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1. Introduction

1.1. Background
In preparation for a public forum on uranium recovery, to be held in the spring of 2010 and hosted by the University of Wyoming’s School of Energy Resources (SER), the forum’s steering committee engaged the Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center (WYSAC) to collect information on the public’s knowledge and concerns about the subject. The purpose of this project was to help the steering committee design a forum that truly addresses the stated concerns and knowledge gaps of the Wyoming citizenry. WYSAC designed and conducted a statewide telephone survey of Wyoming households to obtain that information.

1.2. Organization of this Report
The remainder of this report has three main sections. Section 2 describes the methods used in this study. Demographic comparisons between our survey sample and the state population are presented in Section 3. Section 4 presents statistically significant differences between regions and substantive results across the state. We discuss overall findings in Section 5. Reference citations are presented in Section 6. Section 7 provides the raw frequency counts and percentage distributions of responses to all questions on the survey, presented in the order and with the wording used in the survey. Responses to open-ended questions are presented in appendices A-E.

2. Methods

2.1. Questionnaire Development
The survey questionnaire was developed by WYSAC researchers in collaboration with SER. The questionnaire was designed to collect information about the understanding on the part of the Wyoming public about in situ uranium recovery (ISR) as well as concerns they may have about its development in Wyoming. In drafting the questionnaire, WYSAC researchers relied on the findings from a SER-sponsored workshop on ISR that included representatives of the uranium industry, state and federal regulatory agencies, and the University (Meridian Institute, 2009).

WYSAC completed one pretest of the survey instrument on a small subsample of Wyoming households. The purpose of the pretest was to identify any wording changes that might be needed and to check for any programming flaws in the questionnaire uploaded in WYSAC’s CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) system. As a result of the pilot, one question was changed to assure better comprehension on the part of the respondents.

2.2. Sample Design
The sampling frame for this survey consisted of all Wyoming households with a listed land line phone number. The sample was drawn disproportionately by two geographic regions. Region 1 included Wyoming counties which have had or may eventually have ISR, namely: Albany, Campbell, Carbon, Converse, Crook, Fremont, Johnson, Natrona1, and Sweetwater counties. These represented the population of main interest to SER. The rest of the Wyoming counties were grouped in what is Region 2 for the purposes of this survey. Within each region the sample was drawn proportionately to the size of the counties that comprised that region.

---

1 Natrona county was added to Region 1 (the ISR region) for analysis after sample was drawn. The data was weighted appropriately for analysis.
A sample of telephone numbers large enough to ensure 400 completed interviews from Region 1 and 200 completed interviews from Region 2 was purchased from the Marketing Systems Group (MSG), one of the leading national companies specializing in the generation of scientific samples.

2.3. Data Collection, Response Rates and Margins of Error

The data collection period was from February 15 to February 24, 2010. WYSAC’s trained interviewers conducted the interviews during calling sessions that consisted of Sunday through Thursday evenings from 5 to 9 pm. Some interviews were also completed during the daytime. Phone numbers were called multiple times if previous calls did not result in a completed survey, a disconnected line, or otherwise ineligible number, or an irate refusal. Soft refusals were called more than once in an attempt at refusal conversions. The very tight time line of this survey precluded the continuation of the calling efforts resulting in the sample not being fully exhausted (i.e., 12 or more callbacks per number, which had not yet obtained a final disposition). A total of 935 surveys were completed exceeding by far the target number of 600. Of this total, 686 interviews were completed with households from Region 1 and 249 with households from Region 2. The overall response rate to this survey was 31%.

Random samples of 935 yield a margin of error of about ±3.3 percentage points with 95% confidence. Random samples of 686 and 249 yield margins of error of about ±3.8 and ±6.3 percentage points, respectively, with 95% confidence. In other words, for the state as a whole the results of this survey can be interpreted within ±3.3 percentage points margin with 95% confidence. For Region 1 the results of this survey can be interpreted within ±3.8 percentage points margin with 95% confidence. And for Region 2 the results of this survey can be interpreted within ±6.3 percentage points margin with 95% confidence.

2.4. Data Compilation and Analysis

The data were exported to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 18.0. Data analysts cleaned the data and recoded some of the variables to enable ease of presentation. For the purposes of the state level data analysis, the data were weighted using county weights. When using weighted data, the individual county’s population weight in the sample agrees closely with the actual county’s population weight in the state. The American Community Survey 2005-2007 three year population estimates for counties in Wyoming were used to calculate the appropriate weights (US Census Bureau, 2008).

