

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

INDIAN ENERGY SOLUTION CONFERENCE

GOLDEN NUGGET HOTEL & CASINO  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

AUGUST 6, 2008  
10:03 AM - 12:07 PM

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

NUCLEAR POWER

Moderator: Merv Tano, Esq.  
Founder and Executive Director  
International Institute  
For Indigenous Resource Management  
Denver, Colorado

Chair: Wynona Sinyella, Hualapai Tribe

Reported by: MARY COX DANIEL, NV CCR 710  
RDR, CRR, CBC, CCP

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MS. SINYELLA: Welcome to this session.

3 My name is Wynona Sinyella. I'm with the  
4 Hualapai Tribe. I'm a Tribal Council Member, and I'm  
5 chairing this session.

6 This is nuclear power. Nuclear electric  
7 power was once thought to be a dead subject as far as  
8 the source for the civilian economy was concerned,  
9 killed by Jane Fonda movie, Three Mile Island, and the  
10 disaster at Chernobyl, Ukraine, of the old USSR. But  
11 with global warming becoming the number one  
12 environmental boogeyman threatening world survival,  
13 civilian nuclear is set to make a comeback as a source  
14 of what is called baseload electricity supply. Its  
15 greatest virtue is that it produces no green house  
16 gas; yet, like coal, can operate around the clock all  
17 year long with only short periods of interruption for  
18 maintenance.

19 But many Indian Tribes do not see the return  
20 of the nuclear power option as a blessing. Few  
21 outside of the Tribes that were greatly impacted by  
22 the last uranium mining boom or by the siting of  
23 nuclear power reactors across the fence line from  
24 Tribal lands understand the intimate relationship that  
25 Indians had on every step of the past nuclear fuel

1 cycle; from mining and the health and safety issues  
2 that Indian miners faced to the potential for hundreds  
3 of Indian communities that will be exposed to  
4 potential danger from radioactive waste as they are  
5 shipped to their final storage or disposal site.  
6 Navajo Nation has passed a uranium mining ban  
7 throughout its vast land base, but how will it deal  
8 with mining that takes place across the fence line?  
9 Or how will it deal with the dust and airborne  
10 particulates blown from mining activities far from the  
11 Reservation line? Or by waterborne pollution? Or  
12 from wildlife that has eaten radioactive plants as the  
13 pollutants are concentrated as it moves up to the food  
14 chain?

15           Indian lands lay within the heart of the  
16 uranium ore deposits in the United States from the  
17 Pacific Northwest to the Desert Southwest and the  
18 Northern Plains of the Dakotas. The Prairie Island  
19 Sioux living for decades with a nuclear power plant  
20 with a growing dumpground of spent nuclear fuel  
21 sitting across their fence line on Prairie Island,  
22 Minnesota, know the anxiety of waiting for the  
23 accident that would destroy their People. Or the  
24 Spokane and Eastern Washington that now have a  
25 radioactive lake where once was an open pit uranium

1 mine that is now abandoned leaching into the  
2 groundwater within the drainage of the Columbia River,  
3 with no one and no money to reclaim the mined lands  
4 that have been scarred and damaged perhaps beyond  
5 repair.

6           How can we raise the legitimate concerns of  
7 Indian communities and ask that the litany of these  
8 legacy issues be addressed and safeguards established  
9 to prevent their recurrence before America jumps back  
10 into the nuclear power game? How can America  
11 contemplate its re-entry when it has not yet after  
12 nearly 30 years not been able to resolve the question  
13 of the management and final disposal of the  
14 radioactive waste stream that is produced by the  
15 operating nuclear power plants? Yes, France, Japan,  
16 Germany, and Great Britain all have a large share of  
17 their electricity produced by nuclear reactors. Are  
18 they doing it right? Why can't America get it right?

19           Should Indian Tribes take a proactive role  
20 in the management of waste stream and the generation  
21 of nuclear power to assure that it is done right and  
22 that the safeguards that are in place meet the higher  
23 standards imposed by Tribal standards?

24           Our intention is to be able to present the  
25 next Congress and our new President with a broad

1 Tribal statement on national energy policy and to be  
2 proactive in working with the Congress and the  
3 administration in fashioning a national policy that  
4 has the input of the Tribal Voice.

5           We will begin by hearing from those who have  
6 signed up to speak to this issue of nuclear power.  
7 When all who have signed up have spoken, we will open  
8 the dialogue to an interactive process to allow us to  
9 discuss the issues and raise the questions that we  
10 need to raise to be able to reach important decisions  
11 regarding nuclear power as a part of the domestic  
12 energy supply portfolio. If America decides to go  
13 down this path, how should the legacy of issues of  
14 past uranium and nuclear power impacts on Indian  
15 workers, communities, environmental, and natural  
16 resources be resolved? How can we keep our issues  
17 from being swept under the table by disinterested  
18 officialdom?

19           MR. TANO: My name is Mervyn Tano, Merv.  
20 I'm president of the International Institute for  
21 Indigenous Resource Management. We're a law and  
22 policy research institute based out of Denver,  
23 Colorado.

24           One of the things we could do for the Court  
25 Reporter is to state your name and also speak slowly.

1           By way of background and in the interest of  
2 full disclosure, I should say that I had for several  
3 years been a member of the American Nuclear Society.  
4 I have worked with the Nez Perce Tribe and the  
5 Umatilla Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian  
6 Reservation on environmental reclamation issues  
7 dealing with Hanford, the Hanford site; have been for  
8 several years on the Program Advisory Committee of  
9 Waste Management Symposia. It's a large international  
10 conference that's held annually down in Arizona,  
11 usually in Tucson, but the last year in Phoenix.

12           I should also say that we've been working  
13 with a company, French company, Arriva, and we are  
14 planning to take a delegation of Tribal  
15 representatives to see some of the facilities in  
16 France, see how the French are operating their  
17 systems. We had previously taken a delegation from  
18 the Nez Perce Tribe to British facilities. This was  
19 several years ago.

20           Having said that, I'm neither for nor  
21 against nuclear energy. Our goal is to get smart on  
22 the issues and examine the interface between the  
23 industry in all its manifestations to see how they  
24 implicate Tribal interests and to work with Tribes to  
25 see how their interests can be better protected or

1 advanced as this industry operates, whether or not it  
2 experiences a renaissance or not.

3           So with that, I'd like to open it up for  
4 statements, questions. But one of the ways we operate  
5 is that -- not necessarily taking on a prosecutorial  
6 role, I used to be a prosecutor -- but we may ask some  
7 follow-up questions as well. So with that, any  
8 takers?

9           MS. RYDALCH: My name is Ann Rydalch, and I  
10 work at the Idaho National Lab in Idaho Falls, Idaho.

11           We are a Department of Energy laboratory.  
12 I'm not a Federal employee. We are government-owned  
13 contractor-operated laboratory. And the contractor at  
14 present day is Battelle Energy Alliance, and so they  
15 are the contractor operating that Federal Department  
16 of Energy laboratory.

17           I'm not here speaking as a scientist or as  
18 an engineer, and I'm not a scientist or engineer, but  
19 I work in the international and regional partnerships  
20 office. Our goal is to spread our expertise not only  
21 in nuclear, but in all forms of energy, whether it's  
22 renewable or non-renewable energy.

23           We do have a great expertise in all forms of  
24 energy. Our laboratory has been in existence for over  
25 50 years. And again, I do not speak for them here

1 because I didn't come with prepared text or anything,  
2 but just to let you know that there is a movement in  
3 the nuclear business again to establish nuclear energy  
4 as an emissions-free energy type to be utilized as an  
5 option among the numerous energy options that are out  
6 there.

7           We feel that nuclear should be a player, as  
8 well as oil and gas and clean coal and wind and solar  
9 and all of the other -- geothermal -- any of the other  
10 energies that we think that, the bottom line is that  
11 the nation should be energy-free from foreign oil or  
12 foreign consequences, and not rely on foreign  
13 consequences for our energy supply.

14           You talked about going to Arriva. Arriva  
15 has just contracted with and selected Idaho Falls as  
16 the place to build their uranium enrichment facility,  
17 about a \$4 billion, I believe it is, plant that they  
18 will start building there in Idaho Falls. Idaho Falls  
19 was the site selected to build that facility. Our  
20 Congressional delegation, a member of our  
21 Congressional delegation has just returned from  
22 visiting again the Arriva plant in France and they  
23 have been very favorably impressed all along with the  
24 capabilities of Arriva.

25           The Idaho National Lab, as I mentioned, has

1 been in existence for over 50 years. I've seen --  
2 I've worked there since 1979, and when we had some  
3 12,000 employees. Now we're down to probably 5,000 or  
4 6,000 employees. You've seen that all over the  
5 Federal lab system really, downsizing of Federal lab  
6 employees.

7           But in the field of nuclear generation,  
8 Idaho National Lab has been designated as the lead DOE  
9 lab for the next generation of nuclear plants. And  
10 the NGNP, as we call it, "next generation nuclear  
11 plant," engages the corporations you depend on for  
12 gasoline, plastics, and fertilizer with a progressive  
13 approach to energy production and is starting to  
14 create --

15           MR. TANO: Could I interrupt you for a  
16 second and ask you a question?

17           MS. RYDALCH: Understand, I may not be able  
18 to answer it.

19           MR. TANO: That's fine. But at least so I  
20 can get your ideas on it, and if you don't have the  
21 answer, maybe you can point us in the right direction.  
22 This idea of next generation nuclear plants, for me,  
23 is really important, because what happens generally is  
24 that the discussions about these designs take place  
25 between engineers and scientists and in South Africa

1 and Japan and perhaps Germany or France and the U.S.  
2 And you have then these generating plants,  
3 technologies, being proposed. Now, my concern is that  
4 in the main, Indian Tribes and other stakeholders  
5 really aren't so involved in these kinds of early  
6 discussions. But yet, we deal with, if you will, the  
7 back end of the -- the results of these generation  
8 technologies, because the generation technology  
9 determines fuel form and, therefore, waste form, and,  
10 therefore, transportation campaigns because of, you  
11 know, some burn up more than others, et cetera.

