2

3

4

5

UNITED STATES COMMISSION

ON CIVIL RIGHTS

States Commission on Civil Rights in the Rocky Mountain Region met on Thursday, November 2, 1978, at the Stapleton

topic: OUR FUTURE: WHAT DO WE WANT?

Plaza Hotel, 3333 Quebec, Denver, Colorado, to discuss the

THE STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE to the United

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

PANEL MEMBERS:

Art Raymond

15

Bill Muldrow Allyn Lockner

Ann Charter

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CCR 3 Meet. 154.1

ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL OFFICE EXECUTIVE TOWER—SUITE 1700 1405 CURTIS STREET DENVER, COLORADO 80202 TELEPHONE: (303) 837-2211

January 17, 1979

Ms. Adrienne Pollard Whitlow 729 American National Bank Building Denver, Colorado 80202

Dear Ms. Pollard:

Our office has reviewed your transcript of the informal discussion group entitled "Our Future: What Do We Want?" We appreciate the work you did in transcribing that meeting. For the purpose of clarity, I have made the following corrections:

Cover page: "The State Advisory Committees" "Panel participants (add):

Maggie Aro
Alberta Henry
Chiz Ishimatsu
Dwayne Ostenson
Harriett Skye
Ms. Etcitty"

```
"Mr. Cose" -
Page 3, line 7
                    "Mr. Cose" -
Page 5, line 8
                    "Hill Witt"
        line 25
Page 8, line 9
                    "Coss and Watson"
                    "Rock Springs"
        line 14
                    "Cose", "Kahn"
Page 9, line 8
                    "Alberta (not Elanor)"
        line 11
                    "century"
Page 17, line 3
                    "Fort Yates"
Page 30, 1ine 16
Page 33, lines 22
                    "Murdo (not Burdock), S.D."
           & 24
                    "particularly"
Page 35, 1ine 3
                    "minority descent"
Page 44, 1ine 21
                    "cast (not cost)"
Page 47, 1ine 22
```

Thank you again for your transcript.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LEVIS

Regional Attorney

**ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL OFFICE EXECUTIVE TOWER-SUITE 1700** 1405 CURTIS STREET DENVER, COLORADO 80202 TELEPHONE: (303) 837-2211

December 8, 1978

Ms. Adrienne Whitlow 729 American National Bank Building 818 17th Street Denver, Colorado 80202

Dear Ms. Whitlow:

On November 2, 1978, you transcribed a meeting of the Rocky Mountain Regional Advisory Committees to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Although you agreed to submit a transcript within 10 working days of that meeting, we have not received it as of this date. Our office needs the document to write a report of the proceedings.

Please submit the transcript no later than December 15. If Court deporter

512 0570

Colled 12/18 12/19 to un you have any questions, please call William F. Muldrow, Deputy Director of our office.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LEVIS Regional Attorney

cc: Mabel Webber Purchasing

WL:elj

Bcc: WFM

## PROCEEDINGS

-12

MR. RAYMOND: Art Raymond from the State

Advisory Committee of North Dakota. The other person sharing
the duties of being moderator for this group is Bill Muldrow
of the regional staff here in Denver. We have two resource
people here with us this evening. We have Ann Charter with
the Northern Plains Resource Council and Allyn Lockner of
the South Dakota EPA. Ann is on my left and Allyn is sitting
over there in that chair.

Adrienne Whitlow is recording these meetings here this evening.

To start this off, however, I would like to ask Ann and Allyn to make a few brief remarks of where you stand, keeping in mind that tonight's session is "Our Future: What Do We Want?"

I don't know from where you come, I have no idea what you want to say, but, we're all here to talk.

These people have been wanting to talk now for two days and they haven't had a chance. Now, Ann, since you are closest to me, would you like to start?

MS. CHARTER: Okay. I'll start out by saying if the purpose of this conference has been to stir people up, it's done it, as far as I'm concerned. Because what I have seen so far, that the context has been in yesterday's thinking and not thinking for the future, and after attending the

session today I tore up all the notes that I had carefully prepared, and I'm going to start over. I made a few more, but mostly what I can tell you if you want to hear. Because I think we've all been talked at enough and this is the chance for everybody to talk and I don't think you want me to tell you what you want your future to be any more than I appreciated Mr. Coast and Mr. Watson telling me that my future was locked up in more and more fossil fuel energy development.

So I'll briefly try to tell you what I can tell you and if you're interested then you can answer me.

I can tell you that our future is now and that we can shape it. I don't believe in the great Americay myth that escalating energy production and use produces prosperity and jobs. But just the opposite, that more production creates more use which creates automation which eliminates jobs and creates the chaos we've been trying to find solutions for today. Now I can tell you something about overcoming apathy, and I can give you an alternative to boom towns if you're interested.

My background is I'm a rancher and the things that I can tell you come from firsthand grassroots experience of dealing with industry and government. My husband, who died this summer, but not before he had done his work and done it well, and not before he had become a legend and I were instrumental in starting the Bowmana Mountain Land Owners

Organization which was the first area group to fight strip 1 mining on ranch land, and we later helped form the Northern 2 Plains Resource Council which is an umbrella group for many 3 area groups such as the Bow Mountain Land Owners scattered 4 all over eastern Montana. And just to let you know how we 5 have to operate, we have a board of directors representing all 6 these groups. We meet once a month and form policy, we have 7 a very efficient staff that help us do research and carry out 8 the policy, and most of us have to drive at least 200 miles 9 to get there. 10

I can tell you that because we are highly motivated, highly dedicated and fighting mad and do our homework, that we've become one of the most effective and respected citizen's groups. We not only fight "progress and unrestrained fossil fuel energy development," but we believe that there are viable alternatives that can be put into operation now and we're fighting equally as hard for them.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(

I can tell you why we're fighting to prevent their building coal strip 3 and 4, and the reasons that it shouldn't be built and use it as a classic example of why we should not need any fossil fuel power plant in our future.

Now, my information has been based on my research material, has been "Amory Lovins' Energy Strategy:
The Road Not Taken?" and his book "Soft Energy Paths:
Towards a Durable Peace" and this pamphlet, "Jobs and Energy

by Environmentalists for Full Development," and if there isn't time, I've got a whole list of facts and statistics here. If you ask the right questions and I could find the right card, I could answer them, but the alternatives to that would be for everybody to make this a must in reading and in passing around. It has the address here where you can send for it, only costs two dollars. To me it's one of the most important documents that is written. Mr. Coast said that he didn't find the theory in it substantial but, I think that can be challenged, and so I'll let it go at that, and if any of this interests you, then I'll try to go into further detail.

MR. RAYMOND: Ann, would you like to read off the address?

MS. CHARTER: Okay.

Guide to Jobs and Energy, Environmentalists for Full Development, Room 300, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, Northwest; Washington, D.C., 20036. \$2.00.

MR. RAYMOND: Thank you very much.

Allyn Lockner is from my home state of South

Dakota. I did not know Allyn there, of course, but he hails

from Pierre and works for the Environmental Protection Agency.

Is that right? So, Allyn, you're on.

MR. LOCKNER: Thank you very much, Art.

