EVENING SESSION

7:30 p.m.

(The following was moderated by Ms. Donna Lucero)

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much for all coming tonight.

The topic this evening is how to influence policy decisions, which I think is really extremely important to the whole focus of the consultation for these two days and obviously you must think it's pretty important too or you wouldn't be here.

We have heard throughout the day of what some of the problems are, what is the reality of the current situation in resource development, and energy impacts, and of the current attempts that are being made to include minorities and women in the whole process.

There is a lot more that can be done, and I hope that this evening we can focus on the -- some affirmative actions that we can do in the future on our own as individuals and as whoever we represent, and be positive and concrete in suggestions that are made that not only we have seen can be used, and can be used by others, but things that haven't worked in the past and that we'd like to share failures too, so that somebody else doesn't have to reinvent a bad wheel.

A

We had started out asking a few people to come to be resource people tonight because of their obvious expertise. But I have realized from the participation through questions and answers throughout the day, that the audience really, each of you are resource people in your own field. You each have a point of view that you brought to the conference, hopefully it has hit against other points of view and the real value, the reason that we wanted to have a group smaller this evening, is because you didn't all have time to speak out during the day and you all have points of view that are very valid and need to be heard.

And I hope that you will bring these out tonight, and really have much more communication, because that is what is going to have some impact on policy making in the energy area is this cross fertilization of ideas.

For the format this evening, I would like in a minute to ask each of you to go around the room and introduce yourselves and if you can limit it to 60 seconds or pretty close thereto, state why you're here, and a concept that you feel is important to deal with tonight from your point of view.

And Ron Taoka from the staff will write this up on the board so that we can refer to them, and then I'd like for the resource people, all of you resource people in the room, to contribute more in-depth your point of view once we have gone around the room once.

·14

First time introduce yourself and then from there on we will use the chart so that you do not have to introduce yourselves unless you would like to. Okay?

Are you willing to start, be the first one?

MS. HOLLIDAY: Not really, but I will.

Roundup, Montana. I am here representing the rural American women. I participated in that conference this spring in Washington, D.C., and because of that organization I was invited to participate in this.

I am a rancher, and I serve on the governor's economic advisory council.

MS. BRERTON: My name is Rene Brerton and I work for senior citizens organization and I am rather concerned about the lack of citizen involvement into the process that's determining the energy impact. And also lack of corporate responsibility in assuming the effects of energy.

MS. ANDREA VALESQUEZ: And I am Andrea Valesquez and I'm here just to learn more about what's going on.

MR. RICHARD TUTTLE: My name is Rich Tuttle and I
work for an organization that works in four of the western
states that are being impacted by energy development. And
I'm interested in seeing more citizen participation through
community organization and direct involvement in policy making

decisions.

I'm personnel manager for ecology consultants, an ecology consulting firm that does environmental impact statements up and down the front range and I've just been new in the field and I'm really interested in learning about the energy expansion and as a learning curve for any particular position and in any way I can volunteer information or take back information to my company that could, in turn, maybe direct things in the proper directions that you're trying to set today.

MS. MARGARET LIPPIS: I'm Margaret Lippis, I'm, I work for the division of employment and training, I'm state supervisor of, I have three hats, no, two hats. I'm state supervisor of counseling and testing and also state supervisor of women in employment.

MS. HESTER McNULTY: What state?

MS. LIPPIS: Colorado. And I'm interested in the part of my job that deals with women in employment, as far as nontraditional employment for women, and also innovative ideas on how I can help women applicants who come into our job service section.

MR. JAMES BOGGS: I'm Jim Boggs from the Northern
Cheyenne research project in Montana, and I'm a research
sociologist, I've been working for the tribe for two years,

a little over two years now, and as many of you know the Northern Cheyenne Tribe is literally ringed in all kind of energy development but it has a lot of coal on the reservation itself, and there are just a lot of issues relating to local communities in energy development areas that I'm interested in.

MR. CARL WHITMAN: My name is Carl Whitman, I'm a planner from three affiliated tribes, the three affiliated tribes in North Dakota. I have been interested in these alternative energies rather than systems that are -- I rely on, exhaustible resources.

MS. DONNA DAVIDSON: My name is Donna Davidson, I am a boomtown specialist working for energy industry, and my interest is cooperation between industry and the communities, and also grass roots power community control. But the opposite side of the coin of power is responsibility, and I'm very much concerned with getting local citizens and local communities to be willing and capable of taking the responsibility that goes with the power.

MS. McNuLTY: My real name's Hester, my nickname's
Tess, McNulty, and at the moment I'm natural resources coordinator for the League of Women Voters of the United States,
and I've got to worry about the whole country but before
I started doing that, I was very active in the impact of
energy development in region 8. And I think that we have

3% of the population and that we just haven't found the way to influence policy and it isn't enough that government officials get in there to influence policy, we have to get everybody here into citizen participation, government participation, the whole ball of wax, if we're going to have any meaning whatsoever or impact on Washington.

Right now, federal government's deciding leasing policy and I heard today over and over again, how can we make it slow down or maybe not happen all at once, how can we influence it? So it's happening now, and the citizen reaction has been like nil.

MR. BURMAN LORENSON: My name is Burman Lorenson,
I currently am the director of the federal regional council,
energy impact office, just prior to that I was the oil
shale coordinator for the State of Colorado in the socioeconomic coordinator for the State of Colorado.

My main purpose is to assist in mitigation of impacts in boomtowns in the six-state area currently.

MS. HONEY ROBERTS: My name is Honey Roberts, I'm representing the national organization for women. I and we are interested, of course, on the impact of everything on women. Including the mitigation of that.

MR. KENNETH LEDFORD: My name is Ken Ledford, I'm an international union representative, I was asked to attend this conference because of my stand on women's rights and

. -: ".

minorities' rights in the mine area.

MR. JOHN FOSTER: I'm John Foster, I'm with the federation of 26 Indian tribes of the northern great plains, I'm acting executive director and I'm also a geologist.

The name of our organization is Native American

Natural Resources Development Federation. I'm concerned

with the impact of natural resource development on Indian

reservations and I'm an advocate of solar and alternate

energy for use on Indian reservations. And I draw your

attention to some brochures out on the registration desk about

a conference we are sponsoring in Albuquerque December 5, 6

and 7, the title of that is solar and alternate energy for

Indian reservations.

MS. BETSY TOOKA: I'm Betsy Tooka, I'm a nonpaid, interested citizen in this topic. I'm particularly interested in the grass roots community organizing aspect of this issue.

MS. MARY VOGEL: I'm Mary Vogel, I work for the Colorado Civil Rights Commission, currently as compliance review officer, looking at the implementation of the governor's executive order on affirmative action in state contracts, especially capital construction contracts.

Prior to that I worked with the civil rights commission in exclusionary land use and housing project on A-95 reviews of the community development block grant fund.

And I'm doing my master's thesis in urban and regional planning on housing policy, especially policy in the area of housing, finance and housing production.

The concept that I would like to see addressed is getting decent housing built at affordable cost in a way that addresses and begins to put a stop to the skyrocketing costs of housing.

For low and moderate income people of whom, of course, women and minorities are very disproportionate segment, and some of the ideas that I have in this area are state housing and pension planning much more utilization of public housing authorities, housing cooperatives, community land trusts and land banking.

MR. DONALD DUNCAN: My name is Don Duncan and I'm legislative coordinator for the energy minerals division, Phillips Petroleum Company, and we're relatively new into the coal and uranium areas of energy and we're here mostly just to get insight as to what some of the local needs are and again as all you're concerned a while ago, we're concerned with maintaining a close contact between our particular industry and the local needs and the people at the local level.

MR. MANUEL QUINTANA: I am Manuel Quintana, retired fireman. And I'm here just to see what I can learn about what's going on in the world.

2

3 4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

THE MODERATOR: Where are you from?

MR. QUINTANA: Sheridan, Wyoming.

MR. MARLO GONZALEZ: My name is Mario Gonzalez, better known as Mario from the reservation I come from. am an enrolled member of the Ogalala Sioux Tribe, Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, and I'm presently serving as the tribal attorney for the tribe. I also serve as a state chairperson to the South Dakota SAC.

MR. RAYMOND TSOSIE: I'm Raymond Tsosie, and represent Utah International and Navajo Mine in New Mexico. I'm personnel manager for the company. My primary interest is to try to be responsible for the affirmative action plan for the company, for the mine there at Fruitland, and also I'm responsible for the enforcement and compliance to the union contract we do have with the operating engineers and I'm mostly responsible for enforcing our agreement with the Navajo Tribe by which we operate the mine, and that contract is a provision for Indian preference and my job is to enforce that contract.

And also the contract with the operating engineers. MR. BARBAROSSA: My name's Omar Barbarossa. asked to be a speaker here probably because of my past involvements more than my current involvement. assistant to the governor, State of New Mexico, for Manpower and energy planning. I also did a special consultation for

4 5

EPA in the area of energy and environmental planning. I did my graduate at UNM and the area of that was policy and energy alternatives.

I'm currently project officer in the equitable insurance and I'm in development and as it deals with financing minority enterprise, which has nothing to do with energy. But hopefully it will.

The concept I would like to address, and while I concur with most of the concerns here tonight, is one that I feel has been overlooked traditionally much like that of the Native American in this part of the country, that is the Chicano or the Espano or the Mexican-American or however you want to phrase it. We call it La Raza, and of course my concern is that we are the largest minority in this area, we were the first settlers of this area, second to the Native American.