12           How do you recommend that Indian Tribes get  
13 involved? What avenues do they have to get involved  
14 in these early discussions on the development of new  
15 technologies? Granted, they're not nuclear engineers.  
16 But certainly, their concerns about fuel form, waste  
17 form, et cetera, should be incorporated.

18           MS. RYDALCH: First of all, let me say that  
19 anyone is always welcome at any time to visit our  
20 plant, our site, and learn firsthand and become  
21 firsthand with engineers and scientists that are doing  
22 this, and they can answer those specific questions.  
23 But that's a way for Tribes to become involved, is to  
24 actually visit and talk with the engineers and  
25 scientists. And we issue an invitation to you at any

1 time to do that, and just contact me there and we'll  
2 set up not only briefings so that you can have ongoing  
3 discussions, but also tours to let you see what is  
4 happening. So that is an immediate way to get  
5 involved.

6           Now, having said that, you've heard a lot in  
7 the news perhaps about the next generation, the next  
8 type of nuclear power plant. One that they're looking  
9 at there is developing a high temperature gas cooled  
10 reactor that is to produce energy that is able to run  
11 both a primary and a secondary industrial application.  
12 The heat generated by the high temperature reactor can  
13 be used to run more efficient turbines to produce  
14 electricity for homes and to use the residual steam  
15 from that process to manufacture plastic components  
16 from raw materials or generate ammonia for fertilizer.  
17 Numerous industrial applications and energy  
18 distribution methods can be integrated.

19           It's a closed -- what I've heard them talk  
20 about, it's a closed-cycle reactor, so that it burns  
21 up the waste within the reactor itself, not a hundred  
22 percent, but there would be very, very little residue  
23 left for shipment to a facility like Yucca Mountain,  
24 for example. So that's a neat thing, in my opinion,  
25 is it reprocesses the waste within the reactor itself.

1 How it does that, I don't know, but it supposedly  
2 does.

3 MR. CONRAD: David Conrad with Osage Nation.

4 I think to Merv's question, it's partially,  
5 I think, framing the issue, packaging energy options,  
6 I think, because why would a Tribe set up a tour, I  
7 mean, unless they're only defining it as into the  
8 waste stream interest. But if you package it as --  
9 people are packaging wind and hydro in the northwest  
10 because when the wind isn't blowing, you have the  
11 potential with the dams. When the wind is blowing,  
12 you're saving the water for salmon. And it firms up  
13 your wind.

14 Nuclear can also be a zero emissions firming  
15 source for any other sources rather than firming with  
16 coal. If you package them that way, then all of a  
17 sudden you buy the package. Then your interest can be  
18 anywhere in the package rather than to say -- or, you  
19 know, as a policy option, maybe at the policy  
20 dialogue, we have to talk about how we frame these  
21 things and package them together. Otherwise, you're  
22 going to say if it's individual technologies and  
23 you're defining it by impacts on me, then every energy  
24 choice has down sides. But how you put them together  
25 is going to be like, well, then there's only 13 Tribes

1 that have them, or 135 on transportation corridors,  
2 but they don't have an interest in the generation, or  
3 they don't have an interest in the depository, or they  
4 don't have the weapons interest, you know. So we get  
5 parcelled out according to the Federal program rather  
6 than packaging policy options or policy choices. I  
7 think then you get people interested in it. Then you  
8 get people to say, well, maybe I need to get smart  
9 about nuclear because like -- an analogy would be like  
10 hydro stores the water and the energy; nuclear creates  
11 a pool of intellectual potential because it takes a  
12 lot of study, a lot of knowledge about complex issues.  
13 And that's creating intellectual capital in Indian  
14 Country if they will even look at it. And they won't  
15 look at it unless it's packaged as a way to shape  
16 peoples' interests.

17           So I think on one level, I mean, sure, we  
18 have to discuss the options in the development and  
19 technology, and if we don't invest in it, it's never  
20 going to improve the technology. Cell phones,  
21 computers, they've gotten smaller, smarter, faster.  
22 If we never invest in nuclear, it will never get  
23 cleaner, faster, safer. But nobody will look at it  
24 because it's off limits. It's in its own category.  
25 It's not associated with anything else. It's not seen

1 as being a partner in a policy, a set of policy  
2 choices.

3 MR. TANO: Except that that's not  
4 necessarily true, because we talk about the nuclear  
5 renaissance here, but that's only in the U.S. China  
6 is going great guns. India is doing it. Even the  
7 guys in Europe who put thumbs down are rethinking it  
8 in light of Kyoto.

9 MR. CONRAD: But I know people that are a  
10 part of environmental and conservation organizations  
11 can't touch nuclear as a topic by itself. It has to  
12 be part of climate change options. It has to be  
13 packaged in a certain way. Otherwise, their 500,000  
14 members won't allow them to even discuss it.

15 MS. RYDALCH: Well, there is a website. Let  
16 me give you a website that you can learn more about  
17 what we're doing at the Idaho National Lab in the next  
18 generation nuclear plant. And that is  
19 <http://www.nextgenerationnuclearplant.com>. And that  
20 will get you into a website for what the -- and there  
21 is, as has been mentioned, there is a worldwide Global  
22 Nuclear Energy Partnership, GNEP, that is very, very  
23 strong. Numerous countries have signed already onto  
24 that.

25 And the neat thing about the new reactor



1 MS. RYDALCH: Understand, you get what you  
2 get. Had I known I was going to speak, I would have  
3 come prepared.

4 MR. TANO: There is some significant kind of  
5 waste management issues with GNEP in terms of -- our  
6 concern for non-proliferation, where we'll take in the  
7 waste.

8 MS. RYDALCH: But the countries -- and maybe  
9 our DOE person can speak to this better than I can --  
10 but as I understand, in the GNEP, there are countries  
11 that have signed on do so for the sake of  
12 non-proliferation. That's the neat thing about the  
13 next generation of nuclear power plants, as I'm told  
14 by scientists, and I mentioned that it's  
15 self-contained, that it recycles the fuel within the  
16 reactor itself. It's a closed cycle. So there is  
17 less waste to even deal with in the first place which  
18 helps the proliferation issue as well as a waste  
19 issue.

20 So, again, let me invite you to come into  
21 our lab at any time. You've got my contact  
22 information. My phone number there at the lab,  
23 208-526-1010. And I welcome at any time for you to  
24 come in, and I can get you in touch with the  
25 scientists and engineers and have you tour what we are

1 doing there. We are really proud -- we've always been  
2 a DOE lab, but we're really proud to be designated as  
3 the lead lab for the next generation of nuclear  
4 reactors.

5           We understand -- I understand that we're not  
6 always going to have people that agree with nuclear.  
7 That's a given. Let me give you another website to  
8 think about because the thing that disheartens me the  
9 most, I guess, in all of this is the fact that  
10 misinformation that is perpetuated rather than dealing  
11 with facts.

12           If you go to the website of  
13 noteviljustwrong, noteviljustwrong, you will see some  
14 filmmakers -- and we're not associated with them at  
15 all as a lab or me as a person -- I just happened to  
16 view a trailer of their hour-and-a-half documentary  
17 that they're doing -- Irish filmmakers is who is doing  
18 it -- that we're putting on, that's trying to combat  
19 some of the misinformation about coal and about  
20 nuclear and about whatever form of energy. A former  
21 Greenpeace founder is illustrated in the documentary.

22           So it's just the misinformation -- and we're  
23 not ever going to win, but we just feel like nuclear  
24 should be part of the portfolio of energy that's out  
25 there to be utilized for whether it's nuclear, coal,

1 clean coal, all of the renewables, and the  
2 non-renewables. It should be a balanced portfolio of  
3 energy choices. And we hope that nuclear will be part  
4 of that as well.

5           Have I confused you enough? Next time let  
6 me know I'm going to be a speaker.

7           MR. TANO: Any more questions? Comments?  
8 Reactions?

9           Yes, ma'am?

10          MS. DITMER: Renae Ditmer. I'm representing  
11 Stratcon, which is my own company.

12          I just wanted to comment on a couple of  
13 things both Ann and David said. One is David's  
14 question -- why would the Tribes be interested in the  
15 development process of, say, the next generation of  
16 nuclear power? In my experience -- and understand it  
17 comes from working these issues in a different  
18 department of the government over the last few  
19 years -- is that there is a basic mistrust of what the  
20 government tells you is going to happen as a result  
21 of, say, a new process or a new product, and what  
22 really did happen. And we do have those legacy issues  
23 that we're still dealing with at the Reservations or  
24 near the Reservations. So that's part of the answer  
25 to the question.

1           The other is, to be a more active voice, I  
2 think, and determining -- because if we're going to  
3 put something like this on the Reservations to use  
4 them to generate not only power for the Reservations,  
5 but perhaps to sell power to the public, then we need  
6 to have something that's very safe and very secure.  
7 We should be as informed about that process and what  
8 that is as anybody else, or maybe even more so.  
9 That's our right as the producer, the lessor instead  
10 of the lessee. I think that point was well made this  
11 morning.

12           A couple of other miscellaneous sort of  
13 comments. I guess that one of my jobs over the last  
14 few years is kind of determining for a different  
15 department of the government how clean SAFE is for  
16 different things, for chemical exposure, for  
17 biological agents, nuclear and radiological exposure.  
18 And I don't think that as Tribes we've done -- we've  
19 decided that, really. We've come down on the side of  
20 pristine as being acceptable. But pristine is not  
21 necessarily safe. But we haven't really drawn that  
22 line for ourselves to say, what are we going to allow  
23 on the Reservations? What is safe enough for us? How  
24 much exposure can we put up with, whether it's from  
25 mining on our own land, or from having an impact from

1 mining next door to us, or having power generation  
2 facility actually on or near us, because all of those  
3 have some kind of exposure risk associated with them,  
4 or at least they have in the past.