A few months ago Bill Muldrow and Dr. Shirley

Hillwitz stopped in the office here of the Environmental

Protection Agency here and began talking about the impacts of energy development upon communities in South Dakota, but more specifically, minorities and women, and particularly senior citizens, Indian citizens, low-income people, et cetera.

Then the short conversation grew into a much longer conversation, and I was asked at that time might I be interested in having a meeting of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission on this topic and I said sure, and about a week or so ago or ten days ago I received a phone call asking me to attend this meeting.

What I would like to do if you would like for

What I would like to do, if you would like for me to do it, is to build on what has transpired today in the morning and afternoon sessions, and I'm prepared to share with you the concept that I have about the life cycle of energy, or more specifically resource development facilities, and it goes beyond what I understand are some of the ideas that other speakers had today in our morning and afternoon sessions.

Secondly; I would like to share with you another concept, namely that of the decision-making brain work that we find ourselves in with respect to energy development. I think that these two concepts will allow us to get a better handle on the topic we have before us this evening: namely, "Our Future: What Do We Want?"

Then I would like to share with you what I believe to be some of the choices that we have before us without, at the same time, telling you what those futures

should be, but to point out to you the things that we must have in mind or be aware of if we are to make intelligent decisions to achieve the kinds of futures that each one of us might want to have realized.

Then fourthly, if you're interested, I would be in a position to share with you some of the concerns that we in South Dakota have, specifically with respect to energy development, and what we in the state are trying to do to steer that development in a direction and at a pace that is more acceptable to the people of South Dakota, both Indian and non-Indian alike.

I am prepared to speak and discuss with you and answer questions on any of those four general topic areas.

MR. RAYMOND: Thank you, Allyn.

We will now open this up to your comments, your remarks, anything you may want to say, anything that you've been holding within you all day long waiting for the time that you can say it, and now is the time.

As the moderator, I'm not supposed to say very much, but there are some things that I want to say too, but I'm going to wait awhile.

MS. ARO: I really want to hear what both of them have outlined.

MR. RAYMOND: You do?

MS. ARO: Maggie Aro, Colorado SAC Chairman:

Adrienne Pollard Whitlow
Certified Shorthand Reporter
729 American National Bank Building
Denver Colorado 80202 (303) 572-0570

I can't wait to hear what you have to say as to some alternative to the grim, bleak, awful projections that were proffered this morning and this afternoon.

MR. RAYMOND: Alberta?

MS. HENRY: Before I hear them, I have to say what I have to say. Alberta Henry, Utah SAC.

I'm disappointed, very disappointed and I wanted to say to Ann that I was sorry that she was not moved by Mr. Goast and Watkins in Allyn's presentation, because they were right on target, but I guess it's very hard to see unless you've walked in their shoes, because they were talking about we as minorities and the impact of the -- that energy has made an impact for us and it hasn't been.

A case in point was Rock, wyoming, the man that made that one. All I asked was a simple question about Americans there and all the pictures he showed, there were not any of them present, and he told us nothing about the impact on them. So, I was glad to listen to Allyn because he's willing to tell us about -- in his presentation, he said about everyone, Native Americans and people, and I think he may have some information on what we want. If you notice, our subject says this consultation is on resource development in the Intermountain West, but let's not stop there. It adds something more. It says it's impact on women and minorities. And so since even, what was her name now -- Elma, when they

Adrienne Pollard Whitlow
Certified Shorthand Reporter
729 American National Bank Building
Denver Colorado 80202 (303) 572-0570

1 made the study up in Colorado here and she started off by 2. saying there was no minorities, you know, so where does she 3 get her facts from? But she says also that, you know, from what other women that she has made the studies on, that it 4 must have been doubly bad for minorities. 5 We want to know what do you mean doubly bad? 6 7 We want to know what kind of impace, good, bad or negative, so I kind of say Mr. Coast and Mr. Watson and Cane are 8 speaking because we know where we're at here and we know the 9 impace that it's having on us or the lack of impact. 10 MR. RAYMOND: Thank you, Elanor. 11 MS. HENRY: And I'd really like to talk about 12 that. 13 MR. RAYMOND: And I, may I speak? I really 14 have a personal wish that we could get beyond hashing over 15 what has been tonight. 16 MS. CHARTER: I don't think we can, though. 17 MR. RAYMOND: And stick to our subject, "Our 18 What Do We Want?" Future: 19 Now if what Alberta is saying is what do we 20 want is based upon how we get there, then her remarks are very 21 apropos. But I don't want to sit here arguing tonight about 22 what happened to the Indians in South Dakota and North Dakota. 23 I could tell you about the battle of Fremont's Orchards here 24 in 1868 right here in Denver and the terrible things which 25

Adrienne Pollard Whitlow
Certified Shorthand Reporter
729 American National Bank Building
Deput Coloredo 80202 (303) 572-0570

were done, but what's the point, is what I'm saying. We're talking about the future.

MS. HENRY: Before you speak, I'm going to

MS. HENRY: Before you speak, I'm going to leave here, because I thought you asked me here to express what I needed to express; but if I've got a guideline and can't express that, then I can go find a committee that will allow me to be myself here, Alberta Henry speaking. And as the moderator, I thought you were saying "Our Future." We know we're going to discuss it. But if I can discuss it and what has been and what is still and hasn't changed. That's part of my future.

MR. RAYMOND: Whatever you wish.

MS. CHARTER: I'd like to talk about that.

MS. ISHIMATSU: Chiz Ishimatsu, I'm Utah SAC committee member.

I think the whole impact of this, at the discussion stage, was to say that energy producing or mining industry has had an adverse impact for minorities and women both in employment and sociologically and psychologically. That was at the outset. To find those kinds of problems our history concerns the present time. Now, our concern was to take it from there and to make suggestions that if you are going to have, and whether it be a fossil fuel, whether it be a uranium kind of process, I don't think is as much the issue as there will be some kind of impact of industry upon a

Adrienne Pollard Whitlow
Certified Shorthand Reporter
729 American National Bank Building
Denver Colorado 80202 (303) 572-0570

1 c 2 a 3 w 4 a 5 w 6 a 7 T 8 h 9 w 10 c 9

community whether or not the community is ready to receive it, and I thought the whole impact here was to talk about what went over, maybe to talk about what went wrong, and to talk about the future kinds of impact. Maybe the recommendations we can make what direction we could possibly move to take away that kind of adverse impact on minorities and women. That's where I was coming out. That's what I expected to hear and not the kind of criticism -- I think you hear a whole lot of things that went wrong. From there surely we can take some recommendations, some kind of proposals and say what can a new town do if it, in fact, has to exist, and a lot of that is a projection.

MR. RAYMOND: Yes. Go ahead.

MS. CHARTER: Okay. Because this is the whole point, and I don't think I'm being understood, because my question fell absolutely flat when I said do we have to have boom towns. I'm not against solving the problems, but I see the problems as one that have existed for years, and I see that if we go on the same way we've been going with this big energy development, that we are not going to solve the problems, and the reason we're not going to solve them is because when the whole concept of the future is based on creating more energy, it's what I call the great American myth of more energy for prosperity and jobs. That is a completely false assumption and it's thrown us into this present

state of chaos and everybody, as far as I'm concerned here, has been completely brainwashed by the combined energy government of line that has been going out for years. Our way is the only way, there are no alternatives.