I do not want to see another gold rush, if you will, in which we're passed by as a people. So my concern is policy in the area of energy as regards to Hispano y Chicano.

THE MODERATOR: I'm Donna Lucero with the Colorado

Advisory Committee and President of the League of Women

Voters of Denver, and am dedicated full time to the proposition that the more information citizens have, the more they can work on their own without somebody else saying what

citizens want, to influence decisions in government at all levels, and have an impact just as if government has an impact on citizens, citizens can also have an impact on that government, and since Mr. Foster got in a commercial, I will take the same privilege, I have up here some publications for sale from the League of Women Voters on energy dilemmas and a packet of energy briefs and they're each a dollar. And you're welcome to them.

MR. RON TAOKA: Ron Taoka, with the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and I guess I'm just basically interested in the problems that women and minorities are facing due to the energy development in the west and I'd like to maybe find i out what maybe we can do or as citizens to maybe lessen the adverse impacts on minorities and women in the west due to energy development.

MR. CAL ROLLINS: I'm Cal Rollins, the research writer for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Rocky Mountain regional office and I'm here to listen because I'll be writing reports.

MR. FRED OSWALD: Fred Oswald, I'm a member of the Utah SAC.

THE MODERATOR: Would you say why you care about being at this conference?

MR. OSWALD: I think Utah is experiencing the same kinds of energy problems that other states in the region are,

and although I'm from Salt Lake, and not as familiar with some of the boomtown problems that other areas are having, we still have our own problems and other things going on and I think that it does have tremendous impact in the civil rights area for minorities and women, and so I'm interested in being here and very interested in what's gone on so far.

MR. MARTIN GARBOR: My name is Martin Garbor, I'm assistant to the president of Phillips Petroleum Company, also have a dual role of being the director of the external liaison department for the American Petroleum Institute.

I'm here in dual capacity, basically to learn from you all as to some of your problems that might be affected, affecting some of our operations in the west, and at the same time, hopefully to explain some of our problems in trying to develop some of those properties.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. You two are welcome to come up to these two chairs if you would like, or you can stay where you are.

MR. BARBAROSSA: I thought I voiced a concern.

MR. TAOKA: Hispanics?

THE MODERATOR: While this is an impressive group, and I will ask the resource people that I had specifically invited, Tess McNulty, Burman Lorenson, Martin Garbor and Jim Boggs, to add your comments as we get into the issues where you have a specific expertise. Do you mind? Okay.

4 5

And let's get on to our topic now, how can policy decisions be influenced? By each of us here, how should they be and how shouldn't they be? I'd like to hear from the perspective of the industry itself as well as people who are being impacted or have other concerns.

MS. DAVIDSON: Policy decisions about what, you have something like 20 areas of policy decisions have been mentioned, pick one to start on, please.

THE MODERATOR: This is a varied enough group and we all need to carry something back to our state that we came from that it really does need to stay as broad as energy development, that is currently taking place. And impacting on citizens in that state.

And if that is not too broad, it really will be helpful to have some tools --

MS. McNuLTY: You have the first question on how much is going to be developed, which is your very first question. Is how much is going to be developed? Then, after you find that out, if you can influence that decision, then you get to the next one is how do you handle the growth that that level of energy development is going to create and how do you create opportunities for women and minorities to get a piece of the pie.

MR. OSWALD: I think there were several of the speakers today who talked about the necessity of involving people in

the decision making and policy process. And how important it was for individuals to be involved. And I think that raises the question, a very serious question for me, because I see it taking place in Utah and I'm sure it takes place in other states, and that is, that as we have energy development usually taking place in our rural areas, we have found that those people who are living in those rural areas have been very vocal about the fact that they want to be the people who make those decisions, and they don't want either people from urban areas or the federal government making decisions for them.

And there was a comment at dinner tonight that if we had any sort of a referendum in our rural areas about whether we wanted to have development in those areas, I think it would be overwhelming in terms of the response that they do want that.

And I think if those local people were sitting and hearing all of the factual information that we heard all day today, they would, even after hearing all of the negative things that happen as a result of development, would still be very strong in voicing their opinion, and so I think first of all we have to recognize that the people who are involved in making those decisions in the very real sense are the people who are living in those communities where those decisions -- where those -- that development is taking place,

and I can't make the decision for them either because I live in the same state, because I'm not living in that community and I don't think that the government agencies or even private enterprise can do that.

THE MODERATOR: Are you suggesting that there should be some citizen input into the federal government deciding what land they are going to lease for energy development?

And citizens having decisions at that level?

MS. McNULTY: Yes, they're coming out with their whole leasing policy, there was a suit and RDC, natural resources defense council against the department of -- it's against whose office, then, the undersecretary of interior, that's been settled.

We are now going into a leasing policy. And I think it behooves this whole region and I would like to say that one thing that I felt is we should add New Mexico to region 8, they don't like being with Texas and Arkansas anyhow.

MR. BARBAROSSA: Never liked it.

MS. McNULTY: It would give us more of a regional voice to begin with, to tell them, yes, we're willing to have energy development in that local community that wants growth but we don't want it all at once. And we don't want you to put two lease tracks in the same agricultural valley and overwhelm agriculture. We want you to stage your leasing, but nobody is out there saying that.

Once you get the federal government to have a leasing policy of staging, then your experts here can better prepare the communities for the growth that's going to accompany it. But with 3% of the population we're not going to have a say unless we get citizens, government officials, everybody.

THE MODERATOR: Are you saying Colorado's 3% of the population?

MS: McNULTY: No, the whole --

THE MODERATOR: Region 8?

MS. McNULTY: Region 8.

MR. BARBAROSSA: The whole region, yes.

MS. McNULTY: You see where we're coming from?

MR. BARBAROSSA: But we have what, 70, 64% of the total energy development, see? You know, I hate to bring some things to a head but there's some questions I think we got to address before we start looking for some answers.

We say policy, are we talking about public policy, talking about private policy, are we talking about, is that all one kind of policy? Okay, because I think that needs to be defined.

Also when you talk about private or public policy, what policy are you talking about? And we say how can we influence policy? I think before you go to that, we have to look at things like who are the people who make policy? What

is their attitude? What is their view? You know. Who are the vested interests, if there really are? What role they play in development and in sharing of that development.

All those things relate to the policy of where do we fit in if we're really talking about women and minorities, is there really such a thing? Is it really a matter of importance to the decision makers or policy makers? Those are the kinds.

VOICE: The answer is no, isn't it?

MR. BARBAROSSA: I don't know.

MR. WILLIAM VEEDER: Oh, the people that made the decisions don't give a damn about you or me or anyone else.

They make the decisions and it's rammed down your throat.

I'm sorry I popped off so quickly but when I hear somebody's thinking that he's participating in making policy and he's encountered the Denver Water Board or Exxon or Shell, he's out of his mind if he thinks he's participating in the decision making policy. He's crazy.

THE MODERATOR: That is the frustration that citizens often feel from looking on the outside trying to look in.

And I'm sure --

MR. VEEDER: I'm not frustrated. I do not, you do, you sue them.

THE MODERATOR: May I speak please?

MR. VEEDER: Go ahead.

with a vested interest and with a lot to offer, developing what is there for a local community, have a completely different view, and the part of this conference is for people with stereotypes about people they've never met or talked to, to have an opportunity to talk to each other now and communicate, and please, could we hear somebody from industry?

MR. FUENTES: I'm not from industry but I'd like to make a comment.

THE MODERATOR: Before we move off the point, okay?

Is it on the point?

MS. DAVIDSON: I'll speak from an industry point of view on this and that is the question of the federal leasing policy and some of the other federal policies influence industry's decision very, very much.

The other thing is the matter of the regulations constantly changing. I mean there are lots of times when industry has just said wait a minute, regulations are going to change, within the next year and a half, we're just going to stand here and see if something falls out.

It becomes exceedingly costly for industry, if they
don't know what the rules of the game are going to be six
months from now. I think in some instances at the local
level, at the project site, industry does want more responsible

input from citizens. I know Phillips has had some good relations down in the Crown Coin area but they go nutty because Crown Coin is an unincorporated community and there isn't anybody who has the authority to respond to anything.

Who makes decisions in industry and how does this affect some of these things? Well, decisions on major stuff are made pretty high up in the echelons and a lot of that is affected by simple economic factors. But at some of the boomtown levels we've been talking about, industry is not a they, some big cloudy thing, industry is individuals, and the important decision makers for any community are the project manager for that mine or power plant or whatever it is, and his vice president, those are the two people who sign off on budgets.

Those are the two people who say that we will put so much money in for impact alleviation or we will not put so much money in, those are the two people who say we will go for Indian preference hiring, we will change it or we won't. And I have seen companies and projects go from Black to White and White to Black when one individual was replaced and that individual was the project manager or his vice president.

And if you can get to those people, I mean that's where you can get some -- some input, I think Phillips' people will bear me out on that, some of their experience.

MR. TSOSIE: I think my experience there at the Navajo Mine has been that of the Navajos in the area have made a lot of noise, and irregardless of the mine manager saying the hell with the local people, he's kidding himself. He's only saying that out of frustration.