5           Now, the new generation of reactors, they  
6 are supposed to be the closed-loop systems. They are  
7 much smaller. They are much cleaner. They are  
8 designed to totally use up, or almost totally use up  
9 the fuel that's in them. And there is much smaller  
10 amounts of fuel. We're not talking about Three Mile  
11 Island any more. They're meant to be more  
12 user-friendly and much safer. The big problems that  
13 the U.S. Government and the international community is  
14 worried about is still the proliferation problem,  
15 which is why the GNEP program exists. We want to  
16 control all the nuclear waste in the world basically,  
17 so that we know where it is.

18           MR. TANO: Right. And, see, I think people  
19 don't really quite -- you can understand not  
20 proliferation, we don't want to get this stuff in the  
21 hands of terrorists. But when it also includes, as in  
22 the case of foreign reactors, bringing back the waste  
23 to Savannah River, or someplace else, then all of a  
24 sudden people say, "Oh, I didn't know that." I think  
25 that's one of the things we really need to have out on

1 the table.

2           MS. DITMER: And that's a very legitimate  
3 concern, not only for the Tribes, but the general  
4 public feels the same way. You talk to anybody. You  
5 were on the Hanford site, so you know that area quite  
6 well. People in all that area, within 150 miles of  
7 Hanford, will tell you their concerns are the people,  
8 whether they're Tribal people or whether they're just  
9 general public, they're all worried about exposure,  
10 anybody in the Nevada sites. So I'm not sure that the  
11 issues are different except we're talking about  
12 perhaps, because we have uranium deposits in some of  
13 the Reservations, if we reopen those, that's reopening  
14 a different can of worms for us. Also the power  
15 generation on the Reservations would be opening up  
16 another issue for us.

17           MR. TANO: Right. Mr. Arthur from Navajo?

18           MR. ARTHUR: Good morning.

19           I just stopped by to see what was the  
20 discussion referenced to this issue. I don't know if  
21 the panel here or the individuals here -- I'm sure Mr.  
22 Frost might be familiar with the Navajo issue. When  
23 you talk nuclear, the Navajo starts looking over his  
24 or her shoulders. In Navajo, we basically have lived  
25 a nightmare in reference to the nuclear initiatives

1 that were conducted with the Federal programs,  
2 Department of Energy, Department of Defense, during  
3 the early '30s and '40s and thereafter during the Cold  
4 War. There are several mines that were put into place  
5 on Navajo, or within the Four Corners area --  
6 Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. Today Navajo Nation,  
7 the Navajo people, have a very strong opposition to  
8 any discussion in reference to uranium or nuclear  
9 initiatives.

10           We went to the extent of enacting a law,  
11 Navajo Nation law referred to as the Resource  
12 Protection Act, which basically bans mining or  
13 processing of uranium products or by-products within  
14 Navajo territory.

15           At present, we are faced with a challenge  
16 that New Mexico has issued, or are in the process of  
17 issuing permits to proceed with mining in the Grants,  
18 New Mexico area, which is just a few miles away from  
19 the Navajo Nation borders. It also is the place, from  
20 the religious aspects, one of our Four Sacred  
21 Mountains, in which some of these permits will be  
22 initiated for companies to mine. So we're looking at  
23 it from that aspect, too, from the religious aspect,  
24 too, that this industry would have against what Navajo  
25 Nation stands for.

1           Our experience has been sort of devastating,  
2 that in reality our Navajo men mined these products,  
3 went into the mine, lived in the mine for the hours  
4 that they were mining without any safety apparatus.  
5 They had lunch in the mines where they were mining,  
6 drinking the water that was supposedly coming from  
7 these mines. And as time went on, it became a health  
8 issue.

9           Numerous of those miners have passed on.  
10 Very few are still alive. Most of them have died of  
11 cancers or some type of illness. It did not only stop  
12 there, but the wives that were washing and cleaning  
13 their clothes came in contact as well with the health  
14 issues. It did not only stop there. The children  
15 from those mine areas that played in the mines, in the  
16 mining areas, also either have passed on or are  
17 infected by cancerous type health problems. The birth  
18 rates from families in that area that were directly in  
19 the mining, a lot of those births were abnormal.

20           All of this was done and played out, later  
21 to be learned that the Federal Government knew exactly  
22 what they were doing. There were two things that was  
23 accomplished in that process. One was the mining of  
24 the ore. The other was to find out what the  
25 radioactive material would do to the human being. Now

1 we know.

2           So when one talks about radioactive uranium  
3 within the Navajo Nation, it's, "Hell no."

4           The law reads that until such time that the  
5 companies and the Federal Government that were a part  
6 of this initiative addresses and corrects the wrong  
7 and the health of the Navajo people, it would impact  
8 it. Until such time, we may be looking at it again.

9           MR. TANO: Norman John --

10          MR. ARTHUR: Up in Washington?

11          MR. TANO: Yeah. He was at one of our  
12 meetings in Denver. He's also Council Member. He was  
13 with Fred White, who is a Deputy Director of the  
14 Navajo Natural Resource Department. They were also at  
15 a meeting of the National Mining Association and the  
16 Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and they made the same  
17 points that you made. But one of the things that came  
18 out of that meeting was the possibility of coming up  
19 with some sort of initiative, because what Norman was  
20 saying was that you needed "X" number of dollars -- I  
21 forget the amount he was talking about -- to at least  
22 begin the fixing of the issue. And there seemed to  
23 have been some support for that amongst the folks in  
24 the National Mining Association.

25          The question I have is: Is that an

1 initiative that you think is worth pursuing, to come  
2 up with some sort of partnership, if you will, to go  
3 up to the Hill and try to get the kind of money that  
4 you all need to begin the work?

5           MR. ARTHUR: Right now we have a discussion  
6 with EPA and the company that we hold liable for one  
7 of the sites. This is just one site referred to as  
8 the Church Rock Site. The maximum, if we chose to  
9 have all of the radioactive material, contaminated  
10 material removed and shipped out either to Utah or to  
11 Colorado, depository areas, if we did that, the EPA  
12 estimated it would cost \$260 million, just one site.  
13 And we have several hundred sites that still need to  
14 be cleaned up.

15           MR. TANO: This is kind of a related  
16 question to that, because I've taken a look at the  
17 EPA's five-year plan, and it's predicated on, in a  
18 sense, almost unlimited monies. Okay. To my way of  
19 thinking, that ain't going to happen. And they talk  
20 about their plan as being risk-based, the most people  
21 exposed to the most ionizing radiation.

22           I talked with -- what's his name, who heads  
23 up that uranium mine program? I think it's Begay.  
24 But if I were going to do that -- I suggest it as an  
25 approach -- not to take the, let's say, use the

1 risk-based paradigm that EPA would use, but in a sense  
2 figure out what the low-hanging fruit are, and work  
3 some sort of collaborative effort between, for  
4 example, Laguna construction, who has experience in  
5 mine reclamation, with the Navajo construction folks,  
6 and with some of the expertise from the uranium  
7 companies to take care of one, just one low-hanging  
8 problem as a way of saying, a couple things -- one,  
9 we're doing something about it. So the government,  
10 Navajo Nation government can say we're doing something  
11 about it. But, two, in a sense to establish this  
12 notion that we can work collaboratively  
13 inter-tribally, Tribe industry, Tribe industry,  
14 government, and it would seem to me that might make it  
15 easier to get the kind of money to do more of that  
16 kind of work.

17           Is that something you guys would be  
18 interested in pursuing?

19           MR. ARTHUR: On this particular site, we  
20 have a discussion going with EPA, of course, and also  
21 General Electric, who has been identified as a company  
22 that's liable for what was there, what's left there.  
23 There are negotiations going on as we speak. And I  
24 know that one of the far-reaching suggestions was to  
25 remove that material and take it into some abandoned

1 mines in the Grants area. And I don't know if that is  
2 still on the table or not. But as far as the  
3 discussion is concerned, this is just one side -- I  
4 want to stress -- that if someone, the Federal  
5 Government, the companies, make a halfway decent  
6 suggestion of remediating any of these abandoned  
7 sites, I think we would seriously look at it.

8 MR. TANO: Okay.

9 MR. CONRAD: These are mine tailings?

10 MR. ARTHUR: They're both mines -- we have  
11 mines that are open, and then we have mine tailings,  
12 and abandoned mines.

13 MR. CONRAD: Because, I mean, as part of  
14 reclamation, is there any way to process the mine  
15 tailings and get what's out of that, and then that  
16 would be a market for the mine tailings? The nuclear  
17 initiative would buy those as a source of uranium that  
18 you want to get rid of?

19 MR. ARTHUR: Yeah, I think that was  
20 suggested yesterday in a real brief conversation we  
21 had.

22 MR. CONRAD: Because Quapaw, for instance,  
23 with the lead and zinc mines, they have huge, 200-foot  
24 mine tailing piles. They're trying to sell that chaff  
25 as well. And it's contaminating their rivers and

1 streams at the same time. But there is a use for it.  
2 The market has changed, and they're trying to sell it.