Now, if you want me to, I can just give you a little example of the alternatives and how we can do it so that minorities can start from scratch on an equal basis, not as a minority group that is trying to crash the establishment, but that are starting on a equal footing, and one really good example of that is the Cheyenne Indians cooperation with us working together to present coal strip 3 and 4 and they came out with a brilliant idea or the honest desire to have class one air on their reservation, and that's what's holding coal strip up right now. All the legal things and everything else, you can't do anything because the judges, the whole court system and everything else, our whole economy, our whole country is geared to energy.

MS. ISHIMATSU: I find it very difficult to understand you because you're saying the basic assumption that we're working on is that there will be some kind of energy required and that energy is it's not the conventional type that we're now doing, that we would have to rely on some of our natural resources here in the United States. Mainly, in the western states. That, I think, is an underlying process we're saying. We're not taking on the issue, I don't

Adrienne Pollard Whitlow
Certified Shorthand Reporter
729 American National Bank Building
Decree Calculate 80202 (202) 572 0570

Ä

think, of whether or not we can go on an accelerated program to use energy. We're saying there has to be some replacement of the current energies that may have to be done other than the petroleum products, and from that I think is our concept that it's the western states primarily that have a natural resource, whether it be in the conventional fossil fuels or be in the shale-type or it can be in other types of forms, and so you're saying they can't be using -- maybe the alternative is if we are using coal as a conventional means, maybe the processing is a problem, and I hear you saying that, but to deny the fact that we will have to use some form of energy, okay.

MS. CHARTER: Okay. Can I address that?

MS. ISHIMATSU: All right,

MR. CHARTER: Maybe I can give you an example of what would happen if three coal strips -- do you all know what coal strip 3 and 4 is? Maybe not. The coal strip in Montana was strip mined many years back but on a small scale so it didn't make a big impact and it's the first place that industry got its foothold in Montana and we opposed the first two power plants from the beginning, but a federal judge ruled that construction had been begun because they'd poured cement, that they'd poured it before they got permission, but anyhow, it was one of those doubtful decisions but they were built. They were built mostly to provide energy for Montana.

The question right now is whether they're going to build two more plants, but at the time when one and two were planned, there were government and industry projections in volumes like this that weren't supposed to be seen by the public until we unearthed them and made them best sellers.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Showing what the industrial development in eastern Montana was to be, they had plans that would have turned it into the biggest industrial site in the world and they had these brilliant complicated aquaduct exchanges of what they were going to do. Take all the water and put it into the plants and to heck with agriculture. Okay. We saw what that would mean to Montana and to the agricultural and the whole bit, and it disturbed us, and our first fight was to save our agricultural base, but we knew that in fighting that, and they told us we were fighting progress, that we were unpatriotic, that everybody would press to death in the dark if they went our way. We knew we couldn't just be negative, that there had to be a solution. So, right from the very beginning one of our -- well, it started in our office and then became an affiliate organization, and I'd like to pass these around and have everyone have one to take home and read. We decided that there had to be another way to go and we started just doing grassroots of work on alternative energy. Well, since that we have become a great deal more sophisticated and we talk a great deal about net energy, how

1

much you get out at the end, how much fuel you put into the beginning. Well, now on a pretty cold audience, it's kind of hard to know where to begin, but maybe it would be best if I just keep to this coal strip 3 and 4.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

These two plants would supply 700 megawatts of electricity and it would cost 1.4 billion dollars to build them on a cost-plus basis and the plus is 12 percent built-in profit and four percent retirement of debt, I guess, and that 12 and four percent goes to our electric rates in Montana. Actually, the electricity for three and four goes out of the state, although that really isn't pertinent. Okay. What does It would create 4,000 temporary jobs for about one year, 1,000 jobs for several years, 90 permanent jobs in maintaining the plants, and as I've pointed out earlier today, the five major energy companies provide five and a half percent of the total jobs in this country. Okay. What would happen if they weren't built? One and four-tenths billion dollars worth of capital would be freed to use elsewhere. Take, for example, what could be done with it. For one-sixth of that amount you could put it into retrofitting housing, which means making old existing buildings more insulated so they don't lose the energy, better use of energy, use of heat pumps to put hot air from the hot side of the building over to the cold. The technology is there. The architecture is there. It's available for us. It could be used in the energy

companies, the industries using coal generation, which means using the escaped steam or heat, cycling it back and using it for their own energy and they, industry, could provide half of their own energy by doing this. All of these things, and especially retrofitting, would produce probably twice as many jobs and they would be permanent jobs. They would mostly be local jobs, they wouldn't be as highly skilled and as highly specialized as the jobs for these mammoth industries. So, you would be creating jobs but you'd be creating them where you need them.

Now, let me give you just one thought that came to me and maybe illustrates this.

What could we have instead of a boom town?

At some point I read about a government project, I think it was, where they went into a slum neighborhood. They used the neighborhood people to remodel their own houses. They had job training programs in training them in all these different skills. So, what they accomplished was they created skills, they improved their standard of living and they could live on a higher level because they could get jobs.

Well, now if you think of the money the government spends subsidizing the oil and gas industry or you just think of taking some of this freed capital for not building the power plants and put it into retrofitting, every building in this country we could save enough energy, and that's all

the statistics have been worked out and are here. So we would have zero energy growth by this fabulous, you know, turn of the centry, 2000.

Now, everybody said okay, then that means you're going to reduce your standard of living. Well, just one thing that kind of illustrates that, I don't know how well it would stand, but we use twice as much energy today as we did ten years ago. So, if we reduce, does that mean that ten years ago our standard of living was half of what it is now? That's just one way of looking at it. Another illustration of this is that the United States uses at least a third of all the world's energy. Countries like Sweden, Switzerland and West Germany who use just a fraction of the energy that we use have a high or higher standard of living. So, this is another one of the big American myths, that the amount of energy you use makes your standard of living.

Let me just make one more point, and that is, that if we went on the projection and all these projections of the energy that we're going to need and so we need this strip mining and the fossil fuel is based on this idea that our energy needs will double every year, and the reason they'll double every year -- I mean that's purely a company thing that that's the way the company had made their profits in the past, and in order to keep in making profits, that's what they have to do. But if we went on this projection to

the year 2000, the energy that would be wasted would be the same amount that we used in 1971 and the waste comes from when you turn coal into electricity you lose two-thirds of the BTU's that were in that coal and when you transport it over transmission lines, you lose another ten percent, and this is going into making electricity, and when an analysis has been made of our energy needs, only seven percent of the energy needs to be produced by electricity.

MS. ISHIMATSU: Could I interrupt at this point? I'm Chiz Ishimatsu: I didn't think the issue of this conference was on the use of energy or the kinds of energy. We're talking about, I thought, of those energy-producing industries or mineral industries currently in operation with maybe the projection that these are going to be long-term processes. I don't think that we're here to talk about the energy or the substitute for energies.

MS. CHARTER: Well, aren't you concerned with minorities and their getting jobs? Aren't you concerned about problems? Is that beside the point?