Regional results are analyzed using data weighted at the regional level, and state-wide results are analyzed using data weighted at the state level. The detailed results of the survey findings are contained in Section 7, with regional and statewide results presented side-by-side in easy to read tables. The raw frequency counts and percentage distributions of responses to all questions on the survey are reported in the order and with the wording used in the survey. Frequency counts represent the actual number of responses for each survey question. Survey responses of Don’t Know, No Answer or Refused are excluded from the percentage calculations. Percentages for Check All that Apply survey items (i.e., questions for which multiple response choices are possible) may total more than 100%.

We tested observed regional differences for statistical significance using the overall Chi-square test and the Linear-by-linear test of association, as appropriate. For all instances in which either the
overall Pearson’s chi-square or the Linear-by-linear or both tests came back significant (p<0.05) there is a notation in the respective table.

In addition, using weighted state-level data, the public’s position on continued uranium development (i.e., in support of, neutral, or in opposition to) was examined against prior knowledge of ISR, perception of potential issues with ISR and the corresponding level of concern, as well as across key demographic variables (i.e., gender, education, age, and number of children). Again, differences observed were tested for statistical significance using the above mentioned tests. For all instances in which either the overall Pearson’s chi-square or the Linear-by-linear or both tests came back significant (p<0.05) there is a notation in the respective table.

3. Demographics

Based on the US Census Bureau 2009 population estimates for counties in Wyoming, Region 1, which includes Wyoming counties which have or will have ISR, comprises 50.9% of the state population or 276,881 residents and Region 2 comprises 49.1% of the state population or 267,389 residents (US Census Bureau, 2010). Our sample was disproportionately stratified by region. Region 1 was deliberately oversampled in order to obtain greater precision (i.e., smaller margin of error) for the population of main interest to SER. In our sample the responses from Region 1 represent 73% of all responses. As a reminder, when examining statewide results, the data are weighted to accurately reflect the actual population distribution in Wyoming.

Table 1 presents a comparison of our statewide sample to the population of Wyoming as a whole, using the demographic characteristics collected in the survey. As can be seen, our sample is slightly biased toward female responders. It is a very common problem in phone surveys for the sample of respondents to be heavily biased toward female responders. The subject matter of this survey worked against this trend. The educational distribution of our sample is notably biased toward the more educated public, which again can be explained by the survey topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>2008 statewide estimates*</th>
<th>Statewide survey sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate or GED</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or technical school</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and older</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: US Census Bureau, 2009
The age composition of the responders to this survey is significantly biased toward the older generations. The explanation for this is two-fold. Younger people tend to be much less responsive to surveys and in particular to phone surveys. In addition, by using a sample of only landline phone numbers, our sample did not include the ever growing universe of cell phone only households, currently over 11% of Wyoming households (National Center for Health Statistics, 2009). The prevalence of cell phone only households among young adults is even higher.

4. Key Findings
We found a significant difference in the level of previous knowledge regarding ISR between Region 1 and Region 2 (see Table 2). Nearly 69% of Region 1 respondents report to know a little, a moderate amount, or a lot compared to only 47% of Region 2. In other words, over half (53%) of the respondents from the non-uranium counties indicate they know nothing about ISR compared to 31.1% of respondents in the uranium counties.

Table 2. Regional Comparison of Prior Knowledge of In Situ Uranium Recovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-square test: p<.001
†Linear-by-linear association test p<.001

Table 3 summarizes the considerations Wyoming residents take into account when thinking about continued energy development in the state. Job creation is their top consideration (80.0%) followed by tax revenue for the state, the cost to their household, and health impacts (70.2%, 68.5%, and 65.6%, respectively). Environmental impacts and greenhouse gases produced are considered very important by less than half of the Wyoming public (49.3% and 37.0%, respectively). A quarter (24.9%) of the Wyoming public does not consider greenhouse gases produced important in thinking about continued energy development in the state.

Table 3. Considerations for Energy Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not important¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax revenue for the state</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost to your household</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health impacts</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse gases produced</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Not important equals the combined results for “not that important” and “not at all important.”

² The very tight timeline of this project precluded the use of a limited sampling frame. Including cell phone numbers in the sampling frame adds significantly to the duration and cost of a survey.
Public support for continued energy development of all types are summarized in Table 4. The public equally supports continued energy development of oil and natural gas, coal, and wind (80.5%, 79.5%, and 78.1%, respectively). Uranium extraction is supported by the public (61.4%), however, not as strongly as the other three and also has the highest percentage of opposition (9.6%). Interestingly, uranium extraction also has a higher percentage of respondents who report that they are neutral about its continued development (29.0%).

