs, they're going through the traditional process here. We're just going to bump it up to SEISs, so we're going to move at that stage.

What the GEIS is, is essentially a bundle of information that can be incorporated into SEISs, to make them EISs. The GEIS cannot stand on its own for any facility. That always needs to be supplemented by site-specific information.

But in Crow Butte, because it was docketed prior to this, we're going through the traditional

NEAL R. GROSS

NEPA process, which we're doing an EA, figuring out if there are any significant impacts that require an EIS, and then move forward with that. If there are no significant impacts, and we not make any determination either way, we would docket and finally note significant impacts. So, that's where we're at now.

MR. RAGONA: If I may, Mike's is going to introduce Chief Oliver, but I -- since we talked about Crow Butte, I'd just like to ask one question. I know there's some concern, the licensing is up for renewal, and the officers received this document on May 31st, and they want -- and it's a 14-day comment period. And I talked to some of our hydrologists and some other folks here who would like to review it, and our office will most likely write the comments on it.

The problem is, the 14-day period really is not enough. Concern was expressed that information and documentation that they need to review and comment on so they can talk to us about it, kind of explain it down so we can put our comments to paper, we need an extension on that 14 days. Fourteen days just isn't enough, it should be more like a 30 to 60-day time period, because I was told that we don't even know where some of these documents are that would have to be referenced. So, with that, I think that's the

NEAL R. GROSS

, 1
request that we need, is two-fold. One, an extension
on the comment time period. And, two, so our
hydrologists, our geologists, our people who are going
to come together and get this information to us have
the time to look at this information, but they also
need to know where to get it, and whether or not it
can be supplied to them, or at least tell them where
they can get it so it doesn't become a scavenger hunt
and take up more time.
MR. VON TILL: Okay. Thank you. Nathan
is the Project Manager, so we'll record that as an

action item.

MR. RAGONA: Okay, great.

MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Let's do the report to Mr. Red Cloud.

MR. VON TILL: Sounds good.

MR. RED CLOUD: Good morning. I guess, I told you before who I am. I'm Chief Red Cloud, Oglala Sioux Tribe. I'm head of the eighth reservation on treaty rights, Black Hills Sioux, Sioux Nation Council. And I take care of the treaty rights. treaty is still standing, and that's where I am. I'm sitting over there listening to what they're showing here. I went through that before.

> You know, we have a treaty. It still

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

stands with the United States. But our treaty is under United Nations, not under United States. So, anything like this we have to have that Article 12. And anybody in the United States violate my treaty, or overlook my treaty, I have to use Article 1. That still stands.

And nobody else can give clemency to nobody on treaty rights, because right now this reservation, eighth reservation is under 51 Treaty, and all our mineral rights are under there. And it still stands.

And regardless who, Senator, Congress, whomever, they have to come and see me, because I have rights, Article 1 under United Nations. And that's the law, that's me, and United States Constitution law, they can't go over me.

So, today you're talking about what you're going to do here, I don't go along. I've told these people, I told them, "Stay away." Under 51, that's my right. They come from New York, they come, I told them, "Go away." They chase them out of the reservation, "Don't come back." Because under treaty rights, I don't agree with them, because United States can violate the laws of my treaty. Where is treaty valid with 51. And down the line, they violate. So,

NEAL R. GROSS

like you say, who give the Commission, no but I have to take you. If you do, I have to take you to United Nations or Supreme Court on Article 1.

You don't believe me, read that. And that's me, because my great-great-grandfather made that treaty, and here you are, look to United States, how many of your people honor that treaty? And look where I am. Still, take what I have.

I talked to a lot of people, and today I'm here, and I want no part of this. Now, sure we could go to the highest court, we could go, I could go with you. You have to show your right, and I have to show mine, my treaty, my rights. I was born here, I was created here. You come from out of the country, try to tell me what to do.

So I have to take them to court, or we have to sit down. I still have my rights under United Nations, other United Nations, and I know my rights on natural law is under -- so, United States have to be careful.

Like I said before, for the treaty that's valid is 51. To that, all Lakota people, eighth reservation. And the land, that's treaty land. So, today I'm sitting over there. I've talked about the people, generation, and generation, generation, and

NEAL R. GROSS

there's some more coming.

So, what you're going to do here today, I can't swallow that. I have eighth reservation, Article 12, I could use that, and you're still pushing me. I have to use Article 1. You don't believe me, the way I look, but I know my rights. So, that's why I have to tell you I know my people really don't understand what's going on. Just a few people here know, so now I have to go back and tell the people what's going on. But you can't give permission to nobody, go through me. I believe the Tribal Council, this is a treaty council, and we're the one, big treaty. That's why you're here.

Thank you very much. I have to tell you that, so be careful what you are going to do. That's me, Chief Red Cloud, Oliver. I'm 92-years old. I'm still fighting for my rights. Thank you very much.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you. Thank you very much. We appreciate your comments.

MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Any other comments before we break for lunch?

MS. WHITE PLUM: Good morning. I want to greet our elders, Chief Red Cloud, our elected officials, tribal employees, and our visitors here from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Cameco

NEAL R. GROSS

Corporation, Powertech Corporation.

For those of you who don't know me, my name is Debra White Plum. This is our home here with the Oglala band of the Lakota Nation. Our way is to be good to our visitors. Some of you have seen I'm the lead plaintiff against Cameco Corporation in Nebraska, Crow Butte, ISL uranium mines. I'm a plaintiff against North Trend Uranium Mine. I'll be a plaintiff against Three Crow. We'll do everything we can to get standing to fight this.

We'll fight Powertech, so I don't come here friendly. I don't come here hostile. I just come to speak the truth, the way I understand it. All of you all is doing your jobs working for mining corporations, working for the United States Government. I'm here doing my job as a Lakota woman, mother, grandmother, great-grandmother. This is my job.

I want the record to show this is not a consultation. You're not consulting with our band. You're here with program staff. Following your procedures and your process, the United States Government is trying to put a round peg in a square hole.

We have two different ways of looking at

NEAL R. GROSS

everything. You say cultural properties, historical properties. We know about that, how you fit a little place, this right here, there's a grave here. This right here, there's a teepee ring. This right here, and then you're going to say well, we won't mine there, we'll mine all around that, but we won't mine right there. We won't disturb that right there, but we'll disturb everything else. That's what your process is. We know about that.

The different ways that we look at things, all of that is our cultural property, all of this is our historical property. First off in a spiritual manner, our relationship to Mother Earth, Grandmother Earth, including the water under the ground, the water above the ground, the water coming from the sky. We have a spiritual relationship, and a spiritual obligation because of that relationship.

You heard Chief Red Cloud; that's treaty land over there, this is treaty land. So, we have two different ways of looking at this. You believe it's your territory, we believe it's ours. It is ours through treaty law, just because your government violates it doesn't make it right.

So, you think you have the right to mine

NEAL R. GROSS

there if we gather here and satisfy your little requirements. That's what you're going to do, you're going to take it back and say we consulted with the Oglalas, but this ain't a consultation.

You want us to prove these little places here and there, and then you'll say well, we won't disturb it, and you'll mine all around it. Well, I'm here to say all of that shouldn't be disturbed, all of that land, all of the groundwater, all of the surface water, the air shouldn't be disturbed. That's how we see things differently.

The miners, the government who are supposed to regulate the miners, you don't see the way we see. It's all one. There's no separation between the environment and human beings. There's no separation from this little piece of land, and the whole rest of the so-called mining permit areas. To us, it's all one.

That used to be a Humblecha site, Crow Butte. Crazy Horse sat up there and he prayed with his Chenupa every day until he was killed there at Fort Robinson. We can't Humblecha there no more. That's one of our sacred ancient rituals, because there's a uranium mine there now. So, it already is impacting our human right to be who we are.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Medicine grows there. Me and some elders went over there, but there's a fence, and it says, "Radioactive." That's where our medicine grows, on the other side of that fence. So, we have to sneak in there and pick medicine for our stomachs, and our hearts.

The government by allowing these miners to come in is already denying us our human right to be who we are, and our future generations the right to clean water. You can't separate cultural properties, historical properties from the coming generations, and from us here today.

I know the government doesn't see the way see. This isn't the first time we sat with government officials and miners, and it probably won't be the last. That land over there where Crow Butte is, where they want to put North Trend, where they want to put Three Crow, where they want to put Our surface water connects, our groundwater That isn't enough for the government and connects. the corporations to shut down. So, isolating these little pieces of land where there's a grave, or a teepee ring, that doesn't fit in our world. you see things doesn't fit in our world, but yet you try to make us fit into your world. So, there's a

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

problem there.

That's why we're challenging Cameco foreign-owned corporation with a little American subsidiary, LLC set up in America. Same with Powertech, Canadian, Belgian, French, all the way back to the Suez, huge corporation, French Suez.

So, I have to tell you this today. We don't want you to mine there. We don't want the government to approve a mine there. Just because you say okay, there's a teepee ring, there's a grave, there's a card, we acknowledge that, we acknowledge your ancient history, and we won't disturb that one place, but we're going to disturb everything else. That's not okay with us.

I'm trying to help you to understand our paradigm. I understand yours, but I want you to understand ours. It's important to us, and it's important to the future generations, as well, who we represent.

In 20, 30 years all of you all is going to be gone, the uranium will be gone, and you'll all be gone. We're going to still be here, those of us who are surviving the cancer, the diabetes, the renal failure caused by your mines, by your rules, and laws, and regulations. So, our perspective is different.

NEAL R. GROSS

That whole land is our cultural property, our historical property, all that water, the air, not what little pieces your archeologists found. This isn't an information-gathering session either. All that's represented here is Indian Reorganization Act Government. You were fortunate our Chief came to speak to you, but we have many spiritual leaders who should be here. The tribes should have made them be here, tell them we'll give you gas money and a meal, come, defend our land. But the tribe isn't going to do that. They could have called on their own experts, spiritual leaders, medicine our our men, our historians, our treaty people.

We have Lakota scientists. They're not here. This isn't a fair information-gathering, because the government is only corresponding with Indian Reorganization Act Government. I have nothing against the IRA people in here, friends, relatives, but it's the system, it's the process. So, this isn't even a fair information-gathering session.

I want the record to show that I said that. This is just the Oglala band. We have Sicangu, Hunkpapas, a lot of other tribal nations could all have their people here, their experts to give testimony on this, but the way your process and your

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

system is set up is to your advantage, not ours. So, this isn't a fair information-gathering session as part of your overall consultation process, which means you sit down with our government. Your government sits down with our government. That hasn't happened, and it's not going to happen. Consultation process cannot happen because it's not going to be fair.

There's something in international called free and prior informed consent. You're not giving that by only communicating with the tribal government, because that's just one part of society. We exist side-by-side, traditional way with Sometimes we're on the same tribal government way. side, sometimes we bump heads, but at the end of the day we're all friends and relatives again. So, this whole process isn't fair, does not give us our free informed and prior consent. And that's an international standard of recognition for people impacted by government decisions, government actions, which includes mining.

The government nor the mining corporations had the free and prior informed consent of the Oglala band, the Lakota Nation. You do not have that. I don't know how you'll get it using the processes that you employ. But I want the record to show that I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

here defending my right to free prior informed consent under international law.

So, we live in two different paradigms, we have two different perspectives. All you all is on the payroll, you're getting paid to come here, sit here and listen to us, type up your reports, file them when you go home. So, this information-gathering session is inadequate, and it's to your advantage, and that's wrong.

Up in the Black Hills where Powertech and Cynataw, and Suez Corporations want to mine uranium, that's a real special place to us up there. Any mining up there is wrong, just as it is in Nebraska. That's where our ancestors wanted to settle. our choice after the Black Hills. We couldn't do Powder River, couldn't do Black Hills, so we wanted there, but they were moving us, forced march under arms, they were moving our ancestors, the Oglalas, They were marching us, going to settle us Sicanqus. way over there but a blizzard hit. Sicangus got ahead A blizzard hit, we're in this area, so we stayed here. That's how we come to be here. were being marched under gunfire from there, so now we're here.

The Black Hills area is already

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

contaminated by past uranium miners, past government officials who sat in your places years ago, left their ISL mining stores, toxic soup deep waste behind. underground like you are at Crawford, like you want to do some more, like you want to do some up there. that all, too, is our cultural/historical property, all of it. And it's not just ours, it's generations to come, it's the birds, the four-legged, those that crawl and swim. So we have to oppose that mining in the Black Hills, as well, for all of that benefit.

So, this is not an adequate informationgathering session for either Cameco or Powertech's proposed mining permit areas. We used to gather eagle feathers over there, fish. We can't do that no more. Our rights have been erased by that uranium mine. That's how it's going to be in the Black Hills, it's going to be worse in Nebraska than it is now. Our rights are going to get killed more, more rights are The more advantageous it is to going to get killed. the miners and the government, the less advantageous So, right away we have a confrontation it is to us. because of the way we see things, and because of the way we're impacted.

So, I want the record to show that this

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

87
challenge, you're challenging us. You come here to
our land and challenge us, and you're on the payroll
to do it, so you're doing your jobs. But there are
people who oppose the desecration of that land, the
desecration of that land and water. Money isn't
important to us when it comes to making those kind of
decisions. We don't want no money for mining.
Setting up your mines and mining is a
desecration of our cultural property, of our
historical property. We wanted our lawyers to be
here. NRC has their lawyers here. That's not allowed
in your process. That's also unfair and

disadvantageous to anyone who doesn't support mining.

I want the record to show that. And I guess I'll see Cameco June 22^{nd} at your hearing in Crawford.

MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Thanks. Is there anybody else?

MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you for the comments.

MR. YOUNG BUCK: I'll introduce myself.

I'm Martin Young Buck from Basin, South Dakota. I'll
talk honky so everybody understands what I'm saying.

I come from Phoenix, Arizona. I live 27 miles east, called Apache Junction. I just came through the forest fire, saw that smoke come up to

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

here. That's why we're still here. And as you notice lately, winds are picking up. What happens when the radiation comes our way? We're in -- Crawford's southwest of us here. And right now, all the mining, open pit mines in New Mexico, and Arizona, a lot of high rate of leukemia and cancer now of the wind blowing.