MS. ISHIMATSU: Could I finish my point? I've talked about alternatives to the current conventional energy and the usage of energy and I didn't think the focus of this conference was on that. The other one is not the creation of jobs per jobs' sake, but the fact that there are not minoirities and women currently in mineral or the energy-

Adrienne Pollard Whitlow
Certified Shorthand Reporter
729 American National Bank Building
Danier Coloreda, 80202 (303) 572-0570

producing areas and also, we are talking about those kinds of industries as they currently are now operating with the projections whatever industries are doing, should they come in, is there any way we can prevent the kinds of things that occurred before? And I don't think any, at least I'm not prepared to argue on the usage of energy, how you can decrease or increase that or jobs as jobs' sake for employment of minorities, but the fact is the current industry energyproducing areas and the mineral industry do not employ minorities or women in any significant numbers in any kinds of career-producing areas, and I think -- I thought our projection was to talk about those kinds of things and what has been done in the past, is there any way remediating? What it takes to go on that kind of process. I'm not going to sit here and argue with you how many per tons of cubic feet of coal is being wasted or that process, okay?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CHARTER: Okay. Then I really haven't any input to this group, because my point, I mean the way I see it, is that that is such a short-sighted approach, that it's not going to accomplish anything. You aren't going to help your minorities, you aren't going to help your women as long as you are set and concrete in the way things have been going in the past, because whenever there's a shortage, who comes out the small end? It came out today. The women and the minorities, right?

Adrienne Pollard Whitlow Certified Shorthand Reporter 729 American National Bank Building Denver. Colorado 80202 (303) 572-0570

2

3

4

5

0

7

9

10

12

14

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ISHIMATSU: I just want to ask one more question. Taking the alternative of energy-producing methods, and you're talking about -- how would you do that and have a viable impact on employment? Maybe those are the kinds of things you need to talk about.

MS. CHARTER: All right. Then, very simply, if you go into a program instead of encouraging using our non-renewable resources, that we go to saving waste. Now, the worst way I can spend a job dollar is to put it into the fossil fuel energy. The most you can get for your job dollar is to put it into conservation of energy and waste and that is where the United States fall so below the rest of the world. I mean, we think we're the great leaders and tell everybody else how to live. Every other country you look at has already gone way ahead of us in actual solar heating and so on, but a whole new concept is coming out and they were talking about the solar heating that was such a big flop, you The ones creating the panels and everything else. Well, solar heating has to come up to the same standards as fossil fuel in net energy avoiding waste. It has to show where it's efficient, and that has led people into the energy conservation, which, through conservation, you create megawatts of electricity and so you don't have to build the power plants and the jobs are local jobs for minorities groups in their own neighborhoods. If we did this in our neighborhoods.

Now, did I give you the example? Yes.

2

MR. OSTENSON: Point of fact, if I may.

I don't believe during today's discussion that

Because of the subsidy of the

3

Dwayne Ostenson, United Tribe, Bismarck, North Dakota.

4

5 they had indicated that it was a total flop, if I may, as far

MS. CHARTER:

6

as solar energy. I think the area which they alluded to was

7

the fact that at this particular point in time it is not

8

economically feasible to get into the solar energy aspect because of the enormous cost until it has to be at a greater

fossil fuel energy. If they were on an equal basis with the

government, they'd be -- not only could compete, but they'd

be ahead of it and cheaper, and that's what I can't under-

stand. I can't understand a group of this, with their con-

cerns in people, not being better informed. And to hear the

same old company lines over and over, it's just terrifying to

10

point.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

me.

19

MR. RAYMOND: Bill.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MULDROW: There were several issues here that I think we're getting kind of confused. For one thing, some of the points that were brought out today concern what we might call conventional energy technology, production of fossil fuel, production of electricity from coal, transporting it while paralyzed and whatnot, and much of the

discussion today centered around the allegations or facts, I think we could say they are, that minorities and women have been left out of the jobs available in the sector of the job market. They are left out.

MS. CHARTER: Okay. Why?

MR. MULDROW: I don't know all the reasons why. I think the reasons why are complex, but they have been left out and it seems quite evident that for some time to come that this is going to continue in this area regardless of what alternative technology -- so, that remains a problem and that's the problem that Alberta -- problems to a lot of people that were left out of that area of the job market. That's a continuing problem and we want to know what the future is in that area.

The other thing, now perhaps you're talking about, some of the speakers are talking about, the possibility of alternative technology which would open up a whole new area in which there would be new jobs created and the contention is that here is new opportunities for minorities and women can get in on the ground floor and fight for their share of a new technology rather than trying to break into the old. That's the second kind of issue that I see as developing, and people want to know how that can be done. And it doesn't seem to me that at this point in time it's an either/or kind of a proposition. It may be.

ļ

MS. CHARTER: For the present.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MULDROW: For the turn of the century, it may be, but I think those are the two issues we have to focus on.

Then there's a third area which concerns states like South Dakota which do not have a large share of the natural resources available to Montana or North Dakota or Colorado. Their role is something different in the area of economic influence, a share of the job pie comes from another kind of job market and that is something which is also fairly new in the way of transportation. South Dakota doesn't have the resources, but they're going to be heavily impacted because of the spinoff of the production of power in Montana or wherever, because they're going to be the bridge state transporting this back to the eastern states. So, here's a relative new job market that is opening up in South Dakota which is equivalent to the alternative technology you're talking about. It would seem to me that minorities might have a legitimate claim to the share of the jobs to the transportation industry.

MS. ISHIMATSU: Could I just make a comment here? I thought whether or not the types of form of energy is not so much the process as it is how do we get them into those kinds of a thing and can it be a model for your future in whatever form it takes. That when these types of industry

> Adrienne Pollard Whitlow Certified Shorthand Reporter 729 American National Bank Building Denver Colorado 80202 (303) 572-0570

come in, is there a vehicle or a recommendation or a process that says that we can be more -- to utilize more meaningful maneuvers, minorities and women into those kinds of jobs and what we set for convention fuel might take place in the alternative energy thing and it might take place as a spinoff process, but maybe those are things that we need to address.

MS. CHARTER: Could I just make one more point and then I'll shut up and let someone else talk.

I want to answer you, but I agreed with you a hundred percent up to the either/or. I agree that there is a present problem with present industry and what is being done, but what I'm trying to say is let's stop it here. Let's solve our problems. I'm a hundred percent with you in trying to find solutions for what is existing now. But do we want to have those same problems go on forever so that we're always going to have to look for solutions? And my answer to you is when you way what can we do, we can use the capital, the government money or just plain people's ingenuity and start in the neighborhood, start back at a bright smooth thing. It's possible. It's happening. It's happening in Billings and in Roundup on a very small scale. It can be done, but it will take a lot of different kinds of thinking and a new view of the future and then we've got our future thing solved.

I agree right now with your problems and that something should be done. I'm not against that. Now, I've

had my say.

2

MR. RAYMOND: Allyn.

