1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	PUBLIC MEETING
5	PROPOSED RULE: GEIS SCOPING MEETING
6	+ + + +
7	SEPTEMBER 27, 2007
8	+ + + +
9	GALLUP, NEW MEXICO
10	+ + + +
11	The public meeting convened in the Best
12	Western Inn and Suites, Banquet Room, 3009 W. Highway
13	66, Gallup, New Mexico, at 7:07 p.m.
14	Present on behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory
15	Commission:
16	SCOTT FLANDERS
17	GREGORY SUBER
18	PAUL MICHALAK
19	JOAN OLMSTEAD, ESQ.
20	PERRY CHARLEY
21	LANCE RAKOVAN
22	LIZETTE ROLDAN
23	CAROL WALLS
24	
25	

2	INDEX
3	Welcome and Introductions, Lance Rakovan 3
4	Opening Remarks, Scott Flanders 8
5	Meeting Objections/NRC's Role & Responsibility
6	Slide Presentation, Scott Flanders 8
7	In Situ Leach Process Slide Presentation,
8	Paul Michalak
9	NRC Environmental Regulations Presentation,
LO	Gregory Suber
L1	Public Comment
L2	Closing Comments, Lance Rakovan
L3	Adjourn
L4	
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	NEAL D. ODOGO

#### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2	7:07	p.m.
3	MR. RAKOVAN: Good evening, everyone.	Му
4	name is Lance Rakovan. I am a communications	

name is Lance Rakovan. I am a communications assistant at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or NRC, based in Rockville, Maryland, and it's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for tonight's public meeting.

The purpose of tonight's meeting is to obtain comments on the scope of the uranium recovery Generic Environmental Impact Statement, or GEIS, as I'm sure you'll hear a number of NRC types refer to it tonight.

It's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for tonight's meeting. Before things get started, I wanted to go over kind of what to expect from tonight and also go over a few ground rules in terms of participation at tonight's meeting.

If you take a look at tonight's agenda, which there were copies of on the back table, where hopefully you registered when you came in. If you want you can go grab one right now.

We're going to start out with some presentations that we're hoping to give you some background and some base information about the topics

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

that the Generic Environmental Impact Statements will cover and also about NRC's rules and responsibilities, and the safety review of the uranium recovery's application and amendments.

So we're going to start out with those.

After that, we're basically going to turn the meeting over to why we're here tonight, and that's to listen to you, to get your opinions on what we should take into account when looking at the scoping of this Generic Environmental Impact Statement. So we're going to be opening up the floor to you.

When you walked in, hopefully you were given a choice to fill out your yellow card, which would designate that you were hoping to speak tonight, or a blue card which meant that you were just here more or less to observe.

Now, if you didn't sign up to speak,
that's okay, you can always change your mind during
the meeting. If you would like to sign up to speak as
I'm done, simply put your hand up, get my attention.
I have a few yellow cards. Essentially what we're
going to do is once we're done with the presentations,
I'm going to go through the cards as I have them, call
people up to the microphone. Given the amount of time
that they have and the number of speakers that we

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

have, I'm going to try to ask that you limit your comments to a few minutes.

I'm probably going to ask about five minutes maximum. That way that gives a chance for everybody who signed up to talk, and for those who were too shy to sign up initially and wanted to get up after everybody else is done, they may have a chance to say something too. So we're going to try and give everybody a chance to come up here.

I just want to stress that getting a statement at tonight's meeting is not the only way that you can have your comments taken. We'll be going through the other ways that you can do that tonight during our presentations. And also tonight at the meeting, if you want to provide a written statement, again just get my attention, and we'll have that included into the record of tonight's meeting.

Which again I want to point out that we are transcribing tonight's meeting. So it's very important when you're speaking to use a microphone, to make sure that you have only one person speaking at a time, and that way we could get a clean transcript.

And also, so we know who's speaking, when you come up to speak, if you can identify yourself, and if there's any group that you're with, give us that as

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

well; and that way we'll get a clean transcript and we'll have a good idea of who all of our speakers were tonight.

Just a few ground rules again, try to be respectful of everyone who's speaking, especially when they come up to the podium and the floor is theirs, even if you don't agree with their opinion. That'll help the meeting go smoother.

Also if someone previous to you made a statement that you agree with, if you just want to go ahead and say, you know, this gentleman has already said this and refer back to them, that's okay too.

That helps us remember -- or get down in the transcript that we had more than one person who agreed with a particular point and helps the meeting to go faster.

I'd like to introduce Mr. Perry Charley who is going to be doing some translating for us tonight. He is associated with DinDoña Shiprock Campus. He's been our cultural consultant while we've been here and hopefully he'll be providing some interpretation in Navajo tonight. So if anybody's speaking too quickly like I probably am right now, you know, throw something at us and hopefully we'll slow down.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

For those of you who came in and signed up, there were some public meeting feedback forms on the back table. If you could fill those out and either give them to an NRC person or drop them in the mail. Once they get to us, those give us an idea on how we can improve our public meetings in the future.

Also, if everyone could please silence your cell phones or any other electronic equipment you have at this point. I was at a meeting recently where I think at least four or five times during the meeting a different person's cell phone or pager or whatever rang and it really disrupted the meeting. So we appreciate silencing those at this point.

The restrooms are when you leave, on your right, both men and women. Obviously the exits are in the back of the room, so if anything happens, emergency-wise, hopefully not, but obviously your exits are going to be behind you.

I appreciate all your help in making tonight a productive meeting and I'm going to see if Mr. Charley wants a little time to translate and I'm actually going to give him my notes as well, just in case he would like to use them, if you could read my writing.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 MR. RAKOVAN: It sounds so much cooler when he says it. 2 Again, if you have not signed up to speak 3 and yet would like to, I have a couple of the yellow 4 5 cards here that would help us, you know, keep track. So if you want to raise your hand I could bring those 6 to you now. With that, I will turn things over to 7 Scott Flanders. 8 MR. FLANDERS: Good evening, everyone. Can you hear me okay? Good evening. My name is Scott 10 11 Flanders. I'm the Deputy Director of the Division of 12 Waste Management, Environment Protection at the 13 Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 14 And I first want to welcome you and thank 15 you for coming out to our meeting tonight. 16 recognize that you all have busy schedules and we 17 appreciate you taking the time to come out and 18 participate in the process. 19 As Lance mentioned earlier, the purpose of 20 tonight's meeting is to -- is for us to receive 21 comments from you on the Generic Environmental Impact 22 Statement (GEIS) that we're working on for in situ 23 leach uranium recovery facilities. 24 The public process and public comment 25 portion of the -- of our process is very important to

us, and we really appreciate again the time that you take -- you've taken out of your schedule to come and participate in our meeting.

Before I go any further let me introduce some of the NRC staff who's here with us. At the far end of the table, there's Mr. Gregory Suber, who is the Branch Chief of our Environmental Review Branch and has lead responsibility for preparing the Generic Environmental Impact Statement.

Next to him is Ms. Joan Olmstead, who is a member of our General Counsel's Office. And sitting on the other side of Mr. Charley is Paul Michalak, which, which is one of our senior project managers and technical experts on the area of the uranium recovery in situ leach recovery activities. So with that, if I could have the next slide, please.

Before we go -- we get too far, I want to just spend a little bit of time giving you a brief overview of what to expect tonight.

First, we're going to start off with a brief overview of the NRC's roles and responsibilities for those of you who may not be as familiar with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I know some of you are, but for those who might not be, we're going to spend just a few minutes going over the NRC's rules

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

and responsibilities. And I'll do that in just a few moments.

Next, we're going to have Mr. Paul

Michalak talk about the NRC safety review process and

we -- for in situ leach recovery. And we thought this

was an important piece, to give you some background as

Mr. Rakovan -- or Lance -- mentioned earlier about the

process, to ensure that you have good background, to

provide his comments on the Generic Environmental

Impact Statement.

And then Mr. Suber is going to discuss the environmental review process for in situ leach uranium recovery facilities and he is going to, in that presentation, talk about how the Generic Environmental Impact Statement fits within that overall site-specific review for -- again, in situ leach facilities, when -- if and when we receive applications for actual site-specific facilities.

And then the final, and the heart of the presentation or the meeting tonight is going to be the public comment process. The -- that is where you are going to get the opportunity to provide us comments on the Generic Environmental Impact Statement.

So that is the key part of the meeting, so we're going to try to keep our presentations as brief

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

as possible and then move on from there. Now Paul's motioning for Mr. Charley.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. FLANDERS: Okay. If you could make that the next slide.

I'm just going to briefly go over the NRC's roles and responsibilities. And the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is an independent federal agency that's headed by a five - five-member Commission, one of which is designated by the President as the Chairman. The other five, the other members are also appointed by the President and confirmed by the U.S. Senate into their positions.

Now the NRC's primary mission is to regulate the nation's civilian uses of radioactive materials to ensure adequate protection of public health and safety, to promote the common defense and security, and to protect the environment.

We have regulatory authority over a diverse set of facilities, nuclear facilities and uses of nuclear materials. However, you can group them to three primary categories. One being reactors; we regulate commercial nuclear reactors that generate electricity, and we also regulate research and test reactors that you may find in a university for

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

academic research activities.

The next wide grouping, you can consider as materials which uses -- which involves the use of nuclear materials in medical, industrial and academic settings, as well as facilities that produce nuclear field.

The last and third group would be waste.

And that group include transportation and storage of 
- and dispose of nuclear materials and waste and the

decommissioning of nuclear facilities.

So if you think about them in those three bar groups, that demonstrates a diverse set -- of responsibility that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory has.

How do we carry out our mission? If you can think of three primary guideposts that -- and keep this in mind, you'll understand how the NRC carries out its mission.

The first is, that we establish regulations and standards by which licensees are originally licensed and must meet throughout their operating life, their facility or for their use of nuclear materials.

The next is the licensing process, and once we establish the regulations, we then evaluate each application to ensure that that application

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

satisfies the regulations that have been established for that particular technology or use of that particular material.

Once, and if we decide that a facility should be licensed and meets all of our safety standards, then we continue to inspect them throughout the lifetime of the facility or the use of the material to ensure that they're in compliance with those regulations; and if we determine through our inspection process that they are not in compliance with those regulations then we will use enforcement action to bring them back into compliance.

This was just a quick overview of our regulatory process. You will hear more about the licensing process as it relates to in situ leach facilities in Mr. Suber and Mr. Michalak's presentations.

So in closing, I want to leave you with one final thought, and if you take this away, that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's primary mission is to protect public health and safety. And we do this by focusing on our licensing activities, inspection activities and the regulations that we generate.

Again, if you want to find out more about the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, you can go to

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	our website at www.nrc.gov. With that I'll stop and
2	let Mr. Charley provide translation, and then turn it
3	over to Mr. Michalak.
4	(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)
5	MR. MICHALAK: Hi. My name's Paul
6	Michalak, I'm the Project Manager with the Uranium
7	Recovery and Licensing Branch of the NRC.
8	The focus of my presentation today will be
9	the safety review portion of the NRC's site-specific
LO	uranium recovery application review process.
L1	But before I get into the safety review,
L2	I'd like to briefly describe in situ leach uranium
L3	recovery.
L4	(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)
L5	MR. MICHALAK: What I've done is I've
L6	broken down the process into three general components.
L7	The first component is subsurface injection and
L8	recovery. The second component is surface, where
L9	there's further processing performed, and the third
20	component is restoration of ground water.
21	(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)
22	MR. MICHALAK: The subsurface component
23	involves taking a mixture of native ground water,
24	oxygen, bicarbonate, sometimes carbon dioxide and
25	injecting it into the ore zone. That mixture is known

as a lixiviant and it dissolves the uranium into the
ground water. That ground water is then pumped to the
surface.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. MICHALAK: In the surface component

MR. MICHALAK: In the surface component that uranium mixture called a lixiviant is pumped into a processing plant. This is a processing plant at the Smith Ranch ISL near Douglas, Wyoming. In the processing plant, ion exchange, elution, precipitation, thickening, drying and then packing is performed on the liquid. The final product is a commodity known as yellow cake. It's a yellowish-greenish powder, uranium oxide.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. MICHALAK: When the in situ leach process is completed, ground water in the ore zone is restored to either pre-operational levels, EPA drinking water standards, or secondary standards if there are some constituents that prove problematic with respect to restoring to either pre-operational or EPA drinking water standards.