I brought a map, I'm going to pass it up that we created, but it shows about 30 mines that are on Indian reservations. It's kind of funny, you know, they put us on the most desolate land, and we're sitting on riches, and they're after it.

In 1998, the Mojave Indian Reservation was invaded by the State of California to put a nuclear dump site on the reservation right on top of a water aquifer. As a member of the American Indian Movement we stopped it, because we had -- the whole community didn't know what was going on. But this situation here, we've got to be very careful. And it was mentioned in Japan, what happened in Japan, Chernobyl, once it gets contaminated, it's gone.

I'm not going to take the most of your time, but you know I'm against it. That's all there is to it. Thank you.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

The

MR. CATCHES ENEMY: I guess we'll break for lunch now for an hour. Michael, before we MODERATOR HSUEH: break, just а point of clarification. participants of this meeting, we have government officials from NRC, we have tribal officials, we have We have not invited the Cameco tribal members. employees or Powertech employees to this meeting, so I just want to make that clarification. Only government officials, tribal members, and the tribal officials, and tribal leaders. Thank you. (Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 12:27 p.m., and resumed at 1:59 p.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

7	
T	

2

4

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you. This is Kevin Hsueh again. As you know, tomorrow we are going to have a site visit to Powertech, Dewey-Burdock site, and for the same purpose. And we would just like to have a good estimate of how many people are going to

Tomorrow we will follow the same format as Saturday night, and so we are going to have a prayer session, and then after that we think that we probably will leave here around 9:30.

-- for the site visit tomorrow.

And I already know how many people from NRC and -- staff and NRC contractors, so -- I already know the number. What I would like to have is the tribal leaders, tribal members, and tribal officials, how many of you plan to participate in tomorrow's site visit.

So if you can raise your hand also the other agencies, like BLM, so please raise your hands, and then Haimanot is going to help me count.

MS. YILMA: I have nine so far.

MODERATOR HSUEH: You have nine so far?

All right. Thank you. All right. Okay. All right.

NEAL R. GROSS

Thank you. MR. CLARK: Kevin? MODERATOR HSUEH: Yes. MR. CLARK: Where are we going to meet Is it going to be here or in the other -the board meeting room? **HSUEH:** MODERATOR Oh, that's good I would propose tomorrow that we meet in 8 front of the hotel, because that's where the bus stops 9 10 -- or stays. So let's meet there. 11 And then, also tomorrow, Thursday, which is also at the conference over there instead of here. 12 So we will meet there tomorrow at 9 o'clock over 13 14 there at the hotel. Michael? All right. 15 MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Okay. 16 Next on our agenda is the proposed Crow Butte license renewal and 17 North Trend expansion area ISR projects with Nathan 18 Goodman. 19 We are going to spend a 20 MR. GOODMAN: 21 little bit of time now focusing our efforts in on the 22 two Crow Butte projects that we have currently in review, and those are the proposed license renewal of 23 24 the current operating facilities.

And some of you went on the site visit,

and so you got to see the sites, and you have -- now you will be able to -- you know, this will be a review for you. But for others, who didn't, so we will have and show that.

Actually, can you go back one? Sorry.

I think all of you have met me now. My name is Nathan, and I'm the project manager for the environmental review of the two Crow Butte facilities in-house. My goal is to briefly go over the proposed project, including an overview of the archaeological surveys completed by the applicant, and invite you to share your concerns and/or provide additional information for the NRC to consider in its review.

If you would like to discuss or provide information pertaining to the cultural site and/or sensitive information, NRC will ensure confidentiality of this information according to NRC procedures and processes.

This is a map of the two facilities we have. It's pretty small, but the one to the southeast is the current facility. The current license area is one mile southeast of Crawford, Nebraska, and the license area is 3,300 acres. And the proposed North Trend expansion area is two miles north of Crawford, and it's about 2,100 acres.

NEAL R. GROSS

The NRC is currently reviewing archaeological surveys submitted by the applicant as part of the application for both the current facility and the proposed North Trend expansion area. The purpose of these surveys is to determine if there are potential adverse impacts to the properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Registry of Historic Places.

What the applicant provided is a starting point for our review. We make an independent analysis based on a lot of things, based on the survey submitted by the applicant, based on information we get here today, based on information that we gather, and we come up with an independent analysis, and we provide that in our report.

And so right now where we are is we are going to review some of the information provided by the applicant. Those are not our conclusions; that is just our starting point. That is where we are right now. And so we will make an independent analysis based on a lot of information, and part of that analysis is based on information that we get through the Section 106 process, which is why we are all here.

For the Crow Butte operating facility, the

NEAL R. GROSS

application for license renewal, architectural survey submitted by applicant, identified the 72 archaeological and architectural sites. Of these 72, zero were identified eligible for listing. And for the proposed North Trend, the archaeological survey submitted by the applicant identified six. six, zero were identified as eliqible listing.

Yesterday at the site visit we did hear the man say that there was one significant site identified as a Homestead site when we went by it. We will research that, in combination with surveys that we got, in combination with our own independent review, and comments we receive both from our experts as well as from all of you and, again, come up with an independent analysis.

So just because this slide says zero doesn't mean that's our conclusion and that's our starting point.

I just wanted to go over a little bit of our Section 106 consultation process to date. In August of 2010, the NRC consulted with SHPO. In September of 2010, invitation letters were sent to 20 tribes for the proposed North Trend expansion area site. In November of 2010, invitation letters were

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	sent to the 20 tribes for the proposed license renewal
2	sites, and we are here today in June for the
3	information-gathering.
4	And just in conclusion, all information
5	gathered today will help the NRC staff conduct an
6	independent analysis to determine whether traditional
7	cultural properties or additional archaeological sites
8	eligible for listing under the NRH requirement.
9	And that's all I have. I would be happy
10	to take any questions that you all may have.
11	MR. ROM: You said that for this new
12	facility that there are 72 sites identified?
13	MR. GOODMAN: In the survey that we
14	received from the applicant, that's correct.
15	MR. ROM: That's not what that's not
16	what is in what was sent out to the tribes, not in the
17	materials what was sent out.
18	MR. GOODMAN: Do you have a different
19	number?
20	MR. ROM: A lot less, like 12 or less.
21	MR. GOODMAN: I can I can go over with
22	you afterwards
23	MR. ROM: What was sent out to the tribes
24	was done in 1980, a survey done in early 1980. Okay.
25	So there's not 72 sites.

	MR. GOODMAN: I can go over with you the
2	survey in a little bit of detail as to how they got
3	some of the sites that you see that were given
4	specific reviews from the 72. I'd be happy to do
5	that.
6	MR. ROM: Okay. I don't know, Wilmer, do
7	you want to talk about these things now, or do you
8	want to give them a letter later with some details, or
9	what would you think is appropriate? About the
10	reports for this project.
11	Wilmer would like to I think write a
12	letter or something more official, formal, later
13	MR. GOODMAN: Okay.
14	MR. ROM: about these two projects.
15	MR. GOODMAN: The statement was that the
16	Oglala Sioux Tribe would like to submit a more formal
17	letter later on in their discussion and concerns with
18	the survey submitted by the applicant. Did I get that
19	correct?
20	MR. ROM: Yes, that can you look at
21	this report that I haven't seen? It's the same report
22	that you are talking about or it's just and
23	there is even pages that are missing from that one, so
24	there's two reports there. One is for the
25	expansion, and one is for the -

MR. GOODMAN: He has handed me a Crow
Butte Resources North Trend Expansion Area Class 3
Cultural Resource Inventory. And I think he has also
stapled to it the license renewal cultural report that
we sent the tribes in the mail. Is that correct? And
he would like me to look at it and say where I got the
number 72 from.
MR. ROM: So that is a correct report that
you are referring to.
MR. GOODMAN: Again, I haven't had the
time to actually look through and make sure, but it
seems very similar, and, yes, I would believe it is
the same report, yes. It does look the same.
The question was, was that report
redacted, and, yes, the version of the cultural
surveys that you received were redacted versions,
according to regulations provided to us by the SHPO.
MR. ROM: But tribes have a right to that
information under the Section 106 review process. So
this is the THPO's office. They need to have their
complete reports.
MR. GOODMAN: Right. And I'm not I'm
not very familiar with how the how the process
works, but at some point I believe that we will we

-- to receive the non-redacted version, for a tribe to

receive the non-redacted version, we would have to go through the State Historic Preservation Office to ensure their permission and to understand -- let them know that we are sending it out. I believe that that is the case.

MR. ROM: Well, I don't think that's the way it works under the regulations, because the tribe can't comment until they have the complete documents.

MR. KLUKAN: This is Brett Klukan. To complete their statement, the point is, what we sent to you was essentially a starting point. That doesn't mean that it's entirely accurate to all of this information from the tribes. It's just that that's what we had available up on our website and through our public documents system.

We are more than willing to work with the tribes to get you that information through secure channels, so that you can review it. The intent is not to withhold it from you; the intent is that what we sent you was just our public release.

But, again, that is not to say that you specifically, in your tribal rights consultation under Section 106, having the need for this information, that you wouldn't have access to it. It's just that this particular version of the document had bad

NEAL R. GROSS

information, and we are willing to work with tribes to 1 make sure that you have that information, so that you 2 3 can fully comment on the Section 106 process. MS. JEHLE: And I think that Paige might be able to add something. You know, we -- I would MS. OLSON: Oh. encourage that NRH provide complete copies of all of the surveys to the tribes, because that's the only way 8 they are going to know that they are looking at and 9 10 comment on. And the information is protected under Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act, 11 12 and then it is also protected under our state law. I would encourage your agency to provide it to any of 13 14 the tribes that need it. MR. KLUKAN: So what I would suggest is 15 that at this point, for any tribe leader that has 16 information to contact -- speak with me before the 17 close of this meeting, and then we can set up how we 18 19 can get that information. MR. GOODMAN: And I understand that Oglala 20 21 is one tribe that would like to set up and get this 22 complete. They have. 23 MS. JEHLE: 24 MR. GOODMAN: Our decision is based on a number of factors, and, you know, they consist of the 25

applicant's survey, they consist of tribal consultation, they consist of our own independent analysis with our own expert archaeologists, and consultation of other state and federal agencies, the SHPO office. A whole number of things go into our determination of that.

The NRC determination, though, is we will include -- we will incorporate the analysis and information we get from it.

MR. KLUKAN: I apologize for interrupting, but -- this is Brett Klukan again. Under the Section 106 regulations, I mean, we are required to consult with tribes regarding the identification of historic properties. And so what this information is is simply what the applicant prepared, its own thinking regarding what it thinks is eligible based on the National Registry. That's not to say that's our thinking as Nathan pointed out.

Once we gather the information that we think is necessary, just the information-gathering is huge, we will go back to the tribes and say, "Here is what we have collected, and here is what we think. What do you think?" And then, we will move on from there. So that's how we see the process proceeding, in accordance with the regulations on Chapter 36 CFR.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MS. OLSON: How do you anticipate the
2	identification of traditional cultural properties for
3	the Dewey-Burdock project specifically?
4	MR. GOODMAN: I think we are going to
5	answer the Dewey-Burdock questions when we get into
6	the Dewey-Burdock
7	MS. OLSON: Okay.
8	MR. GOODMAN: if that's okay with you.
9	MS. OLSON: Yes.
10	MR. GOODMAN: Okay, great.
11	MR. ROM: That question applies to the
12	Crow Butte ones, too.
13	MR. GOODMAN: How are we going to
14	determine the location of traditional cultural
15	properties?
16	MR. ROM: Or gathering areas or spiritual
17	sites or
18	MR. GOODMAN: The very same way that sort
19	of Brett and I have been talking about. We are going
20	to continue to gather information from a whole lot of
21	different sources, and the information we get from the
22	tribes is a part of that. And so information provided
23	by the tribes as to the location and necessity of
24	needing to do a survey, that is all included and will
25	all he included in our analysis

And as Brett said, we are not -- we are not stopping tribal consultation here. This is just -- this is just the first step in the whole 106 process.

MR. CATCHES ENEMY: This is Michael Catches Enemy. Will NRC be able to fund something like that if the tribe wanted to do a traditional cultural property survey?

MR. GOODMAN: There is no standard policy by the NRC on funding right now. However, in the past reviews NRC has not -- for the Crow Butte project has not provided funding.

MR. KLUKAN: I'll phrase it this way, to add on to what has been said. Under the regulations, we are required to determine what is reasonable under the circumstances, given the import of potential sites involved, the cultural properties involved. And I think the NRC's case at this point is while we can't say specifically how much we can fund, we can approve a project.

And we'll do whatever is necessary to in good faith fulfill our Section 106 obligation and figure out how things get paid down the road. But we are going to do whatever it is that is necessary to do that.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Yes. And under that
2	Section 106 to, you know, properly and respectfully
3	in a respectful manner to tribes, it seemed like this
4	would be one of the biggest, you know, things to allow
5	the tribes to feel like they have a stake in what the
6	history and the area is about. Besides the
7	archaeologists, they might not have gotten any
8	information from the tribal side of it. He's doing
9	his job to be an archaeologist. That's that goes
10	only so far, but the tribes can provide so much more
11	information on the history and the personal ties to
12	that.
13	MR. GOODMAN: We certainly acknowledge the
14	tribal expertise. And as Brett said, you know, we
15	can't we can't those haven't happened yet, but
16	we will fulfill the 106. And if that doesn't include
17	the surveys, then we will.
18	MR. VANCE: Steve Vance from the Cheyenne
19	River. When the archaeological surveys that were
20	done, when was that last one?
21	MR. GOODMAN: For which project are you
22	referring to?
22	
23	MR. VANCE: The Crow Butte.

25

current facility?