3 MR. TANO: It gets to this notion of, there  
4 is no such thing as the back end, because a lot of the  
5 back end now turns out to be the front end. You look  
6 at --

7 MR. CONRAD: Solid waste is a source of gas  
8 and other energies.

9 MR. TANO: Right.

10 MR. CONRAD: It is kind of interesting. But  
11 also, people talk about nuclear as, are we going to  
12 build a plant on the Reservation to provide us power?  
13 It's like, no, we don't have a rate base that could  
14 ever afford a nuclear plant. We would never build one  
15 for the Reservation. You have to build one for the  
16 large population base and get it to the grid and --

17 MS. RYDALCH: Not any more.

18 MR. CONRAD: Well, we wouldn't. And so if  
19 we are looking at investment opportunities as a  
20 business, that's different from looking at it from a  
21 Reservation land base prospective. We look at it as  
22 an investment opportunity, either as a partner in a  
23 business, or as we have an investment portfolio that's  
24 going to invest in utility stocks. So there is  
25 interest beyond just straight production and siting

1 and looking at it from -- the Reservation is our  
2 world, you know. We're looking at it -- you have to  
3 also examine it in a bigger prospective of investor  
4 relations. And is it acceptable? Is it a market that  
5 we should look at? McCain's proposal for  
6 construction, it's going to take off.

7 MS. RYDALCH: Especially in these, what I  
8 referred to as the high temperature gas cooled  
9 reactor, which has had significant advantages in  
10 places where the electric system infrastructure is not  
11 developed, smaller population centers that are widely  
12 disbursed, or load growth is slower. It would allow  
13 for power production in areas that are currently  
14 unsupported by the electrical grid but don't have the  
15 same high economy of production as your high light  
16 water reactors in the past had.

17 So it's a whole new design type, as I  
18 understand, and closed cycle, again, because it  
19 recycles the used fuel within the reactor itself, not  
20 completely, but lessens the amount for storage. So  
21 that's the whole purpose behind some of these new  
22 technologies.

23 And I would hope that we never close our  
24 mind to advancing whatever area of -- you look at  
25 clean coal technology now, or coal plants that are

1 being sought after with near zero emissions that are  
2 being built. So new technology is enormous, as well  
3 as with clean-up. And you talk about the tailings,  
4 the abandoned mines. There are all kinds of  
5 environmental technologies now out there for clean-up.  
6 So it's a very important subject matter that you're  
7 discussing.

8           MR. ARTHUR: I guess, to have the technology  
9 to do the clean-up, that's not -- I don't think that's  
10 our issue. Our issue is somebody doing it. Whether  
11 it's the company that left it or the Department of  
12 Defense, or EPA, or whoever, they left their dump on  
13 our land. Out of that dump, we have health problems.  
14 So we just want someone to clean it up. But it  
15 shouldn't be at our cost.

16           MR. TANO: One of the things that might  
17 happen is, there is a new kind of organization that is  
18 being created international. It's a forum on the  
19 sustainable options for uranium production. It  
20 includes people like the National Atomic Energy  
21 Association, World Nuclear Association, and some of  
22 the folks in the U.S. as well. It may be worthwhile  
23 to have someone from Navajo talk about these issues at  
24 the next meeting which will be in Arizona, because one  
25 of the things that I really try to push towards at

1 this organization was they can't talk about  
2 sustainability as being from today onward. They've  
3 got to define "sustainability" looking historically  
4 and fixing up the problems of the past.

5           I think people are somewhat aware that, if  
6 they're going to mine, that it serves them no good to  
7 have that festering problem in Navajo. So you want to  
8 look at it in terms of their self-interest. Their  
9 interest is in having that problem go away. Now,  
10 they're not going to buy the problem, but they may  
11 take pieces of it.

12           MR. CONRAD: The oil and gas industry in  
13 Oklahoma created an Oklahoma Energy Resource Board, or  
14 something like that, OERB. They do free abandoned oil  
15 and gas well remediation on your land to solve exactly  
16 that, their public relations issue where, even if it's  
17 not their company, the company is defunct and gone,  
18 somebody's land is scarred up and it affects  
19 everybody. So the producers have created this  
20 environmental clean-up. And they're going around the  
21 state for free taking off -- plugging old wells that  
22 aren't plugged, removing all the pipes and the  
23 concrete off of people's land, because when they had  
24 settlements, or they would settle with the landowner,  
25 the landowner would say they get \$17,000 to remove

1 this stuff. They go buy a pick-up truck and not clean  
2 up. So it would pass on to the next landowner and  
3 their problems would --

4 MR. TANO: Plus the pick-up.

5 MR. CONRAD: Plus the pick-up. So they  
6 said, well, if we're going to be spending any money,  
7 we want to control the result. Rather than all these  
8 individual settlements by individual companies, they  
9 pooled their resources and they're actually investing  
10 in clean-up, because that's going to make their job  
11 getting the next lease easier. So they've done that,  
12 and it's been going for a few years now.

13 MR. TANO: Yeah. See, that's the kind of  
14 model I had in mind with the uranium producers.

15 MS. DITMER: Well, they'll get to that point  
16 when it's economically feasible for them to do. I  
17 mean, frankly, it's easier to cap an oil well and  
18 clean up that mess than it is to pay \$260 million for  
19 a small site. They've got, what, a hundred, at least,  
20 different sites on Navajo alone. When nuclear energy  
21 becomes something that industry is interested in  
22 making money off of and they can actually do that,  
23 they'll put the money into cleaning up Navajo if they  
24 want to get that uranium, and make it right somehow.

25 MR. TANO: Well, I guess my point is that --

1 we can't just look at nuclear in the U.S. context,  
2 because the growth, even if McCain's wildest dreams  
3 are realized -- and I doubt that seriously -- China is  
4 going to do it.

5 MS. DITMER: China is already doing it.

6 MR. TANO: If you take a look at those  
7 30-odd reactors that China has on their books at  
8 various stages of development, and you look at what  
9 technologies they're using, ain't no U.S. ones there.

10 MS. DITMER: No. And there is huge concern  
11 about the technologies that they're using and their  
12 ability to keep them safe. The World Health  
13 Organization -- I've done some work for them -- that's  
14 their biggest concern, is the public health issues  
15 that emanate from improper installation and  
16 monitoring.

17 But back to the Navajo problem -- in terms  
18 of pure economics, the companies aren't going to put  
19 the money together to clean up the site until they can  
20 make money off of the clean-up, basically.

21 MR. TANO: Right. But I don't think anybody  
22 is going to buy into, unless they're dragged kicking  
23 and screaming, to deal with Church Rock. But of the  
24 110, you have a lot of artesian mines over there where  
25 nobody knows, you know, who was doing that. And those

1 are much more amenable to quick fixes.

2           MS. DITMER: They might be. Back to your  
3 question on risk-based versus low-hanging fruit -- I  
4 mean, the one problem strategically with going with  
5 just a low-hanging fruit sort of approach, which might  
6 be a good faith effort, like you said, is that it  
7 might not really address a real problem, and that  
8 might have a backlash effect. For example, say we did  
9 a low-hanging fruit clean-up. We picked a spot that  
10 was easy, not expensive to do, it was a collaborative  
11 effort, whatever, but it really didn't have any  
12 positive impact on Navajo health. It didn't really  
13 protect anyone. It didn't reduce the risk, the real  
14 risk of exposure to people on the Reservation. I  
15 think the government would probably, and all the  
16 collaborators, would get accused of doing something  
17 that really wasn't that useful. And we want to have  
18 positive collaboration. So we have to figure out,  
19 okay, maybe not the lowest-hanging fruit, what is the  
20 lowest-hanging risk that we can address that has some  
21 real impact out there, and go after that one. So  
22 somewhere between the low-hanging approach and the  
23 risk-based approach, I think, is --

24           MR. TANO: Yeah. There are probably more  
25 political consequences that I'm thinking of than human

1 health and safety.

2 MS. DITMER: I'm trying to balance the three  
3 or four things out. What you don't want to do is have  
4 somebody come back and say, oh, it's the same old U.S.  
5 Government baloney that they're feeding us.

6 MR. TANO: But, you see, the thing is, it  
7 wouldn't be U.S. Government. It would be Navajo.

8 MS. DITMER: I thought you were talking  
9 about a collaborative effort with --

10 MR. TANO: Yeah, but it would be Navajo-led,  
11 you see.

12 MS. DITMER: It could have an equal backlash  
13 on a Navajo, though, if it didn't reduce the risk,  
14 though, I guess, is what I'm saying.

15 MR. TANO: Okay. Other issues -- getting  
16 back to Ann -- we had Richard Holman -- do you know  
17 him?

18 MS. RYDALCH: I do.

19 MR. TANO: Okay. We're talking about  
20 workforce development issues. Several people spoke  
21 about this yesterday, and especially Conrad, talking  
22 about the baby boomers retiring, and they're retiring  
23 all over, including all manner of nuclear technology,  
24 technicians. Is this something that Tribes want to  
25 engage in in developing the kind of workforce around

1 all the kinds of technologies that are involved in the  
2 nuclear fuel cycle, everything from dealing with  
3 regularly-scheduled outages and refueling, to  
4 repairing the trucks that are needed? Is that  
5 something that Tribes want to be engaged in? Because  
6 these are good paying jobs.

7 MS. RYDALCH: There are also opportunities  
8 in the Federal labs for internships or that kind of  
9 thing, summer camps that are put on for kids, students  
10 of all ages. Our lab does that, and I know other labs  
11 do that.

12 When you consider there are over 700 Federal  
13 labs in the system, most of those are ag labs,  
14 agriculture labs, in fact, 711. And I chaired the  
15 Federal Lab Consortium for two years, which is a  
16 network of those 700 labs and 17 Federal agencies. So  
17 there are numerous opportunities out there in training  
18 workforce through those just in the Federal lab system  
19 that could happen as well. Or if you're wanting to  
20 know who is doing research on such-and-such a subject  
21 matter is available just by going on line in the  
22 [federallabs.org](http://federallabs.org), and you can find out numerous  
23 opportunities for workforce development as well. So I  
24 think it's a very, very important subject to include  
25 the Native Americans.