Before any secondary standards are approved, the applicant or licensee must show that U.S. EPA drinking water standards will not be exceeded in any potential drinking water source.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 (Mr. Charley translates in Navajo) 2 MR. MICHALAK: The applicable uranium recovery regulations for the NRC are found in 10 CFR 3 Part 40 Appendix A. The primary reference used by the 4 5 uranium recovery branch in our safety reviews is NUREG-1569, the Standard Review Plan for In Situ 6 7 Uranium Extraction License Applications. NUREG-1569 is a comprehensive document 8 9 that contains all the acceptance criteria that we use in our safety reviews, and this is available on the 10 11 NRC website. 12 (Mr. Charley translates in Navajo) 13 MR. MICHALAK: In general ISL facilities 14 must be designed and operated such that radiation dose is in -- is kept within specific regulatory limits. 15 16 The facility must also have a monitoring 17 program to verify that they keep the radiation dose 18 within specified regulatory limits. Beyond just the 19 regulations, the NRC expects the applicant to design a 20 system where radiation is as low as reasonably 21 achievable. We call that program ALARA. And then 22 finally, personnel have appropriate radiation safety 23 training. 24 (Mr. Charley translates in Navajo) 25 MR. MICHALAK: The scope of the NRC's

1 safety review covers effluent control systems, 2 operations, radiation safety controls and monitoring, which is really a subset of operations, ground water 3 4 and plant decommissioning. 5 (Mr. Charley translates in Navajo) MR. MICHALAK: The safety review evaluates 6 the effluent control systems with respect to gases and 7 airborne particulates, liquids and solids and 8 contaminated equipment. A good example of this would be the 10 11 monitoring and controls in the facility's yellowcake 12 drying and packing areas. These are locations where 13 there's a potential for airborne particulates that contain uranium. 14 (Mr. Charley translates in Navajo) 15 16 MR. MICHALAK: The safety review will also 17 include an evaluation of -- a detailed description of 18 operational components. I think a good example of 19 this would be the applicant's radiation safety 20 training program. 21 ISLs will likely hire large amounts of 22 plumbers, electricians and mechanics who will not have 23 any radiation safety training backgrounds. It's going

application will not be approved unless it contains a

to be important for these people to be trained, and an

24

1 rigorous and comprehensive radiation safety-training program. 2 (Mr. Charley translates in Navajo) 3 MR. MICHALAK: The safety review will also 4 evaluate detailed descriptions of the applicant's 5 radiation safety components. 6 A couple of good examples of this will be 7 our evaluation of methods, instrumentation and 8 9 equipment associated with external radiation and airborne radiation monitoring programs. Another good 10 11 example will be our evaluation of their bioassay 12 program. We will expect a program in which baseline bioassay urinalyses are collected at the time of hire. 13 We will also expect periodic testing during operation, 14 and exit urinalysis at the time of employment 15 16 termination. 17 (Mr. Charley translates in Navajo) 18 MR. MICHALAK: Our site-specific safety 19 review will include an evaluation of ground water data 20 and information with respect to preoperational 21 conditions, operational conditions, and 22 post-operational conditions. 23 A good example of this is the need to verify the hydraulic connection between the ore zone 24 25 and the monitoring network. This is important because

the monitoring network will be used to verify the existence of an inward gradient in the well field; and it's the inward gradient, which is one of the components that controls the uranium solution in the well field. The hydraulic connection between the ore zone and the monitoring network is also important because that monitoring network is sampled because it's monitored -- because they use that monitoring system to identify if an excursion of uranium mixture occurs outside the ore body.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. MICHALAK: In plant decommissioning, the NRC evaluates methodologies used to clean up the site when operations are completed.

Of particular interest on this slide is the need for a - for the applicant to have a surety, a financial surety. When -- at the time the first shovel breaks ground at the facility, the licensee is required to have a financial note, a bond, or some kind of insurance that would have sufficient funds to decommission the site. In this way, if they would become bankrupt, there would be enough money to perform decommissioning, reclamation and ground water restoration.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. MICHALAK: I'd now like to turn the floor over to Greg.

MR. SUBER: Thank you, Paul.

First of all, I'd like to thank everybody for coming out. We know that you made a sacrifice to come out to our meeting today, but we would like to thank you because the kind of interaction that we get here is very important to us. Public participation is important to the NRC, it's important to our process.

In fact, the reason we are here tonight is because when we had a meeting in Albuquerque, you told us that we needed to come to this area because if this is where the activities were potentially going to be sited, then the people here wanted to have their voice heard in this community. We heard you and we're here tonight, and we welcome your further comments.

My name is Gregory Suber and I am the
Chief of the Environmental Review branch that is
review -- that is producing the Generic Environmental
Impact Statement. This is -- Lizette Roldan is here
also, she's one of my staff members and if anybody
would prefer to communicate in Spanish, then they can
feel free to talk to Ms. Roldan and she will
facilitate that for us.

Okay. Scott has already talked to you

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

about the NRC, what we are and what we do. And Paul has given you an overview of our safety review for ISLs. What I would like to do is I would like to discuss the environmental regulations that the NRC must adhere to. To detail for you the review process that we go in -- that we're going to undertake for this GEIS process, and also describe the ways that you can participate in this process.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. SUBER: I'd like to quickly just reiterate something that my supervisor Scott Flanders mentioned today. Our goal, our mission is to protect human health and to protect the environment. That's why we're here, and we are fulfilling our obligations.

In fact, when we do our safety review, we're fulfilling our regulatory responsibilities to protect the environment through implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act. Now the National Environmental Policy Act, also known as NEPA, was enacted in 1969. And what NEPA did is it required all federal agencies to conduct a systematic review of the environmental impacts for their federal actions. What that means is the NRC has to take a hard look at the implications to the environment for all of its licensing actions.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

NEPA is what we call a disclosure tool, and what that means is that we gather information and then we disclose to the public what information we're going to use in our analysis; and then we invite the public to comment to us as to what they think is important, what part of our analysis we should concentrate on and how they think we should conduct our analysis.

what this results in, is it results in an exchange that allows our review to become better, because it reflects what's important in your community. So right now, I'm going to take a few minutes to do a couple of things. I'm going to discuss the purpose of the uranium covering GEIS, I'm going to describe the review process that we're going to use and then I'm going to identify the areas in our evaluation. And then we're going to get out of the way and let you comment on what you - on where -- what aspects of our review you think we should concentrate on.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. SUBER: And now I'd like to discuss the purpose of the GEIS. The NRC proposed doing the GEIS because they wanted to take advantage of a framework that we wanted to create in grouping issues

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that are common to ISL facilities and creating one document that examined those issues, and then on a site-specific basis, create another document that looks at the unique features of a particular site that couldn't be covered in the GEIS.

Now what this approach did, is it allowed us to eliminate or reduce redundancies in our analysis. Once we did an analysis, if it was applicable to other sites, we wouldn't have to repeat it time and time again. It was an efficiency that we gained in reviewing our applications. And what that did, and what we hoped to achieve by this is to take our resources at the site-specific level and be able to target those resources into the areas that are most important.

And that would allow us to focus our review on the site-specific aspects of the application when we receive an application, focus that review on those important site-specific areas that are unique and that need a very thorough and rigorous evaluation.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. SUBER: Here we have a graph of the review process and how we envision going forward from this point. But in order to create the GEIS, we have to gather information and that information comes from

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

a variety of sources, but right now we're doing what we call the scoping process.

And in the scoping process, we go to the public and we look for public input on our process.

We look for exchange between the NRC and the public as to how you think we should go forward in our review, and what areas you think we think -- you think we should cover in our reviews, excuse me.

And we also use technical information that we gather to come together and to draft a Generic Environmental Impact Statement. Now, we have public participation here at the scoping meeting, but also once we finish the generic -- once we have the draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement, we have another public comment meeting. And the reason for that meeting is to come out and to let you evaluate the draft GEIS and to tell us how well we reflected your comments that you submitted to us through this scoping period.

Now, once issued, and we receive the comments from the public, we'll issue a final draft -- a final GEIS. And upon receiving site-specific applications, we will take those applications and we will evaluate those applications with respect to the GEIS. And what we'll find is, we'll find that there

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

are resource areas in that site-specific application that may be bound by the GEIS, meaning that the conclusions of the GEIS are applicable to that specific site.

There may also be areas, resource areas in the site-specific evaluation that are not bound by the GEIS, and at that point, we'll have to focus our attention specifically on those areas that are not bound by the GEIS.

Now, if we look at those areas, and we can evaluate them, and we can come to what we call a finding of no significant impact, then we'll prepare an environmental assessment and we'll look close at the findings. However, and this is important, if we evaluate that resource area in the site-specific review, and we cannot come to a finding, then we will have to initiate a supplemental EIS for that site.

So there's two possibilities for a site-specific review. We can either have an EA that closes with a FONSI or we can have a supplemental EIS.

Now, to go to another point, in our last meeting at Albuquerque, you made it quite clear that you wanted to be sure that you could comment on an EA that we issued. And there was not -- it was not certain at that time whether the process would allow

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that. But because of your comments, we've gone back and we are going to release -- we are going to -- when we issue our draft environmental assessment, we're going to issue those for public comment. So you'll have another opportunity to comment, even if we conclude that the site-specific review can be closed with a FONSI.

And of course, if the site-specific review is closed with a supplemental EIS, then we'll have another scoping meeting and we'll have another draft public environmental impact statement meeting.

So all along the process, there's a variety of points where you, the public, can inform us as to how you think our evaluation is going, and give us input as to what the scope of that evaluation should be.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. SUBER: Now this slide was put here just to illustrate a point that this is not a new undertaking for the NRC. We've done several Generic Environmental Impact Statements in the past. In fact, the one that's probably more -- most similar to the one that we're doing now is the GEIS that we did for license renewal where we performed the Generic Environmental Impact Statement for license renewal,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

and then for each individual plant, we did a supplemental environmental impact statement.

Now the term "generic" may be throwing some people off. Other agencies use what they call programmatic EIS's. Well, we just call them generic EIS's, but it's basically the same term.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. SUBER: Now what you see on this slide are the typical or traditional impact areas that we look at. Now this slide is not all inclusive, maybe that -- there may be some areas up here that you think are important that are included on the slide. And that's where this scoping process comes in handy, because we are looking for comments for you -- from you as to which areas here you think we should concentrate the most effort on, and also, and more importantly, if there are some areas that you know of, there are some concerns that you have that are not reflected on this slide, what this does is it improves our process.

It improves the quality of our review because we know from you what's important. We don't live in this community. You live in this community. You know the resources in this community. You know the areas of this community. You know the values of

#### NEAL R. GROSS

this community. And the more you communicate those values to us, the more quality and the better review we'll be able to prepare.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. SUBER: Now this slide shows a proposed schedule for the GEIS. I would like to pull your attention to this slide here. The scoping period, the scoping comment period has been extended. Initially the scoping period was due to end on September the 4<sup>th</sup>, and we received comments from the public that that just wasn't enough time. And we consequently extended it to October the 8<sup>th</sup>, but after reviewing our schedule and understanding the amount of concern that we had from the public, we went ahead and extended it 'til October the 31<sup>st</sup>.

And that's basically because we want to be responsive to your concerns, and we want you to have time to give us input in this process.

The next line I'd like to pull your attention to is the draft GEIS stage. Presently, this schedule -- we are scheduled to issue the draft GEIS around April of 2008. Now once we issue that draft document, we'll have another public comment meeting where we'll come out again into your community and accept your comments on the draft GEIS; and

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

ultimately, we'll -- we plan to issue the final GEIS
in January of 2009.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. DALY: Excuse me, Mr. Suber, Chief

Suber. We're now an hour behind our schedule. I

called for the order today, can we get on with this

MR. RAKOVAN: Just for the transcript, the gentleman stood up and complained about the length of time that it was taking. I was going to address that when we started again, and thank you for your patience, but I guess it's a little too late for that.

The fact is, is that tonight is maybe the only night that we have in Gallup to convey this information to you, so we thought that it was important to do so. As you can see -- well, okay.

That's -- it's gone.

As you could see on the previous slide, you have until October 31<sup>st</sup> to comment on this process, so tonight is not the only night that you have to get up here and comment. So we understand that this is taking a long time. We believe that having the translation is very important and we wanted to provide that service and to do that. So I apologize if it's taking a long time, but we think it's necessary. So

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

meeting?

if -- please. And we can stay a lot longer than nine o'clock. I understand it's taking a long time, but we can be here for a while.