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

20

22

23

24

25

MR. LOCKNER: If we were to have a map of the northern plains Rocky Mountain region and if you were to locate the areas in which coal development, uranium development, oil and gas development is occurring, you would find, as is indicated by the discussions today and so far this evening, that it's occurring in eastern Montana, eastern Wyoming, southwestern and south central North Dakota. is no coal mining or coal-fired electrical generating plants in western South Dakota. There are no uranium mines and mills in western South Dakota today, but does that necessarily mean that South Dakota is going to escape the kinds of impacts that are associated with energy development? I think not. South Dakota finds itself being impacted largely for two One, as has already been indicated this evening, South Dakota is a great state between the energy-producing areas and the densely populated industrial centers that are located to the east and to the south of those energyproducing areas. I'm thinking now of Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, other areas, metropolitan areas to the east. That's where the market is for the energy. It has to be transmitted or transported from those energyproducing areas to those mass markets. How do you transmit energy? There are basically three or four ways.

Number one, using it to transport the coal from those energy-producing areas to the metropolitan highly industrialized areas, that means unit trains of some kind.

Number two, you do it by means of electrical transmission lines, if there are coal-fired electrical generating plants built at the mouths of the lines and the electricity is transmitted and generated to the East.

Thirdly, there may very well be coal gassification plants or liquifaction plants in which case there has to be pipelines that are constructed that would transmit the gas from the producing areas to the metropolitan areas.

Those are three basic ways in which South
Dakota may be impacted, in that those transportation
facilities are going to be located across the state. Is there
another way? Yes, there is. The northern plains states are
an arid area. There is a lack of water not only from the
standpoint of hydrologic scarcity of water, but also from the
standpoint that there is a legal scarcity of water. That
means that if you're going to have to have large amounts of
water to generate the energy, and that water is not available
in the Yellowstone River Basin that underlies the coal mining
and uranium mining areas, you're going to look elsewhere for
that water.

One of the major sources of water is the reservoirs that are on the main stem of the Missouri River

which commences up in Montana and there's a series of reservoirs that moved from Montana on down through North Dakota,
South Dakota and then finally it enters Iowa, that's Sioux
City, and then there are no reservoirs below that point. The largest single volume of unclaimed water in the northern plains states that's available for alternative uses is located in the Missouri River main stem reservoir.

Now, there are a lot of problems associated with that. Not only the question of hydrologic availability of it, but also the legal availability of it. There are claims by Indian tribes that have been made and have to be resolved. There are claims by the federal government, reserve rights, and then there are also the competition among the states in the Upper Missouri River Basin; namely, Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota and South Dakota. But nevertheless, this is one possible source of water.

Now, either you transmit the water from the Missouri River reservoirs over into eastern Wyoming and southeastern Montana or you bring the electrical generating facilities and perhaps the coal gassifications plants from that area over into South Dakota, locate them on the reservoirs and transport the coal from southeastern Montana and eastern Wyoming over into South Dakota.

Now, there are plans now. In fact, there is a feasibility study that is going to be completed this fall

23

24

25

that addresses the question about the technical and economic feasibility of constructing a pipeline that will draw water from the Oahe Reservoir, which is located, the dam itself is located at Pierre and the reservoir backs water up from that dam located at Pierre 250 miles up to Bismarck, North Dakota. They are going to be looking at the feasibility technologically and economically of taking that water out of the reservoir and transporting it, by pipeline, over into the Powder River Basin in Wyoming for purposes of using that water to slurry coal from the Powder River Basin down to a point in Now, that involves several thousand acre feet of Arkansas. water per year. Now, if that scenario is not possible, then if water is the most constraining resource that stands in the way of coal development in eastern Wyoming and southeastern Montana and to a lesser extent in southern North Dakota, then the possibility becomes of taking those power plants, locating them on those reservoirs in South Dakota and shipping the coal from eastern Wyoming and southeastern Montana over into South Dakota, generating the electricity there and then transmitting it by transmission line to the markets to the East.

Now, the point that I'm making here is simply this. That even though the large and very rich coal deposits are not underlying South Dakota. South Dakota stands to be impacted as well as the tribal governments in South Dakota

2

3

4

5

6

8

7

10

9

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in the states to the west and north and northwest of South

Now, there is another aspect of the way in which coal development can affect South Dakota. that if the electrical generating plants are, in fact, built and operated in Montana and North Dakota and Wyoming, then South Dakota is concerned for the reason that it is downwind from those coal-fired electrically generating plants. We are concerned about the air pollutants that will be emitted from those plants and what the effect of those pollutants will be upon human health and secondly, upon our agriculture and ranching industry in the state from the standpoint of the effect upon vegetation and the growth of vegetation, crops upon which our agriculture is heavily dependent. And we have established a monetary network in western and northern South Dakota to begin to collect baseline data so that we can demonstrate, if we need to in the future, of whether or not there's been any degradation of air quality in South Dakota, and if we need to, to be successful in going into court and alleging that there has been a deterioration of air quality in the state, if there is not sufficient air pollution, available equipment placed upon those power plants that be built in other states.

The point that I'm making here is that there

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

..13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

may not ever be a shovel full of coal or a shovel full of uranium ore mined in South Dakota, but energy development can still have an effect upon the Indian and non-Indian in our state and we're very mindful of the possibility of the developments that I've just described.

MR. RAYMOND: I saw Dwayne's hand up first.

MR. OSTENSON: Dwayne Ostenson. You clarified, as you progressed, my immediate response was when you had indicated unclaimed water which brought to mind a number of things that as a result of those dams, the Oahe in South Dakota, the Garrison in North Dakota, the majority of the land which ended up flooding happened to be Indian land, and this is the point that I wanted to bring out, and if there is a claim to that land, I think that claim lies with the Native American Indian population in both states, North Dakota and South Dakota, because Oahe has flooded much of the Fort Gates Reservation, the Garrison Dam has flooded much of the Fort Berthold Reservation which we have in North Dakota, and it was just a point in fact that the fact that you had mentioned it was unclaimed, I think needed clarification, because I think there is claim to that water, and I think much of that claim lies with the Native American.

MR. LOCKNER: We've opened up another topic which is not too surprising in terms of a spinoff. We're talking about energy development which was spurred by an

energy crisis with the word quotes around crisis, and because of the semi-arid northern plains, the availability of water and the value of that water is very critical to any venture that utilizes water for carrying out that venture, whatever it might be.

Now, this gentleman over here has raised a very good question about the competing claims for waters in the Missouri River reservoirs. There are a number of parties that have and are and will continue to lay claims to that water. There are basically three ways of resolving those claims.

Number one is through litigation. If we ever pursue litigation, all of us in this room are going to be dead before that litigation ever decides who's got that water and to what use it can be put. You can write that on the wall over there, take a picture of it, take it home with you and show it to your children and your children's children and their children's children and it's true, I am convinced of it.

The second way is through congressional legislation that's going to be very time consuming particularly when you consider that the northern plains states have lost and are losing and will continue to lose its voting power, not such in the United States Senate, but certainly in the United States House of Representatives.

The third way of resolving these matters and

20

21

22

23

24

25

the preferred way is that non-Indians and Indians sit down and talk about these matters and negotiate these matters because I believe, speaking for myself and a lot of other people in South Dakota state government, that we need to use these water resources to the mutual benefit of Indian and non-Indian alike and we are not going to have the desired economic prosperity and economic stability until we begin to think about each other, and I would like to see that as an avenue that is utilized by South Dakota officials in sitting down with our sister tribal officials and Indian citizens in South Dakota, to lay out a strategy where we can use this water for the mutual benefit of Indians and non-Indians alike, and I think that's the way to go, and I think we can see the use of that water to the benefit of Indians and non-Indians alike in our lifetime if we have the wisdom of utilizing that approach and that may be for agriculture, it may be for energy, it may be for domestic use, like drinking water. Ιt could be for livestock watering or any other possible beneficial uses including in-stream uses, fish and wildlife propogation.