At the same time, he's talking to me and saying, what are they saying? You know, what shall we do? Most often my recommendation is, suddenly I think we'll have to give in to their demands. I mean we might have to delay certain decisions on say local hiring, but you know, we don't make it look like we -- we're submitting to them.

MS. DAVIDSON: You have to play the game, everybody's got to come out without egg on their face, and this is a lot of game playing.

MR. TSOSIE: I think that that's the way we've operated there, and even locally, I think our managers are involved in city government. There again they're -- they're the ears of the -- of the mine.

MS. DAVIDSON: Project manager is key.

MR. TSOSIE: And they keep an ear on that, and he does listen.

MS. DAVIDSON: Right.

MR. TSOSIE: And I do because he tells me to listen, because he's, you know, to listen to him, to go in the direction he wants me to go.

MS. DAVIDSON: But some of them, they're a whole pile of individuals and some are very progressive and some just have to be convinced every day.

MR. TSOSIE: And of course, you know, I was hired on there because I was known to be outspoken and be very confrontive, and he told me he wanted somebody, well, of that mind and that personality. And he welcomes it. But not all mine managers are like that.

MS. McNULTY: Are we going to leave it to the mine manager or are we going to have a national policy where those New York offices of the energy companies are told that there's going to be affirmative action in the coal fields and the power plants and have it come down from on top so we don't have the Black and White mine managers, the good guys and the bad guys, but it's a policy of the companies.

MS. BRERTON: I would add that your definition of responsible community input limits the people who are having the most negative results of the energy impact, that being low income citizens, whose voices are seldom heard because they're not, quote, responsible.

And when energy assumes that type of parental attitude, the results will always be the same.

MS. DAVIDSON: I obviously did not make myself clear,

I meant responsible in the sense of being willing to undertake
the proper community responsibilities for growth management,

which includes things like floating bond issues, land use planning, more community, the community itself taking on the responsibilities that it is properly supposed to undertake. I did not mean in the sense that poor people are not responsible, poor people are not organized very often, and that is one of the reasons that they don't get heard as much is that their lack of organization into a strong vocal group where you have strong minority organization such as La Raza, they're hurt. They're hurt.

And they're willing to undertake responsibilities for their own people. I did not mean irresponsible in the sense of -- of -- well, apathy or wanting, I meant responsibility in the sense of undertaking what they should do as constituted local governments.

MR. GONZALEZ: Getting back to my initial comments, we get out of context here. As Native Americans we've always had to deal with affecting policy, public policy mostly, because it seems like one follows the other, policy is made in Washington, D.C., private industry and everybody down below gears their policy to what the federal policy usually is. But we have always been small in number, our population is under one million people, and when you compare that with the rest of the nation, we're less than 1% of the total population of the United States, so we have absolutely no political clout, in state government or federal government.

As a result, most of the major dams in the United States, for example, have been built on reservations. Because we do not affect policy in Washington to prevent this, so usually we get stepped on, and somebody in Washington does make a policy decision, we've learned over the years how to combat that and that's basically done by two methods.

One is educating the people in the east, eastern seaboard and sometimes in the south to support us by putting pressure on our congressmen, and going directly to those congressmen and lobbying to get legislation or other types of regulations that we need for our own protection.

But we haven't always been too successful, many times we've lost, we've lost a lot.

An example is -- we have to be on our toes all the time also. An example of where a bill has been passed where we had no input is the Missouri River Commission, which is, I believe, a ten-member board, Mr. Veeder knows a lot more about this than I do, it's been in existence for six years and it executes the policy for the Missouri River Basin to use the water rights. All the states are represented but not a single tribe has representation on that commission, and yet we have a substantial interest in the policy of the Missouri River.

We own a substantial portion of the water rights there, yet we have no say in it. And that's an example, so we have

to go back now and get that bill amended to get an Indian on the commission.

But I guess in essence what I'm saying is that the only way we've been successful is to educate the people back east, locally, to support us, and actually go to Washington and lobbying different congressmen to vote for or against legislation.

THE MODERATOR: So you're saying a lot of policy that you need to influence is being made through legislation, national lesiglation?

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes.

MR. VEEDER: And isn't it true that legislation is normally prepared and submitted and taken through the committees and ultimately passed by the energy cartels and the big industrial giants that make the decisions and as I've said before, you take it or leave it.

MR. BARBAROSSA: Well, you're talking --

MR. GONZALEZ: It's always a battle.

MR. BARBAROSSA: Yes, but it's a lobbying process, we all have access to that, we may be outnumbered in terms of monies, okay, certainly that, but on the other hand in terms of numbers, we can make up for that.

And through this education that he's talking about, if people become aware of what the policy is, how policy is made, one very, very good avenue is through lobbying and

through collective lobbying, maybe everybody in this room as a majority, maybe not all of us but as a majority to support certain ideas or certain goals in policy making, so why couldn't we get together, band together, if you will, to influence lobbying? You know.

MR. VEEDER: I'm with you. I'm with you.

MS. McNULTY: That's what I say.

MR. BARBAROSSA: So it's not only the big cartels that you talk about, that's one access in this country, fortunately, that we do have, that a cartel can not be the sole representative or the sole factor of legislation.

MR. VEEDER: Face the fact the Indians have walk-in privileges in more senators' office and congressmen's office than any group I know. That's a fact.

MR. BARBAROSSA: Then they ought to be making all the policy decisions.

MR. VEEDER: No, no, the real problem, the real problem, though, and it's a genuine problem, that when Peabody, for example, which is now part of a conglomerate, decides to spend a million dollars to influence strip mining legislation, there is no way that you do much more than stand out in the wind and cry. Now, I'm not a Kassandra at all, I believe in the struggle, I've lived it for 40 years. But I'm saying to you that the fundamental way to get to these things is to know who runs Exxon —

MS. McNULTY: Yes.

MR. VEEDER: -- and put the lights right on them and say, we know this is a crooked deal, and we know you're perpetrating it. See, I -- that's how I live.

THE MODERATOR: I think it's time to hear from our industry or maybe I shouldn't say only industry representatives, but we've got somebody, an assistant to the president of Phillips Petroleum, really like to hear from you, Mr. Garbor.

MR. VEEDER: I'd be delighted to hear.

MR. GARBOR: Well, I'm not sure that I would disagree entirely with Mr. Veeder. He has one option at his control, he's obvious — the Indians have a great deal of power today and have used it over the years as it relates to the legislative effort.

MR. GONZALEZ: What power is that you're referring to?

MR. GARBOR: Basically you have a great deal of numbers, you have used them in Washington.

MR. GONZALEZ: Numbers, what do you mean, numbers?
MR. GARBOR: To influence congressmen.

MR. GONZALEZ: There's less than a million of us in the United States.

MR. GARBOR: Well, you have open door, generally up until recently I'd say that I would tend to agree with you that there was a great deal of sympathy with the cause, you know, from the oil and gas industry and the mining industry

too, I'll have to admit that we may not agree with the tribes, the Indian people, even anybody on any issue. That's not to say, though, that because -- and I think that's inherent, it's inherent for a lot of different reasons.

We represent many other people than the obvious, of course we represent stockholders, the corporation does, the owners of the corporation, we also have to look at selling a product which means we, in essence, have to consider the consumer a little bit. If we didn't, that consumer may not buy our product.

Many corporations today look at also the communities, I think many of us, and I won't say all of us because there's still a lot live in the dark ages, but many of us are very concerned about what the communities where we live and operate think also.

From the standpoint we realize we've got to do business in that community, and that's, in essence, where we're going to make a profit if we do. We've got to be able to attract people to work for our corporation in that community. Whether it's local people or whether it's people that we might need to transfer into that community to do a specific job.

MR. GONZALEZ: I tend to disagree with you that we have any type of political clout. The fact is we have none. And the only way -- and our struggle is basically one for

:::.

survival. It's not really an economic survival like the boomtowns are facing, it's a cultural survival and once we're extinguished from the face of this earth as a culture, we no longer exist and that's basically what we're fighting for, and as a result, we have so much at stake a lot more than anybody else in this country, maybe with a few exceptions, we have to devote a tremendous amount of our resources, what little we have, in litigation, in lobbying, in whatever, it's taken a -- like I think some of the budgets of some tribes approximately one-third to one-half of the total budget goes to attorneys' fees, lobbying fees, and that's -- that's why we're able to get what little we can done in Washington, D.C.

And that's the only political clout we have, other than the good graces of the people back east who sympathize with us, have somewhat of a conscience.

MR. VEEDER: But Judge, isn't it true that if the secretary of the interior and the department of justice perform their functions, and they don't as you and I both know, that your problem will be greatly relieved and greatly relieved, isn't that right?

MR. GONZALEZ: That's true but sometimes these people are worse -- are our worst enemies because there's so many conflicts of interest, for example the bureau of indian affairs under the interior department, so is the corps of

engineers, so is the bureau of land management and sometimes the secretary has to make a decision lot of times he sides with these other bureaus against us. And --

MR. VEEDER: And with the big coal companies that call the shots by and large for him.

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes, they have more political clout with the secretary of the interior than we do.

THE MODERATOR: I think you may have hit the nail on the head, though, when you said that you have used your numbers to do community education to get to the community education, to get to the constituents of legislators, and it broadens your base considerably and of course it expands the knowledge, too, that people need to be aware of on the whole issue.