MR. FLANDERS: Excuse me. We're about to wrap up. We have just one more -- two more slides that give you some information in terms of how you can provide comments and we'll extend the meeting by an hour or longer as necessary, as long as we're able to stay, to ensure you have ample opportunity to provide your comments. Thank you.

MR. SUBER: And the information you have here on the slide shows you one -- well, actually two ways to submit comments. I'd like to make the point that this meeting that we're having tonight is being transcribed, so all of the comments that you give orally will be transcribed and will be treated by the NRC with the same weight that we treat written comments.

Now, written comments can be submitted by mail to this address, or if you'd prefer, you can also email written comments to our email address. Now this information is also included on a handout that's on a table right outside this room, so if you don't have a pen or you don't want to write it down, that's fine, because you can get the information right outside the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 room.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. SUBER: Okay. Now this is contact information and this is also available on the slide outside the room.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. SUBER: And we've also set up a web page that has information about the GEIS process, and also this -- I don't want to be redundant, but this is also on the slide that you can receive on the table outside the room.

(Mr. Charley translates in Navajo)

MR. SUBER: Okay. And that concludes my presentation. I'd once again like to thank you for your patience, and thank you for coming out tonight and I look forward to your comments.

And I'd just like to say as Lance is walking up, that your comments are important to us. As you've already seen, they have affected the way we are conducting the review in the GEIS process. We've extended the comment period. We're issuing EAs for public comment, so your comments have been heard and they are important to us. And I'd just like to thank you for your attention.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thanks, guys. And again, I

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

apologize to all those who think that we took too long in doing that. I've got the public meeting feedback forms right here, if you want to fill it out and give it to me, I'd be more than happy to take your comments. This is one of the few meetings that we've ever done with a translator and we are learning. So I apologize that it took so long to get to this point.

We're going to go ahead and go to the comment period. Perry, as long as you're okay with continuing to translate, do you want to give a shot at maybe summarizing the speakers once they come up and speak? Does that sound okay? Okay.

Again, given the amount of time that we have, I'm going to ask that people be concise. We do want your comments, we do want to hear from you, but I have quite a few speakers signed up to speak and we're going to try to stay as long as possible, so hopefully we can have a chance to get everybody up here.

What I'm going to do is I'm just going to start going through the cards. I'll probably read two or three names at a time, just to give you an idea of who to expect. Once you come up to the mic, if you could please identify yourself and any group or organization that you're with if that's appropriate.

And basically the floor is yours.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 Specifically as we went through in our 2 presentations, we are looking for comments on what we should take into account in terms of the Generic 3 4 Environmental Impact Statement. 5 So having said that, let's start out with George Arthur from the Navajo Nation Council. 6 MR. ARTHUR: Well, good evening everybody 7 that's here. I am glad that the general public has a 8 great interest in this discussion, and I appreciate again, your presence here and showing your interest. 10 11 I'd also like to thank the panel here for 12 coming to this area. Oftentimes only a handful of 13 people get the chance to visit you in the Washington 14 area. My name is George Arthur. I am presently 15 16 serving on the Navajo Nation Council. I sit with the Natural Resources Committee, as their chairman. 17 18 just real quick, our questions and comments. 19 First of all, I want to ask the Commission 20 in what shape or form do you have provisions that you 21 can assure my people, the Native American people, that 22 the sincerity of protecting religious sites in your 23 generic EIS? Where in your discussion do you have that provision? And if you can assure the Navajo 24

people and Native American that have symbolic,

1	religious symbols in these areas, primarily as we
2	discuss now the Mount Taylor area; that is part of our
3	sacred mountains.
4	Second is that a few years ago during the
5	Clinton administration, there was an executive order
6	that was issued and as far as I know, it hasn't been
7	rescinded, that all cabinet branches have trust
8	responsibility. And I'm sure as NRC, that you are
9	answerable to some form of cabinet level review.
LO	So in maybe in that instance, I don't
L1	know whether or not you also are charged with trust
L2	responsibility for Navajo people and Native American
L3	in general. With that scenario, do you played out
L4	that role?
L5	And my conclusion question, I'm sure you
L6	are aware that the Navajo Nation Council has
L7	established and has a position in reference to these
L8	additional development in respect to uranium mining
L9	and processing. That is Navajo Nation's position, and
20	it's not going to be altered from that. Thank you.
21	(Applause)
22	MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you, sir.
23	Perry, do you want to do some translation
24	or
25	(Mr. Charley questions in Navajo)
	NEAL D. ODOGO

1 MR. RAKOVAN: Okay. It doesn't look like -- okay. 2 Then the next few speakers; David 3 Ulibarri, Cibola County Manager, and following him Joe 4 5 Murrietta from City of Grants. David Ulibarri from 6 Cibola County Manager. Okay. Joe Murrietta from the City of Grants. 7

MR. MURRIETTA: Good evening. My name is Joe Murrietta and I'm the mayor of the City of Grants, New Mexico.

And I'm here tonight to let you know that as a lifelong citizen of the Grants area, which in a few months will be 60 years, and I only bring it up to your -- for your information because I want to let you know that I am personally familiar with over 50 -over -- with a majority of my citizens in the Grants area, and also in reality, I'm probably related to a good percentage of them.

But with that in mind, I'm here tonight to express the City of Grants' support for the development of the uranium recovery industry, which was illustrated with the passage of a resolution support of this industry by the Grants City Council unanimously late last year. With that in mind, the -my citizens are -- understand the industry because of

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

our past experience with the industry.

We eagerly anticipate the development of this industry in the next few years because we all -we recognize the economic benefit from this industry, the potential for growth within our communities. And also that we understand that, and fully realize that we need a dependable, productive alternative fuel source which will provide fuel and power for our nation -- and the entire world as a matter of fact, and will lessen the dependence which we have now on foreign fuels, which -- and which are -- I think we all are -- recognize at this time.

Again, I'd like to say the City of Grants wholeheartedly supports the development of the uranium recovery industry.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you, sir.

Next, we'll go to Danny Charley, Jay Charley, and then Rick Van Horn.

MR. CHARLEY: Hello everyone, and good evening NRC. My name is Danny Charley, and I'm an allottee. And I have uranium in my land and I'm confident in saying that property rights to which the greatest interest in the development of uranium.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

What is at stake here? Economic development and hundreds of jobs that the people can have that they don't have right now. Not only that, economic development. In Crownpoint area, people are, you know, they're desperately in need of jobs.

Crownpoint can grow the surrounding areas. The towns can grow. And it can bring a lot of money into our communities and into our towns.

As citizens who drink water, we also have concerns regarding protection of our local environment, including drinking water. Both these issues are extremely important to all of us allottees. We're not just looking at the money. My land can help a lot of people get jobs. There's people running around, groups that are against uranium. They're not going to give us jobs, but my land will. My land will give several hundred people jobs and provide food to their families.

My understanding is that NRC will evaluate recent U.S. uranium operations Generic Environmental Impact Statement. Using this information, NRC will weigh the potential impacts associated with such proposed operations and will use this information to make new uranium operations safer. And if we can just understand that.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

Allottees, all of us allottees, strongly support the preparation of this Generic Environmental Impact Statement, and we believe that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's effort is in the best interests of all Navajos, and not only the allottees.

In closing, let me say that ENDAUM, uranium -they're saying that uranium is dangerous, that ENDAUM
has nothing to lose by opposing uranium development.
Us allottees do.

We are offered an opportunity to have the Federal Government prepare a neutral ground base study to evaluate safety. Why do some people oppose this study? I do not want to see this opportunity wasted at this time, when the recovery of uranium presents a chance to improve the livelihood of a lot of people that can have jobs. A lot of men and women out there are wishing that they can have a job.

Instead of going to food stamp offices and selling burritos at flea markets, you know, they can have a check. The recovery of uranium presents a chance to improve the livelihood of Navajo families, escape their poor financial conditions. Why not let us all work together and do this? Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: And we're going to go next to Jay Charley, then Rick VanHorn, and then George

### NEAL R. GROSS

Byers.

MR. CHARLEY: Good evening everybody. My name is Jay Charley. Just real quick, I had a question. You guys are going to do this study, right? And you guys are just here to see what we want you guys to focus on or if we miss any of the areas that you guys need to focus on, is that what you guys are here for? Right?

MR. RAKOVAN: I'll give a yes.

MR. CHARLEY: So you're not here to see whether or not uranium mining is bad or not, you're just here to say what we should focus on, what is our concerns, what we need you guys to focus on; is that what you guys are here for? Is that the main reason why you're here?

MR. RAKOVAN: That's the main reason why we're here. And I don't want to get into a Q and A with you, because we're here mostly to listen to you. And since I'm the facilitator, any of these gentlemen can probably go and answer your question in back, but we want to leave the microphone open for comments, so

MR. CHARLEY: That's just what I wanted to know. I mean, I just didn't want this to turn into, you know, whether or not -- I think we're losing the

focus here. You guys are here to listen to what we need you guys to focus on, not whether or not the uranium mine should go through. Yes, I believe it should, but I believe that, you know, instead of taking off in one direction that we need to focus on what you guys are here for. I don't know if you guys think the same way, or -- but you guys are here for that reason.

MR. FLANDERS: I just want to say that we're here to listen tonight, and I -- and we'll listen to all comments. Again, the focus of tonight's meeting, as we stated earlier the purpose was to receive comments on the scope of the Generic Environmental Impact Statement, but we're here to listen, and we'll listen to all comments.

MR. CHARLEY: Okay. That's all I wanted to just say is I was getting confused on whether or not, you know, but you guys are going to do the study, right? And you're just here to listen on what we want you guys to focus on? All right. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Rick VanHorn, please.

MR. VANHORN: My name is Rick VanHorn. I'm the COO for Uranium Resources/HRI. As you know, we have been working to the Church Rock facility for over 20 years. We have our EIS completed. It was

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

completed --

MR. RAKOVAN: If you want to move the mike around, please.

MR. VANHORN: We have completed our EIS, it was completed in 1997. We have an NRC license to operate at Church Rock and Crownpoint.

We believe that the GEIS process will provide an unbiased review of the past 30 years of ISL mining. Our company has been in ISL for - well, sometime in 1977. We also -- we think it'll identify and put to rest misconceptions that exist about the industry. We believe it'll also identify areas of concern. This is good for all of us.

The one thing it will not do is it will not allow us to gloss over site-specific issues, but rather it's going to highlight them, so we can pay attention to them.

And based on all that, Uranium Resources and HRI support your process with GEIS and look forward to the results. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. I'd like to thank all the speakers so far for coming up here, staying to the point, staying concise, and introducing yourself so we can make sure that we know who's speaking on the transcript.

1 Our next three speakers, I have George Byers, Cal Curley and Larry King. 2 Mr. Byers? And careful of the cords, 3 4 please. 5 MR. BYERS: Thank you. I'm George Byers with Neutron Energy. Our company controls about 6 7 30 million pounds or more of historic uranium resources, most of which are on the east side of 8 Mount Taylor, most of which are conventional minable, but some of which have ISL potential. 10 11 And I want to thank you and commend you for 12 listening in Albuquerque. You heard a couple of 13 things. You heard people say we want another public 14 meeting and you're holding it. You heard the 15 confusion about whether or not a generic EIS would be 16 the only thing. And you went to great lengths 17 tonight to explain that there is going to be additional assessment. 18 19 Our company, all the other companies that I 20 know of, are doing our site evaluations now, our data 21 gathering on the basis that we most likely are going 22 to have to do in the EIS, and we're prepared to do 23 that. We're prepared to take that step. The location that our company has its 24 25 uranium resources are on two land grants, Juan Tafoya

1 and Cebolleta on the east side of Mount Taylor. 2 The people that live there have lived there for many 3 generations, for about 400 years. They have been 4 ranchers, they have been farmers, they have used the 5 water, and they understand what uranium mining has 6 meant to them because they've done this in the past. They've done it safely, and they're prepared to do it 7 8 again. They know that one of the benefits they're 9 going to get is going to be royalty payments that they are going to receive. They're going to get 10 11 scholarship money which is already beginning. 12 royalty payments come upon production, and they are already preparing to -- how do we improve irrigation 13 14 systems, waste water systems, domestic water systems, 15 transfer stations. They're already looking at ways 16 to use that uranium royalty money to benefit them and 17 their people. They're fortunate. They may not 18 understand, but they are prepared to do what the --19 probably the best conservation president we had said. 20 That was Teddy Roosevelt. He said, "Do what you can 21 with what you have, where you are." 22 The people at Cebolleta and Juan Tafoya 23 have uranium, they're prepared to do the best with

MR. RAKOVAN: Cal Curley.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

it.