1           MR. ARTHUR: I agree that there should be an  
2 effort. Just because we have the staunch position in  
3 the discussion of nuclear or radioactive uranium, if  
4 you will, doesn't mean that we're opposed to any  
5 opportunities for young people to become a part of the  
6 growing labor force.

7           As I stated yesterday, in Navajo Nation, 51  
8 or so unemployment. And to limit our young people to  
9 specific careers, that's not fair either. We do have,  
10 as far as I know, we do have one physicist that has  
11 worked with Los Alamos Lab for many years. And he's  
12 over there. He's trying to promote Native American  
13 interns as careers, not related to Navajo, but he's  
14 there. But he's really never been really visible,  
15 never been promoted. I think we should use those type  
16 of career persons to motivate and bring more out to  
17 job fairs, and high schools, colleges. I hadn't known  
18 of anyone doing that. He comes out to public meetings  
19 once in a while. But stuff like that. There are  
20 opportunities.

21           Some of our Navajo individuals work for  
22 Arizona Public Service, and they do have the nuclear  
23 power plant there. I know that some of them have gone  
24 to work over there. But it's a quiet type of an  
25 operation. I think companies need to come and step

1 forward and be open about those opportunities.

2           MS. DITMER: I'm a joint venture partner  
3 with the Yakama Nation. They have a Tribal 8(a), and  
4 we actually bid on and tried to become a subcontractor  
5 for some of the Hanford site work last year. They had  
6 four RFPs out last year. And we talked to several  
7 different contracting companies, and we talked to the  
8 small business reps at the offices, and they had two  
9 comments for us.

10           One was a concern about training -- well,  
11 three comments. One was a concern that we didn't have  
12 enough experience within the Tribe to actually bring  
13 Tribal workers to the workplace that would be ready to  
14 work. So there was a front-end training cost  
15 associated with that. That's not unusual. They have  
16 that with other workers. So that could be addressed.

17           The second thing was this, quite frankly, a  
18 sociocultural thing where they were concerned that  
19 they would invest in the training, but then the  
20 workers wouldn't regularly show up, because they had a  
21 negative experience with Native workers in the past  
22 from that area.

23           Now, the third thing was something that  
24 everybody said to us, and that was that they couldn't  
25 understand why we would want to bring Yakama workers

1 to the site when the Yakama position was basically  
2 that they were opposed to what was happening in  
3 Hanford, and it was an ethical issue.

4           Those are roadblocks in getting to the point  
5 where we want to get more involved in the whole  
6 nuclear cycle. So we're working on trying to address  
7 those things in different ways now. But those were  
8 the things that they threw out in front of us.

9           MS. RYDALCH: I wanted to give an example of  
10 where you talked about how can they become more  
11 involved.

12           On the Fort Hall Reservation, for example,  
13 they had a tremendous innovative science teacher that  
14 partnered with our laboratory on summer camps and for  
15 students and science camps, and that kind of thing.  
16 But also, they went the extra mile of coming up with a  
17 project that their students were engaged in to put it  
18 on the NASA shuttle experiment on one of the shuttles.  
19 And they got a lot of press in our area because of  
20 their innovative way that they were working in that  
21 scientific class at the Fort Hall Reservation.

22           And I guess I can't stress that enough, that  
23 it's -- scientists and engineers get so involved in  
24 the projects they're working on, that perhaps if  
25 someone comes to them, they're more than happy to help

1 guide a scientific experiment or help science  
2 teachers, or help whatever in any way they can. But  
3 the important thing is to make that contact and have  
4 those Native American instructors get in touch with  
5 the people in those Federal labs and ask for help, ask  
6 for ways to innovate and ways to integrate into a  
7 system there that they can help with. And I'm sure  
8 that they would come up with ways to do that and  
9 projects that they can work on.

10           They would go into communities, for example,  
11 in their science camp, find out problems in that  
12 community, and then work with a scientist and  
13 engineers to come up with a remedy to help solve that  
14 problem. It may have been contamination of something.  
15 They would help that community solve that problem.  
16 And it got a lot of press coverage in our area for  
17 what Fort Hall was doing in that scientific class.

18           MR. ARTHUR: I think we would be interested  
19 in doing that. And as far as something like that, we  
20 have been -- at one time, we opened our doors and  
21 supported NASA when they were preparing the modular of  
22 a vehicle that they were shipping to Mars or some  
23 place, and they needed a test site. And they came to  
24 Western Navajo, which is my understanding, the surface  
25 and the land conditions are ideal and almost looked

1 like -- I think it was Mars -- that they were trying  
2 to get to. And that's where they did all the testing.  
3 They brought in the students, the schools from the  
4 area, and they worked with the schools for about three  
5 to four weeks.

6           And the reaction of the students was  
7 phenomenal that, where they spent most of their time  
8 playing video games and watching TV, and stuff, they  
9 were actually out there trying to learn more, trying  
10 to get all the information they wanted. Stuff like  
11 that, I think, most places are open to. We just need  
12 to -- we just need the contacts. We just need someone  
13 to step forward and say, here we are, we're willing to  
14 do this for communities and for students. I don't  
15 think any Tribe or any community would walk away from  
16 that.

17           The science world and the technical world  
18 out there and the labs, they're so closed, that they  
19 basically have their own communities. But if they  
20 step out of it, I think the Tribes and community  
21 members would embrace them.

22           We do have students that do periodic work at  
23 places like Lawrence Livermore. They have a little  
24 program going with a college, and things like that.  
25 But even that is not very publicly known. They just

1 come in in the corner over here. And I mentioned  
2 working with Sandia Lab and places like that. We need  
3 these people. We need those exposures. And that  
4 would, to me -- you know, I might have come on very  
5 negatively in reference to some of the issues. But if  
6 there is a positive thing in a negative environment,  
7 the only way it would be neutralized is to see both  
8 sides of the picture.

9           MR. TANO: All right. If we could, could we  
10 talk about the interface between nuclear energy and  
11 water in a couple ways?

12           People might be aware that in the Middle  
13 East and places in Africa, you've got, in a sense,  
14 coal location of nukes with desalination plants  
15 because these plants are power hungry. People might  
16 also be aware that it may be part of -- one of the  
17 manifestations of climate change may be water  
18 shortages, droughts, lowered water tables. People in  
19 places like India are going past 300 meters for fresh  
20 water. And that has a devastating impact on  
21 agricultural, especially the kind of small  
22 agricultural. You just further marginalize marginal  
23 operations. And nukes need water for cooling.

24           So there are, I guess, some technology  
25 issues that come about. I think there are some legal



1 state to the next, or from the upper basin to the  
2 lower basin, or vice versa.

3           So Tribes, although we've never been a party  
4 to this agreement that was supposedly done back in  
5 1922, we're limited as well to that law of the river.

6           For Navajo, it's more complex because we  
7 deal with three states, and we also deal with both  
8 basins, the upper and lower basin. Our land base is  
9 structured or situated in that complexity. So how we  
10 move our water is very limited.

11           Our market capabilities are also limited  
12 because, first of all, we move our settlement rights  
13 under the context that we need all the water that we  
14 can get for internal use. Then when we go along to  
15 some extent, we turn around and say, well, I have  
16 surplus water and I want to move it. That sort of  
17 sits in a situation that is contrary to how our  
18 settlements are driven.

19           MR. TANO: Because one of the things I was  
20 thinking about was that if you have a nuclear  
21 renaissance over here, generally speaking, it's not  
22 going to happen in California. It's going to be kind  
23 of one state inland at least. Okay. So are there  
24 opportunities for Tribes to lease water to these  
25 companies? Similarly, if they're in, inland, does it

1 make sense, for example, in Southern Ute, as they deal  
2 with coal bed methane, to use the kind of power that  
3 would be generated to treat the water to produce water  
4 so that it becomes potable water as opposed to a waste  
5 issue? Because I think one of the things -- we now  
6 talk about how we used to waste natural gas by flaring  
7 the wells. It may be five years from now, we'll be  
8 talking about how we wasted the produced water, when  
9 that gets to be more expensive than gas.

10           MR. ARTHUR: I guess I would think that  
11 would be a task to, or a challenge to figure a way how  
12 to divert that water for industrial use in this  
13 particular industry. You talk about the coal bed  
14 methane. I know in the Powder River, they do a lot of  
15 it. The water that they use up there, quite a bit of  
16 it's recycled to the point where you can drink it.  
17 They have it on the market in bottled water.

18           I don't know how Southern Ute is doing with  
19 their utilities up there, but we are beginning to talk  
20 with companies, individuals, in reference to coal bed  
21 methane type of drilling. We are anticipating the  
22 question of ore. We have preliminary discussions with  
23 the power plants, instead of using water out of the  
24 river or the wells, maybe divert these waters into  
25 their system, because they could use it, one

1 initiative that we're pushing in respect to use of  
2 water and other commodities that are there.

3           But I don't know to what extent any  
4 development discussions are in reference to nuclear  
5 activities within Navajo. I really don't have any  
6 idea. All I know is that the industry, uranium  
7 industry, also contaminated a lot of our wells.

8           MR. TANO: Yeah. There has been a series of  
9 articles in one of the Denver papers about the  
10 inaction of the Department of Labor and redressing  
11 some of those health problems.

12           MR. ARTHUR: Yeah. We have taken our case  
13 to Mr. Waxman's committee, and we've had several  
14 testimonies that we presented. We're scheduled to go  
15 back to his committee in September. The hearing we  
16 had was back in February or so before his committee  
17 where, alongside us -- I testified that -- beside me  
18 was the Department of Energy, EPA, the Department of  
19 Interior, and Indian Health Service. And they were  
20 all questioned, every one of them, all four of them  
21 were questioned as to what they were doing about our  
22 situation. None of those individuals had any  
23 awareness of the discussion.