1	MR. VANCE: The one we were at yesterday.
2	MR. GOODMAN: We were at both yesterday,
3	sorry.
4	MR. VANCE: Well, the Crow Butte.
5	MR. GOODMAN: Okay. I will just answer
6	for both. The North Trend expansion survey I believe
7	was done in the mid-2000s, like the 2004 to 2006
8	MR. VANCE: 2007?
9	MR. GOODMAN: timeframe, but not
10	entirely 2007. And the license renewal was done much
11	before that in the '80s.
12	MR. VANCE: Okay. And, of course, we all
13	know about every day something becomes exposed to
14	erosion and whatever else. I think that's a concern
15	for the tribes about, you know, as far as being
16	involved in that survey. And we come across this all
17	the time. We come across archaeologists going in and
18	identifying sites or historical property, and then
19	tribal monitors or surveys going in next and
20	identifying and I don't believe that was all for
21	that time period.
22	I think what should happen is another
23	survey being done with the help of the tribes on the
24	ground, so they are there actually. And now is a hard

time to do that, because the visibility right now is

1	very limited because of the grass being three feet
2	tall in some places.
3	And that's why we tried to get out to a
4	lot of these site visits earlier in the year when
5	visibility was more successful for what we are going
6	to, you know, comment on. Right now the grass is
7	tall. It's hard to see or anything, really.
8	But I think that's what should be offered
9	before this is that another survey be done, updated,
10	allowing the tribe to identify and evaluate, because
11	right now, as was stated yesterday, tribes really are
12	more interested home sites -
13	MR. GOODMAN: Right.
14	MR. VANCE: although they were
15	basically in the 1800s or
16	MR. GOODMAN: Right.
17	MR. VANCE: what we're looking at is
18	really beyond that.
19	MR. GOODMAN: Right.
20	MR. VANCE: Hundreds and thousands of
21	years ago.
22	MR. GOODMAN: And speaking with you on the
23	bus, I got that same
24	MR. VANCE: Okay. So that's kind of what
25	I'd like to see brought forward again another
	NEAL D. CDOSS

1	survey be done, updated, with the input of the tribe.
2	Then, we can determine what's historical or not, and
3	as he said again that becomes a burden on the
4	financial side with the limited, you know, sources of
5	funding.
6	And most of these sites that we've been
7	going back into that haven't been offered at the
8	beginning, neither the applicant or the agency would
9	come to, you know, and that makes our determination to
10	go here or there easier, because this we can afford.
11	That's why a lot of us are here.
12	MR. GOODMAN: Right.
13	MR. VANCE: Because there's reimbursement
14	in it.
15	MR. GOODMAN: Right.
16	MR. VANCE: And that is it comes down
17	to a big issue. There should be something made
18	available to try to come to. They're just making
19	outrageous amounts of money, and yet we are here
20	looking at, you know, historical protections of sites
21	and properties. That all comes back into the final
22	figure too.
23	MR. GOODMAN: Thank you very much. I think
24	there was a hand up. Bryce?
25	MR. IN THE WOODS: It was sort of this
	NEAL D. ODGGG

consultation is -- through the statutes requiring consultation government-wide, American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resource Protection Act, and National Historic Preservation Act, and also the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

And regulations require consultation government-wide. The National Environmental Policy Act and maybe some executive orders as far as its constitutional policy. NRC doesn't really have any policy for government to government consultation. And there is a situation in treaty territory that involves Nichols Ranch. BLM has mineral rights for gas, but it's hard rock, so NRC has the permit on the uranium.

But the company, when we were on the ground, we wanted to do a TCP survey, and we were told no. But then, after further discussion, and after a couple of weeks went by, we're trying to work right now with the Bureau of Land Management recently, we developed a consultation policy, so that if we hear some concerns here verbally, but there's nothing black or white yet as a formal policy we can come to some kind of an agreement on or understanding.

And given Nichols Ranch has a private owner is giving the okay for us to go in there and

NEAL R. GROSS

enter a unit. They have -- a private owner has both units, and the energy company said they already did their radiological survey, and with a 700-and-somepage environmental impact statement.

But we still need to do that TCP survey.

That's what you heard. But using that as an example,
we are hoping they will go in there and do that TCP
survey and get those rights.

And no matter how it comes to be, our attorney is not sitting with us. And I'm hoping some day that we will get to that plant, and we really can discuss government-to-government policy with the NRC, because there's kind of a catch-22 here using that example of BLM having minerals, but NRC having that permit.

So it sounds like there might have to be an interagency type of agreement between the NRC and BLM, and there is a draft MOA with that that we reviewed, but, still, we didn't call it consultation, because the other parties were -- government officials weren't involved in that negotiation.

But we are still -- NRC is moving forward with that, and we'd like to some day see all of that -- that government to government -- and you heard nation to nation.

NEAL R. GROSS

Now, with President Obama, I think he upgraded some Executive Order on our regulations and review for all the federal agencies in which the way you permit the companies to extract, it's all up to NRC to develop maybe some more meaningful and in the permitting process itself, you know, whereas before, like when I mentioned that the door was closed on tribal nations, our concern is they are almost there, we were never at the table.

Now, we are at the table, and we still don't have that policy. You know, we are still looking at working on MOAs. There has to be some policy that has to do with creeks. And the NRC has a lot of weight, I would say, in the permitting process that you guys need to look at, and how you issue your permit.

hoping that And I'm once there's government -- tribal government officials that we can concerns and recommendations express our process, because we have senators and representatives that represent their states, maybe negatively or positively, but still pressing their issues on NRC. And maybe not -- maybe not for the benefit of all of the constituents in their states either, you know.

So there's a lot of variables that make up

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

what is happening today, but because -- because it comes into chief territory, you know, and we want to be just as influential as any senator or representative from the U.S. Congress. You know, some of them actually wish that some federal agencies would disappear, you know? I mean, that's the mind set of some elected officials.

But as long as you get to the consultation part, there is other regulations that constitute government-wide consultation. I just wanted to point that out.

MR. GOODMAN: Yes. One just sort of follow up because you brought up Nichols Branch, I'm not the Nichols Ranch project manager, so I'm not going to speak in detail. But I do know they are much further along in the process than I am with Crow Butte. And so I encourage you, because we are early on in the Crow Butte 106 consultation process to continue to communicate with me and continue to bring up your concerns, and we will make sure and satisfy our 106 consultation for the Crow Butte facilities.

MR. VANCE: Steve Vance from Cheyenne River. You know, actually, you are probably at about the same stage as we are with Nichols Ranch, because when it comes to the consultation part of tribal

NEAL R. GROSS

input, they had a webinar teleconference last week, and Cheyenne River was the only tribe on that conference call.

Other tribes, you know, they were on travel, they couldn't make the meeting, so I voiced that issue, that it wasn't government to government, because we were only represented by one tribe at the table, which is unfair, you know. You know, looking around here, we've got pretty good representation today, but there are times when the meetings set up -- and they went ahead with their MOA.

They went ahead and started doing a draft MOA. You know, and I stayed in there with them and made comments on the MOA, but we still never finished step one and we're going into step three. So where you're at is like at the same place. From the tribes anyway, there was a lot of people not at the table.

And that was a letter that Curly wrote, Curly Youpee from Fort Peck wrote that, but, you know, horse feeding way of doing something was rushing the tribe into making these decisions. And that's why I say, you know, you are supposed to take full interest in the tribe in consultation. You know, the interest of the tribe is what has to be personally.

And as we talked with Gary, he heard from,

NEAL R. GROSS

you know, people and stuff like that, when you talk about the Lakota, you know, or the Sioux, whether it be Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe or Oglala Sioux Tribe, you know, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, all that comes down to, again, as was stated earlier, document of nation-to-nation or government-to-government treaties in the Great Sioux Nation.

So when I come to the table here, I am representing the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, but I cannot ignore the other six bands of that nation. And so when we sat here -- or we sit here at the table and we talk about this, that's government to government, that level, that there is more representation from tribal groups.

But with our webinar with the Nichols Ranch, Cheyenne River was the only one there, and I told them, I said, "We're opposing this, because everybody is not at the table." So we put that on record, that we felt that this was a thing that needed to be -- step back and say, "Okay. When all parties are involved, then we'll move forward." But they went ahead and moved forward without all parties.

So here we've got all parties here, and, you know, so you are basically, you know, at the same level as that consultation process is with Nichols

NEAL R. GROSS

Ranch, too.

MR. GOODMAN: I was more referring to sort of the whole environmental review process, but thank you very much for that clarification on that.

Am I missing -- yes, please.

MR. WHITTED: Yes. When tribes are asked to comment on projects, and to let you know what sites that are important to them, it's very hard for them to do that many times, because we haven't had access to these areas for over 150 years. There's areas that we've heard about, but we don't actually know what's there until we get out there and actually have a presence.

And one way to do this is through the TCP surveys where the tribes are involved, not just one tribe usually, but several tribes involved, send people out there that are capable of identifying culturally sensitive sites to tribal people.

It works well that way. We just recently got on -- we were on a project up in North Dakota. There was six tribes involved in that one. It was a wind farm. They did an arc survey on that project, not quite 900 acres. They reported four stone features on that site.

And we were very familiar with that area

and knew very well that there was a lot more there. We requested a TCP survey, went out there, and the tribal people in that crew identified over 2,000 stone features, and they only reported four.

So that tells you the difference, the view of the archaeologist and the view of the tribal -- from the tribal perspective. That's why it is important that we have people in the field that can make these calls, because we know what is there and what is related to tribal importance.

So that just goes to speak for -- and I think it is really important that the tribes be allowed to do TCP surveys on this project down here, as well as the Dewey-Burdock project, where we know there is a lot sites. Good argument there. And once we have that information and identify sites to be avoided, they can possibly be avoided. Not a place that we want to put one of these operations, because there are so many sites there.

MR. GOODMAN: Thank you very much for your comment.

Am I missing anybody?

MR. CLOUTHIER: You mentioned good faith Section 106 process, and I'm curious that if the tribes do request a TCP study, and the NRC doesn't

NEAL R. GROSS

fund it, or the client through applicant doesn't fund it, is that going to be considered good faith? If the tribes are requesting one thing and you guys decide not to go through with it or won't fund that study, will that be considered good faith negotiations?

MR. KLUKAN: Well, the point here is is what these, I think, regulations are used for. What are the potential sites involved? And then, the NRC is going to look at this in the context of what new information -- the technical information we receive today to make the determination of what is necessary to move forward with the identification of these sort of properties.

And, granted, I am simply an attorney, so I don't have the technical expertise to actually answer that question. I can't tell you what the staff is going to determine is necessary.

But what I can say is that we won't approve the project until the undertaking -- this is what we are legally bound by -- until we have completed Section 106. And we will do whatever is necessary under Section 106 or under the regulations in order to satisfy our obligation under 106.

Not to sound like a broken record again, but I can't speak to the specifics, because I'm not an

NEAL R. GROSS

archaeologist, I'm not familiar with this. I'm just an attorney. And so I don't have the expertise to answer those type of questions for you right now. And I don't know if we've gathered all the information we need yet in order to figure out what is necessary either. That's up to the staff.

But with regards to funding, I mean, what I would say at this point is that we will do regardless -- we will do what is necessary in order to comply with Section 106, and then that -- that's what the bottom line is at this point. And then, we won't issue a license until we have done it. But I can't tell you what is necessary at this point, or what kind of work we need to do, because that's -- again, I'm just an attorney.

Moreover, I don't think we have the information necessary right now in order to make that.

We have to go back, think about it, figure out what else we need to make that decision and what else we need to do, and then make it.

MR. GOODMAN: And to sort of follow up, we do not have all that information collected yet to make that determination as to what is a site. Yes?

MS. BIG CROW: Since we're gathering information, I guess I might as well put mine out

NEAL R. GROSS

there. As a tribe and through this area, we were -it's kind of a big race track, I guess you would call
it, around Black Hills. And what we did was at
certain points of the year, we have to be at certain
points in order to gather our medicines, we have to be
at certain points in order to get our lodge pulls,
because like in May, that is when the pulls are the
lightest, so we have to be there at that time.

There were times where we had to also go to pick up our paints and stuff at certain times of the year. Help me out, Wilmer. And so that's going to be my information to this, because -- and we have be in the Black Hills for our ceremonies, and then come back around the fall and the hunting ground part of it and stand, and do our hides and the tepees. And so that's why it's so important for the tribes.

MR. GOODMAN: Anything else?

Okay. Again, I want to just stress that at the beginning of the presentation it had my name and contact information, phone number, e-mail. And please don't hesitate to use it. Don't hesitate to call. Don't hesitate to send me an e-mail. I'm really glad to be here, and I'm really glad that you all are here.

And I understand that this is a starting

NEAL R. GROSS

point. This is one of our earlier steps, and I want communication with the tribes to continue. And I like the fact that we are all here, and I'm really encouraged by that. But let's not stop here. Make sure that I continue to communicate with you guys and that you guys continue to communicate with me, and let's continue to keep this consultation process going.

MR. YELLOW THUNDER: This is Dennis Yellow Thunder from Natural Resources Registry Agency. And I guess my question is regarding to the site we visited yesterday. We spoke yesterday -- or they spoke yesterday about the output of the amount of uranium they say that they are mining there.

Now, is that sufficient for your needs in generating the power that you say you guys generate? Is that a sufficient mine? I mean, is that amount of uranium that is being recovered that, is that a sufficient amount? And what justified an expansion? Isn't enough uranium being produced there to meet the needs? And why would you want to expand an area if there is enough uranium being mined there? Or is there not enough? Is it being depleted? Is it being used up? Or is it just -- what is your intention? I mean, why is it -- would you want to expand a mine's

NEAL R. GROSS

unit to build more?

MR. GOODMAN: That's a great question. I'm going to answer, and then an attorney is probably going to follow up. But we are a regulatory agency, and so we don't -- we don't say we need X amount of uranium. We just regulate the applications that we get in our review. We stay completely neutral on the matter. We are neither for nor against it.

MR. YELLOW THUNDER: Because -- well, that was just basically what I was sitting here wondering about, you know, and is it the quality of the uranium that is being recovered there, that it's not sufficient? Or is it the amount, that it's not enough? Or what -- you know, you as the -- yours is a regulatory commission, right? So you basically have the last word on whether or not we can expand to the North Trend or not. I mean, so --

MR. FESKO: Can I --

MR. GOODMAN: Sure.

MR. FESKO: I'm Greg Fesko with the BLM.

I guess in the United States we have nuclear reactors.

They use about 45 million pounds a year, and we produce about four and a half million pounds within the United States. And so the balance is imported from Canada and from the USSR.

MR. KLUKAN: Russia.

MR. FESKO: Russia.

MR. KLUKAN: We don't call it that.

(Laughter.)