MR. RAYMOND: Harriett, you had a question?

MS. SKYE: The comment was made this morning,

I'm going to direct my comment to Mr. Lockner. I'm Harriet

Skye and I'm the SAC Chairman of North Dakota.

The statement was made this morning in Mr.

Sherman's opening keynote address that 56 percent of the -let me check my notes. I want to make sure that I'm right.

Fifty-six percent of the land in western United States was
federally owned. Eighty percent of that was high grade shale,
that was in federal lands, 60 percent of the coal was on
federal land. I went out and asked the gentleman if that
included Indian reservations and he said no, he never included
Indian reservations in any of his statistics because he felt
that that was something that should be a part.

We Indian people have all be impacted already by the energy kinds of things that are happening close to or on the reservation, and I'm wondering, you're talking about sitting down and communicating with tribal governments. I think that one of the reasons that this is not happening is because of what Mr. Raymond said. Is because Indians have been screwed, and they're scared to death that they're going to get screwed again, only this time it's going to be royally. We're going to end up with nothing, with less than what we have now.

I understand, also, and correct me if I'm wrong, wasn't there a uranium mine that was just discovered on the Rose Bud Indian Reservation near Burdock, South Dakota?

MR. LOCKNER: There is a uranium mine that is planned for Burdock, South Dakota, but it is not on a reservation.

Adrienne Pollard Whitlow
Certified Shorthand Reporter
729 American National Bank Building
Denver Colorado 80202 (303) 572-0570

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SKYE: I think that's where the whole problem is, as I see it in talking to tribal chairmen, in talking to tribal councilmen, is that they want to declare the Indian reservations a class one, make them all wilderness areas because they feel that's the only way they can keep their land base.

My question is this. Is there that kind of involvement in South Dakota with the state talking to the Indian people and the Indian people talking to -- are you communicating?

MR. LOCKNER: Yes. I'm secretary of Environmental Protection and there are nine tribal governments in South Dakota. To date we have signed contracts with seven of the nine tribal governments for purposes of the tribal governments going out and identifying, in this particular case, water pollution problems on reservations, and that we pay over to them certain amounts of money in return for them fulfilling certain provisions in the contract. We have sat down, we've negotiated contracts with seven of those nine tribal govern-I think there's a good chance of getting the eighth one. The ninth one is going to take some time, but I think that is tangible evidence. I can't speak about what's happened in the past, but I have tangible evidence of what we've tried to do in the South Dakota Department of Environmental Protection with respect to working with tribal

Adrienne Pollard Whitlow
Certified Shorthand Reporter
729 American National Bank Building
Deputer Colorada 80202 (303) 572-0570

governments in South Dakota, and it's taken a great deal --1 2 we've got a hundred percent plus of history and it hasn't been 3 the best on either side and particuarly on the white side, I recognize that, but we're beginning to deal with that. 4 been secretary of Environmental Protection for a little over 5 6 five years now and that's the record that I can point to, that 7 we've tried to do it. We've sat down and we've said we don't want to tell you tribal governments what to do, you tell us 8 what your water pollution problems are on your reservations, 9 we'll help you solve those problems. You're in the driver's 10 seat. We've not on top, you're on top. We're on tap. We're 11 here to help you and we hope, over a period of time as we 12 build up this trust and confidence, if somebody doesn't come 13 along and mess it up, we'll be able to help them with their 14 drinking water supplies, with their solid waste problems and 15 their other environmental problems in the state. 16 17 MR. RAYMOND: Allyn, these are contracts with 18

the seven tribes for water pollution control?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR, LOCKNER: Right. The contracts are between the Department of Environmental Protection and each of the tribes and we approach each tribe individually, each tribe is a separate entity. They've got their own treaties, their own leadership and you do not try to negotiate with all tribes or any two tribes at the same time. They're individuals and we've approached it that way and the purpose of it

1	is to identify water pollution problems on the reservations							
2	and to identify measures of correcting those problems and							
3	preventing similar problems from arising in the future.							
4	MR. RAYMOND: But they are the contractor and							
5	if I may coin a new word, you are the contractee?							
6	MR. LOCKNER: We're both parties to the							
7	contract, yes.							
8	MR. RAYMOND: In effect, they are hiring you							
9	to do the job?							
10	MR. LOCKNER: No, no. The moneys are paid over							
11	from the Department of Environmental Protection over to the							
12	tribal governments. They can use their own employees to do							
13	the work, they can go out and hire a consultant. That's their							
14	complete discretion in terms of identifying the water pollu-							
15	tion problem and measures to prevent and correct those							
16	problems from arising in the future.							
17	MR. RAYMOND: But they contract with you to do							
18	it?							
19	MR. LOCKNER: They contract with the Department							
20	of Environmental Protection.							
21	MR. RAYMOND: That's my point. In the kind of							
22	negotiations in sitting down and talking with you about it							
23	wouldn't be that kind of a contract.							
24	MR. LOCKNER: Contract.							
25	MR. RAYMOND: It wouldn't be that kind of a							
	Adrienne Pollard Whitlow							

Certified Shorthand Reporter
729 American National Bank Building

contract. Sitting down and talking that you mentioned earlier over water use.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LOCKNER: Oh, I recognize the terms of who's got claim to Missouri River water. That's a different matter altogether.

MR. RAYMOND: A while ago out of the corner of my eye I saw a hand.

MS. ARO: Maggie, Aro, Colorado SAC Chair.

Speaking to Al, the long process that you went through to show us what they are planning on, I'm assuming you're talking about the government, to get energy from the mountain states that we are talking about to the large users. By the time you complain in South Dakota about the air pollution, it would all be done, and at that point irrevocable in many people's minds. In other words, the plant will be built, the water is running the coal down or something, one of the alternatives. In other words, you can't complain about a problem until all of this is done. We have heard a whole day of facts about how bad boom towns are and the impact of this kind of energy development. I think that our lady from Montana has a very positive thing to say about alternatives and I think that we need to start thinking in this direction, for minorities, for women, for all of us. Evidently the large production of fossil fuels is damaging to the places that it is produced from. All of the facts seem to point in

Adrienne Pollard Whitlow
Certified Shorthand Reporter
729 American National Bank Building
Danier Calanda 80202 (303) 572-0570

1 this direction. They can't do it slowly, they cannot under-2 impact an area, they can't do it gently. It evidently is a 3 rape of the land and I think we have to look at something that is easier on all of us. The reclamation or the -- you 4 5 say then we could complain about air pollution. What would be 6 done about it? Are they going to tear down the plants at 7 that point? Are they going to stop this great big operation that is involving all of these people and millions and 8 billions of dollars? I don't think so, and to do it before, 9 10 what is the action toward not doing either of the alternatives of getting that energy from the mountain states to the big 11 12 cities? There is none? 13 MR. LOCKNER: In my own mind the issue is not 14 energy development versus no energy development. I can't 15 accept that. 16 MS. ARO: I don't mean no --17 MR. LOCKNER: I'm talking about energy produc-

MR. LOCKNER: I'm talking about energy production in the northern plains states. Uranium, coal, that's going to happen.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ARO: You feel that is inevitable? There is absolutely no alternative to that fact?