Thank you.

24

MR. CURLEY: (Speaks in Navajo) I'm going to talk in Navajo and then we can interpret in English. Just kidding.

Good evening, everyone. My name is Cal Curley and I'm with Congressman Tom Udall's office here in Gallup, and I am here to read Congressman Udall's statement:

"Dear Commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this discussion. As you know, we have a troubled history with uranium mining in Navajo country, and this is an important issue for us.

"Sixty years ago, government engineers came to Navajo country to begin mining uranium for a new weapon that the world was just coming to know and fear. They spoke of defending the nation, and they promised economic benefits to the Navajo people, but they did not mention the brutal health and environmental effects of mining radioactive materials. By the 1980's, the damage done by uranium mining was all too apparent. Hundreds of families had lost their loved ones and breadwinners to the efforts of mining.

"With loved ones dying young from lung cancer and other radiation-related diseases, the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Navajo people filed suit to demand compensation.

My father, Stuart Udall, got the first court case calling for justice for Navajo miners, a paramount case I had the opportunity to work on with him.

"His work and the efforts of Navajo activists led to the passage of the Radiation Exposure Act (RECA). Today, the Federal Government still has not found the financial resources to fully fund RECA. The Navajos struggled to receive compensation they deserved. Sadly some seemed more interested in expanding uranium mining than cleaning up the mess left behind by uranium industries.

"As the NRC works quickly to streamline their approval process for more uranium mining, you must ensure that the errors of the past are not repeated. Navajo land is a brutal reminder of what can happen when planners allow zeal for mining to cloud their judgment. Too often, attempts to simplify environmental protection measures deny local communities their opportunity to affect the approval process for new mines.

"In New Mexico, uranium mines have been located near some of the most vulnerable communities in the state. The Federal Government has the duty to protect these communities from harm, and the NRC

### NEAL R. GROSS

should not limit the ability of community members to protect themselves from potentially ill-advised mining projects.

"For example, the Navajo Nation has passed legislation banning uranium extraction and processing on tribal lands. The NRC should respect sovereign right to reject these potentially dangerous activities. Any future mining raises particular concerns.

"As you know, water is a precious resource in New Mexico, and future mining has the potential to compromise the water supply to tens of thousands of New Mexicans.

"In Wyoming, the NRC certified water as restored, despite a uranium level 100 times higher than the EPA considers safe.

"For the NRC -- before the NRC rushes to approve new mines, it should address safety concerns and standards related to any future mining and ensure that local communities have the opportunity to protect water supplies during the mining approval process. As you develop your proposal, I ask you to remember that the environmental impact statement is not just another piece of red tape. It is a crucial defense against the kind of irresponsibility that has

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

already led to the death of too many Navajo miners, and to the poisoning of some of the most beautiful land in our nation.

"This is about our lives, our land, our communities. On behalf of the Navajo people and all of those who have been and will be affected by uranium mining, I urge you to be cautious and I look forward to working with you to protect the citizens of New Mexico and the nation. Sincerely, Tom Udall, a member of Congress."

Thank you for your time.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you. Next three speakers, I have Larry King, Stephen Etsitty, and James Martinez.

Mr. King.

MR. KING: Good evening, everybody. My name is Larry King and I live in Church Rock chapter area and HRI is proposing an in situ leach mining right in my own backyard, about a thousand feet away.

And number one, the community of

Church Rock is opposed to any new type of mining

company moving into our community. There are still a

lot of contaminants still left behind from previous

mining. That needs to be addressed first before it

can be even considered letting applicants, new mining

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

to process their applications.

And to get to the point of what the meeting is about tonight, the GEIS I think should not even be an issue at all because it's only from what I read in the papers, it's to speed up the process of issuing a license to mining companies, just to make some people in Washington, to make their job a lot easier and quicker. This GEIS should not even be an issue right now.

Each EIS should be taken and reviewed, piece-by-piece, for each mining company. These proposed mine sites and geographic locations are not the same from New Mexico or to Wyoming. So these EIS, to me, should be taken by locations, not with this Generic Environment Impact Statement. To me it's discrimination against the native America people.

We practice our native traditional -- I'm a traditional person. I believe in my traditional values. I value the Mother Earth as sacred and the plants that are around the area, the water we hold sacred. Gallup is always in the paper saying that the water in the Gallup area is going to be scarce in about ten years if nothing is done. What if that happens? The Navajo people have to rely on a lot of

these outlying areas where there's watering points.

Crownpoint chapter has a watering point, and

Crownpoint community has a few thousand people, but
there's several outlying communities that rely on
this watering point, from Lake Valley, from Toreon,
from Smith Lake. What if these waters, the aquifers
are contaminated? Where are you guys going to get
your water?

So I'm also proud to say -- I just became an heir to some allotments, several allotment, a lot of land, so all allottees are not for uranium mining. I'm against uranium mining. Thank you.

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you, sir.

Stephen Etsitty.

MR. ETSITTY: My name is Stephen Etsitty.

I'm the executive director for the Navajo Nation's

Environmental Protection Agency. NNEPA requires

meaningful public involvement, especially for

individuals in communities who may be directly and

indirectly impacted by a proposed action. It's my

hope that the result of this scoping process is the

realization that the no-action alternative is the

preferred alternative, meaning that no action would

be to not build or license potential uranium milling

facilities, and that under this alternative the NRC

would not approve future license applications.

In this process, NRC shall not assume that conditions are the same or similar in all western states where past, current, or proposed ISL mining and milling developments are occurring or likely to occur. NRC's proposed GEIS shall not limit public — meaningful public participation, nor limit the ability to identify significant issues, nor limit the analysis of direct, indirect, or cumulative effects.

The proposed GEIS shall not increase the likelihood that a private individual or developer forego the process of a site-specific environmental review and documentation for a proposed ISL mining and milling license application.

As was explained earlier, the GEIS potentially shortens the need for process and implies to some extent that local government decisions and/or authorities that limit or prohibit ISL mining and milling may not be acknowledged or considered by the NRC. It was stated earlier that important land use laws that should be deemed to be important is the Navajo Nation's Diné Natural Resources Protection Act of 2005 which prohibits uranium development.

The Navajo government submits that there is no other political geographical area in the United

States and perhaps the world that has suffered and continues to suffer from the environmental impacts of past uranium mining and processing to the same extent as the Navajo Nation.

There is no guarantee that the proposed GEIS will improve NRC's efficiency. In addition, there is no guarantee that NRC will respond adequately to environmental consequences of new uranium development.

Therefore the Navajo Nation respectfully requests the NRC to provide the Nation and the public with any examples of aquifers utilized for ISL mining where the post-ISL mining condition of the aquifer is as good as the pre-ISL mining conditions. Let me wrap up here.

The uranium legacy on the Navajo Nation goes back approximately 90 years, and the legacy consists of approximately 1,349 abandoned uranium mines, four former uranium military processing facilities known as UMTRCA sites, and two known ISL pilot projects located on free land surrounded by Navajo Nation trust land. Together these sites are the sources of known and potentially hazardous substance releases, and today more than one-third of our 110 Navajo communities and a growing population

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

of young and elderly are living with varied and significant health impacts from past uranium development.

During the '80s, the Navajo Nation began conducting radiological surveys of abandoned uranium mines, waste ore piles, uranium military sites, transfer and haul roads, and homes that were constructed with some of these waste uranium ore material.

In 1993, the Navajo Nation testified in hearings before Congress and requested assistance to assess and mitigate adverse environmental and human health impacts attributed to historical uranium mining and milling activities.

Since then, the U.S. Government's response has been sporadic, and the Navajo Nation's efforts have resulted in the identification of additional contaminated sites which have yet to be addressed.

The Navajo Nation has also determined that the NRC and the Atomic Energy Commission approved waste management practices, for example the disposal of mill tailings at the two mine shafts at northeast Church Rock mine near Pine Hill, New Mexico, which posed potential adverse impacts to ground water resources.

Although NRC's decisions may have been coordinated with state agencies in New Mexico, there was no available documentation to indicate that NRC formally consulted with the Navajo Nation on a government-to-government basis.

Formal consultations were also lacking with the Atomic Energy Commission's decisions to exclude mill waste for proper disposal, which was — has been discovered by the Navajo Nation on adjacent vicinity property at a former Rare Metals of America uranium milling facility near Tuba City, Arizona.

So the U.S. Government has yet to completely verify, assess, or mitigate ongoing hazardous substance releases throughout the Navajo Nation from the last wave or uranium development. How is it possible that the NRC's proposed GEIS appropriately address all these impacts, cumulative impacts, sufficiently to justify issuance of future leases or licenses for renewed uranium development?

How would NRC's proposed GEIS appropriately address abandoned uranium mining and milling impacts within adjacent state jurisdictions?

The states of Arizona, Utah, and New Mexico have not formally proposed an agreeable approach to assess the -- to assess and mitigate hazardous

### NEAL R. GROSS

substance releases from state lands that are adversely impacting the Navajo Nation.

How will NRC's proposed GEIS acknowledge, assess, and mitigate the unique history of the Navajo Nation's uranium legacy? Our current conditions and the impacts from the last wave of uranium development are neither well understood nor predictable.

What assurances do we have that new uranium development will not adversely impact human health and the environment on the Navajo Nation?

How will NRC's proposed GEIS address potential cumulative impacts, which may include impacts from both past and new -- actually which should include impacts from both past and new uranium development activities.

The renewed interest in uranium resources is driven by current uranium prices, and NRC is proposing to expedite the NEPA process with the proposed GEIS, which has the likely potential to exacerbate existing and devastating conditions on the Navajo Nation.

So formal consultation and the proposed

GEIS must acknowledge the existing impacts to the

Navajo people from past uranium development, current

Navajo law, which prohibits new uranium development

1	until the legacy of adverse and devastating impacts
2	have been completely addressed by the U.S.
3	Government. Thank you very much.
4	MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you for your comments.
5	The next three speakers, James Martinez,
6	Benjamin House, and Chee Smith, Jr.
7	MR. MARTINEZ: My name is James Martinez.
8	I am here on behalf of myself, my family, Puerta
9	Villa Land Grant Corporation, which I am an heir to.
LO	I attended the NRC hearing on August 9th in
L1	Albuquerque. I had the opportunity to listen to all
L2	the representatives speaking, and I am concerned
L3	about some that made who spoke and referred to
L4	Mount Taylor as their mountain.
L5	As me as I am second generation heir to
L6	the Land Grant which is also Mount Taylor, I want to
L7	also make it clear and state that Mount Taylor is my
L8	mountain too.
L9	Over 30 years ago, uranium mining began in
20	our community. We have a mine and shaft a mine,
21	shaft, and mill in the midst of our Land Grant, and
22	mining was done safely during that time. We have
23	never had any issues on our land being harmed and not
24	being able to provide our crops and water for our

livestock and our own personal use. We continue to

1 raise livestock, develop our lands with crops, and maintain our water hand-in-hand with uranium mining. 2 3 And also, we also already are benefiting 4 from the mining with the scholarships that are being 5 offered to my children and the Land Grant children. We are already starting to teach our children. 6 7 And also I want to say that I have a lot of health problems, and I wish I could blame it on the 8 9 uranium. My family has a lot of health problems, and I wish I could blame it on the uranium. 10 That way the 11 doctors could pinpoint it right away. 12 And everybody is scared about the uranium, I don't know why. You know, it's going to generate a 13 lot of jobs for a lot of people here, and also for my 14 15 people. The money that we're going to generate, 16 hopefully we could maybe get the mine back that we 17 lost like Laguna did. Laguna made a lot of money 18 with the uranium, and they bought a lot of land back 19 that they had lost. And hopefully my people can do 20 the same. 21 I just want to thank you all for listening 22 to me. 23 (Applause) 24 MR. RAKOVAN: Benjamin House. 25 My name is Benjamin House, an MR. HOUSE:

allottee and president of the Eastern Navajo Allotees' Association.

In his new book, <u>The Age of Turbulence</u>,

Alan Greenspan makes it clear that the Iraq war was largely about oil.

My point is that energy is so necessary in modern society that we will send our sons and daughters to war to fight for it because we do not have sufficient oil here in the States. This is not acceptable.