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VON TILL: Let's just be clear. The NRC is an independent regulatory agency. Department of Energy looks at energy needs and things like that. Our job -- we don't get into whether there is a need for more energy or anything like that. What our job is is to review the application of this mill site and it's safe, protective of the make sure protective of the public and the environment, that's it. That's our job.

We don't get into any aspect of whether there is a need for the expansion or anything like that, so I just want to be clear about that. We are only looking at the safety of the facility. So we don't do an evaluation of whether they need an expansion here, an expansion there, whether the needs of the earth or the people of the world need that expansion for energy. We don't do that at all. We just look at the safety of the facility, and that's the only part that we have with that. Just so --

MR. YELLOW THUNDER: Who makes that determination of whether you need to expand or not?

MR. VON TILL: Nobody.

MR. YELLOW THUNDER: Crow Butte themselves?

MR. VON TILL: The industry does, because some of the uranium is used here in the country, and some of it is not. Some of it is used in Canada. There is no prohibition against a foreign company, you know, operating. As long as they have an export license, they can export it out. So we don't evaluate that aspect. What we do is evaluate the safety and health and environmental aspects of this.

So I just want to be clear as to the limitations of what we do and what we don't do.

MR. VANCE: I've got a question from yesterday. Okay. I thought we had kind of mentioned yesterday that -- after, you know, we had come back from the site, but I guess for the record I would like to hear that comment from NRC as to the project with Crow Butte.

Basically, all we did is we drove around pretty much, you know, as a site visit. I was prepared to get out and walk the ground, but, you know, it's pretty dusty and everything, couldn't really, you know, question that, too. But then there are talks about the environmental part of all of the

area, you know, with the dust and everything blowing around in that area. It's kind of -- you know, those of you who are out there probably didn't notice it, but it was really behind us. And there was times where we had to go way back just to see the bus in front of us.

So, again, there's, you know, the question

- I had asked a question on that driving around the

perimeter of that -- that there was still digging

activity there. And if the permit -- this is a

renewal, which would mean the permit expired.

Just for the record, I would like to make that comment as to why they allowed to continue digging today when the permit was expired.

MR. KLUKAN: I'll take a shot at it if you want me to. The answer to that is, under the NRC's regulations, if an applicant submits -- or a licensee submits a renewal prior to the -- and this is for certain licenses. For the -- prior to the expiration of their license, they will be allowed to continue operation under the previous version of their license, which for Crow Butte has now expired, while the NRC reviews their renewal application.

Assuming that the NRC were to deny that renewal application, their license would have to --

they would have to stop operations and enter that information in. But for that pendency, they are allowed to continue operations under the terms and conditions of their prior license. It doesn't mean that they can do whatever they want. It means that the license is essentially extended for the pendency of the NRC's review of their renewal application.

But one thing I would point out -- and this is different from power reactors -- is that under Part 40 renewal applications are treated exactly as new applications, meaning that we review them exactly as we would an entirely new application under Part 40. So there is nothing -- whereas in reactors we are locked out of as part of the -- we don't go back and look at -- we go back and look at everything again, as if it were an entirely new application.

Just to point that out for the record, because that is one of the new things about Part 40 for source material licenses, which is the type of license that we issue for this type of facility, for both renewal and North Trend expansion area.

MR. VANCE: So like yesterday -- the activity we saw yesterday was laying pipeline. And so under those conditions, while they have an application in, they could continue at what level? Can they go

NEAL R. GROSS

beyond -- I mean, my concern was the digging, because on Cheyenne River we require all ground-disturbing activity to be monitored by a traditional or a tribal monitor.

So when the ground is being turned, they can identify what is coming up out of it, and then the operator who is running that backhoe or, you know, ditch-witch or whatever, you know, equipment he is using, he is an operator. He don't know if he is turning over pottery or bones or -- you know, if it would be a buffalo bone or a cow bone. He don't know. He is just digging. That's his job.

Cheyenne River we require all But on contractors to have on-the-job -- hired the hired tribal monitors to observe contractor, all ground-disturbing activities. That's what, you know, brought my attention to -- well, if you guys have an expired permit, anyway, you asked me that question. But, again, how much activity can they actually be there, besides -- like pipeline was doing out yesterday, maybe today they are drilling.

MR. KLUKAN: The answer to that would be is under the license they are allowed to build so many well fields. You see those -- the wells out there, and when they start up the application they don't

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

build all of them at once. It's not where we actually need a complete reactor in place before you can operate it, and then go and inspect it.

They can build them in series or staggered series, meaning we are going to build well field one, and then move on to two, and then move on to three, and then we will go back and decommission one, and then build four, five, six.

So what you see construction there is construction that was authorized under the license as it currently exists. Were they to build, or want to build, new well fields that go beyond what was analyzed in their license as it exists right now, they would need to come in with an amendment.

And that is why we have North Trend or why we have a proceeding ongoing for the North Trend amendment or why they need an amendment, because that is construction that wasn't contemplated within the scope of the original license application, or as with -- not in your license application, within the license as last approved in their last renewal cycle.

MR. GOODMAN: I believe this gentleman has had his hand up for quite some time, so I want to -The question is, is it going to do us -- and by "us" you're saying is it going to do the tribe any good in

NEAL R. GROSS

1	the future?
2	MR. RED CLOUD: Yes.
3	MR. GOODMAN: The answer to that question
4	is, I don't know, but that's not a purpose of the NRC.
5	Our purpose is to regulate.
6	MR. GOODMAN: What's that?
7	MR. RED CLOUD: Where are you going to
8	gather them?
9	MR. KLUKAN: Do you mean this particular
10	meeting or the actual project?
11	MR. GOODMAN: What are the tribes going to
12	get out of the Crow Butte site?
13	MR. RED CLOUD: What do we get out of it?
14	MR. GOODMAN: Again, I don't I cannot
15	give you a detailed answer to that question, but that
16	is also not part of our review or process.
17	PARTICIPANT: We are literally the
18	children of great dreams, Red Cloud, Sitting Bull. We
19	are the living artifacts, so in our time, you all
20	sitting here couldn't comprehend. The Black Hills
21	still belong to our people. So to us you have no
22	purpose, no right, to be here. And my grandfather
23	claimed 10,000 acres, and me, as a grandmother, I
24	would fight to stop that. It's not going to happen.
25	But we are living artifacts.

MR. GOODMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

PARTICIPANT: That's all I have to say.

MR. GOODMAN: Thank you. Yes.

MS. ANTOINE: I'm Paula Antoine from the Oglala Sioux Tribe. My question is, you know, it says tribal consultation but in your presentation, you are just asking us how to determine if there are any culturally significant rights that cam be put on the National Registry? So what about anything else that has happened? What about anything that culturally or spiritual or any other significance to any -- to our tribes that is not eligible to be on the national registry? Will that be ignored? And what are our comments going to do? If you are just a regulatory agency, how are our comments going to affect what is happening?

MR. GOODMAN: Your comments here today provide information for Section 106 our us And the NRC approves or denies consultation process. the application that the applicant has submitted, and part of our process, our review, is to satisfy and fulfill the Section 106 process. And part of that process is getting input from tribes in a facility like that.

MS. ANTOINE: What are you going to do

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

with it?

MR. GOODMAN: We are going to use it to help generate an independent analysis and conclusion.

And if our analysis and conclusion is that we need more information from the tribes, then we are going to continue to interact, and we are going to continue to involve you in every step of the process.

MS. WHITE PLUM: Excuse me. You didn't answer the question. She asked you -- there are places there that did not fit the criteria to be placed on the National Historic -- National Registry of Historic Places. What happens then? You didn't answer her question.

MR. GOODMAN: We do our own independent analysis of all of those sites, all of them, not just the ones that -- the applicant has submitted that cultural survey and that information. That is our starting point. That's not our own independent analysis, and that's not our own independent review. And so we will look at the potential impacts to all of those sites that you are talking about. Yes, we will do that.

MS. WHITE PLUM: So you will make that decision, then. The NRC will make that decision.

MR. GOODMAN: Not me personally, because I

	129
1	am not an expert.
2	MS. WHITE PLUM: By "you" I mean the NRC
3	will make the decision.
4	MR. GOODMAN: That is correct.
5	MS. OLSON: So just Paige Olson. Just
6	to clarify, this is I guess I have a question,
7	probably for one of the attorneys. In terms of how
8	this process works when you are using 800.8 of the
9	regulations, just because it the National Historic
10	Preservation Act is very specific in what a historical
11	property is.
12	NEPA allows for a broader use of cultural
13	resources in terms of things that are intangible. How
14	does that work on this type of process? When you are
15	using 800.8, are you are you able to also sort of
16	use this more kind of intangible.
17	MR. KLUKAN: Generally speaking, yes.
18	MS. OLSON: Okay.
19	MR. KLUKAN: So that was going to be one
20	of the things I point out. NEPA and the National
21	Environmental Policy Act, their outcomes are different
22	from what the outcomes that at NHPA or the
23	National Historic Preservation Act are.
24	But we do also and the other point of
25	this is is not all of the information you give us

today is going to be used for NHPA purposes, but also for our national environmental -- NEPA compliance as well, for cultural impacts, what we generally call cultural impacts, which as you point are a broader range of things than what is covered under that.

So that's also, I think as we mentioned in

our letter inviting you here today. And when we initially sent out to tribes -- consultation letters -- that we were also asking for information under NEPA, just broad cultural significance information. And so that is one of the things we will look at as part of our NEPA analysis is just broader cultural impacts, which don't fall into the more rigid definition of historic properties within the National Historic Preservation Act. So that's to supplement what Nathan said.

MR. GOODMAN: Thank you.

MR. KLUKAN: That's a good point.

MR. GOODMAN: When we -- when the NRC approves an application, we are saying we are approving it because we feel that it can operate safely, yes.

PARTICIPANT: So the premise is that nature can be controlled under certain conditions.

And aren't you guys creating opposition to anything

NEAL R. GROSS

that is?

MR. GOODMAN: I understand.

PARTICIPANT: And aren't you -- that is really at the crux of the problem and what people are trying to say is that you have assumptions that nature can be controlled. We see it all the time. We see it -- like at one time there used to be bear country. And now it's malignant. The ranchers have safety for their cattle. We have wildlife management, we have bans, we have all of these things which are the result of attitudes that nature needs to be controlled. This is totally a white-dominant society.

On the part of those who follow earth, we believe that it is not only wrong but is hazardous to all living things that nature needs to be controlled or should be controlled. And we believe that it wouldn't take a whole lot to upset the balance, and so we see that in a lot of the nature here, that the balance of earth is being disrupted continuously by those who dominate.

And I think that's a major issue with this. Therefore, it's hard for me to be neutral and say, "Well, we don't represent the government. We don't represent the corporations. And we don't -- you know, we don't take their side, and we don't take your

side." But, in the end, you have to take a side. MR. GOODMAN: Just to clarify one point. We do represent the government. We are an independent 3 federal regulatory agency. PARTICIPANT: Yes. represent MR. GOODMAN: We do the government. Well, yes, in that sense. 8 PARTICIPANT: I also heard you say, you know, that you're 9 10 independent. 11 MR. GOODMAN: That is correct. Okay. So as an independent 12 PARTICIPANT: it's presumed that you are you don't 13 so 14 actually representing them, but you are representing --15 16 GOODMAN: We do not represent the MR. applicants. We do not represent the utilities. 17 is also correct, yes. 18 Independent refers to our 19 KLUKAN: position in the executive department, and what that 20 21 means for our -- how our Commission operates, and what 22 is required to comply with in terms 23 Executive Orders and what not. That's what we mean by 24 "independent." We still represent the Federal 25 Government with regard to matters relating -- within the scope of our jurisdiction. That's really all we mean by that.

PARTICIPANT: And one of the other things that I heard you say is, was that your biggest concern was the water, but it also actually includes the air.

MR. GOODMAN: Thank you. Thank you for your comment. I think we'll just go -- the question is, do we look at the tribal mineral rights?

MR. VON TILL: We don't look at the leasing arrangements or the mineral rights or anything like that. The BLM, if it's on BLM land, would look at that kind of aspect. But, again, that is not a safety aspect of the review. That's separately done between the industry and the people who own the land, whether they have their operations, and who owns the mining rights, the mineral rights, and so forth, beneath that land. So we don't get involved in that.

Now, with the exception of BLM land or Forest Service land, the U.S. Government does get involved in some capacity there, if it was BLM land or Forest Service land. But like the Crawford site that we're talking about, there is no government land. It's private land, and there's private mineral rights. There is no Indian mineral rights there on Crawford, so there is not an issue there.

NEAL R. GROSS

But in the past, like the Navajo Nation, there was some issue with some of that there in the early '50s, and so forth. But we don't have that with Crawford right now.

MR. ROM: Can I just clarify the question?

He is referring to the treaty, that they never gave up the mineral rights. Basically, telling you that these are not private mineral rights, they are not government mineral rights, they are the tribe's minerals. Is that correct?

MR. GOODMAN: Thank you.

MR. ROM: So, you know, NRC may believe there is not an issue there, but I guess that's for the attorneys and courts to figure out.

MR. KLUKAN: Well, our position is that we don't really have the -- our jurisdiction is very limited in terms of safety analysis, because they -- we would not be the people -- we don't have the authority to make that decision, nor should we be the people to make that decision for you.

That's a matter for the courts and for the tribes themselves to determine through, you know, mechanisms provided under our legal system. But we are not -- we don't have the jurisdiction to tell you what is your -- within your treaty and not within your

NEAL R. GROSS

treaty. That far exceeds the bounds of our limited 1 safety jurisdiction. 2 Sorry. We will finish up, 3 MR. GOODMAN: and then we are going to go in the back, and then Bryce, and then the gentleman with the hat, and then I promise I will get to all four of you. MS. WHITE PLUM: Well, I just want to say that that's why this whole process is unfair, because 8 the attorneys are doing all the answering, and our 9 tribal attorneys are not here. There are several 10 11 bands here. Our attorneys aren't here. As the plaintiffs, our attorneys aren't 12 here, so I think we should just not even deal with 13 14 what -- we don't want to litigate things in here. think whoever is running this meeting needs to move it 15 on to another comment or something, rather than having 16 the attorneys do all the talking. I'd just like to 17 say that much. 18 19 MR. GOODMAN: Thank you. As people have their hands up, I would like to answer questions, 20 21 though. Finish your statement, I'm sorry. 22 MR. ROM: Well, this goes back to some things before. Under NEPA, you are going to deal with 23 24 purpose and need for the projects, right?