MR. GARBOR: Well, we might sit here and argue all night about these type things, but, and I'm sure that there's a lot of people in this room that I would disagree on a lot of things about, but I would think that there would be also a lot of people in here that might agree with me on some things.

I would hope that this particular group might like to look at some of those things we might agree on and what we might not agree on, and --

MR. BARBAROSSA: What are those things?

MR. GARBOR: See if we might move towards some positive

thoughts as to how we might, to work for some solutions, how you might understand our business a little bit better and we might understand you a little bit better, to accomplish some mutual objectives.

MR. BARBAROSSA: Okay, you're saying let's be specific, right?

MR. GARBOR: Pardon?

MR. BARBAROSSA: You're saying let's be specific,
I can give you some. Number 1, the question here that I
don't think has been addressed is one of we keep talking
about policy, and I hear things about, that we're going to
use the people to work and one thing I haven't heard discussed is, how do we become owners of energy companies
or subcontractors or leasors or developers or production,
you know, okay, how do we get in on that action? And don't
tell me there's no way to do it because you know someone's
going to do it. Okay? Now, if it's as democratic, okay,
and if it's open as we're saying it is, how come we ain't
getting none of that action?

And I'm putting it as blunt as can be, okay? Now, we have a gentleman over here from the energy impact office. Department of energy. I haven't heard him say anything about how do we impact federal policy, or how do you feel about what we said tonight.

We have a gentleman over here that represents industry,

one of the biggest companies in America, you know, how do
we become subcontractors with your company? Is it possible?

THE MODERATOR: Let him answer about eight of your questions before you ask any more.

MR. GARBOR: I get a little nervous when we say the federal government owns this and the federal government owns that, the federal government doesn't own anything.

MR. BARBAROSSA: I never said that.

MR. GARBOR: Well, there was some reference to it today in the opening session, I believe Mr. Sherman said the federal government owns 50% of the coal in this area and the lands. The federal government doesn't own anything. We, in this room, own this, the people own it. Federal government manages it for us. And from that standpoint we already, all of us here in this room, own a piece of it and none of us may be very happy with the way it's being managed.

And that's up to us to affect that. But I think those, you're asking some questions that are very good, how do you become more active? How do you get more of the piece --

MR. BARBAROSSA: We're active, I want to participate.

MR. GARBOR: -- of the action in it. And I can't speak for every industry, you have many, many organizations here, we have a representative of Utah International, which is a very large corporation also here. There are some

companies that are more progressive than others. I can give you some insights I think, from our corporation, the corporate structure, how it works, whereby it's just like anything, if I wanted to influence somebody or something, I'd learn all I could about that organization before I'd start in after them.

I would become as knowledgeable as I could to find out how the decisions are made, why does a corporation or why does an individual go one direction versus another?

There's obviously a reason for that. It's very difficult to try to affect that decision without knowing a great deal of the background behind it. And I think it's inherent upon all of us to learn as much about each other as we can, so that we might be able to affect that decision a little bit better.

THE MODERATOR: Is there a way that a woman or minority could serve on the policy making board to give impact before -- is that a naive question?

MR. GARBOR: No, it's not, Phillips Petroleum Company has a woman on our board of directors, a Black woman.

MR. VEEDER: Stock, is she --

MR. GARBOR: A Black woman.

MS. McNULTY: You solved two problems with one person.

MR. VEEDER: How much stock?

MR. GARBOR: I couldn't tell you exactly.

MR. VEEDER: She wouldn't be there if she didn't own stock?

MR. GARBOR: No? Well, she -- she owns some, but not a great deal. She's the wife of the current dean of the -- of Michigan State University.

MR. VEEDER: I'm delighted, but I'll lay you ten to one the only way you guys make decisions in the big corporations is how much money am I going to make and my friend over there who says we'd like to participate --

MR. GARBOR: Sure we do. Sure --

MR. VEEDER: But just let me finish, but we're a bunch of citizens here and I'm a very conservative guy. But I know cockeyed well that I couldn't influence your decision in regard to Phillips Petroleum, I know that. I know that I couldn't influence General Motors, I know that.

I was raised in the State of Montana where the Anaconda Copper called every shot, every day, every way and you either turned copper color or you left and I left. So let's not kid ourselves, the only way you're going to participate in this thing is have enough dough to buy into the decision making area.

THE MODERATOR: Let's get back to our focus -MR. VEEDER: I think we should but --

THE MODERATOR: Is an affirmative design that we can use to walk out of this and use in the future. Let's not keep

discussing the problems but how it can be done.

Mr. Garbor, you have said find out all you can about who you want to influence and go at it -- about it from that way. Could you give me more of an answer about how someone could get on a policy making board so that they could be privy to a decision before it was made instead of reacting to it afterwards? Do they need to be voted in?

MR. GARBOR: Well, as far as the -- you know, the board of directors, that's right, and that's a very difficult thing to accomplish. And -- but I'm not sure that you -- this particular group really needs to do that before you can affect the policy decision of a corporation. I think you need to look at the various organizations as far as the individual development that they might be looking at, and try to learn as much about that as possible. I'm always amazed, groups similar to this seem to not feel they have enough information about what the corporations are doing in their own locale.

I sometimes wonder why. In the first place from our industry, we're very regulated, and I can only talk from the oil and gas -- well, I shouldn't say that, from the minerals side too, my own corporation. It's not too difficult to find out quite a deal about specific developments or planned developments. We file reports with many different government agencies. For instance, if we were to develop an oil and gas

4 5

field, the USGS, specially in the west it's generally federal lands, has all kinds of reports on that. The department of energy does. We file environmental assessments, we file environmental impact statements. If the various corporations are responsible citizens, generally they'll go in and visit with some of the local government people, specially if they have to move people into that community.

We're in the process, Phillips is, of developing a major complex down in New Mexico, many of you might know. Up in the northwest corner. Right next to the Navajo Reservation.

We have been actively visiting, not only with the tribe and the local tribal chapter there, but also the local community, communities, the state, and the federal officials for months and months.

We've got real problems that have to be solved, problems such as where do the people live? Where are the work force coming from? We've spent extra efforts on those two subjects, and the only way we could possibly develop a project like that is with the cooperation of all people in that area. We recognize that.

Because anything we do in that particular area, we are creating a boomtown in northwest New Mexico. But in essence, it is with full cooperation of the local community there. We've helped them in financing, we've helped them

develop housing, we're in the process of doing that, we've helped them develop additional school capacity, medical capacity, recreational facilities, all this is being constructed right now.

But even here, we wouldn't have been able to do it without cooperation of the local people. And some of the local people, quite frankly, have been more aggressive than others. And I think that — that's very positive from our standpoint.

When a corporation like ours comes into an area we may have three or four different directions to go do developing it. Some of the -- the cities down there were very positive and aggressive on trying to acquire our corporation in to come help develop the housing in their area. They saw benefits. And we worked closely with those people. But it has been through joint efforts and I think that's where our type organization can be very beneficial, you've got to learn something about our objectives, but working together I think we can solve some of these problems that people are concerned about, like boomtowns.

MR. VEEDER: But the lady asked the question, how do you get in the -- the policy making process? And the policy making process is accomplished, you're talking about these little peripheral things, when the policy making determination is made we're going to put a half billion

2 3 4

dollars out here, see, that's the decision, that is the decision that this lady is talking about. Not whether you have water supply, the thing that is really interesting to us and at least to me, Mr. Phillips Petroleum, is when you make the decision to invest a billion dollars in the middle east, and it drains all of our money out.

Now, that is beginning to make policy, that's an extremely important element. But we can't participate in that.

THE MODERATOR: I don't mean to put Mr. Garbor on the defensive and I really appreciate the fact that he is here, I think many people who have been frustrated in this area by having been impacted on something, as nebulous that they can't get a finger on, tend to think of industry people as having horns, and at least now you know one gentleman who does not have horns.

MR. VEEDER: I love them all.

MR. GONZALEZ: I'd like to comment before we go on to another subject on what he just stated. When you get involved with tribes, actually the tribe should be making these decisions and some, some corporations do have good PR, but when you start pumping money into the tribal economy like that you start dividing traditional people against assimilated people, and it's kind of a buying, buying your votes with the council when you start paying this element,

you know, so much, and it looks good like you say, and we're doing this or we're building recreational areas, we're doing that, but you have internal tribal conflicts with the traditional people are saying we don't want these things and assimilated Indians are saying yes, we want these things, these are good, and so it's destroying the cultural aspect.

MR. TSOSIE: The only thing on that is it happens to not only the Indians, I think you know, industry is also selling themselves to the, you know, to the -- to the rural White areas also, I think the same is true, I don't think there's any difference there, I don't see it.

MR. GONZALEZ: That lady that spoke this afternoon talked about dividing and conquering, I think that's the same effect.

MS. DAVIDSON: I would like to comment on that, and that is the problem of cultural continuity with the Indian tribes, is the same that has been faced by a number of ethnic minorities who have immigrated into the United States.

The Jewish people have faced it for several thousand years. It's something that only the Indians can deal with and if we look at history it's a generational process.