24           MR. TANO: Okay. I have one last question.

25           But did you have anything, issue you wanted

1 to raise?

2 MS. SINYELLA: No, just that -- at Hualapai,  
3 we've had a lot of, just within this past year, a lot  
4 of companies, at least six companies, that have come  
5 to the Tribe asking to be a partnership with them in  
6 uranium. And so far, we've just said no, but, you  
7 know -- and a lot of our elders have said, no, we'll  
8 not open up to uranium here. So that's where we're at  
9 right now. The last one came to us just within this  
10 last couple of months and wanted to do the uranium  
11 mining there, and we've got a lot of it on the  
12 outside -- interior boundaries outside of the  
13 community. So that's where we're at right now. And  
14 this is just all -- I'm learning a lot just sitting  
15 here listening to everything.

16 MR. ARTHUR: There is a new method that  
17 they're promoting that's drilling using water --

18 MR. TANO: In situ.

19 MR. ARTHUR: I mean, we do have a company  
20 that's sitting in one of our communities in the  
21 checkerboard area, which is -- the reason why it's  
22 referred to as "checkerboard" is, there are sections  
23 that are trust lands. There are sections that are  
24 individual Indian allotments and state lands, railroad  
25 lands, stuff like that, within Navajo territory. So

1 the company has come down to their allotment holders,  
2 individual allottees. They have come to them because  
3 there are abandoned sites and they want to go back  
4 into those sites using this method. And one of the  
5 sites is just within two miles of the largest  
6 community in the eastern portion of the nation.

7           And that's where the new concept, the new  
8 so-called concept is being also attempted by the big  
9 challenge. And the big question is -- the eastern  
10 part of the Navajo Nation has one major reservoir that  
11 they get their water from. And having that  
12 contaminated will destroy all of eastern Navajo's  
13 water source.

14           MR. TANO: I think that issue there with the  
15 in situ leach mining -- because it really depends on,  
16 one, how accurate the modeling of the aquifers are;  
17 and then, two, how vigilant people are in terms of the  
18 kind of monitoring.

19           In general, the public really doesn't  
20 understand this kind of -- how to read these models,  
21 whether to figure out they're good, bad, or  
22 indifferent. And so you've got to rely on expertise.  
23 You either build it at home or hire it out. But then  
24 ultimately, it also requires a kind of regulatory  
25 capacity to have that day-to-day monitoring once this

1 thing is in operation so that you get, if it goes in,  
2 you get the earliest possible warning of any possible  
3 excursion of the --

4           MR. ARTHUR: All it takes is if you have one  
5 aquifer that feeds 20,000 to 30,000 individuals, would  
6 you want to sacrifice that?

7           MR. TANO: Yeah. Yeah. One of the things  
8 we've talked about is sending some folks over to  
9 places like Texas, and maybe Kazakhstan, or bringing  
10 some of the folks over there who have been experienced  
11 with this in situ leach operations to see, from a  
12 community perspective, is it good, bad, or  
13 indifferent? And that's still in the talking stages  
14 right now.

15           I had a question on what you call waste  
16 management, what they call the back end of the nuclear  
17 fuel cycle. You have for -- what they call --  
18 transuranic waste, what other countries call plutonium  
19 contaminated materials. You've got the operation down  
20 in the salt structures in New Mexico around Carlsbad.  
21 That's actually operating. You have a couple of  
22 low-level radioactive waste facilities. You've got --  
23 up at Hanford for a limited number of clients, out in  
24 South Carolina, also supposedly -- I haven't kept up  
25 with it -- ready to shut down for anyone not in that

1 Compact area. You've got other kinds of specialized  
2 ones like in Utah, and then at the test site. But  
3 what has happened is that -- and you've got for the  
4 high-level stuff, you supposedly have Yucca Mountain,  
5 which is the only place that's being considered right  
6 now.

7           So what happens then, because we don't have  
8 the final resting place, if you will, for these  
9 materials, that you've got de facto interim storage  
10 facilities all over the country. I mean, every  
11 reactor right now, every generating plant is a de  
12 facto interim spent fuel storage facility. They're  
13 either in the pools, or in their dry casks, or on pads  
14 entombed in concrete, all waiting for the moment that  
15 Yucca Mountain, or something like that, opens up and  
16 they can haul them off.

17           Also, you have in hospitals, research  
18 institutions, research labs, you have low-level  
19 radioactive waste. And we won't get into the details  
20 of what constitutes low-level radioactive waste except  
21 to say it's not high level and not transuranic waste.  
22 Very strange way of dealing with it. But you've got  
23 in hospitals, as I say, these become these de facto  
24 interim waste storage facilities.

25           Now, one facility that was being proposed

1 out in the Mojave Desert was the Southwest Compact  
2 including California, Arizona, I believe, and North  
3 and South Dakota. How North and South Dakota got into  
4 the Southwest Compact is, I guess, a matter of  
5 politics.

6           But anyway, suffice it to say that there was  
7 a coalition of environmentalists and anti-nuke folks  
8 and Tribes who didn't want to see the thing over in  
9 the Mojave Desert. So far, they've won.

10           Now, one of the things that happened as a  
11 result of that, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe held a  
12 workshop on low-level radioactive waste management.  
13 And coming out of that was a paper that proposed a  
14 Tribal paradigm for low-level radioactive waste  
15 management. And the authors of those papers were just  
16 lambasted or slammed. As a matter of fact, one of  
17 them was the Chairman of Chemehuevi and he didn't get  
18 re-elected, perhaps due to his co-authorship of that  
19 paper.

20           The interesting thing about that was that  
21 about two years ago, I got from him a news release  
22 where the enviros were suggesting a new paradigm for  
23 low-level radioactive waste management, which was  
24 basically ours.

25           So the question I have is this -- it was one

1 that was raised earlier -- do we want to lay out what  
2 should be the waste management paradigms for low-level  
3 radioactive waste management, for spent fuel?

4 David?

5 MR. CONRAD: If you don't do it with a  
6 company public relations messaging campaign, you  
7 suffer the same fate as the Chairman of the  
8 Chemehuevi. I don't know how many Tribal-elected  
9 leaders will sign onto that paper unless it has some  
10 accompanying package with it to insulate themselves or  
11 to frame it first -- I mean, it's one thing to be  
12 correct. But the perception is totally different, and  
13 that's what people vote on. And it's easy for an  
14 academic to do that because you have tenure, or  
15 whenever you are, something like that. But it's not  
16 for politicians. So you're not going to get many  
17 people stepping out and taking a risky --

18 MR. TANO: How about a CERT policy on  
19 radioactive waste, high-level radioactive management,  
20 as part of the policy?

21 MR. CONRAD: Then CERT needs to hire a PR  
22 firm to manage their image because they'll be branded.  
23 Just like when the nuclear waste negotiator was going  
24 around, people were saying here's CERT trying to  
25 negotiate nuclear waste dumps on Indian land for

1 money. That's not what that was.

2 MR. TANO: Right.

3 MS. RUBIN: Jeanne Rubin with the  
4 International Institute for Indigenous Resource  
5 Management.

6 Do you think it's possible to create a PR  
7 campaign that would be effective, or is it so volatile  
8 that --

9 MR. CONRAD: You know, it gets back to that  
10 framing. If it's just, you have a nuclear position,  
11 you're dead in the water. It has to be packaged that  
12 non-carbon firming of renewable energy includes  
13 nuclear. Then you have a little bit more ground to  
14 stand on. Otherwise, nuclear alone, I think, you're  
15 dead in public perception. And let the nuclear  
16 industry change that perception. You can't, no matter  
17 what public relation firm, you can't change that as  
18 CERT. But if it's part of climate change packages or  
19 options that include nuclear in some capacity in  
20 various configurations, that's much easier to talk  
21 about, I think.

22 MS. DITMER: That's true. The approach that  
23 the political candidates are trying to take right now,  
24 I'm not sure what the American public in general, how  
25 they're reacting to that, because the reaction to

1 nuclear, due to the age of our population -- I'm right  
2 in that cusp where -- the duck and cover babies, and  
3 then moving forward 40 years, we know there are things  
4 to do to contain the problem. But there is this long  
5 memory, and those people are still around. They don't  
6 forget. There are a lot of people that were affected  
7 by this. So I don't know. That's a real delicate  
8 issue even in a broader population.

9 MS. RYDALCH: Recent polls are showing that  
10 shift towards nuclear.

11 MS. DITMER: It is shifting, but --

12 MS. RYDALCH: And I think a lot of that is  
13 the high gas prices, the demand that is placed on our  
14 energy supplies. And the polls are showing that  
15 people say, yes, build nuclear.

16 MR. CONRAD: It's kind of crazy to relate  
17 gas prices to nuclear generation, though.

18 MS. DITMER: You're right, it is. It is  
19 kind of crazy, but I think the general public is --

20 MR. CONRAD: Energy is energy.

21 MS. DITMER: Well, they understand that  
22 there's safer nuclear now. I think that's the general  
23 shift that's taking place. Now, if we were to do the  
24 same poll at the Tribal level, that would be a more  
25 interesting question. And that would answer your

1 question about whether you could create a PR campaign  
2 that would get you to the point you wanted to be at.

3           MR. TANO: I'm not suggesting that we need a  
4 PR campaign. It's the -- do we take a stand about the  
5 nuclear renaissance, or do we, in a sense, let it wash  
6 by, and then deal with it as it comes home to roost in  
7 Navajo, or as it comes home to Sho-Ban, as the  
8 enrichment facility is built and, they say, oh, my  
9 God, we've an enrichment facility being built right  
10 here in River City?

11           MS. DITMER: If that's your question -- and  
12 it's a perfect question -- get out ahead of it and,  
13 yeah, nail something down, but you do take the risk of  
14 getting whacked.