MR. GOODMAN: That's correct.

1	MR. ROM: Okay. So you are not limited to
2	safety issues, because before someone was asking
3	about, do you evaluate the need for the project? And
4	you do that to some extent under NEPA.
5	MR. GOODMAN: In our environmental review,
6	we do, yes.
7	MR. ROM: And then, a lot of the other
8	things that are being brought up here will be somewhat
9	looked at under the environmental justice portion of
10	NEPA as well.
11	MR. GOODMAN: Again, you are correct, sir.
12	MR. ROM: Yes.
13	MR. GOODMAN: Yes, that's a great
14	MR. ROM: So people should understand
15	MR. GOODMAN: Thank you.
16	MR. ROM: that.
17	MR. GOODMAN: Did you understand Lance's
18	point? Under the National Environmental Policy Act,
19	the environmental review we do does incorporate
20	sections like environmental justice and impacts to
21	environmental justice. And all of that will be
22	incorporated in our review.
23	MR. ROM: You'd better explain what
24	environmental justice is, and then they will really
25	make a

MS. WHITE PLUM: I think it would help, if you'd clarify this information-gathering 2 session for the NRC with the national historic places versus what is going to be covered and when will the NEPA process begin, or is this part of it. See, that's what is not clear here. MR. GOODMAN: Okay. I will try to --MS. WHITE PLUM: That's why we're getting all of these questions from all of these --MR. GOODMAN: I will try to answer your question. We are here for both. We are here for both 12 Section 106 consultation, but we are also here to gather information for our NEPA review. And so we are 14 -- we are doing both here today. You also asked when -- did you ask when 15 the NEPA review will be complete? We don't have -- I 16 give you a confirmation 17 can't answer on t.hat. specifically. we are currently in 18 However, the process of writing our environmental document. 19 that is our ongoing process. 20 Yes, please. 22 PARTICIPANT: Ι had question а on 23 information provided. The information that 24 provided to us about these projects, is that coming 25 directly from the application? How was it selected to

3

6

8

9

10

11

13

1	be presented? Is this the entire information from the
2	application? Or is this just selected portions that
3	you wanted us to see.
4	MR. GOODMAN: That is an excellent
5	question. The information that you have in the
6	slides, specific to the ones that I gave, was
7	information we received from the application.
8	Now, as part of the application, they are
9	required the NRC requires them to submit a cultural
10	survey, and so a lot of the information that you
11	received was from that cultural survey. So, yes, as
12	for your question of, is that what I want you to
13	see
14	PARTICIPANT: Yes, is it
14 15	PARTICIPANT: Yes, is it MR. GOODMAN: the application
15	MR. GOODMAN: the application PARTICIPANT: Did you show us the entire
15 16	MR. GOODMAN: the application PARTICIPANT: Did you show us the entire
15 16 17	MR. GOODMAN: the application PARTICIPANT: Did you show us the entire application, or are you just showing us portions or
15 16 17 18	MR. GOODMAN: the application PARTICIPANT: Did you show us the entire application, or are you just showing us portions or highlights of the application?
15 16 17 18	MR. GOODMAN: the application PARTICIPANT: Did you show us the entire application, or are you just showing us portions or highlights of the application? MR. GOODMAN: I wanted to give an
15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GOODMAN: the application PARTICIPANT: Did you show us the entire application, or are you just showing us portions or highlights of the application? MR. GOODMAN: I wanted to give an overview, a sort of Cliff Notes version. So I did
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GOODMAN: the application PARTICIPANT: Did you show us the entire application, or are you just showing us portions or highlights of the application? MR. GOODMAN: I wanted to give an overview, a sort of Cliff Notes version. So I did provide just certain information, that's correct.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GOODMAN: the application PARTICIPANT: Did you show us the entire application, or are you just showing us portions or highlights of the application? MR. GOODMAN: I wanted to give an overview, a sort of Cliff Notes version. So I did provide just certain information, that's correct. However, I am not hiding anything from you. The

	provide the process that they used to complete this
2	cultural survey?
3	MR. GOODMAN: They provided us they
4	provided us information on the survey as to who
5	completed it. Yes, they did that as part of the
6	application.
7	PARTICIPANT: So the process is also in
8	the application?
9	MR. GOODMAN: I believe I'm answering your
10	question yes, but I'm not particularly sure. But yes,
11	they provided information for us regarding the survey.
12	PARTICIPANT: And were tribes part of
13	that?
14	MR. GOODMAN: They do have yes, they do
15	have a slight section on they do have information
16	provided on how they came up with the information they
17	came up with, yes.
18	Bryce, sorry, it has been a while.
19	MR. IN THE WOODS: This question is
20	directed at the NRC, whoever can answer it, because
21	you say emergency situations. For example, we are
22	talking with Keystone XL, and they asked a couple of
23	weeks ago in April did we have any spills, leaks, et
24	cetera, any kind of situation.
25	My the other spill that happened in

Kalamazoo, 30 miles of water -- you know, crude oil, and closed that off. I mentioned that, and how are they going to -- you know, that is an emergency situation. And they had a spill of Keystone 1, a faulty -- piece of equipment that was faulty. So that created a spill.

Is there a contingency that NRC has, you know, that when we have these companies which are paying for the EIS, paying for monitoring, they are doing all of this, because of the climate change that we're basing it on, and there's concern about our water, because you're putting a pipeline under water, you're not guaranteed.

If it spills under the Missouri, it spills under the Big River, the Fan River, it is going to impact -- you know, it is going to impact everybody.

And then, there was a recent earthquake down by St. Louis. I mentioned earthquake to Keystone personnel. They said, "We've got no spills." But now they can't say that. These are real severe.

So when we come to adverse effects and the failure to resolve those effects due to emergency situations that are out of control of the company, NRC, everybody. And we fear it is going to happen. And when it does happen, the area of potential effects

NEAL R. GROSS

is going to be great.

So what is NRC -- what areas have you guys ever handled? And what have you done to resolve -- you know, failure to resolve adverse effects? I was up by -- I can't remember the location now, but you guys have a power plant that is -- the pipelines underneath are leaking -- leaking some radioactive material. And then, the company says they are putting it back in, doing reverse osmosis or whatever, and they are putting it back into the water.

Does that really -- is NRC really looking after that? Are they getting a look at the water quality? Are they going to throw it on EPA?

To give you a little update on EPA, they were hamstringed. The previous administration went to three directors, and that told us something. Now, the EPA is -- again, they are under attack again. And how is NRC going to look at these emergency situations that our people have foretold that these things are coming?

And now we are here, how are you going to deal with that in the committee process that is going to bankrupt the energy companies if failure happens?

I was told by energy company personnel that that's what is going to happen. It's expensive for them to

-- you know, they're leery about it moving up or down instead of like going out there and monitoring it.

And who is going to pay for that? When that contamination happens, who is going to pay for that? Because an emergency situation, we can't tell when it going to happen and where it's going to happen. Is NRC factoring that in on these adverse effects, that that may happen?

MR. GOODMAN: You asked a lot of excellent questions in there, and sort of as an overview, and I hope this does an adequate job of answering your question. When we complete the NEPA review, we determine whether or not there are adverse impacts to the site. And if we do make a determination that there would be adverse impacts, then we would put -- include that in the environmental documents. Yes, we would talk about that.

MR. IN THE WOODS: With that recommendation to -- the recommendation to do what, because you have that documentation, and then, when you do that review, or you do that review with your documentation, is that recommendation going to be in there? Or something unforseen that -- you know, like we were told from Keystone, "We don't have a spill," but yet there are spills going on in this country

NEAL R. GROSS

because of Canada companies, again.

MR. GOODMAN: Right.

MR. VON TILL: But he's talking about -during our review process we do look at accident
analysis, and so forth. And to answer your question,
really, if there's spills that go on, then the company
is required to clean up these spills. The company is
required by our license to clean up the groundwater.

We also have in our regulations a requirement for financial surety, so that all of these facilities -- the operating facilities like Crow Butte, they have a financial surety. I'm not sure what it is right now -- \$35 million, \$40 million, whatever it is.

The purpose of that is if that company goes bankrupt, that a third party can clean up that site. So that's part of the regulations as a part of the UMTRCA that I mentioned earlier, as to requirements to make sure that these sites are cleaned up. And these companies can't just run off and go bankrupt. We have a financial surety. So I just wanted to point that out.

MR. IN THE WOODS: They left some in the northwest corner. That's what happened. They didn't clean it up.

MR. VON TILL: Yes, I -

MR. IN THE WOODS: What I'm saying is that I know this is going to break your companies. They told me that. You know, they can't -- if they permit the aquifer, they are going come in and do reverse osmosis. Very expensive is what they're telling me.

And then, to put that back onto, I mean, that -- who is going to absorb that cost if something happens that we can't foresee? Let's say an earthquake hit over here. You know, there was an earthquake in South Dakota a while back, so that's the scenario I guess, would be an earthquake would really be devastating for a state like Wyoming.

If there was a major earthquake in Wyoming, with all that coal burning and stuff under the ground, it seems like the way they have the CGMs, and then they have let say's Buffalo Butte. The degradation and the integrity, that was not there no more because of all of the building.

NRC can't assure that degradation to the aquifers is there. That's a whole area of drainage and marshes, a whole ecosystem there. And underneath that you can't really -- you can't really say that uranium mining, that there is no type of degradation there, the integrity is gone there, because of all of

NEAL R. GROSS

the mining -- I mean, all of the drilling that is 1 It can't be done. 2 there. 3 I think we're going to look at some real serious issues here if this continues and NRC doesn't factor that in in an emergency situation. You know, it --MR. RED CLOUD: Over here. Well, I'm going back and they haven't done nothing for us. 8 you talk to my people. So I -- what you say here, 9 10 you'd better leave, because that's it. We don't want 11 to hear it anymore. So leave. You've never done 12 nothing for Lakota people. So thank you to come out and try -- talk 13 14 to us. Thank you. MR. GOODMAN: Yes. 15 This is Mike Catches MR. CATCHES ENEMY: 16 Before we continue, I wanted to, first of all, 17 Enemy. 18 thank everybody for their comments. Ι think exactly 19 everybody's comments is what you hopefully came for, you know, to hear all of the 20 comments and issues. 21 I think some of the main comments that are 22 coming up that are really important is how we are 23 24 talking about three different mines right now, but we 25 are also talking about NEPA, and we are also talking about NHPA. So it's a lot to try to keep clear and keep focused on.

And I think one of the good points that was brought up is about the attorneys. You know, a lot of the comments that are coming from the tribes and the other representatives, we don't have our counsel here to, you know, rely on to clarify for us. Nothing against your guys' counsel, but since we don't have our legal folks here, I think there really is a disadvantage for us. It feels that way.

If we say something, it's clarified by you guys, and then we just kind of keep going back and forth. That's not -- I don't think that was the intent of this meeting, to get back and have our attorney. If we're going to do that, then let's have litigation. I don't think this meeting was established for that purpose.

I wanted to yield the floor. He's been waiting, and he waited patiently, and he has kind of been passed over. Dennis, do you have any comments? You had your hand up.

MR. YELLOW THUNDER: Thank you, Mike.

This is Dennis again. Basically, I just was going back to what I had said before about -- about the -- really, the purpose and intent for your expansion into

NEAL R. GROSS

these other mines.

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And with the number of mines that you already have in Wyoming, the 5,400 mines or recovery units that is already in operation, and the number of wells that you will be proposing through this proposed Dewey-Burdock plus the north expansion, North Trend expansion, it just seems like you -- it's like an overkill, in my perspective.

And being a regulatory agency, you are the national regulatory agent -- commission, it seems that you should be regulating that little more intensively, I would say, and be very careful and, you know, consider very -- for the benefit of the people involved the expansions that you should -- you know, that you might be considering to do, and really regulating, actually, doing your job as the regulatory commission to regulate, and maybe not to, you know, I make the expansions that needed, quess are and especially into the Dewey-Burdock area in the Black Hills, which is also very sacred to our people.

And I guess another thing I wanted to ask was, what is the life span of the Crow Butte recovery unit? I mean, is it going to produce at a sufficient rate to meet those energy needs for another five years, another 10 years, 15 years? Or is it like in a

NEAL R. GROSS

situation in which an expansion is, bang, ready, got to expand now? You know, Crow Butte is running out, let's expand.

So, you know, with those kind of things in -- taking those kinds of things into consideration, is an expansion really actually necessary to move into the North Trend area, into Dewey-Burdock? Are those essential? I mean, is it crucial that those expansions be made?

You know, taking into consideration everything that has been mentioned by these other tribes, by concerns of people of the THPO, the SHPO, all of these other entities that are present today.

Is an expansion actually really needed?

Is it really something that is going to, you know -will the energy needs that we have, are they so great
that we need to have this type of expansion at this
rate and into these areas that are very crucial to our
historical perspective and to the artifacts that are
there?

And not only that, but we have also wildlife out there, we have animals, we have birds, we have things that are living in those areas, not only people, and livestock. So in regards to everything that has been said here today, you know, that has been

NEAL R. GROSS

1	my point was, what is the life span of the Crow Butte
2	recovery unit? And what is the urgency for expansion
3	for the expansion that has been proposed?
4	MR. GOODMAN: To answer your question, NRC
5	does not make that determination. We don't
6	determination we don't make the determination as to
7	whether or not the expansion is necessary. We just
8	regulate and approve or deny the application.
9	MR. YELLOW THUNDER: Well, I think in your
10	capacity, then maybe it would be beneficial to really
11	take into consideration everything that has been here
12	to do that.
13	MR. GOODMAN: Thank you so much for your
14	concern.
15	MR. YELLOW THUNDER: You know?
16	MR. GOODMAN: Thank you. That's a good
17	comment.
18	MR. YELLOW THUNDER: Thank you.
19	MR. GOODMAN: I think the gentleman with
20	the hat, you've had your hand up for probably an hour
21	now. Good? Okay.
22	MR. VANCE: Steve Vance from Cheyenne
23	River. Regarding an emergency. What is your priority
24	to fulfill this as a scenario? An earthquake happens,
25	there's a disaster at the Crow Butte facility. What

1	is the applicant or NRC liable for, for recovery of
2	that?
3	MR. GOODMAN: So your question is
4	MR. VANCE: Within the project site alone
5	or beyond it?
6	MR. GOODMAN: Your question is, if there
7	were to be an accident at
8	MR. VANCE: At the Crow Butte facility or
9	something
10	MR. GOODMAN: the Crow Butte facility,
11	what is NRC's obligation at that point? Is that
12	MR. VANCE: Is that beyond the site, too,
13	or
14	MR. GOODMAN: I believe that our we
15	include more than just the site, that we have a radius
16	of impact for accidents and
17	MR. VON TILL: Yes. If there is any kind
18	of an accident, you know, offsite, we would deal with
19	offsite as well. It's not contained to the licensed
20	area.
21	MR. VANCE: Who is responsible, the NRC or
22	the applicant?
23	MR. VON TILL: The company is responsible
24	for dealing with that. We oversee the company
25	response on taking care of any kind of emergency like
11	

that. I think if it would get really bad enough, I think way offsite FEMA - FEMA would also be involved, the Federal -- FEMA, Federal Emergency Management might also be involved, also the state would be involved.