We must develop alternatives to this poor and largely Arabic dependence to oil. One widely acceptable solution is nuclear energy. It is clean and we have the fuel right here at home. Yet there are many who would have nuclear power plants fueled by foreign uranium.

its uranium production the fastest is Kazakhstan, another Arabic society. Does it make sense for the United States to reduce our dependence on Arabic oil by developing nuclear power only to increase on (sic) dependence on Arabic uranium, uranium that we can again go to war for some day?

So here is my request to the NRC, with haste, conduct the Generic Environmental Impact

1 Statement as a matter of energy security. Two, make concrete recommendation that will 2 allow safe development of the country's uranium 3 4 resources. 5 Three, evaluate the national security implications of continued foreign reliance on oil and 6 7 potentially uranium. 8 Finally, if uranium recovery is not safe, 9 just say so. But if it is safe, also say so. the GEIS alternative, let us compare the safety of 10 11 domestic uranium development with the safety of going 12 to war for energy security. Thank you. 13 (Applause) 14 MR. RAKOVAN: Chee Smith, Jr. MR. SMITH: Good evening, ladies and 15 16 gentlemen, NRC Commission, and staff. My name is 17 Chee Smith, Jr. I'm a former chapter president for 18 Power State chapter, which is about 35 miles east of 19 Crownpoint and Eastern Navajo Agency. I also sit on 20 the board of ENDAUM. 21 In the year 2001, ENDAUM traveled to 22 Rockville, Maryland to testify before the NRC 23 Commission to oppose the grant of license to HRI to 24 mine in the Crownpoint area and Church Rock area. 25 Two sites are proposed in Crownpoint, and two sites

are proposed in Church Rock.

As we all know, water is a precious commodity. No matter what you put in the water, water cannot be restored to its original state. We all know that.

People from Wilos Lake travel to Crownpoint 35 miles every day with four or five barrels, 50 gallon barrels in their trucks, hauling water for cooking, for washing, for their livestock. And that takes a toll on their vehicles. So what I'm saying is if the ISL method goes through, people might be --would have to get water from somewhere outside of the Navajo Reservation. And along with -- I agree with the mission of the NRC where they are to protect the public health and safety and the environment. And I think I'm talking about the lives of our people.

The one question or concern that I have falls under the historical and cultural resources.

Mount Taylor is one of our four sacred mountains.

Our people use it, they go up there to gather herbs, they do their prayers up there, and they respect the wildlife that's up there, but they use the eagle feathers for their ceremonies. So we who respect Mother Earth -- and we intend to keep the earth as God has created it for us to respect it. Thank you

1	very much.
2	(Applause)
3	MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you, sir.
4	The next three speakers I have Art Gebeau,
5	Rhilla Vasquez and Jay Tonny Bowman.
6	Art Gebeau.
7	MR. GEBEAU: I'll try to be brief. I
8	believe the previous speakers have pretty well
9	addressed everything. My name is Art Gebeau. I'm a
10	citizen in the Milan area, and next month it'll be 50
11	years, so I've been here a little while.
12	I was in the uranium mining and milling
13	industry for 36 years, from 1957 'til 1993, so I have
14	some acquaintanceship with what we're talking about
15	tonight.
16	Now I'm a member of a group known as the
17	Blue Water Valley Downstream Alliance. We're a group
18	of homeowners who live in the vicinity of the
19	Homestake Mill. Many of these people lived there
20	long before the mill was there. I did not; I came
21	there in '78 to live at that point.
22	The Homestake Mill started up in '58.
23	Within three years, pollution was discovered in the
24	ground water outside of the mill property. This was
25	reported by the United States Public Health Service

as there were no other regulatory agencies doing anything then. After that, things kept on and by the mid to late '70s, the pollution was probably a half-mile outside of the mill boundary. The alluvial aquifer and the three upper bedrock aquifers were all involved by that time.

been diligently working on this problem since about that time, and through their great efforts, now the pollution is about three miles outside the boundary of that mill. They think — they say they're doing good because some of the monitored wells, the pollution levels are lower, but they sure as heck have encompassed a lot more area. My house is in that area. Now they say gee, Homestake is not to blame for all of this because there's something coming at them from upstream, upstream being where two other mills previously were and a bunch of mines.

So they've given Homestake what's called alternate concentration limits. This is a nice way of saying you're not going to meet drinking water standards so we'll just raise up the floor that you've got to meet. And by the way people, don't use your wells. Don't drink the water. Don't feed your livestock with it. Don't raise gardens with it. You

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 probably shouldn't even shower in it. Go find you 2 some water. And that's what the folks in Crownpoint 3 are saying could happen to them. Go find you some 4 water. 5 I want to thank you all for your diligent efforts on the water situation on the Homestake Mill. 6 7 Thank you. 8 (Applause) 9 MR. RAKOVAN: Rhilla Vasquez. MS. VASQUEZ: Hello, I'm Rhilla Vasquez and 10 11 like Art says, I'm with the Blue Water Valley Down 12 Stream Alliance. And our wells are contaminated. 13 As far as NRC goes, I've had questions at 14 previous meetings. We had a meeting at Grants on the 18th. 15 16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you. 17 MS. VASQUEZ: We had a meeting at Grants on 18 September 18th. Mr. Von Till couldn't answer my 19 questions. 20 As far as the GEIS study goes, I -- at this 21 point I don't see what it's going to do. You haven't 22 done anything to help clean up the community as it 23 is. You say you're going to use all your data and 24 all your research. We've asked for research over the 25 last 30 years, but NRC tells us there's no

insufficient data. Well how can you set a standard if there's no insufficient data to back up your standards? So what we're asking for is a little bit of help in trying to clean up the mess.

As far as uranium recovery, you people need to think hard and fast. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. RAKOVAN: Mr. Bowman.

MR. BOWMAN: (Speaks in Navajo) Loud audience. My name is Jay Tonny Bowman. I'm from Twin Lakes, New Mexico, about 15 miles from -- north of here. I'd like to thank U.S. NRC for bringing this hearing to this community. It is enlightening. Do you hear me? I guess I can hear myself or -- it is isn't -- why I say it is enlightening is, this is the first time that I'm hearing this kind of a meeting.

I'm going to speak on the political response to the oppositions to mining and recovery in the uranium in this area. I have heard the Navajo Nation President Joe Shirley express opposition to development of uranium through radio and newspapers. The local uranium supply is on the Navajo allotment land. Joe Shirley expressed that there will be no uranium exploration, mining, recovery on the Navajo

and Navajo allotment land. I believe this is -interferes with Navajo private property and owners
intending to utilize their property in lawful and
profitable manner. Opposition mostly beyond -opposition must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that
the -- through technical, scientific, medical, and
other scientific datas.

On the other hand, President Joe Shirley should assist the Navajo allottees to market their uranium properties to the maximum extent of possibility, not hinder their wishes for business development and opportunities. I'm going to make this comment in non-technical aspect of uranium activities and development, so therefore I fully support uranium development here.

I would request that NRC grant private companies their license to recover uranium in and around Crownpoint and other places for profit, other opportunities which would give the people opportunity to engage in much needed employment. If you oppose this kind of development and opportunity and employment, what are your arguments?

I don't have a job now. What are the opportunities that you can make available for the people, for the kids who I see walking on the road,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

hitchhiking somewhere. They don't have enough education. They have nothing to look forward to, but all I hear now is opposition, opposition, opposition from Joe Shirley. Why don't they help the people here and come up with solutions for the disease that they claim that uranium brings, the disease that the -- the air and the environment. Find solutions, not say don't do something that the people should engage in. It's their property and I heard it mentioned that somebody was here for 60 years. Look, we've been here for thousands and thousands of years on this continent, and so what -- we need opportunities. Give us opportunities. If you have better solutions, let's hear it, not negative obstruction. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. RAKOVAN: I'm going to continue to go through the speakers -- through the cards more or less in the order that I was given them. Our next three speakers I have are Chuck Wade, Teddy Nez, and Derrith Watchman-Moore.

Chuck Wade.

MR. WADE: My name is -- can you hear me back there? Because you can't really tell from here. My name is Chuck Wade. I'm a retired general contractor from here in Gallup, and I have been

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

studying alternative energy for many years. What I'd like for you to know that uranium is not an alternative energy.

(Applause)

MR. WADE: Uranium is finite, and that any rate of use of uranium at some point in time, it's going to be totally depleted off this earth. Then what are we going to do to make electricity? I have a suggestion. Let's not use fuel to make electricity. It's absolutely not necessary.

methods and I have one in my hand here, is a provisional patent application for a heat amplification process that takes no incoming fuel and puts out lots of energy. And I will explain that very, very easily. Take normal electricity and start — and put it into an infrared light bulb. That light bulb will turn it in — turn the electricity into heat. That heat goes into a nano-sized particle. That particle will be — will start self-resonating and will take in 18 times more energy than you put in. And that's — then it will not only take it in, then it will reradiate it out.

Therefore you put in one part of energy, you get out 18 parts of energy. You can take two of

three of those parts of energy that comes out, run it back in, and heat that light bulb and this whole process becomes a self-powering generator. Why I say all this is, we're up here talking about a little bitty in situ mining process that will help a few people here, that will help and hinder and hurt many more people, but it will have almost no effect to the people of this world. What we need to do is solve our energy, our fuel for energy problem. heat amplification process will do that. What I would encourage you to do, for the Navajo Nation and even HRI, to go together and engineer, manufacture, and put this heat amplification process into industry. That way these processes and unit can go throughout the world and help the people of the world, put jobs here on the Navajo Nation. I see a lot of good. And I absolutely cannot see any good of having in situ mining going into our water tables in this arid land.

Let me explain just a little bit what -how uranium does energy, or becomes electricity I
should say. What uranium does it creates heat, very,
very efficiently. That heat boils water to make
steam to turn a turbine and the only thing that
turbine does, folks, is make a -- it goes round and

### NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	round and it creates a rotating magnetic flux. Not
2	one part of that uranium goes down the because
3	that rotating magnetic flux has the energy of the
4	vacuum which is a absolutely the energy of the
5	universe at its disposal. This energy from the
6	vacuum goes into that rotating magnetic flux, is
7	consolidated, and comes out of that flux as usable
8	photons, then it goes into the wire and we use it.
9	There is absolutely nothing in uranium that is used
10	to make electricity per se.
11	I'm sure there's lots of questions and I
12	won't take anymore of your time, and I'd be happy to
13	work with the Navajo Nation and HRI or anyone else
14	that wants to solve our fuel for energy problem.
15	Thank you.
16	(Applause)
17	MR. RAKOVAN: Teddy Nez.
18	I have a feeling that's going to happen a
19	few more times before this meeting is over.
20	MR. NEZ: I'm the next to trip on the
21	extension cord. My name is Teddy Nez. I live at Red
22	Water Pond Road between the two abandoned mines,
23	United Nuclear and Kerr-McGee mining.
24	And I've been my family's been living

there for eight generations. You can calculate that.

And that -- I'll talk about the license issue. And then talk about contamination on the ground, air, plants, sunlight, health, human health.

So I've been living in that area for -1968 and then I went to Vietnam, far from our
country, then came back and then developed posttraumatic syndrome on that site, and then I had to
live with the abandoned uranium mine post-traumatic
syndrome, so health issue.

I need to address that to the NRC and then we need to have the health, our health issue, I have cancer; I'm living it. I live in it everyday. then I have to go through the post-traumatic syndrome with the uranium and then with the -- as a Vietnam veteran, I have to go through with that, living with the contaminated water. Our water is already contaminated, and then on the -- some of the regulations, some of the standards that you have, I would make a request to have that like -- if the water is contaminated, it should be a hundred percent cured, instead of 40, 60, or any of the given factors. So illness, we're living with it. We have people that have cancers, so we have five individuals that we have cancer. So as far as the license issue, I would say no to it. Thank you.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(Applause)

MR. RAKOVAN: Derrith Watchman-Moore.

MS. WATCHMAN-MOORE: Good evening. My name is Derrith Watchman-Moore, and I'm representing the State of New Mexico and the Office of the Governor, Governor Bill Richardson, as well as the New Mexico Environment Department. And I have a letter written by the Governor to Chairman Dale E. Klein of the U.S. Regulatory -- Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and his letter is dated July 31st. And I want to note for the record that the Governor did receive a response from Chairman Klein on September 12th. And I want to submit that particular letter for the record and if you have access, you can, you know, make sure that that letter is in the record.

But I want to preface the Governor's letter first by saying the State of New Mexico wants to applaud the NRC this evening for coming to the community where the action is going to take place. But we also want to say that we, as government, have to do a little better. And you're getting there and — but you're not close.