And it has to be resolved among the Indians as it was resolved among the Jews and other ethnic groups, to what extent do they make the behavioral pattern adaptation to modern life,

I mean you're all pretty good at -- most everybody likes television and washers and dryers and things, you know, and to what extent, how, how perhaps, do you maintain your cultural continuity and how does one tribe maintain its as compared to another tribe with its heritage. And --

MR. WHITMAN: I think --

THE MODERATOR: Yes, let's hear --

MR. WHITMAN: -- I'm surprised to hear a sociologist talk like that. I think she knows better than that. I think it's easy to view this concept of melting pot, conform, for people like the Irish or the Jewish, to come here and melt in. What is not really looked at is in the first place, is that this whole concept of American Culture, quote, really stems from the Anglo Saxon-type of culture, so that the Jew or the German doesn't make as much of an adjustment to fit in.

The other thing that enters in is that anyone who is dissatisfied with their community tends to leave that community. In other words, the rationale is any other place must be better than this damned place so they come here psyched up to make a change. To melt in.

The other thing, the way I look at it, the third thing is that it's all right for her to say this, that they could come here and adjust to the American way of life, the Irishmen come here, becoming American. But the thing, what she doesn't

really see in depth, is that once we assimilate, the Indians assimilate, our culture is gone for good. The Jew or the Irishman can always go back to his country, and you know, it's there. Ours is gone.

THE MODERATOR: And also you didn't make the choice to leave it because the United States assimilated you.

MR. WHITMAN: We didn't leave America. We're quite satisfied with our ways, this is why we stay.

MR. VEEDER: Sir, do the Indians compare to any other minority?

MR. WHITMAN: No.

MR. VEEDER: Nor should they be compared to any other minorities.

THE MODERATOR: Let's hear from some other people today, please.

MR. WHITMAN: There's one other thing I want to mention. I heard her say something about economics. I heard Martin here say something about profit. Really, this economics is all hands of scholars that try to explain this whole concept of economics as a discipline in terms of consumer, producer, the market, price, being determined by supply of demand and the law of useful unit and maximum demand and on and on, but really, when you start ripping off all that jargon, really at the bottom of economics is profit.

Anything that shows a profit is economic. And this

is what he's saying. Now, we -- we're talking about how do we change policy and I think the Indians have already taken a step to do that by -- by forming that council of energy resource tribes. We're saying this is our mineral resource, we got to have something to say, we don't like what you're doing. We want to share in some of that profit. To that extent we are assimilated.

MS. DAVIDSON: And that is also a mechanism for keeping your lands and your cultural traditions.

MR. DUNCAN: I'll make a specific suggestion and maybe talk about a specific measure and that's, I've kind of worn both hats, I've worn the industry hat and before that I was a member of the Indian affairs committee of the house interior committee and also served with an Oklahoma Congressman for a number of years, and got a chance to look at both from the viewpoint of the full committee at energy legislation growth from the viewpoint of the subcommittee at some Indian affairs concerns, of course they were by far, you know, they were specific concerns, not a broad spectrum.

But my suggestion from my experience would be, and it sounds simple but it's -- it really is simple, it's organize, know what your objectives are, and go to Washington. We're talking about boomtown legislation, does anyone know what the energy, energy impact assistance act is? That's probably the most influential piece of legislation that will

be up in the next session of congress, in terms of what we're talking about at this conference.

I would know that thing inside out, I would tear it apart, I would look at areas where I wanted to have an input, things that I thought would meet the objectives if I were a minority or if I were a woman or if I were a local community.

We talk about number. I've not worked for a congressman yet that wasn't scared as hell of numbers. And I think you can have an influence there. The interior committee has a number of eastern members of congress on it and I think you have had input there. I'm not saying you're home free with everything, we all know better than that. But I think inroads have been made in the last three or four years.

But Senator Hart, as you know, has led the fight to 1493 and before it was over he had something like 47 cosponsors in the senate. There's a specific thing a local community can look at, through meetings like this you can get together, you can discuss each other's problems, similarities, things you would like to look at in terms of that bill in the next session and the most important thing and this where you usually talk and then you end up going back to your community and you know, you split apart, and that is look at it and keep generating this communication and look at the objectives that you want in that bill that

meet your similar needs and go after them.

You can talk about corporate policy all you want and I know there are problems there, but the surface mining, we're influenced by the surface mining regulation, clean air, we're influenced by the clean air act, we didn't pass those, we worked on them but jees.

MR. BARBAROSSA: Yes, you did.

MR. DUNCAN: There's several things I would have changed in there had we, had we worked on them. But I think you're fooling yourselves if you think that local communities, minorities, women, by banding together can't have an influence in these committees and that is where the policy is set.

MR. BOGGS: You know, there's a crucial issue that really came out in the first session this morning, that I kind of thought we'd address and we've gone all the way around it. But there was a real difference apparent in the speakers there. There was some people felt like, you know, energy development in the west in the way it's being contemplated on massive scale was inevitable, and probably you're right and the thing to do is cash in on it, you know, so the question in terms of influencing policy and so forth was, well, how minorities and women cash in on it?

But there was another point of view which questioned whether or not, in fact, that kind of development on the

 scale and speed that's being contemplated, was necessary and desirable to begin with, and whether, you know, if you're really looking at the long term benefit of women and minoroties, whether or not there can really be substantial gains made if development does proceed along those lines.

And maybe the better route instead is the alternative energy route, conservation and stuff like that, there might be a lot more jobs, longer term benefit, you know, by going that way. And --

MR. DUNCAN: That's getting back to knowing what your energy projections are going to be.

MR. BOGGS: Yes. You know --

MR. DUNCAN: Have an input at that level.

MR. BOGGS: That is really astounding me more and more, this really isn't my area and I don't know too much about it, but the scale of the energy development being contemplated for this area, it is just incredible.

And you know, when you start talking about things like gasification, there was one Stanford research study that indicated that the entire coal basin could be used up in 40 years under a scenario they were thinking about. Generating plants every 27 miles or something like that. You know. In the northern plains area and this kind of thing.

Well, these are, I mean the scale of this thing is tremendous, and I think when we're talking about policy,

you know, we really ought to consider which one of these two routes we're going to go, whether we're going to go for the large scale massive development, which by the way is being pushed both by government and industry, that's another point, you know, there is a real unity here between government and industry to develop western coal.

Or whether we ought to be considering some of these other options.

MS. McNULTY: That's where I came from to the -- from the beginning is that we have a say right now in leasing policy, and I think that the Indian tribes, by organizing into the energy tribes, have done a fantastic job but you can't do it alone.

We've all, in this region, got to get together, as you said, and be one massive influence on congress and yet if we belong to organizations that have eastern chapters, midwestern chapters, we -- the conquer and divide is going to get us, you just have to get back to our numbers of 3%.

And I think we've all got to get into the act and say we don't want massive development, we're willing to take a certain amount, a reasonable amount of energy development and we want it to be stable so it doesn't overwhelm the region all at one time.

But we're not getting there the way we're doing it now.

MR. GONZALEZ: We're beginning to realize this in

7 8

Missouri River Basin, that if the Indian tribes and citizens of the states don't band together we're going to all lose.

MS. McNULTY: That's right.

MR. GONZALEZ: Because lot of the water that we have, like in the Missouri River, will be channeled, to Wyoming to be pushed on a coal slurry and as a result, we'll lose our water rights, the state's citizens would lose their water rights and everybody's going to lose.

MS. McNULTY: Water is another crucial factor and we've got to write water up there.

I was coordinator for a conference, we toured your Utah International Mine, we also toured the Navajo irrigation project. There's not enough water to keep your -- the Navajo irrigation project and coal gasification and somebody's got to make a decision, are you going to keep the irrigation project on the Navajo Reservation, which hires many Navajos, or aren't you?

And that is in essence a federal decision, sooner or later.

MR. TSOSIE: No coming back, he says that the resources are the federal government's or those put it back upon us. I'm just going through that, you were placing that back upon us by saying it was ours, as the people, well the Indian people lately have begun to say this is ours. When they begin to say this is ours, they began to -- begin to

influence policy in the true sense.

I think the citizens of states in this region need to think in terms of the resources being the citizens', ours. And in that fashion, I think that's when they will begin to truly affect the policies that are being made by corporations and also at Washington level.

MR. OSWALD: If I could make an observation? What I'm hearing tonight and I think I heard during most of the day, is that someone, a few minutes ago, made the observation about that they felt that private industry was being successful in avoiding their responsibilities because they were able to divide and therefore conquer.

And I think the reality is, and as pointed out in the federalism papers, that the nation is a nation of various interest groups, as we talk about developing policy, I think what we're seeing even in this room tonight is that there are a number of interest groups in here who have, who have very different interests, and as a matter of fact, we do not speak with one voice here.

I think that our government knows that, and one of the reasons the government is able to do what they do is because there's so many interest groups that they're able to make up their own mind or if you choose the squeaky wheel may get the grease, or in case, as has been said, lately, tribes getting together, they've been able to influence simply

because of the pressure they've been able to put on, but it seems to me that even if private industry wanted to do a good job in this area, and if they had their ear to the community, they wouldn't be hearing one voice, not even from women and

MR. BARBAROSSA: Nor should they.

minorities.

MR. OSWALD: They're going to be hearing lots and lots of different controversy and as was said in the first two speakers today, one was advocating that we go ahead and develop and move into boomtowns, developing because what we need is jobs for minorities and women and the next speaker said what we need to do is take a new look and try to avoid boomtowns because those things are bad for minorities. and women, and so the first two things we heard today were diametrically opposed.