Recognize, too, that the Crow Butte facility is regulated by the NRC. But it is also regulated by the State of Nebraska under several permits that they have. So we would work with the state on making sure that the Cameco would deal with any kind of emergency that would occur. So I hope that answers the question.

MR. VANCE: Well, great. Because I was just reading one in Wyoming where they were -- the bond covered only -- the site only in an issue like that. That's why I questioned that for NRC, you know, in Nebraska here, who would be responsible, and at what level, you know. And this one with Wyoming, they were talking about Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality made a statement that they were liable within the project boundaries only.

So that is going on to what Bryce mentioned about unpredictable things that can happen, and they will happen. You know, they -- the applicant said yesterday when we questioned, that they would

NEAL R. GROSS

pressure test. They would go down and test. But the effects ain't going to be right away. Nature don't respond, you know, instantly to what, you know, is being applied to it. It could be a year or two or 10 or 50 years down the line that the fault will react to the pressure that's been done to it. We don't know that. Nobody knows that.

So it is an issue of a question that is unknown. That's why we're talking about water and air, you know, the unknown factors. And the state is monitoring this, but they are doing a semi-annual, you know, review. If there was a leak at the time of you guys, you know, doing a test or monitoring, maybe you would understand that there is a leak. But there could be leaks that go unreported, like you said. You kind of assume they would tell everything up front, open.

Going back to another comment I wanted to make is that somebody had mentioned that, you know, the need for uranium is -- falls under the Department of Energy and stuff, but -- and going back to this applicant, we, you know, from Canada.

So there again, you know, I think that should be, you know, addressed also, that it is not from this -- you know, a company from here. Wherever

NEAL R. GROSS

they sell this, if the United States buys it's, it's buying it back from another country, but yet it's being mined out of this country.

You know, I know that question came up, and I know a lot of these things are what -- I believe the same issue. I wasn't there when all this stuff was discussed back in 2006, 2008, whenever, but it seems like it's all the same concerns, same questions, same comments, as what was addressed back then, and the license was issued. And here we're talking about renewal, and the same kind of questions and concerns and issues are still at the table.

So I kind of feel like, you know, it is going to vote for the renewal, because it was issued to begin with, with all of these things brought to the table. I'm just hoping that, you know, they are falling -- you know, it wouldn't fall on deaf ears this time that these concerns -- because they are the same concerns they were back then -- air, water, you know, light, boundaries, you know, historical sites, traditional sites.

All these things were brought up before when they applied for the application to begin with -the permit. And I just kind of sense that. I'm just hoping that it don't go that way, but the same

NEAL R. GROSS

questions, the same concerns -- we haven't changed. The native people haven't changed in their care of what life is. Our ancestors felt that way; we still feel that way.

But I've heard that from many people here, you know, as to what has happened. There is a saying that (Native language). Take a look behind you, your grandchildren are coming. What are we leaving them? Where are the responsible ones? So I just wanted to mention that.

MR. GOODMAN: Did you come up with your question?

MR. BIG CROW: Yes, sir. I would just like to make a few comments about the BIA, Department of Interior, did a survey of this land, the Badlands. So the natural gas that was here on my reservation, the oil, the uranium that they are talking about, is all going to be built into energy later on as the years go by.

So I am assuming that because this thing happening, and it sat on the table, it has been talked about in national life, the political table, in other countries, and so forth, that you guys are coming out here and doing these surveys, and we ask you, United States, to make sure that all of these checkpoints are

done, because of the drilling down to the main water line and to the aquifer water created some problems here, big problems.

Article 6 of the United States Constitution, which the United States has got to live by and honor. In Article 6 it says, "Treaties are the supreme law of the land," and there's two treaties that it is talking about -- no other treaties in the country, in the world -- 1851 and 1853.

Well, some of our older people say, and some of the politicians that I know, that I met, have said this, since Congress adopted treaties and passed it on to 1843, Department of War, to take care of the treaty matters. In this process of treaties, the Supreme Court upheld the treaty aspects to make this agreement. That never happened.

So the treaties are out there, and you guys are coming in from the United States' standpoint and making all of these assessments. You know, I know, other people around this room here know, that the language of this treaty has changed.

In the last 20 years, 25 years, the United States Government has said, "This is our land," meaning "their" land. How did they come to that perception, without the Indians approval already. And

NEAL R. GROSS

it takes two groups of people to make a treaty.

And one side is doing all of this, we're screwed -- excuse my language -- so these assessments that you are going back to make water lines, and drilling, you've got a book set up here to have everybody sign to do your - The assignment, the assessment, that is the evaluation that backs up your document. The adverse practices is being handled and done. I mean, is that the way you got to look at this thing, because the Badlands over here, you start picking up the Badlands, you've got uranium over here, all the way down.

It said Nebraska over here has cut off our main water line, and they haven't approached the tribe or they never made our tribe aware of it. So all of these paper barriers existed. There are a lot of these barriers.

And so if we are going to be true and do our talking here to be on the same table. I have to say something here. Washington, D.C. was built by a black man. Forty years later, we elect a black person in there. Now he is bringing back to the table to make these amendments. And those amendments are not being defined or combined or brought out to benefit the Indian people.

NEAL R. GROSS

Lakota Nation -- that's what we are called -- the Lakota and Nakota and Dakota were the only group of people in the United States that whipped the United States butt and took their flag. And then, somehow in the midst of all this they took their -- they stole their pipe back. They just auctioned that thing off for \$7.3 million.

That's history. Nobody says it. So while you're doing your assessments here and using the Great Sioux Nations' area, being in Rosebud, Cheyenne River, Standing Rock, Oglalas, we are all in this together. If assessments here are going to be done for the United States, and only the United States, without our consent, that's how I view this.

This is how I look at that. Is that what we're doing right now, to make these assessments of the drilling and water to build this energy up for the United States Government? Because that's what going out to in these wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya, that we won't need to import no more oil into the United States, we can use our own energy.

So tell me if we're missing the boat here and need some to create another image. But, yes, we are going to make all of this energy out, and then put it on the table to benefit the United States

NEAL R. GROSS

Government. Is that what is going to happen?

Why we are here today is to MR. GOODMAN: gather information, so that we can complete environmental review process, which includes writing a document within the National Environmental Policy Act, as well as satisfying the Section 106 requirements. I can't necessarily -- I know that's not necessarily the answer that you wanted to hear, but, yes, we are here to write environmental documents. That is why we're Is it -- so, yes, that's why we're here.

MR. BIG CROW: So you're here to benefit the United States and leave the tribes out, right?

MR. GOODMAN: No, that's -- sorry, that's not what I said. That's not correct. We're here, and we are involved in the tribes today, and we continue to -- we will continue to involve the tribes for this entire process. We are not writing this document for the sole purpose of the U.S. Government. In fact, it says in the National Environmental Policy Act that it is written for the public, and it is an environmental review process. So no, we are not going to exclude the tribes from here forward. We are going to continue to include the tribes in this entire process.

MR. RED CLOUD: All right. In other words, right now, you've violated 1851, and Article 6,

NEAL R. GROSS

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	that treaty is violated right now. That is our right.
2	That is very important. But right now you are
3	violating 1851.
4	MR. GOODMAN: Thank you for your comment.
5	MR. RED CLOUD: But it's free.
6	MR. GOODMAN: Are there any other
7	questions?
8	MS. CONVERSE: Yes.
9	MR. GOODMAN: Yes?
10	MS. CONVERSE: Kat Converse. I just
11	wanted to add on to the last two comments in reference
12	to being a clean energy. I was just curious,
13	yesterday during the tour, I believe Wade pointed out
14	that at Crow Butte is kind of an intersection of
15	three different power sources. And I was just curious
16	if the carbon footprint was going to be included in
17	the EA, as far as the usage of fossil fuels in order
18	to run their facilities.
19	MR. GOODMAN: That's an excellent
20	question. Did everyone hear the question? The
21	question was: does the overall carbon footprint get
22	included in the NRC's environmental review? The
23	answer to that question is yes, through something
24	called cumulative impacts.

In any environmental document under NEPA,

NEAL R. GROSS

we do a cumulative impact assessment. The cumulative impact assessment, to use a technical term, includes the action on the table, plus all other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions from any other federal agency, and also any non-federal agency. So it does include everything in the resource impact area. So, yes, we do take a look at all of that in a cumulative impact assessment.

Any other questions?

MR. MESTETH: I would like to make some statements here.

MR. GOODMAN: Certainly.

MR. MESTETH: Okay. My name is Wilmer Mesteth, and I am the Oglala Sioux Tribe tribal historic preservation officer. And I am also a spiritual leader on this reservation all my life, and I am also another traditional leader for my community. And so I represent a lot of people on our Pine Ridge Reservation.

Our tribe is the largest tribe of the Sioux Nation. We have 68,000 people. We are the largest tribe. We are the largest land base. And that's why today I am really happy that a lot of our elders, our people, families come here today to speak. And you need to hear us, you know. NRC needs to hear

NEAL R. GROSS

this. It might be hard to hear, but you have to hear it, because I'm going to tell you about the history, what my uncle is saying here, what these treaty people are saying here.

Our treaty rights, they are the law of the land. It is commissions like this that come here in history, they are the ones that wrote the treaty. We didn't write the treaty. The words that they wrote on those documents come from the (native language). Not one Lakota wrote that word on that treaty.

And they got interpreters to speak to our elders, our chiefs, and the government made promises to these chiefs. In the 1851 treaty, there are seven tribes that are included in the 1851 treaty. At that time, there was a chief -- his name was Matho Wayuhi. He was designated from Washington to be the chief of all of the Lakota. So he represented our people at the 1851 treaty, and it was held in Fort Laramie treaty grounds area in Wyoming.

And they were talking about this land here, and the government wanted a road to our lands. Our lands extended down to the Smoky Hill River in Kansas. And we called it (native language). And that road is coming through Nebraska, right through the heart of our country.

NEAL R. GROSS

At that time, there was millions of head of buffalo, in 1851 -- an estimate of 78 million head of buffalo that roamed this country, and that was our way of life, our food, our life resources. All of the animals that existed here, we hunted those animals. And we drank these waters, and they were pure.

And the next treaty is 1868 treaty. And it is our grandfathers, the chiefs, that are the signatories. If you look at that document, it is not only one chief. We have chiefs -- grandpas that are chiefs. If you just look at that document, their names are on that treaty. There is Northern Cheyennes on it, there is Northern Arapahos, there is Siksikawa people name on that treaty -- 1868 treaty.

And the history of that treaty took place on Fort Laramie again. Chief Red Cloud won this war here on the Powder River. They talked with the United States, and put us up to this road, the Bozeman Trail, and so the government came and took them to Portland, evacuated them. They left them, abandoned them.

And it was the understanding of our chiefs and the warriors that fought that battle that they won the war. They didn't want them coming through the Powder River. And then, they wanted chiefs to come to Fort Laramie and sign the treat in 1867. So Chief

NEAL R. GROSS

Little Wound, Chief Red Cloud, all the chiefs, Chief Young Man Afraid of His Horses, Pawnee Killer, Bad Wound, their names are on there -- all men there, their names are on that treaty.

And here the government turned around what they wrote down, like they are trying to do here -write down our words, misconstrued those words. And today, you know, even our lawyers have treated the way it's written -- it was our understanding through the from the United States interpreters that came Government, misconstrued the words of the chiefs, turned those words around, changed the wording in those treaty agreements to benefit themselves, not our people.

Later on, we discovered that they tricked the people, and then they started taking these lands. My uncle, one of our traditional chiefs, talking about this 1851 treaty, those are lands of Lakota people. So those treaties, you know, were changed after the commissions went to Washington, D.C.

We are trying to tell you how this affecting this mining here today. Then, how it was affecting our resources then, the same story we are trying to tell you again today. And when those lands were taken from our people, Homestead Act opened up

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and gave those lands to those immigrants.

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yesterday we went to view that country there -- Crow Butte. And company people were telling how they had a good relationship going with the landowners, the ranchers, and the county commissioner. And they were even giving donations to their schools, and all of this, you know.

And here we sit, the two landowners. Those are not fully litigated yet. They are still in Our people are still in the court. litigation. want accept money, call it to no compensation. Just compensation, they want to pay us pennies for all that land and resources that this country is living off of -- Lakota land, Lakota minerals, Lakota water, Lakota resources. There are forests still today that the State of Nebraska is benefitting from our land, the State of Wyoming, State of Colorado, and State of Kansas, Montana, Lakota country.

So those people -- homesteaders and the government, probably about 160 acres for the ranchers that live there today. Some of them have lived there 100 years, but that land -- the minerals underneath it, like my cousin was mentioning over here, those minerals belong to our people. Those lands are still

NEAL R. GROSS

in question, in litigation yet.

We've got a court case that is the oldest, longest court case in the history of the United States of America that is still in litigation here. Those answers have been answered by Washington, D.C., and that is what our elders are saying, that's what our chiefs are saying, that's what our people are telling me. You have to understand what happened in history, and so we are trying to tell you this history.

And on this -- it has always been negative towards our people. So right across our border here, the reservation border, is the White River, it runs up there. That's the historical property we are talking about.