I also want to add that it's unfortunate that the NRC did not consult, communicate, invite, or even allow participation by the State of New Mexico

where most of this activity is going to be occurring in the U.S., when you even had the idea of a GEIS. And we would have told you that that particular process is probably not a good one because you're going to end up doing an EIS for every site anyway. So you're not saving any money at all.

And if you were to conduct a cost benefit analysis, your cost benefit analysis will tell you that your proposed EGI -- or GEIS process is not going to save you any money.

And the Governor acknowledges that your goal is efficiency and I believe he talked about cost and time. The State of New Mexico also considers efficiency something that we consider in government decisions, but we also consider the community wishes. And so we are getting better at understanding the community needs.

So I want to read a couple of comments from the letter and I won't read it in detail because I understand this particular letter was also read for the record -- into the record at the Albuquerque meeting.

But the Governor says that he shares your goal of efficiency and governmental oversight, but however in this case he believes that your attempt at

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

efficiency will negatively impact the ability of New Mexico citizens to participate in the NRC licensing processes for individual facilities.

He also says that there is nothing generic about the concerns that many New Mexicos have -- New Mexicans have with proposals to open or start new uranium mining and milling operations in their communities. The Governor states that New Mexico citizens have the right to full involvement in decisions, and that New Mexico citizens have a problem with a proposal of a Generic Environmental Impact Statement -- okay, I have to read this again, that the NRC's GEIS proposal is contrary to the State of New Mexico's public participation permitting process. And that given the concerns of New Mexico citizens and their concern about public participation in this particular process, that the Governor asks that you eliminate the EGIS (sic) process and that you are respectful to the sovereign Native American tribes in Pueblos and the general public, particularly in this particular part of the State.

The Governor states that the -- New Mexico must be assured that the public is given a robust opportunity to participate in the decisions and that all environmental, water, resource, and public --

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

potential public health issues are thoroughly examined for each operation.

And given that we're far into this process,

I would add that the primary area that you should be

concerned about, and given that there are many, many

significant cultural sites and concerns regarding

protection of sacred sites, and given the fact that

there are environmental justice concerns, that you'll

find that these particular concerns and issues will

take you straight to the EIS process.

In conclusion, the Governor wants to be assured that the public to review individual Environmental Impact Statements for proposed uranium mines and mills in New Mexico are on a case-by-case basis and that the only way to get there again is through an Environmental Impact Statement for each particular site. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you.

The next three speakers that I have are Annie Sorrell, Michael Daly, and Eric Jantz.

Annie Sorrell.

MS. SORRELL: Good evening. (Speaks in Navajo) Well just by listening, a lot of us are living out in the past. You know some of us want to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

go forward. We want to see what we can establish.

We want to see what improvement we can make. Too

much of this way back 1968, those years are gone.

That's why our government doesn't get anywhere, it's

because they live in the past. They go back, go back

and forth. We need to go forward.

I'm for uranium mine. I'm allottee, I have a land. Our parents have given us land in Crownpoint and in Smith Lake, and I'd like to see Crownpoint as a city, a town. I'll always say that I want a big motel there. I want a big restaurant because we have a lot of tours that goes to Chaco Canyon. And we need these places, you know, established. I'd really like to see some improvement on the reservation.

Our chapter places are the only thing that lightens up is the Bashas. That's the town Mr.

MacDonald established and what more has been established this year -- for the next -- for the last eight years as far as I know? What are we doing? Where are we going? Do you ever think of your grandchildren, your children? They need jobs. They need to improve themselves in the housing. A lot of these houses are built, the rents are too high because our children are not working. And our grandchildren are coming up. I think we should think

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

again, and I'm in favor of uranium mines. Not that I want the money. We need businesses. We need auto sales. We need a lot of things that we can enjoy while we're here.

You talk about a lot about these sacred places, and it looks like we're pulling Mount Taylor with the Mexican people. They're my people, yes.

And the Navajo, we are pulling them. We're pulling it this way. And the Hopis took our land, they said something about regaining our land. Maybe when we get our uranium we'll buy our land that's been given away. Watching our leaders just -- you know, the lands that were stolen from them.

I'm in favor of a lot of improvements on the reservation and I'd like to see it. A lot of us are middle age and we're grandmas and you know, our - - my parents have -- are both gone, but you know we want to do what we can while we're here. And that's why a lot of our children are off reservation. They have jobs back there because there wasn't -- the jobs weren't available and then the pay was really bad.

So some of you are leaders here like

George. And the rest of you, please think again.

Think tomorrow. We need the best for our children.

We need to concentrate in helping the children with

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

drugs, alcohol, and meth, whatever it is. That's what we need to concentrate on, I think, other than uranium. Not all people are gone with uranium.

There was tuberculosis. I know when I was a little girl, you know, I herd sheep and I always say that we herd sheep near Wilson and Cindy's place (phonetic) and you could just see dust. And I'll always say that we just blew dust away from Cactus and Edith (phonetic). And then if we see ponds when we're thirsty, we just blow all the bugs away and drink water.

What are we afraid of? We need to get away from this being afraid and do something about it.

I'm in favor of uranium and I'm glad these people are supporting us.

(Applause)

MR. RAKOVAN: Michael Daly.

MR. DALY: Thank you. Good evening, NRC staff and ladies and gentlemen. My name is Michael Daly. I'm outgoing chairman of McKinley County Water Board. The county commission appointed us several years to go — to look into issues related to water and to advise them in those matters in a way that might be beneficial to them.

One of the things we looked at was the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

mining by H -- the proposed mining by HRI at

Crownpoint and Church Rock. And the way we did that,

we asked HRI to come in and give a presentation, and

then we asked ENDAUM and the Southwest Research and

Information Center through ENDAUM to come and speak

to us so we could evaluate it. What we received from

HRI was a technical presentation, and parenthetically

while I'm talking about a technical presentation, Mr.

Michalak, I really appreciated your presentation.

It's obvious that you understand the subject and you

could also communicate it very clearly. Thank you.

But -- I liked it. I'm sorry.

But anyway, what we received from HRI was a pretty clear technical presentation and it sounded good to us.

When an ENDAUM representative came to us, what we got was a very heartfelt visceral reaction to any kind of mining. We didn't hear a technical argument against the in situ leach mining. What we heard was about all the past mining problems that we've been hearing about tonight. And Southwest Research and Information Center did not come to our board. They did come to the Gallup water board, however.

What we did then is we investigated --

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

there's a final EIS for HRI's proposals at Church Rock and Crownpoint, and there were appeals made by the Southwest Research Information Center and by ENDAUM, technical presentations, and we got the hearing reports and read those. And based on that, we concluded that there is — that the mining operation won't impair the water.

The conclusion here in a short paragraph:

"After a review of the materials provided, an
investigation into the assertions made by those
opposing in situ leach mining, we discovered no
evidence that would suggest that the mining operation
will impair our water supply."

And there's one other thing here. I want you to know that the people on the water board are all volunteers and we have a broad spectrum. We're not yes-men for the uranium industry and I mean, we just -- we had had a broad view from both sides. And -- but we did come together on this issue.

The other thing, and I think it's more like a recommendation, I'm not sure the environment department is going to be in charge, but we did also recommend that there be frequent split sampling at the monitor wells to be sure that the material is contained, the mining operation is contained in the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 area it's intended. You can have excursions, they 2 do go off. And HRI proposal is to mine \$100 million 3 worth of uranium a year. If they can mine \$100 4 million uranium a year, I think we could probably 5 have weekly or monthly split sampling and it wouldn't break anybody's back and be safe. Thank you. 6 7 (Applause) MR. RAKOVAN: Eric Santz (sic). 8 9 MR. JANTZ: Jantz. 10 MR. RAKOVAN: Jantz, sorry. 11 MR. JANTZ: Not a problem. 12 MR. RAKOVAN: I thought it started with an 13 S. I apologize. It's okay. Hi, my name is Eric 14 MR. JANTZ: 15 I'm a staff attorney with the New Mexico 16 Environmental Law Center. I represent a number of 17 organizations who are submitting written comments on 18 the proposed GEIS, among them Eastern Navajo Diné 19 Against Uranium Mining, Blue Water Valley Down Stream 20 Alliance, Southwest Research and Information Center, and the Haak'u Water Office of the Acoma Pueblo. 21 22 And tonight I'm actually speaking on behalf 23 of, for the most part, Haak'u Water Office of the 24 Acoma Pueblo. The folks from ENDAUM and Blue Water

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Valley have done a great job of giving their concerns

about proposed uranium mining, as well as the legacy of past uranium mining.

One thing I do want to correct that was made in the NRC presentation at the beginning of this meeting is the impression that ground water can be restored after ISL mining. There's never been a commercial ISL mine in the United States that's restored ground water to its pre-mining condition. It hasn't happened.

I have in my hand a report by the U.S.

Geological Survey prepared for the NRC about ground water restoration. The -- one of the examples they give of a successful restoration is the Highland, Wyoming, the Highland Oil Field, a project in Wyoming. The original baseline water quality for uranium, which is a poison; it, if ingested, will result in kidney failure and damage, was .05 (sic) milligrams of water per liter. After restoration, after restoration, it was 3.53 milligrams per liter of water, from 0.5 to 3.53 of this kidney toxicant, and that was considered a successful restoration by the NRC. So I just want to let the folks out here know that that's what restoration means to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

In terms of the GEIS process, it's

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

unfortunate that the NRC has represented that it takes public comment into account. At the Albuquerque meeting, a representative from Haak'u Water stood up before a crowd of 250 so people and asked for a tribal consultation on this GEIS. That hasn't been done. I'm here to ask for that again. A tribal consultation was absolutely not done in the context of whether or not a GEAS -- GEIS should be prepared. And tribal consultation, at least with Acoma Pueblo, has not occurred to date.

As trustee, as a federal trustee for tribes, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, as an agency of the Federal Government, has an obligation to consult with tribal governments. Tribal governments aren't a member of the public, they are governments. Government-to-government consultation is necessary and should commence at the as soon as possible date. Thank you for your time. (Speaks Navajo)

(Applause)

MR. RAKOVAN: I'd like to thank everyone who has spoken tonight and, you know, thank you for keeping with our time so we can get through. I've got a number of people that we're going to get through so we're going to just keep on going.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

The next three speakers that I have are

Jerry Pohl, Terry Fletcher, and Rose Marie Cocchini.

Jerry Pohl.

MR. POHL: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Jerry Pohl. I'm here to represent the Cebolleta Land Grant. I want to thank you -- all you guys for being here and I respect all you guys' thoughts. And as leaders of your people, I know you've got concerns for them, but I also want you guys to respect my thoughts.

I've lived in the Cebolleta Land Grant for many generations, I have come back from the colonial times, my people have been there for just about ever. We live on the east side of Mount Taylor. We used to own 200,000 acres of the mountain on the inside and the Alpy Ranch, the Elkins Ranch, even part of the Flowing B (phonetic) Ranch and the Puerta Villa Land Grant. That all belonged to the Cebolleta Land Grant.

We have had mining in the past in the Cebolleta Land Grant. It never hurt our water. It always produced good jobs for us. In fact, most of the people have stayed in the Cebolleta area because of the mines, because they didn't have to go out and look for jobs. The mines can do a lot of good things

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

for the people. It's governed right. With today's technology I think they can even do a lot better. So don't be afraid of it, don't be afraid of uranium.

I myself have worked ten years in the underground mining. I also have worked in the reclamation of Anaconda Mine. In this respect, I know I can represent a few miners and the mill workers that are anxious and willing to go back to work. I want to thank you all.

(Applause)

MR. RAKOVAN: Terry Fletcher.

MR. FLETCHER: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Terry Fletcher and I'm the president of the New Mexico Mining Association. One of our functions is education of the public and government officials.

The World Health Organization has commented the greatest threat to the health and welfare of rural people is poverty.

Mining can be conducted in a sustainable and environmentally sound manner. We support the GEIS. This allows mining companies to prepare a robust EIS. It allows NRC to concentrate its expertise and experience on the site-specific aspects of each and every site.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

I was going to speak to you a little bit tonight about energy independence for our nation, but Mr. House did a wonderful job, so I'm not going to repeat that. But I do want to point out that we're all feeling the impact of higher natural gas prices and gasoline at \$3 a gallon. Gasoline, we're only dependent on 60 percent of our oil resources outside of the United States. Nuclear power is a given source. Whether we like it or not, it's going to be a mix for the future. Today we only achieve four percent of that from domestic supply. How would we like to be 96 percent dependent on the rest of the world for one of major sources of energy. So energy independence, local jobs, the swift and concise actions from the NRC; we support the GEIS. you.