MR. BARBAROSSA: Was that a minority saying that or was that a woman saying that? Things I keep hearing here are being said by White males. Wait a minute, some of the things in the areas of policy, okay? We're not all going to speak with one voice but I said earlier, we do have common goals. We do have --

MS. McNULTY: Have to find that commonality.

MR. BARBAROSSA: -- now we keep talking about the private sector and the private sector, I asserted earlier, there's a gentleman here from the government, department of

energy, I haven't heard any view or any comment about how 1 they feel, the department of energy ostensibly under the 2 president's magnificent bill is going to readdress the whole 3 question of energy. 4 He's listening. THE MODERATOR: 5 MS. McNULTY: He's federal regional counsel. 6 I haven't heard those common goals. MR. OSWALD: 7 MR. BARBAROSSA: Well --8 MR. TUTTLE: I'd like to take a shot at paraphrasing 9 those goals because it sounds to me what everybody's saying 10 here is that, what I'm here to learn is how do you exploit 11 all these natural resources equally with everybody else. 12 13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I want an equal piece of the exploitation. Seems to me that what we should be talking about is how do we not exploit, these natural resources or the people that are involved with these natural resources.

How do we set up a policy and how do we influence policy that is not going to be detrimental, for instance to existing communities because I know existing communities in Wyoming, for instance, where responsible industry people have knocked the hell out of Rock Springs. They've knocked the hell out of Gillette and they -- and you're sitting there saying well, communities residents have to learn to be responsible like we companies are.

You haven't been responsible and the government's not

responsible either. And the responsible avenue you're taking is yes, let's exploit, but let's exploit equally. Well, why do we have to exploit? Why isn't there a balance and why can't we, when we make our policy decisions, realize that the, for one thing the people existing in the communities in the west have first say over who gets exploited and who doesn't get exploited, the people on the reservations, it would seem to me, who own a lot of these minerals that are going to be exploited, have the right to first of all profit if that's what they want to do, or not have those things exploited.

And that's what I think we should be addressing, is how do we create a situation so the community people can make reasonable decisions based on their perspective of what's reasonable. And combat this mass exploitation they hear all you people saying I want to participate in.

MR. BOGGS: You know, beyond that, I was kind of interested in Tess in you saying that that Hughes case had been resolved because that was an EIS, as I understand it to address federal leasing policy, and there should have been — there should be a comment period, you know, before —

MS. McNULTY: Both sides have basically agreed that once the EIS is done, that then the leasing program will go on and I've already got the alternatives for leasing, low, high and medium, and the medium is scarey enough.

MR. BOGGS: Well, the thing that I kind of wonder about on something like that, you know, like the policy comes out from Washington, energy independence, we're going to exploit the coal, that seems to be a given, and I think you know what you're saying is absolutely correct, that to a large extent, a lot of what's being said here is being said in the context of that as a given.

MS. McNULTY: But it doesn't have to be as big a given, that's how we can influence it.

MR. BOGGS: It doesn't have to be and I'd like some questions to be raised like this maybe, kind of off the wall, I don't know, but one thing that gets me about these studies, for instance again gasification, it's not actual now, it takes absolutely immense amounts of capital to get one of these damned gasification plants going.

MS. McNULTY: And water.

MR. BOGGS: And water and everything else. Okay, if you're talking about a gasification scenario like in this Stanford Research Institute study I mentioned, that would use all the coal in the Fort Union Basin in something like 40 years, the supply liquid fuel to keep on running our cars and everything else we're used to, what the hell's going to happen to the country after that? You know. After we've poured our capital down the tube, in these extremely capital intensive, highly centralized technologies, what's

going to happen after that? Well, now these, it seems to me, are the kinds of fundamental policy questions that ought to be addressed. Yes, that ought to be addressed in something like this EIS.

MR. TSOSIE: When the only thing it's going to happen anyway.

MR. BOGGS: You're doing that at the expense of making an actual sacrifice area out of, you know, the west, and that includes the tribes, the ranching communities, everything else that's out here.

MS. McNULTY: When Vice President Rockefeller was out here a few years ago, I went to a session and I'm always sorry that what tribe stood up or who the representative was, but he turned around and looked at all of us and said, now you all know how we felt when we saw the White man coming over the hill. And we all are in this together. And I think what we have to do is determine the policy that we get a reasonable level of energy development without being totally sacrificed, how minorities and women can profit from that reasonable level, and how, I think you have to influence federal policy first, the federal energy policy first.

Then get the states and the feds and the locals together and then work to make your community.

MS. BRERTON: I think your process is just backwards.

MS. McNULTY: The reason it's backwards, usually I say

go the other way, but you can't when the federal decisions, they're going to be made because they are federal lands and the whole policy is theirs. So I think you have to --

MS. BRERTON: But I work with a lot of federal legislation and I worked for a year and a half on gas regulation. And I spent 25% of my time and I lost, I lost big, I lost 25% of a year and a half of my time because I focused on the wrong point. And I'm willing to say let's back up and let's not put all our eggs in one basket.

MS. McNULTY: Oh, no, there should be local -MS. BRERTON: But I think you know the thing that
we're missing is the way to involve real people in that
process and we don't do that. And we always talk about
doing it, but when push comes to shove we lose, and it's
because we don't look at how to involve real people in that
process.

By the people who are here, I mean I think we had probably maybe one or two real nonemployee types here at this, this conference.

MR. BARBAROSSA: What do you mean by that?

THE MODERATOR: I'm not employed. I work full time but I don't get paid.

MS. BRERTON: No, I mean if we're listening to real people, we're listening to like people who are being affected firsthand, and it seems to me that we just -- we need to

change that process.

MR. BARBAROSS

MR. BARBAROSSA: I know what you're saying, everyone's doing it from a vested interest.

MS. BRERTON: Right, we'll go home from this conference and I don't think we'll have a hell of a lot of solution to anything.

MR. TSOSIE: I don't know, I think I'm real people.

MS. BRERTON: You know what I meant, I'm still alive and breathing too, but unless I can figure out ways to involve community people in effectively making their own decision, --

MR. BARBAROSSA: Aren't we community people?

MS. BRERTON: I don't know, I don't think we are. No.

MR. TSOSIE: When you're saying that, you're just pushing that responsibility off on somebody else, I think we have to deal with it.

MR. LEDFORD: I deal with people, being a union representative I deal with people, I hear their complaints. I see their problems. When they, especially women and minorities and they're trying to get employment in the mines. I would like to know what the civil rights commission or whatever agency would have control over this, what they can do to correct the situations that exist now. So that the people can work in these mines that are already in existence. Is there anyone here that can answer those questions?

And I'll tell you, I have quite a few Indians come into my office in Sheridan, I have an awful lot of women that are seeking employment. The only way that the 23 out of 500 people got the jobs in the Decker Mine, for instance, was for five women to file charges against the company with the equal opportunity agencies. If it hadn't been for that, it hadn't been for some pressure being put on the companies, I doubt if there'd be over one or two women working in the mines right now.

I would like to know what can be done to insure that the people that the minorities and the women can seek employment and be assured that they can have that employment.

MR. DUNCAN: Well, I'm from the Colorado Civil Rights Commission, and I think, well, what's -- that helps us get to a point that I wanted to make anyhow, utilization of current policy that we do already have, seeing that it really is implemented, and enforced in a way that really serves some of our needs. One of the things I was going to speak to was the housing and community development act which is another act that we should know inside out, but it won't really address mining necessarily.

I'd like to talk to you more about that, afterwards.

One thing we are creating at the Colorado Civil
Rights Commission is a new section on, it's going to be
called preventive services section, which will deal much more

contract compliance review in employment, and real enforcement of affirmative action that is already in existence.

Perhaps the mining industry gets some state contracts and you know we could really sort of go at it from that perspective because we do have the governor's executive order on affirmative action.

MR. LEDFORD: I would say that if they had the threat hanging over their head that if they would not live up to their affirmative action program as it was presented, and agreed on, that they stood the chance of, a very good chance of having those coal leases pulled.

MS. McNULTY: Amen.

MR. LEDFORD: I believe that you would find that these coal mines.

MR. TSOSIE: I always perceive these affirmative actions things to be just so much because there's no enforcement.

MS. BRERTON: You know, in a more humorous manner,

I was thinking today when you were talking about that that

if it weren't for the fact that that was located in Sheridan,

perhaps a more visible way to do that would have been to

take 100 women in there and to use the showers and the rest

room and I think that would have changed the policy damned

quick.

MR. LEDFORD: I'll tell you the only thing that

changed their policy was having public attention focused on the problem.

MS. BRERTON: Exactly.

MR. LEDFORD: The Kewitt Company, I'm not saying this, first of all I've been a supervisor for that company, I disagreed with how they -- with their policies, with the way that they tend to do things. I switched to the other side and it's usually the person that is in a union they offer him a good deal and he goes for the company.

It's just backwards with me. I could see that I didn't want any part of what they were doing and I wanted to go about, set out and make some changes. And the only way to do that was to get in there and represent the people.

I believe, I honestly believe that this is a company policy, rather than individuals working on their own. Because whenever you have a company that owns two mines, close together, and you have the same problem in both mines, it's got to be higher up than that local foreman. And I think that you have got to go after that coal lease, you have got — hold something over their heads that's going to make them want to do what's right.