Yesterday, I heard the company -- they are talking about property that the state historical society or the historical -- SHPO in Nebraska gave them that information. They didn't come ask us, because we have our ancestors buried there. Those mountains (native language) our ancestors are buried there.

(Native language) that string of hills there, those are burial grounds and places of worship.

Our people went up in the hills there and prayed.

And the camping sites, I was talking about where the

NEAL R. GROSS

Little Wound people were camped, where Red Cloud was camped, where Crazy Horse, when he surrendered, was camped, Little Killer.

And we have a lot of information about that whole entire area. It's rich in cultural history, our culture.

And there's tribes that also have history there -- the Pawnee, the Arapaho, the Northern Cheyenne, Kiowa, Comanche, Crow, those people have history here in this area. And they have burial grounds here, too, also.

When we went over there, they were only speaking of a few sites right there. Under there, the water, the aquifer and the watersheds got closed to our reservation here, this White River. What is taking place with that mine is going to affect us. It is affecting our historical property there in that area. You see it -- we drove right through it, all of those little canisters. You could see it on the ground there, that mining, in situ mining.

It started on the land there, because an immigrant received a parcel of land, and he thinks he owns the resources underneath it. But no, those belong to our tribe -- our tribe. So you didn't come and ask us, and that's what our people are saying.

NEAL R. GROSS

And it's affecting our people, our generation.

I was mentioning it this morning and yesterday that gestational -- I mean, diabetes is happening, pancreatic cancer showing up all of a sudden here, diabetes increasing, up to 82 percent on our reservation, all of a sudden.

Our water resources were pure when I was a young boy. Today we can't drink this water that flows through the White River. The old springs were used to gather the sacred water and drink it. It's contaminated. What caused that? I want this Commission to look into it, those health issues that -- what we are having to face here on our reservation, look into that, what is causing those.

Before you make a decision for a county commissioner and an immigrant, you know, across the border here, you've got to take a look at all of that information there that we have. We want to tell you those things. That's why we don't trust commissions like this when they come onto our reservation.

And that's why we say these words. It's hard to hear, but you have to hear it and weigh the decision you're going to be making, because don't benefit from those. We don't have mining operations. We don't get money off of that. We don't want that.

NEAL R. GROSS

We banned mining on this reservation. There is no mining activity here, because we are looking to the future, the survival of our generations to come. We are going to live here forever.

So I wanted to mention that I am the tribal historic preservation officer. I take that serious. And my friends from up north in the other tribes, they take their job serious. We are representing our people the best we can, and they are our people.

We want to bring them here, so you can hear them. Maybe you're tired and you don't want to hear it, but you have to hear it, and I want you to hear it, each and every one of you. You have families that you are threatened, how would you react? We feel threatened by that mining.

So that's all I wanted to say.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you very much.

Thank you. I really appreciate all of you sharing your information with us.

As we mentioned at the very beginning, the purpose of this meeting is to try to gather as much information as we can, listen to your concerns and your comments. So we really appreciate all the time that you have spent with us, so we do appreciate that.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. GOODMAN: Are there any other questions or -- yes.

MR. YOUNG DOG: My name is Ber Young Dog, and I'm from South Dakota. From 1970 to 1972, in Golden, Colorado, I worked for our tribe. And I was in their research program. And you know when all this was happening, listening to what I went through, and then hear you talk here. I don't think I want that here myself.

My brother just moved back. He was away, too, but he retired. He is homebound, and I feel the same way. And he was saying what -- since this is my fourth day here, but I haven't been out of the state. And I lived in Denver, Colorado. Actually, I retired from Boulder, Colorado, Salvation Army, a retired acting manager. So I can really say I have a real good background that I've decided I'm not the way I used to be.

You know, and when I came back in here, all the things I learned, the tools that I learned from it, is going to help me, because I hear you talk -- and I look at my brother here. We have horses, he has a ranch, you know, and what it really took to come back to his place. And it's out in the country. He likes to see deer, he likes to see foxes, and prairie

NEAL R. GROSS

170 dogs. That's home. And this you are trying to here, if that -- if it does happen, you are going to rip all 2 of the city -- the country life. That's all I've got to say, thank you. MR. GOODMAN: Thank you very much. Shall we move on to the Dewey-Burdock? (No response.) Thank you all. MS. YILMA: Good afternoon, everyone. am Haimanot Yilma. I am the project manager for the proposed Dewey-Burdock project. Like Nathan here 12 today, my goal is to briefly go over the proposed project and include an overview of the archaeological 14 survey. 15 Ι And and concerns like you have 16 been 17

would like you to share your throughout the presentation. I also would like to make sure that anything you share here in confidence will be kept in confidence.

The proposed Dewey-Burdock project looking at the Great Plains on the edges of the Black Hills. And it's about 13 miles from Edgemont, South Dakota, and about two hours from where we are here today.

> The proposed facility is about 10,500

NEAL R. GROSS

3

8

9

10

11

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	acres wide, and it is composed of two mining units
2	the Burdock unit and the Dewey unit. And as you can
3	see from this drawing, the proposed project borders
4	I'm sorry, the Black Hills National Forest borders the
5	proposed project to the north, northeast, and the
6	east.
7	And I also would like to highlight the
8	proposed project boundary or the areas of potential
9	effect is bordered in black. That's the eight areas.
10	The company did a study outside of the
11	areas potentially affected, and that's what see in
12	purple around the proposed boundary.
13	MR. CLOUTHIER: I'm sorry. Could you
14	repeat what the purple was?
15	MS. YILMA: It's the outside expanded
16	if you want to look at it that way, it's the area of
17	the review for the project.
18	MR. CLOUTHIER: And what's the distance?
19	Is it one mile?
20	MS. YILMA: I'm not sure, but I could
21	definitely get that information for you.
22	MR. CLOUTHIER: But it's about 25 miles,
23	right?
24	MS. YILMA: And as I mentioned, the
25	proposed boundary is about 10,500 acres, of which

10,300 is privately owned land, and about 240 is BLM land. BLM and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission are actually working on the supplemental environmental impact statement together, and we do have some representatives here from BLM today.

If you have any questions regarding BLM's rules and regulations, I'm sure they will be happy to entertain your questions.

They propose to use the ISR process of extraction uranium from the Dewey-Burdock project, and, if approved, the license would be issued for 10 years.

To identify potential impact to cultural and historical properties, the archaeological survey conducted by the applicant over the entire was potential areas affected, and also the expanded area, mentioned. The as survey was conducted by archaeologists from Augstana College. Currently, the NRC is reviewing that survey.

The field investigation -- I'm sorry, the survey included field investigation, a review of available records, literatures, and collections. The field investigation was a subsurface testing, and extensive excavation of some sites.

And I just want to point out, again, what

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I am going over today is what is contained in the applicant's survey. We are -- we will be doing our own independent analysis of the applicant's survey before we make any final decisions.

From the applicant's survey, over 200 archaeological sites were documented, of which four were found eligible for nomination, and 10 are listed on a national registry. And 10 historical properties and structures were documented, two of which are listed on the national registry, and three are eligible for nomination.

And before we make any determination, of course, consultation, information-gathering and further consultation will have to be done before we decide any final recommendations on our cultural resources of the NEPA document.

As I mentioned, the Black Hills National Forest borders the proposed site to the north, northeast, and the east. NRC staff recognizes the safety significance of the Black Hills. Therefore, we would like to invite you to share your concerns, provide additional information. Specifically, we would like to hear or learn more about traditional properties that you think may be impacted by the project.

NEAL R. GROSS

We understand that effective consultation is a process, not just one event. I just want to make a quick summary of what we have done to date. In October 2009, we issued a notice of intent to develop a supplemental environmental impact statement for the proposed project. And in December 2009, we conducted a site visit, which included a visit to the South Dakota SHPO's office, from where we collected a list of tribal representatives which potentially may be impacted by this proposed project.

In March 2010, we sent our first round of invitation letters to 17 different tribes that we collected from the SHPO. And we received one tribe that was interested in the proposed project. In September 2010, we followed up with a follow-up invitation letter to the 16 tribes, of which eight we have heard from to date, and are interested in the consultation part -- consultation process.

In February 2011, we learned three more tribes may be interested in the proposed project, so we went ahead and sent invitation letters to those three additional tribes. And now we are here today to hold our first information-gathering meeting.

As Nathan mentioned, all information gathered here today will be used to help us conduct

NEAL R. GROSS

1	our independent analysis of our environmental review,
2	specifically the cultural resources section of our
3	environmental review, and also help us identify any
4	traditional cultural properties or additional
5	archaeological sites that might not be already
6	highlighted that needs to be included in our cultural
7	section of the NEPA document.
8	So at this time, I would like to open it
9	up for questions, if you have any.
10	MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Mike Catches Enemy,
11	Oglala Sioux Tribe. I wanted to know if you could
12	go back to the map those two creeks that converge
13	to whatever it was.
13 14	to whatever it was. MS. YILMA: What's that?
	MS. YILMA: What's that?
14	MS. YILMA: What's that?
14 15	MS. YILMA: What's that? MR. CATCHES ENEMY: What are the names of those two creeks that are coming right through there?
14 15 16	MS. YILMA: What's that? MR. CATCHES ENEMY: What are the names of those two creeks that are coming right through there?
14 15 16 17	MS. YILMA: What's that? MR. CATCHES ENEMY: What are the names of those two creeks that are coming right through there? MS. YILMA: There is Pass Creek and Beaver Creek.
14 15 16 17	MS. YILMA: What's that? MR. CATCHES ENEMY: What are the names of those two creeks that are coming right through there? MS. YILMA: There is Pass Creek and Beaver Creek.
14 15 16 17 18	MS. YILMA: What's that? MR. CATCHES ENEMY: What are the names of those two creeks that are coming right through there? MS. YILMA: There is Pass Creek and Beaver Creek. Are there any other questions that you have?
14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. YILMA: What's that? MR. CATCHES ENEMY: What are the names of those two creeks that are coming right through there? MS. YILMA: There is Pass Creek and Beaver Creek. Are there any other questions that you have?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. YILMA: What's that? MR. CATCHES ENEMY: What are the names of those two creeks that are coming right through there? MS. YILMA: There is Pass Creek and Beaver Creek. Are there any other questions that you have? MS. OLSON: Paige Olson. Does the company know where they want to place their facility?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. YILMA: What's that? MR. CATCHES ENEMY: What are the names of those two creeks that are coming right through there? MS. YILMA: There is Pass Creek and Beaver Creek. Are there any other questions that you have? MS. OLSON: Paige Olson. Does the company know where they want to place their facility?

1	MS. YILMA: Yes. I think this is the
2	central processing unit, and there's another one right
3	here. This map doesn't show all of the other
4	potential maps, but, yes, there are in the
5	information we do have a map that shows all of the
6	various different land applications and central
7	processing units.
8	MS. OLSON: Is it possible to get a copy
9	of that?
10	MS. YILMA: Oh, definitely. It's actually
11	part of application processing added to the public
12	data also.
13	MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Can you describe the
14	other colors, and the yellow stripes and white
15	stripes, those
16	MS. YILMA: The yellow stripe is BLM.
17	MR. CATCHES ENEMY: The what?
18	MS. YILMA: BLM.
19	MR. CATCHES ENEMY: BLM.
20	MS. YILMA: So the original acres is BLM
21	land. And I know it's kind of small. The red is what
22	I mentioned, the central processing unit. Purple
23	you can't really actually see it. Let me get my
24	bigger map.
25	The blue is the South Dakota school and

public lands. This is bewey Road. I don't think you
can see it very well. This is the railroad right
here. And then, we have the claims, and the federal
claims also in there. I think that's about it. And
these are the proposed mining claims.
MR. ROM: What is the purple line there?
MS. YILMA: The purple line is the
extended the review if you want to look at it,
the review area, the extended review area. Although
the permit boundary is in black, the applicant
actually did the study outside the permit boundary.
MR. ROM: And can you provide any
information on how the area potential effect was
determined to be the exact same as the project
boundary?
MS. YILMA: Yes. The areas of potential
effect is synonymous with the project boundary.
However, if you look in the archaeological survey, you
talk about the expanded areas of potential effect, and
that's what is shown in the purple. So they did those
studies essentially within the limit boundary and
outside.
MR. ROM: Can you tell me why the permit
boundary has been determined to be the area of
potential effect?

1	MS. YILMA: Well, you know, you are
2	talking when you have a determination of areas of
3	potential effect, you look at the potential
4	disturbances that may occur. And the project
5	boundary, even though, again, it's like 10,500 acres,
6	they are not actually disturbing 10,500 acres.
7	MR. ROM: So the area of potential effect,
8	is the area you can cause to have have adverse
9	effects from the project.
10	MS. YILMA: That's correct.
11	MR. ROM: It's not the area of
12	disturbance. That's not
13	MS. YILMA: No.
14	MR. ROM: the same thing. Well, I
15	guess I have one suggestion, that maybe you need to
16	rethink the area of potential effect for this project.
17	MS. YILMA: We can definitely look into
18	it.
19	MR. WHITTED: Do you have a map that shows
20	the sites that were identified by the archaeologists?
21	I see a map that shows the sites that were identified
22	by Augustana when there were out in the field.
23	MS. YILMA: Yes.
24	MR. WHITTED: Do you have that map on the
25	projector? Can se see that?

1	MS. YILMA: No, I don't have it accessible
2	for you to look at. We do have that map. It is
3	provided for us, for our review, and it was marked as
4	sensitive and proprietary, just because there is, you
5	know Paige, you can help me with this one there
6	is a law that says that we cannot identify specific
7	locations of archaeological find. And because of
8	that, it was marked as private and sensitive.
9	MR. WHITTED: How are we expected to
10	comment on the project if we don't know what has been
11	identified there?
12	MS. YILMA: As Nathan mentioned earlier,
13	if you are interested in finding in getting a copy
14	of that information, we are more than welcome to, you
15	know, get that information over to you.
16	MR. WHITTED: Okay. I'm requesting that,
17	as well as the archaeological survey that was
18	performed.
19	MS. YILMA: The archaeological survey we
20	have actually given to
21	MR. WHITTED: Okay.
22	MS. YILMA: you. I think you have a
23	copy of it. But we can get you the map.
24	MR. JEHLE: Patty Jehle with NRC. We will
25	be able to make the archaeological survey reports

available to the tribes who would like to have unredacted versions. We withheld it because it does contain sensitive information, but we understand completely that the tribes would need to have that information to provide a full assessment from their point of view.