(Applause)

MR. RAKOVAN: Rose Marie Cocchini.

MS. COCCHINI: Good evening everyone, and also members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Welcome, and thank you for your presentation.

I'm Sister Rose Marie Cocchini and I'm presently serving as coordinator of the Office of Peace, Justice, and Creations Stewardship for the Diocese of Gallup. And perhaps I'm stepping back

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

with a different perspective, but I think it's a very important perspective, especially for people of faith. And we have many different religions and traditions represented here, but we all share a deep concern for life.

And so I'd like to just begin by sharing the quote from Chief Blackout, who said and reminded us decades ago that we belong to the earth. We do not own the earth. The earth does not belong to us. And it's very obvious that our human life is very dependent upon everything that the earth provides for us. We're all totally dependent on the biosystems of earth.

Yet somehow our western civilization has proceeded and continued to regard the earth as a natural resource to be exploited and used for development and for economic profit. And at this time I think most of us are growing in an awareness that our earth is very limited, and we're seeing it with global warming. We understand that the whole earth is going to suffer as a result from rising seas, from the continuing drought here in the southwest, which will only continue and worsen.

And so as we look at this and we reflect on it, that we all share in one web of life, regardless

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

of our cultural, ethnic and racial backgrounds. If we truly come to that from a religious perspective, then we know that our personal and individual choices are affecting each and every one in our community of life. And that's all living beings, our fellow kin, creatures, the life and the beauty of the southwest, the earth around us.

In learning of this challenge of this possible resumption of uranium mining in the Diocese of Gallup, Bishop Donald Pollot responded by issuing a pastoral statement and the title is "God's Sacred Gift of Water." And he addressed this to all people of faith. And his intent was to place this discussion in a broader context, and that context for people of faith is one of relationship with our creator and the relationship we have with all God's creation. So you may bear with me with some of the traditions of this concept or this idea that we are one family under one creator, that the creation is God's self-revelatory gift to each of us, and it's a revelation of God's love and care.

All of us, each and every human being is created in the image and likeness of our creator. We are all one, brothers and sisters in this family.

These are very basic fundamental beliefs for people

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

who hold religion important and faith and spirituality in their daily living. And so we are each entrusted with the sacred vocation to somehow share and mirror this love for each other, for God's creation, and for all the community of life. And not just for ourselves, but for our future generations. We learned this from our Native Americans brothers and sisters. It's the seventh generation, how will they be impacted.

So in this particular pastoral statement, the Bishop presents the idea that when life-sustaining waters are threatened, we're all challenged then to go deeper and to somehow understand that we need to respect and protect water as God's sacred gift. It's not a natural resource to use and misuse and contaminate because it will bring us more economic profit.

So we're being challenged about renewable energy. What are the possibilities? Where's the solar energy and the hydro energy, the wind energy, where are the alternative energy technologies that our scientists, our very talented scientists and technologies could help us open up for the future.

The -- also in this statement, it is reminded that numerous scientific and medical experts

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

have warned that invasive and experimental in situ leach uranium mining technology would invade and as we have heard already, irreversibly contaminate vital water reserves in the aquifers, pollute soil, air. We've heard this and we see evidence, those of us who have traveled to these former uranium sites.

So there's no scientific evidence, as was presented by Eric Jantz from the New Mexico

Environmental Law Center, no scientific evidence that uranium-contaminated waters have ever been restored to pre-operation standards.

So the Bishop asks us to look at this.

What about the contamination and destruction of vital water reserves? What does that mean for us? For our communities? For all life in our region? And nothing is more precious than what sustains life, the bio regions. We know that.

So the pastoral statement invites us in our public policy making, and our discussions with our officials and those who represent agencies to focus directly on environmental issues at stake, safeguarding vital water reserves for present and future generations. What is the common good for all in the communities involved, which by necessity includes the good of the earth and the earth's living

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 systems. Without water there is no life. And so for those of us who have the 2 3 religious perspective and that spiritual, moral, ethical, environmental justice principles are at the 4 core of our faith journey, our life journey, these 5 are very serious considerations. So we join you all 6 7 in looking at these challenges, but now is the time, here is the place, and we are the stewards of God's 8 sacred creation. Thank you. 10 (Applause) 11 MR. RAKOVAN: From my card count, it looks 12 like we're winding down to the last, like half dozen 13 or so speakers, so we'll keep on moving. 14 Melvin Capitan, Jr., Susan and Juan Elizondo. 15 16 Melvin Capitan, Jr., please. 17 MR. CAPITAN: Good evening or goodnight, 18 NRC representative. I'm Melvin Capitan, Jr. and I'm 19 a Navajo and a geologist for HRI. 20 I strongly support the preparation of the 21 Generic Environmental Impact Statement. I understand 22 your concerns and issue on underground drinking 23 water. I work with the Navajo Nation Environmental Protection Agency under the underground injection 24

control CIE for six years, and then worked for the

BIA for another five years. I'm also a resident of the Greater Aneth oil field, have lived with exploration and production of oil and gas most of my life. I'm aware of the pros and cons of the industry.

My recommendation is that the in situ recovery ISL method is the best method due to the safety and cleanness of the operation and development, because I'm the guy in charge of the geology of the operation.

It is my belief that if we don't pursue with the GEIS, the residents of Crownpoint and Church Rock will lose out on economic benefit.

There have been statements still, as I said in Albuquerque, many in regard to annihilation and genocide of the Navajo people, but if you look at Crownpoint and Church Rock today, the population of those communities seem to have tripled. I see more homes. How will these growth -- growing communities sustain themselves without the resources that money could provide for them.

Finally I'd like to ask the Navajo Nation

Council delegates and the president and vice

president, come on, my own people, can't not work

together. We need to sit down with some -- bring in

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	back the young people like myself back to the
2	reservation, hire us on to resolve all these issues.
3	That's a solution right there. But it's been the
4	past. The past is still with us and I don't like
5	that at all. So I encourage the Navajo Nation to
6	step up. Thank you.
7	(Applause)
8	MR. RAKOVAN: Susan and Juan Elizondo.
9	Susan and Juan Elizondo. Okay.
10	I apologize, but I know I'm going to
11	slaughter this one because I'm having a difficult
12	time reading it. Sarah Nemio-Adeky. If you could
13	please introduce yourself, because I apologize, but I
14	can't make out the name.
15	After her we'll go to Chris Kenny and Phil
16	Harrison.
17	MS. NEMIO-ADEKY: Good evening. It's
18	actually they can call me Adeky which is Japan,
19	it's Japanese, and sometimes it's Adeky but it's
20	actually Adeky. Sara Nemio-Adeky. That's my name.
21	MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you.
22	MS. NEMIO-ADEKY: Good evening, members of
23	the NRC.
24	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.
25	MS. NEMIO-ADEKY: Okay. I just mentioned
	NEAL D. CDOCC

who I am, addressing myself properly here. I'm a Navajo, a member of the Eastern Navajo Agency. I'm also an allottee of the -- within the Eastern Navajo Agency. I'm here to talk about what is happening within our Eastern Navajo Agency communities.

I've been working in that area for the last two and a half years and have come on a one-to-one basis with our community members out there. We have many, many cases of where our people are suffering from the legacy in one way or another. And I think not only if -- until we come on a one-to-one basis with our people, will we find what is really happening out there.

I know that we are in an economical distress time within our nation, but we have to look at what we have and the resources that we have right here in our own areas and where our people are dwelling. There's a lot of rich resources there, and whether it's on the subsurface — in the subsurface area or in the surface area. And our people cherish that, and they don't want to see any more unforeseen, unpleasant things that will happen to them because they don't know, they don't know what's coming down on them. They don't understand the in situ leach mining like a lot of the technical people understand.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

They don't know what is going to happen to them.

We hear testimonies. We hear oil history coming from them, and they are very saddened by what is happening.

So as you look at the -- your Generic Environmental Impact Statement and how you're going to develop that, I just heard just this evening that one of the requirement is the bio assay program that the mining companies have to implement. I think it's just proper to properly -- it's proper to go beyond that and go to the communities and give them the full health studies too. I think they need to be assured that what their health state is like, because this is what is lacking there. They don't know what is happening to them. There are health assessments going on. There's some data gathering going on, but that is not enough. It goes beyond that for our Navajo people. There's many things that have happened, and I think we can go down the line. of it has been mentioned, but the Navajo Nation we kept saying our president, Joe Shirley, he only validated the law.

The Navajo Nation Council, a majority has voted to ban uranium mining and processing. And the -- to this day, the support is still there with the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Navajo Nation Council. And that should be upheld by outside agencies, including the mining companies, as well as our neighboring tribes, Acoma Pueblo, Laguna Pueblo, and all inter-Pueblo council have also passed resolution opposing any new uranium resource development that is going to happen near their sites.

I'm from Cebolla County. I live in Cebolla County and that's where my voting is at. And my home chapter, Ramah Navajo chapter is the only chapter in Cebolla County, and they have the resolution opposing uranium mining.

And it's only the City of Grants, a very few people that are in support of uranium mining.

We hold and cherish our sacred mountain,

Mount Taylor, and we have a Navajo history and

culture committee that have endorsed the resolution

that they will come forth and they will -- in their

own language to say that it's improper and it's also

a -- it's improper for mining companies to go in and

start digging.

Right now we have abandoned mines. We have holes in the earth that go somewhere, and we could hear our mother earth just moaning right there.

She's still hurting. And that's what I know, 'cause I go out there and I look and we do ground truthing,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

and we come across these places, and we investigate in our own ways as to what happened. And it saddens our hearts to see that.

And it just so happens that your comment period ends on October the 31st. And my brother here, Perry Charley, said that's the day that the day that the Little Chube saw something about Little Chube. But you know that's the day that I would say for Halloween, that's the day that people celebrate evil. And in our language we would say (speaks Navajo). And maybe this is rightful. You know it's wrong, it's wrong to be -- start celebrating the in situ leach mining and processing and supporting it, because that's the day of, and the way we see it as Navajo people, it's celebrating evil. And maybe that's where it will end up. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you for your comments. Chris Kenny.

MR. KENNY: Short people here. This feels strange. I'd like to request in the future in your meetings that you allow the speaker to be able to address the people here, as well as people out here, somehow. I think it could be possible.

I wanted to start by just voicing my

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

support for a few of the speakers that I have heard, Larry King, absolutely, Stephen I believe his last name is Edison, absolutely. If Governor Richardson said what I think he did, you'll find out my support for that later. Eric Jantz, absolutely.

I -- so that I don't need to say what those people said. My feeling is what we in this country, maybe especially, but all other the world, have a belief, an inherent belief in the infallibility of our own goodness, and that we couldn't possibly do anything bad.

And I just want to say that my name is

Chris Kenny, and I forgot to say that. And I'm a

scientist like you people, and I can tell, I can look

into your faces and see that you are very genuine in

what you do, you're very competent, you're given a

challenge, you go after it in the best possible way.

And if I were in charge of this task, I couldn't

possibly imagine doing it any better than you have

demonstrated and which you're going to be doing for

the next two years.

However, it does seem like humans are capable of doing things that surprise themselves. If for example we had done an environmental impact study on the initial holocaust to the Navajo in the 1800s,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

I'm sure they were people just like you on the committees in Washington to look at that, and the decision to control the Navajo problem basically was coming from people who saw land they wanted and wanted to get it. And the solution was to assassinate a few million Navajo and put the rest on a reservation, a concentration camp. There's always a justification with well-meaning people who are heavily religious, who are doing what they think is best, but it often is not in their own backyards and not with their own relatives and not with their own people. And we have another example of this going on here.

These people will not live here and they have conveniently chosen the people who live here to be the sufferers if something goes wrong, not themselves.

If we had done an environmental impact study on what would happen to Vietnam -- it's just impossible to imagine how good people can go so wrong. But they do, so we have to keep watch over ourselves.

Every single person in this room I would guess is currently contributing to the holocaust in Iraq every April 15th. You know where your money is

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

going. It's going to kill those people. Do you stop yourselves? No, because you have an inherent belief in the goodness of this country and the goodness of yourselves. And that the allegiance and the service of God and country is your protection system. You can't serve your God and country, because God does not favor a particular country or a particular culture and certainly does not consider the Navajo to be expendable.