15           MS. RYDALCH: Like David says, come up with  
16 a strategy or a policy or a statement or a -- whatever  
17 word I'm looking for -- that packages it as energy,  
18 period, should include a portfolio of energy choices.

19           MR. CONRAD: I think there needs to be a  
20 stand on nuclear for sure, because how are you going  
21 to define your interests when you talk to the nuclear  
22 industry? You're not going to talk to the energy  
23 industry. You're going to have to talk individually  
24 to different companies with specific interests. But  
25 it has to be part of an overall -- there has to be a

1 comprehensive vision including a shield of public  
2 relations, because, I mean, sure, when you're  
3 negotiating a specific deal, you're going to have your  
4 attorneys in a room, and that's not going to be  
5 public. But there is going to be a perception and  
6 people are going to be making judgments based on what  
7 comes out. And if you do have to deal with it, you'll  
8 want to focus on it.

9           MR. TANO: So here's the dilemma -- and I  
10 recognize what you're saying. That's part of the  
11 angst that I'm going through. You say, okay, we like  
12 once through because the spent nuclear fuel standard  
13 is the best pay to deter proliferation of having  
14 somebody hijack this spent fuel and turning it into  
15 atomic bombs or a dirty bomb. Okay.

16           The French seem real comfortable and the  
17 Brits feel real comfortable about reprocessing. Now,  
18 so if you're reprocessing, theoretically you're using  
19 less uranium, which means theoretically you need less  
20 rarer mines up in Northern Australia. You need fewer  
21 folks knocking on the door at Hualapai or at Navajo  
22 saying, we've got a brand new technology, and you'll  
23 make a lot of money, it ain't going to hurt you one  
24 bit. I don't know if that's a legitimate kind of  
25 correlation, or -- but it sounds kind of attractive.

1 If you reprocess, if you, in a sense, recycle, what  
2 they call now recycling, you won't need more mining.  
3 If you don't need more mining, you've lessened the  
4 impacts on Native Peoples throughout the world because  
5 it happens to turn out that a lot of uranium is in  
6 Native --

7           MR. CONRAD: It's like enhanced recovering.  
8 You've pumped a field once, and the price of oil goes  
9 up. And then if you decide, hey, I'm going to go back  
10 in there and flood it with water, or I'm going to go  
11 back in there with CO2, I'm going to get more out of  
12 that same resource. Yeah, it's kind of that -- makes  
13 sense if the economics are there.

14           MR. TANO: Right. And they only make sense  
15 if China is going full-tilt boogie, and India is going  
16 full-tilt boogie, and perhaps the U.S. is dipping  
17 their toes in and actually in the next decade putting  
18 up one more plant, bringing it up to 105.

19           But you see the dilemma? Because if you  
20 say, we're going to stand by and do nothing, then  
21 they're going to want to go to Navajo, and they want  
22 to go to Pine Ridge, and they want to go to Hualapai.  
23 But, as I say, I don't know if that's a legitimate  
24 kind of correlation, but that's the kind of thing that  
25 goes through my head.

1           So do we make a stand on that? Because it  
2 also has this kind of indigenous perspective, but it  
3 also has non-proliferation perspectives as well.

4           MR. CONRAD: So reprocessing takes the  
5 pressure off Native mines?

6           MR. TANO: Potentially. But we have to  
7 admit, notwithstanding how secure things are, if you  
8 got plutonium floating out there, the last thing you  
9 want is a whole bunch of plutonium floating around for  
10 Al-Qaeda or PETA to get their hands on.

11          MS. RYDALCH: That's what's so unique about  
12 the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership that has been  
13 established. Now, whether that continues under our  
14 current, another administration, or just gets another  
15 new name -- you know what I mean? Sometimes when you  
16 get ingoing and outgoing administrations, they don't  
17 want to use the same policy as the past  
18 administration, so they just change the name. So that  
19 may be something. But I'm very impressed with the  
20 GNEP proposal that is out there and that is being  
21 signed on by numerous countries.

22          MR. TANO: Yeah. Because you have this kind  
23 of inherently safe and inherently proliferation-proof  
24 technologies. That's part of GNEP. Now, the  
25 technical term, from a Tribal perspective -- is that

1 shit or shinola shit? Is that --

2 (Laughter)

3 MR. TANO: For the record, let's think of  
4 something more polite.

5 And herein lies the problem. You say we  
6 have to rely on somebody else to say, is the  
7 Department of Energy telling us the truth? Is this  
8 correct? Or is Arjun Makhijani telling us the truth?

9 MS. RYDALCH: There is a checks and balance,  
10 I think, because that's why you have the checks and  
11 balances of the Congressional people and the  
12 Administration, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
13 and Department of Energy, and the -- you know --

14 MR. TANO: Yeah, I understand what you're  
15 saying. But if I'm in Navajo, I'm saying, these are  
16 the same guys who said, "Go ahead and mine, boys."

17 MS. RYDALCH: I guess you have to be part of  
18 the system --

19 MR. TANO: I think that's my point. I think  
20 you have to be smart enough for yourself to make those  
21 kind of independent decisions.

22 MS. RYDALCH: You have to be part of the  
23 system.

24 MR. TANO: Right. So the question is: How  
25 do we establish the kinds of partnerships, the kind of

1 collaborative efforts? How do they get Tribal  
2 colleges and Tribal educational institutions geared up  
3 so that they can get our people smart on these issues,  
4 so that we don't have to figure out whose PR campaign  
5 is better? This is something that came out of Navajo.  
6 Navajo, they understand Navajo tradition. They  
7 understand Navajo history. And it's that kind of -- I  
8 think that's needed.

9           MR. CONRAD: Or as a utility shareholder,  
10 you could be advocating for improved working  
11 relationships with communities where mining is, and  
12 things like that.

13           MR. TANO: So any suggestions in this arena?  
14 That was more of a monologue.

15           MS. RYDALCH: When you visit Arriva, you  
16 should visit also the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
17 the NRC Chairman, Mr. Klein. Take a group and talk  
18 with him.

19           MR. TANO: We're already talking with the  
20 NRC.

21           MS. RYDALCH: And the Nuclear Energy  
22 Institute, NEI, and talk with them and --

23           MR. TANO: And IEER, as well, which is  
24 Makhijani's group, which is on the other side --

25           MS. RYDALCH: -- so that you have a comfort

1 level of the system and that they know you're involved  
2 and they know you want to be involved. I think that's  
3 the way to push the system.

4 MR. TANO: Councilman Arthur's issue with in  
5 situ leach mining, NRC has the generic Environmental  
6 Impact Statement. And they've had hearings down in  
7 Gallup, I think it is, and they've had other ones.  
8 But it's still an open EIS, and somebody needs to  
9 weigh in on this thing. They've got some of the  
10 comments that were oral comments. But the question  
11 is: Who is going to weigh in in this kind of formal  
12 response to the draft EIS?

13 MS. RYDALCH: Is Interior doing anything on  
14 abandoned mines, or anything like that any more? They  
15 used to when they had a Bureau of Mines, but I'm not  
16 sure where they're at on that. My former Governor,  
17 the Idaho Governor, is the Secretary of Interior now,  
18 at least for a few more months. I don't know if  
19 they're doing anything, for example, on abandoned  
20 mines in his administration or not.

21 MR. TANO: Well, they've got that AML. You  
22 guys are using some of that AML money to deal with the  
23 uranium ones as well, not just the coal, right?

24 MR. ARTHUR: Yes.

25 MR. TANO: Right. But that's only small

1 monies.

2           MS. DITMER: But I was just thinking -- I'm  
3 thinking out loud, so forgive this -- but establishing  
4 yourself with an independent position is going to help  
5 you. And then playing that position both at a  
6 national and international level at the same time has  
7 got to be part of your strategy, because I honestly  
8 think that the Tribes will get more of a hearing at  
9 the international level, a fairer hearing and a louder  
10 voice, than they might at the national level  
11 initially. That gives you a lot of leverage.

12           MR. TANO: Right. But, again, here's the  
13 dilemma, okay. You can't go to IAEI and sit down  
14 there kind of half-stepping. You've got to know the  
15 stuff. They're dealing with not the big issue,  
16 they're dealing with some very discrete technical  
17 kinds of issues. And that's where, it seems to me,  
18 part of the CERT policy ought to be to say that we  
19 need to develop these kinds of expertise, because  
20 otherwise we can't interact with these agencies.

21           MS. DITMER: That's a good point. So then  
22 the question becomes -- you have a policy. What's  
23 your strategy for getting there? Unfortunately, what  
24 you might be stuck with for a few years is something  
25 like begging, borrowing, or stealing talent that's

1 sympathetic and then developing your own talent, and  
2 then sitting at the table alone. That's basically  
3 what smaller nations have done with the same problem.  
4 That's what you look at, is what other nation states  
5 have done. This isn't a new problem, but there are a  
6 lot of models out there that you can look at.

7 MR. TANO: Yes. You look at it -- you think  
8 of states within the United States as being kind of  
9 sophisticated folks to some extent. And you find out  
10 that Virginia has no rules at all on uranium mines  
11 because they never knew they had uranium.

12 MS. DITMER: And I'm from Virginia.

13 MR. TANO: Okay. They find out this  
14 community has uranium, they want to mine it, and there  
15 ain't nobody there to tell them what they have to do.

16 MS. DITMER: And so you know how Virginia  
17 deals with things that they don't have any law about?  
18 Every man for himself until they get a law in place,  
19 which is bad policy. That's why we have traffic jams  
20 the size of Manhattan.