The Oglala Sioux were provided with an unredacted version, but the others may certainly request it, and we can provide it.

MR. VANCE: Again, going back to the other project with the survey -- this is Steve Vance from Cheyenne River again -- that, again, we are going to recommend that tribes are allowed to go in and do their survey, because the TCPs that are identified, again, going back to the other project, probably not identified or evaluated by tribes. Like I said, it was a college that provided that archaeological study and survey.

And, again, that's what -- when we look to these -- when they say "revisit a site," that's kind of what we assume we are going to do is to go in and try to identify things. But it is always somebody else identifying stuff we should be identifying. So I don't know if that was done with this one or not.

MS. YILMA: So are you -- I'm sorry, are

NEAL R. GROSS

you asking if there is going to be a TCP survey conducted here at Dewey-Burdock?

MR. VANCE: That's the only way we can evaluate our comment is if we know what we're commenting about, because I think going back to what Jim said -- we can see those sites, we know who determined them, who identified they, how were they nominated, and if there are others that need to be identified. We don't know that.

MS. YILMA: Right. So one of the reasons why we wanted to have the site visit is to facilitate the identification of traditional cultural properties, and that is just the beginning. You know, tomorrow's site visit would be a beginning stage. And if need be, we need to have more site visits or consultation, we can discuss that.

MR. VANCE: Well, like yesterday we drove around the perimeter of the Crow Butte facility. We drove around the perimeter. And we didn't really get, you know, an opportunity -- and the same with North Trend. You know, there was mention of a projectile point found in there, and then, you know, we just kind of looked at the field, and then said, you know, that doesn't give us an opportunity to comment until we go out there and look at it.

NEAL R. GROSS

And, again, you know, the vegetation out there right now limits what you can see on the surface. So I think, you know, we need to see the whole picture before we can comment on it accurately.

Again this is going back to the same one again, but I think it is going to be that way on everything. We are going to hear an archaeologist's, you know, view of a traditional cultural property, and yet we feel we have people who have that expertise to identify it.

MS. YILMA: I understand. That's one of the reasons why we are having this meeting, to make sure we understand things that are, you know, sensitive to you, and so we can consider. And as for tomorrow's site visit, if there are any areas that you might want to take a look, come out of the bus or van, take a look. Let us know. We can see if we can talk about that, and after the van stops, we can get off the do the inspections.

MR. IN THE WOODS: This is Bryce in the Woods from the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe. I guess what we're asking for is that our SHPO offices and maybe some of the selected officials put boots on the ground and go to these sites and confirm what the Augustana college students, or whoever did this

NEAL R. GROSS

survey, confirm some of that. That's sensitive to us.

That's where it's coming from. It's coming from the tribes, the sensitivity, the sites.

We are asking for not only on these two sites, but also Nichols Ranch, which we have clearance from the tribal landowner to go do this. So the minute the company told us no, we are letting the NRC know, along with BLM, and some other sites, that that is what we want to do.

When we say we want to do a TCP survey, it doesn't mean driving by the site and getting off and looking at one site or two. What we're talking about is going -- confirming what you guys are reviewing right now from Augustana College. That's what we're talking -- that's what needs to happen.

MS. YILMA: And if -- you are saying from the traditional cultural properties perspective, not necessarily archaeological sites, or are you saying both?

ΙN MR. THEWOODS: I mentioned those federal laws that apply government-wide to consultation. That's what I'm talking about -- all apply that were just mentioned those laws that earlier. That's what I'm talking about.

And you say government to government

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

consultation, that's what has to happen.

MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Mike Catches Enemy again. I've got a question relayed through me, but the -- to step back in the process a little further, even before the cultural survey or archaeological surveys were done, how does maybe the company or who is issuing the permit to, you know, grant the right of way or the access for Augustana to be there? That's the question I think.

MS. YILMA: Would that be BLM's -

MS. ATKINS: Basically, what -- the company is the one that brought that forward. The BLM minister of public lands, they get a field work authorization form from us to -- a permit to go out there and look on. But the rest of the tribal plan is the private landowners interpretation, let them come in. And the private landowner is in agreeance with Powertech, so they had no problem with it.

And what happened in the boundary, I don't know.

MR. CLOUTHIER: Can you go back to your slide where it shows how many archaeological sites were found? We've got 200 archaeological sites, four of them eligible for nomination. Were all of these sites evaluated for nomination, or are some of them

NEAL R. GROSS

	185
1	still unevaluated?
2	MS. YILMA: Some of them are still
3	unevaluated.
4	MR. CLOUTHIER: And how are you guys going
5	to address the unevaluated sites? Are they going to
6	be considered as potentially eligible, or are they
7	considered to be -
8	MS. YILMA: Actually, we had a discussion
9	with the state archaeologist yesterday. And in South
10	Dakota, unevaluated sites are treated as potentially
11	eligible. And one of the things we are doing is we
12	are looking at these unevaluated sites and determining
13	whether they need to be further evaluated.
14	MR. CLOUTHIER: I would
15	MS. YILMA: We don't have enough
16	information to determine if they are eligible.
17	MR. CLOUTHIER: You are going to run into
18	problems, then, because some of those unevaluated
19	sites are actually traditional cultural properties,
20	according to the tribes.
21	For instance, stone circle sites had
22	cairns, which the tribes all have their own beliefs on
23	what those actually are, and their own knowledge of
24	what those are. And the archaeologists don't

understand that for the most part.

25

And I can tell you that we do not like testing on those sites, and we are going to be trying to test those sites. It's going to be interesting.

MS. YILMA: And we are hoping, from our consultation with the various tribes, we would hear more about traditional cultural properties, and any type of restrictions that remain during the process, our review process. We still haven't completed our reviews. It's still in the very early stages at this point.

MR. CLOUTHIER: The other issue with those archaeological sites as well, the ones that are identified by Augustana College -- for instance, I know they have identified cairns, and they have identified stone circle sites.

There is no guarantees that what they have identified is the complete picture of what is actually at that site, which is why the TCP study needs to be done, because quite often, for instance, when Jim was mentioning earlier the wind farm, I could see -- and I'm not qualified to identify TCPs in any way, shape, or form, I'm just going off of what has been shown to me.

I could see stuff within their pictures that they were missing directly related to what they

NEAL R. GROSS

identified as a site. And I'm talking, you know, not even the distance from me to the woman sitting across away from where they were standing and identifying the stone circle. And it was definitely related to that site, but it ended up being outside the boundary of that site, and you are going to run into those issues, too.

If they have determined that these sites are not eligible, and it is a traditional cultural property, those sites all need to be reevaluated during the TCP study, assuming that there is one, which we are pushing for.

MS. YILMA: Yes. Yes?

MR. RED CLOUD: I want to say something about treaty and tribal lands. Nobody can take away from the rights, the consent away from the Lakota people. Who gave you consent? So what you're doing here, you're just wasting your time. Nobody else can give you consent.

MR. WHITTED: Jim Whitted. I would like to ask Paige and the SHPO's office to comment on the importance of traditional cultural property surveys.

MS. OLSON: Well, I think, you know, I would recommend one. The number of sites listed in this area given the proximity to the Black Hills. You

NEAL R. GROSS

1	know, I would recommend one, so I think it's you
2	know, there is a big difference between an
3	archaeologist what an archaeologist sees and what,
4	you know, an elder sees. I mean, there is a vast
5	difference, and I think that can illustrate that, but
6	I would recommend one.
7	MR. WHITTED: Thank you.
8	MS. YILMA: Any other questions?
9	MR. VANCE: Can we go back to your map
10	with the acreage? The number of acres there that I
11	think 240 by BLM and 10,000
12	MS. YILMA: Approximately 10,500.
13	MR. VANCE: Okay. The question is is on
14	that what of the 240 does BLM have is it
15	minerals or -
16	MS. ATKINS: That's surface, and that
17	surface is also the minerals.
18	MR. VANCE: Okay.
19	MS. ATKINS: There's other federal
20	minerals in there, but we don't have any say in what's
21	going on with them. But there's the 240 acres is
22	BLM-administered surface.
23	MR. VANCE: And how about the 10,000
24	acres, what is that? Who is that is that all
25	private? Are there minerals in there that

1	MS. YILMA: It's all private minerals.
2	MS. ATKINS: It's part of the surface.
3	It's other federal minerals, but there is no decision
4	to be made on those other on federal minerals.
5	MR. WHITTED: That other BLM?
6	MS. ATKINS: No, except for the ones under
7	the BLM surface.
8	MR. WHITTED: BLM has none under that
9	10,500 acres?
10	MS. ATKINS: That it is going to make any
11	decisions on.
12	MR. WHITTED: Yes, we know where that's
13	at.
14	MS. ATKINS: So there are under the
15	1872 mining law, which involves some other things we
16	are going to talk about, but that has says that if
17	the private landowner is in agreeance with the mining
18	claim, then there is no decision from the Federal
19	Government on use of those federal minerals that are
20	under the 1872 mining law.
21	So, therefore, there is no I don't have
22	with me right now what the mineral ownership is. I
23	will have a map tomorrow on that, so you can look at
24	what where the federal minerals are. But there are
25	other federal minerals there, but we have nothing to

-- no decisions to be made on those minerals.

MS. YILMA: Any other questions?

(No response.)

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you for coming today, and I'll turn it back over to Kevin.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. VANCE: Steve Vance again from Cheyenne River. I've got a suggestion to NRC here that being as we requested to go back in and identify and evaluate sites, particularly TCPs, traditional cultural properties, but also other historic architectural, whatever the -- you know, shows up on the property, but maybe NRC can see that that is a concern of tribes, that your next project, prior to letting college students in or other archaeologists in, bring us into the loop then.

So if there is another permit that is going to go in, you are going to send an archaeologist out there, notify the tribe, so that we can get some personnel together to go out there and do that survey then. So we are not driving by later and looking out the window and then heading on. Like Bryce said, boots on the ground.

You know, if we're there at that time, then we don't have to bring this comment back up

NEAL R. GROSS

again, because every project is going to be that way.
And here we are talking about three different
locations, you know, thinking that maybe all of these
three projects should be addressed separately, but
here we are at the table talking about three different
locations. And, you know, again
MS. YILMA: So you basically want the
applicants conducting the survey to have tribal
involvement.
MR. VANCE: To have tribes involved then.
And we're coming in at the end.
MS. YILMA: I just want to clarify, early
on when we started consulting with tribes, the surveys
are done even before the application is submitted to
the applicant I mean, to NRC.
That is a good good feedback, and we
can probably communicate that back to the applicant as
they are preparing their applications for future
applications that they are conducting the survey,
potentially find out who tribal representatives may be
interested and, you know, including them in the
survey.
MR. VANCE: Then, we can discuss the
application. So maybe, you know, at the next project,

when you are going to send an archaeologist out, you

have the tribes in.

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. YILMA: Okay.

might MR. KLUKAN: Ιf Ι make one suggestion not as attorney, just an an interested stakeholder in this decision process. There has been a lot of talk about TCP surveys.

What I would suggest for the tribes that are interested in pursuing that, if you want to see the NRC take action for any of these sites, is to submit written information or whatever you think is -- any justification, what that would look like as well, would be really useful to us in making our decision, and helping us figure out what we need to do, because we don't have the greatest amount of experience with this type of thing, so anything -- proposals, how it would work, why it's needed, what areas, stuff like that, any information I think would be very useful to the NRC in figuring this out.

MS. YILMA: I just want to go around to see if people have additional comments?

MODERATOR HSUEH: And, Mike, you wanted to say a words to end our session -

MR. CATCHES ENEMY: I think the tribes had wanted to get together and have a caucus, and we had planned on doing that a little earlier. But we are

NEAL R. GROSS

still real appreciative of all the comments, and appreciate you being here to listen in on those comments.

And I think the main comments, you know, if we feel threatened, you know, we live here, we raise our children here, our grandchildren, that's our main stakeholders that we are speaking for. There is a lot of other people that aren't here to speak, and we have to be those voices, to a certain degree, for them.

So we may -- we may have even missed some things to tell you that we need to probably put in writing. But for the most part, it's good that you guys can be here and be receptive to hear this. And this is the -- I guess is the first part of many more to come.

So thanks for coming, and I am -- we will probably just take a break, and then, as you guys are cleaning up, we could just use this room here.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Okay. Thank you, Michael. And thank you --

MR. CLARK: Kevin, can I make three quick comments on issues that Michael raised earlier? First, we would encourage you -- we have three attorneys here, Patty Jehle, myself, and Brett Klukan.

NEAL R. GROSS

We would strongly encourage you, if you have legal questions, to talk to your own attorneys. You have good attorneys representing all the tribes, as well as the various government agencies.

Second, your attorneys, they are your legal representatives. They are always welcome at meetings like this. We tried to convey that that was the case. When we sent out the draft agenda, we listed the names of Patty and Brett Klukan. At the time, we didn't know if I was going to show up here. But your attorneys, please let them know that they are always welcome at this type meeting.

Third, if your attorneys have questions, they are certainly free to contact us -- Patty Jehle, Mike Clark, or Brett Klukan. So please let them know that.

And that's all. Thank you.

MODERATOR HSUEH: Okay. Thank you, Mike.

I just wanted to say we really appreciate that, and we will carefully consider all your concerns and comments, especially we have a court reporter here to record all the conversation that we have, so we do have a record of it. We can review it over time and carefully consider all your comments, so thank you.

MR. CATCHES ENEMY: One last question,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Kevin. Will the tribe be able to order a copy of the
2	transcript?
3	MODERATOR HSUEH: Yes. When it's
4	available, we will be able to provide it to you.
5	MR. CATCHES ENEMY: Okay. Thank you.
6	MODERATOR HSUEH: Thank you. So at this
7	moment, I would like to ask the NRC staff and the
8	contractor to leave, and then I think that tribal
9	representatives, they would like to have a
10	conversation.
11	(Whereupon, at 4:45 p.m., the proceedings in the
12	foregoing matter were adjourned.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	NEAL D. CDOCC