Now, with the federal mine safety, with the NLRB, if they catch them doing something wrong, the process of correcting it is such a lengthy thing that it just drags on and on and on. And then, when it finally comes to a conclusion,

1 they get a slap on the wrist and away they go again.

MS. SUTTON: Aren't the new guidelines on EEO stated that they have made a commitment to shut companies down?

MR. LEDFORD: But the hearings, and the process of getting to these things, charges were filed in mid 1977, by five women against Decker Coal, Big Horn Coal, and I helped the women get the -- everything filled out even though they didn't belong to the union that I represent. They come in my office and they told me what the problem was, but it was they've had hearing after hearing, the company has submitted a plan, it's been rejected by the EEO, and send it back and say correct this, and it's been going on like that for a year.

MS. SUTTON: I have a feeling the newest guidelines

July 1st are going to bypass the process a little bit more

quickly and go to shutting people down, you might just look

into them, I haven't been able to get my hands on the thing.

MR. LEDFORD: Another problem is that -- I'm sorry.

MS. ISHIMATSU: I'd like to ask Mr. Ledford.

Chiz Ishimatsu, Uta Advisory. And what would you have done, I mean if a new company were coming in, at the onset, what sort of policies or what kind of methodology would have prevented this kind of inequity that's currently occurring, would you suggest?

MR. LEDFORD: Well, I can tell you what -- are you talking about what policies that I would suggest when they. were starting up?

MS. ISHIMATSU: Yes, I think for the -- we know the current things are existing and the problems that have occurred, but in the future, should a company, such as this mining, coal mining company, come, what would be the best vehicle or one of the ways to prevent the kinds of occurrences -- what kind of policy, company coming in making employment announcement, what are the kinds of processes that you -- would you see that might be utilized instead of the existing ones?

MR. LEDFORD: I think that what I heard this morning about jobs for Coloradans, where you hire your local people, this would solve part of your boomtown situation.

We have a lot of people in Sheridan, for instance, who, for -- since 1972, have been trying to get on at the mine. They're qualified. They have the -- they have some good qualified Indian people, we have some good qualified -- well, just about any nationality that you want to name up there right now. And the companies have gone outside the area to hire people.

I'd like to explain why and how this all happened.

Back in 1972 when Decker Coal was starting up, that they

now have up there, they were afraid of the United Mineworkers

coming in and getting into the mine. Now, United Mineworkers had a history of strikes and demanding high royalties and so forth, so the company went off on the, you would say a shopping spree to try and find a union that they could get along with. The one that didn't charge too much royalty, one that they could kind of dictate policy to and so forth.

And they apparently made some kind of an agreement or they -- they settled on Progressive Mineworkers. This was before I was in the Progressive Mineworkers, and I disagreed with the way everything come about. They couldn't take a chance on hiring any of the people from the Sheridan area because either they knew or were related to people that belonged to the United Mineworkers since there was a United Mineworkers mine there, so they brought in a whole bunch of people from different areas in order to control the vote.

So that they could control a union.

This is -- this is where I disagreed with them, that's where Iwent into the union and I probably fought as much of my international as I have with the company because I disagree with some of their policies, and they have wanted to fire me over some of my views and in backing women and minorities and it's like having a tiger by the tail, you don't know where to let go, but I would rather -- I would rather go down fighting for what I believe is right for the people, than to turn and go the way the company and some

other people want. So I -- in answer to your question, I think that first of all they should make sure that they have used up all the resources in that area as far as the labor market.

MS. ISHIMATSU: Would you like to see that policy maybe instituted on a local or a state level maybe as a policy?

MR. LEDFORD: I think to be effective it's going to have to be at least a state level where the state has some control over the leases.

MS. McNULTY: Or at the federal leasing level.

MR. GONZALEZ: I don't want to get off the subject but I'd like to address a question to the representative of energy.

MR. LORENSON: There isn't one here, by the way.

MR. GONZALEZ: Or general counsel for the department?

THE MODERATOR: He's next.

MR. GONZALEZ: Well, what I was wondering is seems like we've been talking about topics which affect individual interest groups, but there are some areas where we're all affected, like atomic energy development.

For example, President Carter proposed in his energy legislation that the United States would enrich all the uranium and sell it overseas and then we would buy back the used uranium and bury it here in the United States.

And that affects all of us, with that spent, used uranium is going to be buried, because it could have a disasterous effect on those communities, if it -- if it isn't contained properly.

For example, Dixie Lee Bell, the former head of the department of atomic energy commission.

MR. BARBAROSSA: Dixie Lee Rae(Phonetic).

MR. GONZALEZ: Dixie Lee Rae, I don't know where I got the Bell from. She's presently the Governor of the State of Washington, is advocating putting it in the middle of the State of Washington, and there's been adverse reaction to that. And I read a little piece in one of the newspapers the other day that they finally found a spot in New Mexico where they're going to start burying spent uranium.

MR. BARBAROSSA: No, no, we don't want it there.

MR. GONZALEZ: It was a little article in the paper, hidden in page 20.

MR. BARBAROSSA: Put it in Texas.

MR. GONZALEZ: But why this is so important is that if it isn't properly contained and leaks out, it could cause whole populations to die off from exposure to radiation.

So I look at the department of energy as one of the key departments that we're going to have to start influencing.

Do you have any suggestions as to how we could

influence the department policy?

MR. LORENSON: Yes, I do.

THE MODERATOR: Would you first state your name and claim to fame?

MS. McNULTY: Who you really are?

MR. LORENSON: Well, again I'm Burman Lorenson, and I'm in a dual role which I really didn't explain. I'm what's known as an intergovernmental personnel type, and I'm on loan from the governor's office in the State of Colorado to the federal regional council for the express purposes of attempting to mitigate impacts in six states. And the six states of the region.

There may be a lot of reasons why I got the opportunity to do that, but amongst other things I was one of those privileged few who had that power you're talking about or a portion of that decision making process.

I was a member of the governor's energy policy council in Colorado for a couple of years, and we discussed a lot of the things that were on the table that you talked about, we have a lot of the governor's cabinet, the department of natural resources, the department of health, various elements of our state government. And we talked about what was going on around us and we tried to figure out how we as a state could learn some kind of power against the federal agencies one way or another, and if any of you,

the ones who are in Colorado, probably are aware of Governor Lamm's comments about the federal government and a wanting of the decision making power.

One of the things we were very concerned is what one of our sister states was doing like California, there was a referendum up a couple years ago about the very thing you're talking about and they decided that, whether they ought to have atomic power, uranium plants and so forth. We saw various pictures of scenarios of, if that were the situation, what would it mean in terms of generating power plants, coal generating power plants and how many would there have to be and what would be the impact of the rest of the western states?

And we weren't too happy about the idea that California might not like those, uranium power plants, because of what it would do here.

MR. GONZALEZ: Are you stating that we could influence policy on a local level by influencing our state legislatures?

MR. LORENSON: Well, I'll get there in a minute.

We, as a state, hadn't figured out how to do it until we started making confrontations with the federal agencies. The keynote speaker today, Harris Sherman, went to the regional — the department of interior, BLM, started making inquiries, well, how do you make your decisions? It's back to the various parts that I've heard bits and pieces of,

5

one gentleman says you've got to know how to -- what to attack. And one of the basic elements of these type of decisions is, who's the big controller of land out here?

Who really? BLM. They make life and death decisions

over what happens in the states. We're concerned. So we figured out, well before we go working them over pretty good, maybe we'd better find out how they make their decisions and we were all busy being educated because, well, when I came I was a planner-type to the governor's staff. And I didn't know much about the federal government just to be flat honest about it.

I didn't even know what tools the state would have for that matter. And we sit there in the same quandry that you all find yourselves in, and all the outside decisions.

We finally decided what the key elements of the programs were, one was the federal mineral leasing policy, and we decided to take out after it. We decided how to get at those decision making processes. And one of the things that we decided, well, we know the federal government listens to the local people to some extent, if you get a congressman, and maybe it may be a strange thing to say but it's true, I saw one, I saw three companies close down in Craig, Colorado, when the county commissioners said now wait a minute, you guys aren't helping us, we're talking

industry, the way you ought to, we're getting problems here, we got water, sewer, it relates to housing. If you don't have water or sewer you can't have any housing.

The question came, well, how at that level do you get into the decision making process? They, the first thing they did was come for governmental help from Craig and they got the governor on the phone. And the governor sent me out there to find out what was going on. And it was part of my duty anyway.

Eventually he showed up out there. But then our -the state joint budget committee got involved, and what
happened there was that there was a tour of energy sites in
Colorado by a joint budget committee. The local people
said, look what they're doing to us.

One of the members of the joint budget committee and for the people in Colorado, it was Joe Shumaker, who was head of the joint budget committee then, started asking some nasty questions in return.

The local people says, look at that crummy mobile home park up there, haven't got any streets that are any good, doesn't have curb and gutter, and Shumaker says, who makes the regulations? And they said, well, we do. Well, who allowed it? Well, we did. And pretty soon he got the message that the local people had allowed themselves to get into the position they were in.

Now, that didn't negate the need for money, but that was the next step in the process. Some of the suggestions back were, you better go to industry since they're the ones bringing in these people and so forth, you know, there's something we can all do, but the first place you start out at setting down the rules is the local level.