21 MR. TANO: I'm shocked in terms of -- we got  
22 some really good discussions.

23 Anybody want to continue this discussion at  
24 1:30? I mean --

25 MS. RUBIN: Is it on the agenda?

1 MR. TANO: Is it? I thought it was.

2 MS. RYDALCH: No.

3 MR. TANO: Are we okay with this discussion?

4 MS. RUBIN: It's not listed as one of the  
5 agendas.

6 MR. TANO: Thank you.

7 MR. CONRAD: I really think it's on the  
8 national agenda. It's a real option. If we're not  
9 engaging somehow even though for some people it may be  
10 like a mortician's job, you know. Nobody really wants  
11 to know what you do, but it needs to be done. Then  
12 CERT needs to forward that as part of the package.

13 MR. TANO: Yes. This is why we do it,  
14 because we know that we can do it in a certain way,  
15 where even if people dump on us, it doesn't matter.  
16 When I was at CERT, you couldn't do it the way it  
17 should be done because of these things. Even the  
18 little that we did, as you say, was just  
19 mischaracterized and we got smashed. CERT got smashed  
20 for it. But I think the lesson is, it doesn't matter.  
21 You deal with Southern Ute and coal bed methane,  
22 people don't like that. You deal with Navajo and  
23 Desert Rock, people don't like that.

24 MS. DITMER: There's always going to be  
25 somebody.

1 MR. CONRAD: Every choice. Even wind farms  
2 are impacting prairie chicken habitat. So people who  
3 like prairie chicken or chickens and they like their  
4 habitat are opposed to wind.

5 MR. TANO: Are they bad for you right now,  
6 habitats?

7 MS. RYDALCH: That comes with life.

8 MR. CONRAD: If they don't nest within a  
9 mile radius of a large structure.

10 MR. TANO: Is that right? Wow.

11 MS. DITMER: But it's not like there is not  
12 enough prairie really out there for all the chickens.

13 MR. TANO: But you hunt in certain places.

14 MS. DITMER: Everybody's got their -- you're  
15 going to get it from both sides. No matter what your  
16 position is, whether it looks good or it looks bad,  
17 that's just part of politics. They're going to use it  
18 to whatever advantage they want to.

19 MR. CONRAD: I just wish groups like that  
20 Nuclear Energy Institute, or something like that,  
21 would really recognize their value and put some  
22 resources into the Tribes being able to develop  
23 capacity and stay engaged --

24 MS. RYDALCH: They probably aren't even  
25 aware.

1           MR. CONRAD:  -- recognizing how difficult it  
2 is.

3           MR. TANO:  They have been in the past.  On  
4 the wayside, I used to deal with Steve Kraft all the  
5 time, and some of the folks who used to be there at  
6 NEI are now at DOE.  There was a time when we were  
7 fairly well connected with folks, not as kind of  
8 official level.  So people were aware of the Tribal  
9 issues.  But I think having contact with folks like  
10 Southern Cal Edison, I mean, it's the utilities that  
11 start making more sense than something like NEI.

12          MS. DITMER:  There has been some talk in  
13 Washington in the Homeland Defense Office, because  
14 energy is intrinsically part of homeland defense, as a  
15 source of funding for the Tribal communities and  
16 energy, somehow getting your message out there  
17 becoming more of a voice, mainly because the nuclear  
18 resources that largely are on Tribal land.  But there  
19 is no reason you can't leverage that as a broader  
20 source of funding ideas for position.

21          MR. TANO:  Yeah.  Yeah.  And here's one of  
22 the concerns I have with all of these mining proposals  
23 in Indian Country -- that Tribes don't want to do it.  
24 That's fine.  But if they should decide that they want  
25 to do it, and if all they do is take the deal, then

1 you got to understand that that's only one part of the  
2 fuel cycle. And in the sense, it's the most, almost  
3 the most insignificant part of the fuel cycle, that  
4 all of this stuff, you know --

5 MS. DITMER: The trickle-down effect is  
6 monstrous.

7 MR. TANO: -- is where the value is, and you  
8 need to leverage it. Exactly. You need to leverage  
9 your strategic position in that front end of the fuel  
10 cycle to deal with it.

11 MS. DITMER: Absolutely. Tribes are in a  
12 very strong position, in my opinion, right now if they  
13 jump out and get ahead of this, get their position  
14 nailed down, take the flak that's going to fly from  
15 both directions, but just really stand steady and get  
16 involved at every single level -- government,  
17 association, you name it -- I think you've got a  
18 good -- you could build some power pretty fast and  
19 really leverage it.

20 MR. TANO: Yes. Because we talk about fuel  
21 security, but the fact is the only thing about uranium  
22 is that the Canadians and Australians don't wear  
23 turbans, because that's where we're getting our fuel  
24 from, the uranium.

25 MS. DITMER: Right now.

1           MR. TANO: Right now, right. So to some  
2 extent, there is security.

3           MS. DITMER: Hopefully, I'm not speaking out  
4 of turn too much here, but the United States  
5 Government would like to change that actually. As  
6 part of the GNEP extended proposal, there has been  
7 some talk of becoming a single source for nuclear fuel  
8 as well here, for global nuclear fuel. That's an  
9 interesting proposition because we're concerned about  
10 being blown off the map -- I'm not sure that's a  
11 legitimate concern -- but it is one of the concerns in  
12 Washington. That's why they're interested in getting  
13 the Tribes to open up the uranium lines again.

14           MR. TANO: Again, this is looking long term.  
15 The more you can get involved in other parts of the  
16 fuel cycle, the better position you're going to be  
17 when peace comes, when true peace comes, and we start  
18 dismantling all of those warheads, and dealing with  
19 those, because here's the problem -- if all you do is  
20 rely on producing uranium, when they release all that  
21 stuff, you're dead. But if you're involved in other  
22 aspects of it, it doesn't matter where the uranium  
23 comes from, you see.

24           MS. DITMER: They have a grand strategy that  
25 is maybe a little bit more -- it's not as broad as

1 that. But they would like to see -- they would like  
2 to open up the uranium fields here again and be a  
3 supplier, outdistance, so that they know when things  
4 are going in and going out. It sounds like a pipe  
5 dream to me, frankly. I just find that hard to --  
6 because the worldwide nuclear energy, the number of  
7 plants that are going up in the next 10 years is  
8 enormous.

9 MR. TANO: Right.

10 MS. DITMER: The demand for uranium is going  
11 to just skyrocket. There is really, right now, I was  
12 going to say we should have brought the statistics  
13 about what the demand curve looks like over the next  
14 20 years.

15 MS. RYDALCH: It's significant.

16 MS. DITMER: It is significant.

17 MS. SINYELLA: They showed us all those  
18 graphics and everything, the company that came before  
19 us, and it sounds too good to be true. But, yet,  
20 we're not fully educated with it. So I'm sitting  
21 there thinking --

22 MS. DITMER: It's absolutely real given the  
23 number of reactors that are out there right now. But  
24 the interesting thing is like China, in particular --  
25 India is another case -- but China, in particular, is

1 using fairly old technology compared to what Ann was  
2 talking about, because some of this newer stuff, the  
3 Micro Nuclear will fit like on a couple tables in  
4 here, nothing like what we were talking about in the  
5 past. China is putting in what looks like Three Mile  
6 Island plants all over China, and they're going to  
7 add -- I think they've got 20 commissioning in the  
8 next five years, and 40, or 60 beyond that. It's  
9 incredible.

10 MR. TANO: I saw a list of 30 that were in  
11 various --

12 MS. DITMER: They have more than that  
13 planned in their 10-year plan. That's why World  
14 Health, I was working with them in developing a public  
15 health training program for them, kind of a train the  
16 trainer thing, because they were so worried about  
17 having -- they're more worried about an accident than  
18 an attack by nuclear anything. They're more worried  
19 about China not watching the heat of its reactor and  
20 have, all of a sudden, having a major disaster and  
21 having to deal with the public health effects of that  
22 than having China attack or be attacked by somebody  
23 with nuclear weapons. And the impact was much  
24 broader. It was curious to me.

25 MR. TANO: What's interesting about people

1 in the country, we talk about China the way we used to  
2 talk about Russia, the USSR.

3 MS. DITMER: China is our biggest threat.

4 MR. TANO: It's exactly the same situation.

5 They're a bunch of ethnic minorities, and religious  
6 minorities, and a lot of traditional and historical  
7 animosity, and that's what China is.

8 MS. DITMER: With the Chinese military  
9 running the country. Ought to be interesting starting  
10 Friday to see the Olympics.

11 MS. SINYELLA: Here we deal with most of our  
12 clothes and everything comes from China a lot.

13 MS. DITMER: The good news in that is that  
14 they're not going to attack their number one trade  
15 partner because that ends their money stream. We're  
16 paying for their development right now which is -- you  
17 know, you can disagree with a lot of things that Nixon  
18 did, but really he probably prevented a war in some  
19 ways. Our grand strategy changed significantly.

20 MR. TANO: The McDonald's theory of --

21 MS. DITMER: It is, absolutely, and there is  
22 some truth to that. You show up and there is a  
23 Starbucks or a McDonald's. I travel a lot. So you  
24 look around the world.

25 But back to the Indian question, we've got

1 to get out in front of this. We've also got the green  
2 card that we can play. People look at the Tribes as  
3 being sort of naturally environmentally astute. We  
4 have those things.

5 (Proceedings adjourned at 12:07 p.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 STATE OF NEVADA )  
3 )  
3 COUNTY OF CLARK )

4 I, Mary Cox Daniel, Certified Court

5 Reporter, do hereby certify:

6 That I reported in shorthand the proceedings  
7 had in the above-entitled matter at the place and date  
8 indicated.

9 That I thereafter transcribed my said  
10 shorthand notes into typewriting, and that the  
11 typewritten transcript is a complete, true and  
12 accurate transcription of my said shorthand notes.

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have set my hand in my  
14 office in the County of Clark, State of Nevada this  
15 12th day of August, 2008.

16

17

\_\_\_\_\_  
MARY COX DANIEL, CCR #710

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25