

C.A.R.D. NEWSLETTER

February 10, 2009



Coloradoans Against Resource Destruction

CARD, PO Box 143, Wellington, CO 80549, 970-372-0029 (leave message) www.nunnglow.com

Events

February 11, 2009 CARD Town Hall Meeting CARD will hold a public Town Hall Meeting in Fort Collins, February 11, 2009, 7:00 p.m. to provide an update on the status of the proposed in-situ leach mining close to Fort Collins. Meeting will be held at the Fort Collins Senior Center, 1200 Raintree Drive, (1 blk north of Drake on Shields)

Donations, Please!

We again thank our contributors for their generosity. We especially would like to thank the people who continue donating monthly. This greatly helps us with planning and covering our ongoing expenses. Please join them and help fund our operating expenses as well as the upcoming need for expert witnesses for the rule making process.

If you're interested in supporting us on a regular basis, \$20/month would go a long way towards our expenses. You can donate at the www.nunnglow.com website or send your money order or check to CARD, PO Box 143, Wellington, CO 80549. If for some reason you don't want to be publicly acknowledged for your contribution, please let us know.

Your Donations can now be TAX DEDUCTIBLE! Your donations for the continued fight of Uranium Mining in Colorado and the hiring of expert witnesses are now tax deductible. This is where a huge amount of money is urgently needed to hire expert witnesses during the regulation writing process to ensure effective enforcement of House Bill 1161. We can be sure that the mining companies have the money to hire their own expert witnesses to minimize the standards that they have to meet to get the permits to do the mining. Tax deductible donations can be made to;

Information Network for Responsible Mining (INFORM)
P.O. Box 349
Lyons, CO 80540

South Dakota Permit Application Will Impact Colorado

The first permit application for proposed uranium mining in southwestern South Dakota was filed last month. The application is for the "Dewey-Burdock" in situ leach uranium

mine and was submitted to the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The application asks for an Underground Injection Control (UIC) permit. This type of permit is necessary before in situ mining can begin. The permitting process is designed to protect groundwater.

This is important to those who oppose mining in Colorado. South Dakota and Colorado are governed by the same EPA office – EPA’s “Region 8” office in Denver. The same company, Powertech Uranium Corp., wants to mine in both places.

So whatever happens in South Dakota sets a precedent for Colorado. If the EPA is allowed to set lax standards for Powertech in South Dakota, it will be harder to argue that they should set firm standards in Colorado. There has been no in situ leach uranium mining in South Dakota, so the application process is critical to those who oppose the mining there.

People in Colorado need to follow this process closely and to be prepared to support those who oppose uranium mining in South Dakota, so we can protect our own groundwater. For more information, see www.defendblackhills.org

Tallahassee Area Community Faces New Threat

Excerpts from Canon City Daily Record published on January 14, 2009, regarding proposed mining in Fremont County, CO.

An agreement between Black Range Minerals and Uranium One may form the basis of a powerful joint venture to mine a combined 80 million pounds of uranium ore from the Tallahassee area.

BRM, the Australian company currently drilling exploratory holes in the controversial Taylor Ranch Project, said it has entered into a letter of intent with Uranium One Inc. to jointly pursue the development with the adjoining Hansen Project.

Uranium One is a uranium mining and exploration company based in Canada with holdings in South Africa and Australia.

[A company representative said] “Ideally, we’d like to do underground mining, but we need to do some drill test work to make sure it is going to be mineable by underground methods,” he said. “We need to investigate other alternative mining methods.”

Despite the uncertainty of the most suitable mining technique, BRM managing director Mike Haynes is on record saying his company is not considering “in situ recovery,” where leaching solution is pumped into the mineral deposit via a borehole, circulated to dissolve the ore and then extracted and processed.

How Much and Where is it Going?

Excerpts from an article posted at www.powertechexposed.com January 7, 2009

U.S. Dept. of Energy plans to sell 50 million pounds of excess uranium in next ten years

Yearly sales to exceed total amount of uranium mined in U.S. in 2007; political "full-court press" by uranium mining industry fails to stop DOE action; Powertech backs group op-

posed to DOE plans, touts U.S energy independence while agreeing to sell uranium to Belgian firm; Powertech chairman contracts to sell uranium to government of India

In a move intended to cut federal spending and benefit U.S. taxpayers, the U.S. Department of Energy on December 16 released a plan to sell off its excess inventory of uranium. According to the agency, "The Department of Energy has a significant inventory of uranium that is excess to United States defense needs. This inventory is expensive to manage and to secure..."