So first thing they did was try to get industry to come to a meeting and that was collective industry, there were power plant, two coal -- four coal companies, approximately. And industry people didn't seem to, you know, they come and listen for a while and finally the county commissioners and the city fathers of Craig just says, we've got to do something, and the ones that had the local control was the county commissioners, and they -- they just told the company, we'll have a moratorium on you fellows until you come to the bargaining table with us.

That happened. And believe me, all the industrial representatives came. There was a period of two or three months where they were negotiating back and forth, they allowed the moratorium to lapse, and eventually came the state government's turn to be put on the red carpet.

And what occurred there was they called the governor again and says we've got some problems, governor, that we can't solve, we want you to come and listen.

So a bunch of us state types got on a plane, went out

there, and set down, and that was with the industrial representatives, the hospital director, the school district director, the mayor of the town, the various people, and there was a process going on, I'll identify the process when we get done but there's a process going on.

And so the governor says, well, what do you want?

What can we do? And they began to identify the -- what they could do.

The community was in the process of creating what they call the front end funding committee. They now more commonly call it in Colorado impact committees, one in Wyoming the -- called priority board, they all hold similar-type names but they do the same function.

Eventually it came down to putting some pressure on the companies. The local community identified about a half a dozen projects, and by the way, every one of those projects are completed now, because the local people began to organize themselves very clearly.

And it worked on the governor, it worked on industries and I can't -- I can't figure out why in the world it wouldn't work on the federal government.

One of the things that went in was that we said as state people that we were not going to be the only ones trying to respond. Everybody had something to bring to the negotiation table. And the people that came to that negotiation table had

1

4 5

67

8

10

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

19 20

2122

2324

25

to have some resources to apply to the solution. Industry at this point had said a lot of nice things but eventually it got down to one thing, state put in, I think a \$670,000.00 expanding one elementary school, the state legislature, Colorado State Legislature, in their wisdom, says can't use any architectural fees. Well, now that's one of those hangups.

But they says, we'll provide it for the expansion of the school. Then everybody cast about, well, how are we going to get that? How are we going to get the architectural fees and the design fees? And eventually it occurred to some people in general, including some of the local people, that maybe industry could help.

So the next thing that occurred was the governor says, you tell me who their upper management is, give me their phone numbers and I'll make a call.

And shortly after that, that call developed into, in the case of that one school, \$5,000.00 for architectural fees. It can happen. You can use the strength of your governor, and your people, if you're organized and you know what to ask for,

And that goes all the way down to the minority level within the community. We were not dealing with the particular segment that related to jobs, but we were dealing with identifying needs that the community felt like expressing.

And eventually came around to a more formalized mechanism to allow the people in decision making roles to know exactly what the local citizens wanted. And in Colorado, they have about 17 or 18 of these impact teams now.

If I hadn't been here I'd have been in Sidney,

Montana, where they are creating their first and part of the

process that goes into that is identifying your decision

makers in the community, somebody has something that can be,

or they can be a spokesman for a particular group, and it

can be the minorities, or whatever fashion it comes about.

I remember in Rifle, Colorado, they had two groups, not one so unusual but one that was, they had the youth represented in their community through an impact team. And everybody's got responsibility in an impact team, the first responsibility comes from industry.

They must let you know their best guess of what's going to happen in that community and when it's going to happen.

When the workers may arrive, how many, how long are they going to be there, without that type of information you're left in the dark and even if you make a decision it may be totally wrong. Then the next thing that occurs from there is that you provide that information to the community at large through community providers, who's providing the water service, who provides the police

protection, who provides the ambulance service, etcetera.

And from this type information, they try to make some determination of what their future needs are going to be, and you're trying to catch this in advance. If you catch it in the middle, you know, you're just scraping and running and going as fast as you can, the frustrations are great, however, if you do it too far in advance nobody takes it for real.

You've got to see the energy company begin to come down the road before it will work. If it gets too far in advance it's just a big game, pretty soon everybody tires of it and forgets it and throws it on the back shelf.

what's going to come and you do it at the community level,
after you determine what you think is going to come from
the best industry information that you have, you compare that
against what you have already and you begin to identify
gaps in your needs. Whether social workers or clients.

The next process is to begin to prioritize that list, when do you have to have it? And that's about the time you get everybody around the negotiation table, state has some funds, the federal government has a lot of programs that don't necessarily identify impact as their primary mission but they all have services of one kind or another.

So the idea between industry, local governments, state

government and federal government, is to sit around the table after you've identified your gaps and begin to prepare for when it's going to get in line and if that means jobs for women, maybe that better be a part of the process.

And you can get at that decision making, it's not impossible, I've seen a lot of communities do it. Where it hasn't been one and where the people will not take the trouble to do that type of thing, then the decisions are made by somebody else, somewhere else. And I think I've talked enough.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. That was very meaty.

One last speaker and then I would like to try to

sum up. You discussed --

MR. TUTTLE: I've got two things that I'd kind of like to say, number 1 is that historically what you find is that when resources are made available, for instance like this new coal lesiglation, impact legislation, that's coming into the area traditionally what you find is that the people who get the resources, the money that's made available through that impact legislation, are industries and government. And they're expected to form some kind of a coalition to develop policies for other people.

I'd like to make a recommendation possibly and a definite policy statement that we could make that instead of directing these resources to companies and government who

both have a vested interest in seeing how those policies are formed, that the resources be directed into grass roots community organizations, and backed up with the training for those grass roots community organizations to learn how to affect policy.

Instead of giving those resources to people who will determine what the policy will be based on how they view the community. So I don't know if that's very clear, maybe somebody else could clear it up.

MS. McNULTY: The coastal zone management act, for coastal zone planning had that sort of thing written into it, that there had to be citizens involvement and it was funded. In the planning process.

As I -- I saw Senator Hart's bill this year, it was Senator Haskell's bill, I don't believe that citizen participation element was written into it so strongly, so what you really want is a citizens participation element in the inland assistance act, similar to what was required in the coastal zone management act.

MR. TUTTLE: Well, just that the U.S. Civil Rights
Commission make out of this whole conversation that we've
had, I've heard both industry and everybody else say what
has to happen is communities have to organize, if that's
true they need resources, the one guy from Phillips Petroleum
said the Indians could walk into their congressman's office

and had an open door. Well, that open door may be 3,000 1 miles away and they don't have the resources to go down to 2 the grocery store. 3 Let's make the resources available so that we do have the opportunity to impact policy. 5 MR. BARBAROSSA: Isn't there a citizens participation 6 element in the department of energy through the community 7 relations. 8 MR. LORENSON: To a limited extent. There is an 9 assessment process that goes on in the Hart-Haskell bill. 10 MR. BARBAROSSA: Did that pass? 11 MR. LORENSON: And the assessment part includes local 12 government. But it doesn't necessarily specify that, what 13 goes into the local element. 14 MR. BARBAROSSA: Like EPA or --15 THE MODERATOR: Let me try to --16 MS. McNULTY: The coastal zone management --17 THE MODERATOR: I have heard a lot of resources 18 being mentioned tonight and I think there's a lot of things 19 that still need to be said and perhaps they can be said just 20 as well over a drink or coffee or on our feet at this point. 21 We have had two hours of sharing ideas in a larger 22 forum and let me try to summarize, in my own very simple way, 23 what I can without being an expert at all in energy. 24

First of all, the levels at which people can impact

25

on policy are, first level, the federal government in the leasing policies, energy policies and energy legislation, and through federal agencies and their activites.

Certainly at the state level through state policies and state agencies as they work with energy development.

At the county and local levels of government, through the land use policies, provisions of services, whether it's through a bond issue or through the local budget, and at the industrial level at the national board, the president, their lobbyists, at the district level if there is such a thing, or regional level and through the local manager and his vice president.

Tools to impact on these levels. Lobbying in the public interest, community education, so as to provide both numbers and a louder vocal sound, information, both prior and current, through open records, helping to provide information through the environmental impact statements, in public hearings, use the affirmative action policies, use organized public pressure to require compliance and review that, pressure on elected officials, and agency officials, personal contact with policy makers, lawsuits, is a tool.

Impact on local regulations, identification of policy makers and spotlighting their activites, money for impact mitigation is a tool, impact teams, cooperation and negotiation can be tools, that can be used, citizen

1 participation requirements and legislation in general. 2 Did I leave out anything major? 3 MR. WHITMAN: I think there's one thing I'd like to 4 I think people here need to be reminded, several years 5 ago in a gathering like this, the oil man, they're too 6 damned arrogant to come and sit and listen to a bunch of 7 citizens like this, I think it's significant that he's here. 8 Before they were invisible, they were in kind of a 9 laisez faire kind of an operation. 10 MS. McNULTY: But they left early. 11 THE MODERATOR: They had another meeting and they will 12 be back at 10:00 but I'll tell them they can find you. 13 MR. WHITMAN: But anyway, what I'd like to remind 14 you is I think the fact that he's here and they're now 15 very visible. 16 And participants. MR. BARBAROSSA: 17 MR. WHITMAN: Is that we have had some say in the 18 policy already, otherwise he wouldn't have come. 19 THE MODERATOR: That's right. 20 I'd like to thank you all for coming and please con-21 tinue the conversations on an individual basis or whatever, 22 but the meeting is officially closed. 23 24 (Consultation adjourned until 9:00 a.m. November 3, 25 1978)