MR. LOCKNER: Oh, yes, there is an alternative.

I'm saying the choice is not between energy development of a

type that we all fear and no energy development. When I say
energy development, I'm talking now about coal development

1 2 3

4

5

7

6

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

23

25

and uranium development principally in the northern plains The choice that I think that we've got to explore is that being able to manage this development.

MR. RAYMOND: Alberta, you haven't spoken for a long time.

MR. LOCKNER: I'm prepared to talk about that, if you want to talk about it.

MS: HENRY: Albert Henry. I'm good at throwing out phrases and starting an argument and then sitting back and having a good time and enjoying it. So, I'm getting tired of this one, so I'm going to bring us back on track.

Still concerned about the future, what impact and that's what will the future be. My statement is going to be we did not rape the land. The minorities or the women. know that the Native Americans didn't. Now, this I know, right? And I know that we, the blacks didn't. I can't speak for anybody else. We did not rape it. We did not reap the benefits or the money benefits from it. So, I'm looking toward the future and you say you think Ann has it, but she has not showed me where any blacks is helping make the plans for these future in what she's planning to do in the alternative. How do I know they're not trying to rape us in another kind of way and blame it on us? I want to know how we, the women and minorities, in the -- I want you to hear me real

1	good so you don't jump on me. How we can be in the planning
2	stages of it so it doesn't get raped again and we are included
3	in it and the impact will be the same on us as anyone else?
4	What is the future?
5	MR. RAYMOND: Is that a statement or a
6	question?
7	MS. HENRY: That's a question. How can we,
8	and I'm not talking about yesterday and today, beyond the
9	planning for the future that we're going to plan for, the
10	next 20 years or 30 years for our grandchildren?
11	MR. RAYMOND: Another aspect of that same
12	question, and I'll put it out.
13	MS. HENRY: Mr. Chairman: I'd like it to be
14	answered without your superseding me.
15	MR. RAYMOND: All right. Very good. I
16	appreciate your point. Who chooses to answer that?
17	MS. HENRY: I'll direct it to Ann.
18	MS. CHARTER: Okay. I'm a woman and I'm a
19	minority. I became a minority in a hurry
20	MS. HENRY: I can't buy that. No. A majority
21	can be a minority. But go ahead.
22	MS. CHARTER: And I'm doing something about the
23	problem and we first have to start in knowing what the other
24	half is and then we have to do it. And what I have seen in
25	the past three or four years where we have attended every

government gathering and hashed these questions, is that it's all being kept safely in the realm of theory. What can be done and what can't be done, and I really have to disagree with you in that we have to continue with fossil fuel energy development because it's there and we've got it in the past.

.11

Now, where you can do something is, read this, and then do something about it. Take one neighborhood in one place, take it in Denver where you have high crime rate, low employment and women on the streets and get them on a neighborhood basis in one job to put one of these experimental things to work. Improve the neighborhood, job train the people to do it themselves, bring in all the government resources and you've got a beginning, and we have to start somewhere and we've got to start in our heads and then we've got to start in a concrete way.

MR. RAYMOND: Dwayne.

MR. OSTENSON: Dwayne Ostenson, United Tribes, Bismarck.

Again, if I may, I appreciate your views. I do, however, think they're very idealistic, and I've got a bit of a problem, in that right now, today, I've got approximately 50 percent un- or under-employment on the reservations of North Dakota. I don't have, but the state does have this criteria. We have approximately 29 percent of the Native Americans in the state of North Dakota that has an income of

under \$2,000, and what I'm hearing from you is basically what we can look at down the road approximately two or three or four or five years. If we stop what is here and if we go to this particular system, what, pray tell, am I going to do, or what, pray tell, am I going to be able to tell those people about a productive future if I can say in about five years you might have a chance to probably do something but in the meantime you're going to be stuck with \$2,000 income. this isn't the answer. What I'm looking for in this particular conference, in this particular session, is what can I do for those people that are in desparate need at the present?

MS. CHARTER: I think you're going to get it from industry.

MR. OSTENSON: This is why I'm here, but I do know that the possibility of the industry are there at present. Now, if we don't take advantage of them as minorities and as various female groups that have these possibilities to avail us at this present time, pray tell if we let this bypass us and it develops anyway, what are we going to be doing then? We will not have people trained, we will not have people in the industry and as you know, most of the large corporations advance and progress within their own structure. So, what are we going to be doing down the road three years if we wait for your idealistic -- I love it. I

love the land probably just as much, if not more than you, but for crying out loud, we're sitting here with poverty, we're sitting there with distress, we're sitting there with frustration. Now, how can I solve that today, not five years from today but today?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CHARTER: Okay. Get your government money or whatever, capital, and put it into training the Indians to be leaders in the use of solar energy. They're the most logical people to do it. Get them interested in beginning to study it and find out about it and see where it's used before and how it can be used effectively. Challenge them to solve their own problems. Get help in doing it and the government should help because if they're going to subsidize the fossil fuels they should be subsidized solar and solar is competitive. The best thing to do would be to take off all subsidies Then it would really become competitive. Why don't the Indians start small scale industry of some kind? Solar lends itself to community on the spot, small enterprises. We have dozens of them starting all over Montana. People that are afire with the idea and they go in, they start with nothing and they're going to be the big guys two or three, four or five years down the line. Why can't the Indians do it? It's something that would really fit in with their cultural and initiave and everything else. They could be independent and do it.

1

2

3

4

5

7 8

9

10

12

14

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. OSTENSON: Culturally speaking, I tend to speak with you because this is one of the basic philosophies of Indian people, is not to as was stated before, rape the land, and I agree with you 100 percent. However, at the present time the economic feasibility of something like this I cannot quite see for the mere fact that if I have an individual Indian person who is making approximately \$2,000 a year, it's going to take them five years just to pay for the initial individual unit in their particular home. if you're going to take five years from that and during which time most of them kind of prefer to eat, and that \$2,000 which they are having as an income is basically expended for the necessities of life. Now, how are you going to take something and make something out of nothing? And as far as federally funding programs in North Dakota, I would like to sit down and talk with you at length as to what federal funding in North Dakota gets. We have tried on numerous occasions to get federal funding for various projects, one of which was OMBE, but we haven't even been able to get an OMBE office in North Dakota and there are businesses of minority dissent in the state, as a matter of fact, somewhere around 15. But what I'm saying is that I love your idea, I truly do, but is it feasible, at this point in time is it feasible with what we have?

Now, we know good and well that if we are

going to start talking about the rape, how about talking about the American dollar? Now, what has happened to the American dollar overseas -- now we're supposedly coming out of the inflation which is going to make the American dollar more scarce. For crying out loud, it's going to be impossible for the whites to get a loan much less a person of Indian descent.

MS. CHARTER: Okay. It doesn't help us, but you have to start somewhere. Well, very briefly, new minorities are being created all the time through this and recently I went to Minnesota, Glenwood, Minnesota and I met with the transmission line people, the ones that are being made minorities through transmission lines. There were 200 people from 21 different states. They're fighting and they're fighting mad and something has to be done.