I would say you already have your answer.

You've had it for years now. The Navajo clearly said

no. Why do another study? Because you're paid to do

it and you have a job. Find another job.

(Applause)

MR. KENNY: And I'm sure you can do a good job in other areas where your true beliefs can be in action and know that you're doing the right thing.

You're very smart people.

Now, I would encourage, and I want to mention Chuck Wade here in a particular kind of way. He mentions using a renewable resource. Uranium is like oil; it will come to an end. What do we have? Why I am wearing this T-shirt? We have renewable, sustainable energy, plentiful. It's cheap. Just because we have 30 new nuclear plants being approved

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	in Texas does not mean they have to come here and
2	as a afterthought, figure out how to get the uranium.
3	We just say no, no. I say no now, you say
4	no, we fire these people. No study. Use their
5	salaries to build a solar plant for our city and
6	we'll have a lot of money left over. Thank you.
7	(Applause)
8	MR. RAKOVAN: Suddenly I'm glad that I'm
9	the facilitator of this meeting.
10	(Laughter)
11	MR. RAKOVAN: Having said that, we've got
12	three more speakers that I have signed up to speak
13	tonight. Phil Harrison, Leona Morgan, and Linda
14	Evers.
15	If we could we please have Phil Harrison.
16	MR. HARRISON: I need to lower this a bit
17	here. The uranium made me short.
18	Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name
19	is Phil Harrison and I'm from Red Valley co-chapter.
20	And I it's my first term on the Navajo Nation
21	Council and I sit on the resource committee. I
22	wanted to speak on the issue, being a concerned
23	citizen and a concerned leader.
24	I have dealt with uranium for since the
25	1950s. I grew up in the mining camps and I lost my
	NEAL P. GPOSS

father to lung cancer. And I also worked in the mines too, and went through some health problems.

And I lost many relatives in the Community of Cove (phonetic) and the Community of Red Valley.

If you experience these health problems and the destruction of our mother earth and contamination in our water, contamination in the vegetation, the air that we breathe, what life that we have, you would know what you're talking about. If you were never exposed to any kind of genocide or radiation exposure, then if you don't live in the impacted areas, then you wouldn't care. You wouldn't know what will come of it.

I have experienced this firsthand, and this is my first time that I actually -- going on record, but I spent 27 years of my life. I been to the military, and came back on the hardship discharge because of my father was dying; I had to help my family. The uranium had denied my education, and I had to cut short of my military career. And I lobbied for 27 years to, along with Tom Udahl, Congressman Udahl, and Stewart Udahl, and by the way, I had really enjoined the statement that Congressman Udahl delivered. Thank you very much, Congressman Udahl. And he had helped us. And he had seen this

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

and spent many hours on the road meeting with people, meeting with congressional people, and seeing that we're starting another trend of uranium mining, which is not good for us, not good for us.

And I sat back there and having people talk about saying that this is good for all of us. What do you mean by that? As leaders, we have to take care of our younger generation, we have to take care of our elderly. And that's how I took my oath in January. As leaders, you don't poison your people, you don't bring harm to your relatives, to your children. This is really outrageous. If they can make bombs with uranium, we are fragile. Just imagine what they will do.

Money is not the answer. To me I think this is greed, ignorance, and the nuclear field cycle as you know, ends up back in the Native American country. You mine, you mill, you burn, where does the ashes go. It goes back to the Native Americans' territory. And that is how I describe nuclear field cycle.

So I do not support this and I will stand by what the 40th council has passed, the Natural Resource Protection Act, that ban uranium mining or any kind of technology until, as our honorable

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	president says, that until they find a cure for
2	cancer. So that's something that I will support
3	while I sit on the council.
4	And by the way, talking about Halloween, if
5	you see that word there GIS, that half of that
6	word means crazy. If you finish it, add some more
7	letters to it, it will be crazy. Thank you.
8	(Applause)
9	MR. RAKOVAN: Leona Morgan. Leona Morgan.
10	MS. MORGAN: Right here.
11	MR. RAKOVAN: Okay, I see her. Thanks.
12	MS. MORGAN: (Speaks in Navajo) Hello, my
13	name is Leona Morgan. I am the lead organizer of the
14	organization ENDAUM Eastern Navajo Diné Against
15	Uranium workers I mean against uranium mining, not
16	uranium workers. It's been a long night.
17	I have some print for to submit to the
18	NRC. I'd just like to make my commentary on all the
19	things that were said tonight and on the Generic
20	Environmental Impact Statement.
21	As a community organization, ENDAUM is
22	concerned with the quality of life of Diné people.
23	We are also concerned for our future generations.
24	And as a community organizer, I have been trained in
25	working with grassroots people, and one of the things

that we observed in our Navajo people is the lack
of education. Yes, there's poverty, there's other
issues. And I understand that there's individuals
that are concerned for the benefit of their own
family because they need to know that there is job
security, there's economic development so that when
their kids go to school, they'd have jobs to come
home to. That is a concern, and so I'm going to
address that in a minute, but I just wanted to point
out that we are all concerned for the best things
that we want for our people. And so right now I
believe that if there was more education on the
effects, both negative and positive, if we can look
at the cost benefit analysis and see that there is
the benefit for a short time that is a little bit of
fuel for some people that are not on the reservation
it's a little bit of energy through the nuclear fuel
chain that we just heard about, and it's also a
little bit of economic development for our people,
but only for a short time.

If you think about the uranium industry, the reason why it ended and all the other things that have happened, we've seen this before and it's a process that we need to re-examine because it ended for a reason and we're going to go through the same

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

thing again if we don't learn our lesson.

And so part of the thing I'm stressing about education is that there are risks, there are risks that will affect our future generations beyond my lifetime, beyond my children's lifetime. If the uranium — if the half—life of uranium is longer than any of our lives, we will not see the total effects that it is causing our people. And so there's just one thing I wanted to point out that the effects are much longer that we even can imagine.

But I want to talk a little bit about the job, economic development. If we are able as Navajo people to create our own industries, we can find better solutions. Someone was commenting about better solutions and alternate sources of energy. There are excellent abundant sources of energy in this region that are wind and solar, so I'd like to stress to the NRC, and to all the people here tonight, that we should as Navajo people look into the industries of wind and solar, because we can develop these ourselves and we don't have to allow other companies to come in and benefit from our resources.

And so that's one thing that we should consider as the U.S. -- one of the countries that

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

uses the most energy in the world, when our population is growing, that's just going to increase our need for energy, and uranium is just going to pollute our land even more. So we need to find energy sources that will last as much as our energy needs are growing.

And so the other thing I wanted to address about the Generic Environmental Impact Statement is that EIS, they should be -- an EIS is made to be site-specific. So we need -- each site needs to be examined and have its own individual EIS. And that needs to be presented to each community, meaning if it's in a chapter area, it's appropriate to address the chapter and to do tribal consultation.

I know at the Albuquerque meeting of the NRC, Robert Tookey presented a resolution from the all Indian Pueblo Council, which is a representative of all the 19 pueblos in the state of New Mexico, and they signed a resolution that has been submitted to the NRC at the last meeting in Albuquerque.

And so tonight what I want to submit to you, the NRC, and to point out to the people listening is that the Navajo tribe has had a ban on uranium through our Diné Natural Resources Protection Act of 2005, and so I have a copy of that right here

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that I'd like to submit. I'm sure you have several copies, but this is just to add to the record.

So right here what I have also is a packet of all the resolutions signed by different communities dating back to 2003. There are several groups, chapters, Church Rock chapter, Crownpoint chapter, that have all signed resolutions opposing uranium mining.

There are also letters from our different
Navajo Nation leadership, including -- going all the
way back to President Zaw and Shirley, and right here
I want to represent -- I want to present this which
I'd like to call the past, present, and future, the
past being all the resolutions signed, the present
being the -- our current ban, Navajo Nation ban that
I'd like to stress to ask the NRC to please respect
the sovereignty of the Navajo people. When we make a
law in our country, in Navajo Indian country, that
pertains to everything within it. And that includes
independent Indian communities such as Church Rock
and Crownpoint.

(Applause)

MS. MORGAN: And so unfortunately one of the sites that is currently under, I guess, under

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

attack is Mount Taylor, and so as a community organization, we are also concerned about our sacred sites. As Diné people, it is explained -- it's try -- it's almost explained in the fundamental law, but unless you speak and understand our tradition, the fundamental law in its written form is just a description of what the belief is of the Navajo people, which defines our, in western words, our religion.

It is not a religion, it is a way of life, but as Americans, our First Amendment Right is to the freedom of any religion of our choosing. And as Navajo people, this is a religion that has existed since time immemorial. And so as a sacred site, Mount Taylor is inherently important in our community -- in our people's philosophy that there are teachings that go way back that explain that when things happen to our sacred sites, things that are negative or a long time ago we refer to a lot of these as monsters such as poverty and laziness and all these things. We knew of them as monsters and so currently uranium is a new kind of monster. something that is plaguing our people and it's destroying the health and it's also creating this false economy.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

If HRI and other companies are coming in asking to use our resources, it's only to benefit themselves. And the economy will only go to benefit the people in the offices and the cities that are wherever the energy is going, not our own Diné people.

And so I'd just like to present this other article. It says, "The Luke Chapter Considers Just Transition." Just transition is — it's an energy development between the Navajo and the Hopi with the State of California to promote and to increase the production of wind and solar power. And so here — these are all the documents and so someone else was asking for proof. There's a book I have right here that everyone, I'm sure you've seen, has lots of proof about the scientific documentation against uranium mining and why it's bad for our people.

And so I'd just like to thank the NRC for holding additional meetings and for extending the commentary period. And so I'd like to thank you for that.

And lastly I'd just like to reiterate that we would like tribal consultation, not just for Navajo, for all the tribes in affected areas in every state, and so federally-recognized tribes. And to go

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

to all the communities.

And also that as Diné people, when there are negative effects to our natural world, it affects us as people. And so that's when things start to happen to our mentality and the stories that go with it; there's disease, there's growing substance abuse, all of these things. There are effects of -- that were taught to us in our traditions.

And so again I'd just like to say thank you. Thank you for your time and (speaks Navajo).

(Applause)

MR. RAKOVAN: The final card that I have is Linda Evers.

MS. EVERS: I'll keep it short. It's almost morning again. We are with Post 71 Uranium Committee. We have been doing an involuntary survey on safety guidelines and health problems and safety meetings that people had to work with in the previous uranium boom. We're trying to get compensation extended up 'til 1990 to include all the people that were over-radiated and were never informed.

For one thing that I would like to make a point is, Mayor Marietta out of Grants has turned a blind eye and a deaf ear to our people and our predicaments and our health problems. And he does

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

not speak for Grants and Milan when it comes to saying that they support uranium mining.

(Applause)

MS. EVERS: There is a big constituent that does not support it at all because we're sick and dying in our 30s and 40s, and it's from radiation overexposure, lack of safety equipment. I saw in your presentation that you talked a lot about safety training. Safety training and safety equipment are two different things. You could be trained all you want but unless you're properly protected, you're still overly radiated.

You've heard over and over again there's no way to reclaim water once it's toxic. I live in Art Gebeau's neighborhood. The EPA came out and tested my well. My well was a little contaminated, so instead of telling me it was contaminated, they raised the numbers and told me I could consume the water. When I took a jar of water to the EPA's office and set it on his desk and told him you drink it first, he put on a rubber glove and carried it out of his office.

So we have good reason to not trust the NRA (sic), we have good reason not to trust the EPA, and you're not going to convince us with a little study.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	You're going to have to step up, you're going to
2	have to put up. I know uranium is a renewable,
3	reusable energy. Our point is, is we shouldn't have
4	to sacrifice one more life to get uranium out of the
5	ground. Thank you for your time.
6	MR. RAKOVAN: Thank you.
7	Scott, did you want to close things out?
8	MR. FLANDERS: I just want to say in
9	closing I want to thank all of you for coming out for
LO	the meeting. I know it's been a long meeting and I
L1	appreciate you staying until the end to provide your
L2	comments. All your comments will be taken into
L3	consideration as we prepare the draft Generic
L4	Environmental Impact Statement and we will be back
L5	out as Greg said before when we actually have a draft
L6	for you to provide comments to us on that as well.
L7	Again, we appreciate you for your time and
L8	attention. Thank you very much.
L9	(Whereupon the above-entitled matter was
20	concluded at 11:01 p.m.)
21	
22	