Powertech Uranium Corp., along with other Canadian and U.S. firms, has been attempting to dissuade the DOE from disposing of this uranium because it will push down prices for the radioactive metal. They argue that the U.S. uranium mining industry could be hurt by the DOE sales and that a weakened mining industry would compromise U.S energy security.

The Excess Uranium Inventory Management Plan calls for the sale of approximately 50 million pounds of uranium over the next ten years. Beginning in 2008, the agency plans to sell about five million pounds a year, which is 10% of the DOE's estimated annual requirements of the U.S. nuclear power industry.

In a March 11, 2008 policy statement, DOE Secretary Samuel Bodman expressed the department's belief that introducing five million pounds of uranium into the market per year "should not have an adverse material impact on the domestic uranium industry."

Evidently, the industry does not agree. In a May 8, 2007 article by uranium market analyst James Finch, he describes efforts by the uranium mining industry to prevent the DOE from selling its excess uranium. He quotes TradeTech chief executive Gene Clark, who said "The uranium producers were in a political 'full-court press' on DOE to prevent sales of this material, stating that such sales would undercut market prices." (TradeTech sets the weekly spot price for uranium.)

The Uranium Producers of America, a Sante Fe, New Mexico-based lobbying group, has taken the lead in lobbying the DOE. The UPA's executive director, Jon Indall, has urged the DOE to "hold back their material", according to a July 7, 2006 interview by Mr. Finch. The UPA is an association of 13 uranium mining companies, including Powertech Uranium Corp. The UPA's mission is "to promote the viability of the domestic uranium industry." Ironically, nine of the 13 member companies are Canadian or are controlled by Canadian firms.

Since announcing the Centennial Project, Powertech CEO Richard Clement has repeatedly made public statements that Powertech would sell uranium only to U.S. utilities. In an August 2007 letter to project opponents, titled "Response to Concerned Citizens' Questions Regarding the Centennial Project", Clement responded to the question "What market is the uranium mined by Powertech Uranium Corporation sold to?"

Answer: Due to high demand, a deficit of domestic uranium supplies, and concerns about the security of foreign supplies, the uranium mined in the United States will stay in the United States for nuclear power generation.....Nuclear power generators simply prefer to buy uranium produced in the U.S., and we can provide them an adequate and secure supply.

Ten months later, Clement changed his tune when he accepted a \$9 million check from Belgian nuclear company Société Belge de Combustibles Nucléaires Synatom SA. Synatom signed a private placement agreement with Powertech giving the Belgian firm the option to buy uranium from the Centennial and Dewey Burdock (South Dakota) projects.

Clement has also failed to mention that Powertech Chairman, Chief Operating Officer, and co-founder Wallace Mays has a five-year contract to sell 5.5 million pounds of uranium to the Nuclear Fuel Complex (NFC) in Hyderabad, India. The contract was signed in late 2006, after Mays traveled to India with a U.S. trade delegation. The contract is between the NFC and WM Mining Company, LLC, a Denver company formed in 1995 by Mays and attorney Leonard Waldbaum. The Nuclear Fuel Complex is owned and operated by the Government of India.

Virginia Still in the Fight

Excerpts from Lynchburg News Advance published on January 6, 2009:

About 500 people showed up Tuesday night to advise a state panel about how Virginia should study uranium mining, and several speakers accused the panel members of accepting campaign money from the company that wants to mine a nearby ore deposit.

Other speakers urged the panel to make sure scientists in the study take a close look at mining's impact on water and air quality, the health of nearby residents and the economic benefits versus negatives of having a mine in Pittsylvania County.

Virginia Tech's role in the study also came under attack, with several speakers saying the university has a conflict of interest because it is reviving a nuclear-engineering program whose graduates could get jobs if the study led to mining.

Jack Dunavant, head of Southside Concerned Citizens, said the commission members should recuse themselves from the study because Virginia Uranium Inc. is listed as a donor to several General Assembly members on the vpap.org Web site.

Dunavant said mining should not be tolerated and "if Richmond tries to shove this down our throat we will fight to the bitter end, to the last man standing."

Shireen Parsons, who described herself as a "community organizer" from Christiansburg, was easily the loudest and most forceful speaker of the night.

Parsons compared the study to mountaintop-removal coal mining, said it was being "criminally managed," was an "illegitimate public process" and "is a travesty and a mockery."

