


United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Official Hearing Exhibit	
In the Matter of: POWERTECH USA, INC. (Dewey-Burdock In Situ Uranium Recovery Facility)	
	ASLBP #: 10-898-02-MLA-BD01
	Docket #: 04009075
	Exhibit #: INT-019-00-BD01
	Admitted: 8/19/2014
	Rejected:
	Other:
	Identified: 8/19/2014 Withdrawn: Stricken:

INT-019

Red Feather Archeology  
PO Box 116  
Yoder, WY 82244  
(307) 534-2172  
redfeather@wyomail.com


Mr. David Frankel, esq.  
July 13, 2014

Dear Mr. Frankel

In further response to your latest overwhelming group of documents concerning the upcoming litigation, I felt it might be a bit enlightening to enlarge on the place that the Guidelines I specified occupies in the scheme of these proceedings. In 1966, under section 101 of the National Historic preservation Act (NHPA) the federal government formed what has become know as the State Historic Preservation Offices within the several States. Although each of the States was allowed some autonomy within its own borders, some generalities were given so that minimal resemblances would appear nationally. One of these was to define specific guidelines for the operation of archaeological and historical surveys and recoveries and subsequent reporting within the boundaries of each of the several States. Although the guidelines were general, it was primarily left to each of the State's historic societies, if one were present, and legislative branches to work out these guidelines. Those for the State of South Dakota during the 1990's were called the "Guidelines for Cultural Resources Surveys and Survey Reports in South Dakota" and dated as to the latest updated copy by the State Historical Society/State Historical Preservation Office. These guidelines stipulated everything from the qualification of field survey personnel; those qualified to conduct archaeological investigations and the levels at which they might be qualified; what constituted the different levels of archaeological investigations; intervals that could be utilized for conducting different levels of investigations; *actions necessary upon encountering any type of archaeological or historical materials; what constitutes an archaeological/historical site; proper recording procedures for archaeological/historical materials or sites; proper reporting procedures for archaeological/historical materials or sites.* It is these items that I have italicized that I feel have been violated from the beginning of this project, and continue to be ignored by the esoteric rhetoric that has lately accumulated with such

astonishing weight and utter meaninglessness. None of the current diatribe appears or indeed has appeared to have addressed the initial issue that the initial cultural resource report was not a clearance survey under the Guidelines of South Dakota as defined through the years, but was rather a simple inventory at best of probable cultural resource that were present in the project area.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Louis A. Redmond". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "L" and "R".

Louis A. Redmond, PhD  
President/owner  
Red Feather Archeology