Now, you have to fight for something and you have to have a plan and you have to have a workable plan and there's just as much chance you're going to get help to do something constructive and new and innovative as there is -- you said what are we going to do? You don't know. You're looking for answers. You're not going to find the answers going along the same way that we've always been going because the answers haven't been there, but there are answers. So, you start the idea and get the government to use you as a model project. This is what can be done, and you demand equal subsidy with the fossil fuel thing. Okay. I'll admit

that working with the present government approach, it looks very hopeless, but there's one thing that we have learned and we have come a long way and we have done the impossible in Montana and we're going to continue to do it because we don't assume that government or industry or anybody else has the answers for our problems, and we don't sit down and let them tell us what we should do or what we shouldn't do. We think still before that outside industry money comes in and takes our politics over completely and we still have a little say, we're going to go in there and we're going to map our future and that's what we're supposed to be doing today. And in mapping it, you've got to think new thoughts. You can't think 12 the old ones, and the Indians can do it maybe better than anyone else, I think.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RAYMOND: Give me your name, please.

MS. ET CITTY: I'm with the Utah International, Inc. Corporation out of Fruitland, New Mexico.

All of this time I've just been listening back and forth on all these things we've all been talking about. Well, a few years ago my family went through quite a bit of a shock because a certain strip mining company went through our homes without us knowing about it. No one, not from the tribe or the government came to our home to tell us that they were going to do this. So, being frustrated and without a home suddenly we didn't know how to approach this.

> Adrienne Pollard Whitlow Certified Shorthand Reporter 729 American National Bank Building D.\_\_\_\_ (1...] 80000 (202) 570 0570

We tried to be radical, we demanded answers, we wanted payment of some sort, but all that wasn't enough. So, one day, feeling very bad about everything, we got together and decided why don't we just enter these certain companies and start within. So, that's how I happen to be with the Utah International. I'm inside now but I find new problems inside the company.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I came here simply to find out whether or not you all might have some answers to the problems we have within the company. I find that there's a lot of discrimination, of course, everywhere, but to the women where I work some of them have worked there for years and have never advanced past clerk typist and we have a clause in the contract we have with this company that there is an Indian preference clause in it and that's the only reason why they hired Indians. But once an Indian gets into a certain position, especially in management, well, the person just In that one small position. And I came here to stays there. find out, first of all, the title is "Our Future: What Do We Want?" Well, what I figure I want out of this consultation is how can -- maybe you all have some experience in this, but how can women get better pay when the cost is basically all male and their thinking is completely male? I'm the only woman that's ever gone on any of these trips simply because I raised so much cain and I hope to take something back over

there so that I can help the women that have been there for years who have just lost hope. Some of the things you were bringing out made a lot of sense to me. I think the Indians should start within the companies and start -- although we are, I guess, the ones that are raping the land, but that all happened because the main decision makers weren't Indians, and I feel that if we get in the company, then we can say no, we cannot do this or we cannot do that.

MS. CHARTER: I would say you have the answer to your own question right in yourself, because I think the very fact that you are interested enough to come to the meeting and to look for answers, that you aren't going to stay on that level. You aren't going to stay there, you're going to go up, and you can take the message back, I really believe it, to your coworkers. The thing that we found our strongest asset as an organization, was to have a goal, and, if possible, a constructive goal to stick together and to never cringe in the face of authority and to never give one iota.

Now, that was the first advice that we had and at times, I'll admit, it's hard for me to live up to it because I'm a compromiser by heart. I just found myself, it didn't sound like it, but I am. All right. You don't believe me, but I'd rather compromise, I'd rather have everybody happy and everything else, but you can't do it during

a steady group on other ways to do things or whatever your group is interested in, become informed on something, a better way to improve your company or something you can do in the company that's better than you're doing an make an impact.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ä

Now, my husband, he likes to say he had a fourth-grade education. I think he went through the tenth grade, but maybe he still had just a fourth-grade education, the way things go, but he didn't back down from anybody for any authority or anybody telling him what to do, and as a group of people we stuck together although our only interest was in our fight to preserve our land. That was the one thing that we agreed that we would always stick together on, and every time a company man or a government man came to talk to any one of us, we said wait a minute, we don't talk until a neighbor comes in and the neighbor comes in and we finally got it to if you want to talk to us, you come to our next monthly meeting. That ended it. We never saw a consolidation coat again after that. We were a bunch of inexperienced ranchers. We'd never done anything before except roam our ranches. In a way we had very selfish, self-centered lives, you might say, and we weren't really too interested in what went out in the outside world, but when we got our backs out, we found that we had power and I truly believe that you have the same power, but our whole thinking, I mean you

didn't have a chance, you see. We saw it in time to get in there, and you really have to be one step ahead of the game, but it's never too late. And I think just your interest is a wonderful beginning. I put my faith and you could go out and help find the answers and they're there and they're new ones of doing things and don't let anyone tell you that they aren't.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RAYMOND: We're going to have to take a short break in a few minutes. There's just one thing I want to say before we take that break.

The coal development on Indian lands is inevitable. It already has started and the main difference between the other 56 percent Indian lands or federal lands and Indian lands and privately owned or state lands is that the federal law on coal mining is much more lenient than are the state laws. I served in the North Dakota state legislature for six years. I was a part of that so I know what that is all about. So these big coal companies come in and they go right immediately to the Indian reservations. Now, because they can get a much better deal there, and that is something this commission ought to address itself to and we haven't even talked about that here today. It's not been mentioned one time. The Indian people owned those lands and they also are going to provide the bulk work of the employment when that time comes. So, we've got a different set of

, 1	problems and that coal development, Dwayne approached it for										
2	another reason, but that coal development is inevitable there.										
3	It already has started. It's already ongoing, so we're going										
4	to make the best use of what we can here and now. What you're										
5	talking about maybe was good, I'm not even telling you my										
6	position on it. I'm just saying it may be well and good, but										
7	that's not the problem which faces us today.										
8	MS. CHARTER: We've been working with your										
9	problem with the Crows.										
10	MR. RAYMOND: We'll take a break and we'll be										
11	back.										
12	(Whereupon, the panel discussion was then										
13	closed.)										
14	* * *										
15	·										
16											
17	-										
18											
19											
20											
21											
22											
23	·										
24											
25											

Adrienne Pollard Whitlow
Certified Shorthand Reporter
729 American National Bank Building
Daniel Calanda 80202 (303) 572 0570

## <u>C E R T I F I C A T I O N</u>

. . .

I, ADRIENNE POLLARD WHITLOW, Certified

Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public within Colorado,
appointed to take the panel discussion of "Our Future: What

Do We Want?" certify that the panel discussion was taken by
me at 3333 Quebec Street, Denver, Colorado 80207, on

November 2, 1978; then reduced to typewritten form, consisting
of fifty-two pages herein; that the foregoing is a true
transcript of the proceedings had.

I further certify that I am not related to any party herein or their counsel, and have no interest in the results of this panel discussion.

		IN	WITNESS	WHEREOF,	I	have	hereunto	sei	my
hand	this	da	ay of					, .	L978

Adrienne Pollard Whitlow Certified Shorthand Reporter