Gary Fountain, head of the Chatham Hall boarding school for girls, said the mere presence of a uranium mine in the community would make it harder for the school to compete in a worldwide market for students.

Did We Learn Anything?

From the Archives *Excerpts from an article in the Greeley Tribune published on August 18, 1976:*

Uranium test permit delayed

By John Seelmeyer

Tribune Staff Writer

After voicing numerous concerns about potential contamination of groundwater, Weld County Planning Commission Tuesday tabled consideration of a special use permit for a uranium mining test site southwest of Grover.

Purpose of the tabling action is to allow the Colorado Water Quality Control Commission to prepare regulations for the proposed test site before county officials make a final decision on the special use permit.

The water quality commission approved plans for the facility earlier this month, but said it still must develop specific regulations for the test mine.

A hearing on the test site scheduled for the county commissioners Wednesday will probably be postponed until planning commission has made a recommendation, according to Assistant County Attorney Kay McEver. In a two-hour discussion of the proposal by Wyoming Mineral Corp. (WMC) Tuesday, county planning commission gave most of its attention to methods of preventing water pollution.

WMC has proposed pumping chemicals about 200 feet underground to free uranium ore. The test site, which is five miles southwest of Grover, would involve an area about 40 feet by 40 feet on a seven acre parcel.

Planning Commission member J. Ben Nix told WMC officials, "Everyone concerned should be sure we're not going to contaminate the water or the people. We're not going to give you a green light until we have those answers."

WMC spokesman Bill Eisenbarth said, however, the firm will restore water in the area to at least the level it was before mining operations began.

He said chemical treatment and screening of the water will take place before it's injected back into the ground.

Planning staff member Tom Honn said county officials are concerned that contaminated water from the aquifer in which WMC is working will seep up or down into other aquifers.

WMC spokesmen responded, saying they haven't found any indications that water from one aquifer in the area seeps to another aquifer. They said old mining holes in the area shouldn't allow water to travel from one aquifer to another because those old holes have apparently sealed themselves naturally.

And they noted that extensive monitoring of water quality in the area will be run along with the uranium test mine.

Norm Brown of the Weld County Ag Council, one of two citizens to speak at the meeting, said his group is especially concerned with WMC's capabilities to finance the operation and cleanup which will follow. Brown said WMC should post at least a \$25 million bond to insure the test site doesn't damage farms or ranches in the Grover area.

Planning Commission member Chuck Carlson told WMC officials they face some opposition from Grover-area residents, largely because other uranium tests in the area have left test holes unplugged. "It's like a fellow who sucks gasoline out and gets a taste of it in his mouth. It takes a long time to get rid of the bad taste," Carlson said.

During Tuesday's meeting, Planning Director Gary Fortner and Honn proposed a set of development standards for the test site. WMC officials generally agreed to the standards, but indicated they want to work with staff members to liberalize some of the requirements.

Development standards proposed include:

- The test site will be operated for only three or four months.
- Testing will be limited to a solution-mining process, recovery of uranium ore and storage of ore at the site.
- The test will be limited to the seven-acre site.
- Only mobile homes, storage tanks and other items needed for the test will be allowed on the site.
- The site will be fenced and posted with radiation warning signs.
- Soil erosion, fugitive dust and weeds will be limited on the site.
- Access to the site will be limited.
- Domestic water will be trucked to the site or pumped from a well still to be drilled.
- Waste will be removed according to county health department regulations.
- Well permits must be obtained through proper agencies.
- Cleanup of the site will involve restoration of the aquifer, removal of all equipment, plugging of test holes and seeding of the area.

For a followup to what went on and the "Restoration" go to <http://www.nunnglow.com/documents/Grover/SLTestSiteThesis.pdf>

Greener Utilities?

Visit <http://www.pvpioneers.org/home.html> for a look at what a group of PVREA members vision for the utility is.

Who Are We?

CARD (Coloradoans Against Resource Destruction) is a diverse collection of citizens concerned about the health, environmental and economic impacts of uranium-related activity. We are convinced this project will have dire consequences for northern Colorado and set a dangerous precedent. Our goal is to prevent uranium mining in Colorado and protect our valuable resources, especially our water, for future generations.

The CARD website, www.nunnglow.com, has a wealth of information about the proposed mining, the processes and the potential impact on our air and water. On our website you can learn what you can do to stop the proposed uranium mining, sign an online petition and make a donation.