Table 4. Degree of Support for Continued Energy Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>In opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraction wells for oil &amp; natural gas</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal mining</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind turbines</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uranium extraction</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When looking specifically at the level of support or opposition for coal mining, there is a significant difference between respondents in Region 1 and Region 2. Nearly 85% of respondents in Region 1 report to be in support of continued coal mining development, while 75.5% of respondents in Region 2 report the same way. While the level of opposition to coal mining is similar (3.2% and 4.6%, respectively) in the two regions, 12.5% of respondents in Region 1 are neutral on the subject, while the respective number for Region 2 is 20%. (See Table 17.)

Survey results show that having some prior level of knowledge about ISR is correlated with the degree of support for continued uranium development (see Table 5). People who report to have prior knowledge of uranium recovery are more likely to support its continued development than those who report they have no prior knowledge.

Table 5. Degree of Support for Continued Uranium Development by Prior Knowledge of In Situ Uranium Recovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>Position on Continued Uranium Development</th>
<th>In support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>In opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot, a moderate amount, or a little</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-square test: p<.001
†Linear-by-linear association test p<.001
We found that key demographic variables are also associated with the level of support for continued uranium development (see Table 6). Men tend to be more in favor of development, compared to women who tend to oppose or be neutral on the topic. Households with no children are more likely to be in favor of continued development, compared to households with children (who tend to be neutral). People who have attended college are more likely to oppose continued development of uranium than those who did not attend college, although the level of support is nearly the same.

Table 6. Degree of Support for Continued Uranium Development by Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender***</th>
<th>In support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>In opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children***</th>
<th>In support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>In opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 child</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more children</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education**</th>
<th>In support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>In opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school degree, GED or less</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, college degree or graduate degree</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Chi-square test: p<.001
**Chi-square test: p<.01

Based on what respondents know about ISR (at the time of the survey), a majority of the Wyoming public believes that this process might cause groundwater contamination and pollution from waste water spills (76.5% and 71.7%, respectively). Fewer Wyoming residents believe this process might cause land disturbance as a result of exploration and recovery (57.5%) and an increased risk to public health (52.9%). Less than one third (30.9%) believe uranium recovery might result in unsafe roadways where uranium is transported (see Table 7).

Table 7. Belief that In Situ Uranium Recovery MIGHT Cause Potential Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Problem</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater contamination</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution from waste water spills</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land disturbance as a result of exploration and recovery</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An increased risk to public health</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe roadways where uranium is transported</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 is a graphic presentation of the findings addressed in Table 7. The results again are arranged in descending order of the percentage of respondents who believe ISR might cause each potential problem and are presented for the two regions separately. As can be seen, there is little variation by region and none of the differences observed are statistically significant. (See Tables 22-30.)

Figure 1. Percent Believing In Situ Uranium Recovery MIGHT Cause Potential Problem by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Problem</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater contamination</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution from waste water spills</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land disturbance</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An increased risk to public health</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe roadways</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We found a statistically significant relationship between those who believe that uranium recovery might cause a potential problem and the degree of support for continued uranium development (see Table 8). Those who are neutral or opposed to continued uranium development are more likely to believe that uranium recovery might cause groundwater contamination, pollution from waste water spills, land disturbance from exploration and recovery, and an increased risk to public health than those who are in support of development. Even so, over 60% of those in support of continued uranium development believe it might cause groundwater contamination and pollution from waste water spills (68.2% and 61.6%, respectively).

Table 8. Belief that In Situ Uranium Recovery MIGHT Cause Potential Problems by Degree of Support for Continued Uranium Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Problem</th>
<th>Position on Continued Uranium Development</th>
<th>In support</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>In opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater contamination**†</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution from waste water spills**†</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land disturbance as a result of exploration and recovery**†</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An increased risk to public health**†</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe roadways where uranium is transported**†</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-square test: p<.001
†Linear-by-linear association test p<.001

Table 9 summarizes the degree of concern associated with the potential problems that continued uranium development might cause. Respondents who reported they thought ISR might cause the potential problem were asked about their degree of concern about the potential problem. Among those who believe that uranium recovery might cause groundwater contamination and pollution from waste water spills, more than half are very concerned (54.9% and 51.0%, respectively) about the respective potential problem and around one third are somewhat concerned (30.4% and 33.7%, respectively). Although over half (57.5%) of Wyoming residents believe uranium recovery might cause land disturbance as a result of exploration, less than a quarter of those (23.4%) are very concerned with this potential problem and 47.3% are somewhat concerned. Among those who believe uranium recovery might cause an increased risk to public health, 45.8% are very concerned with this potential problem and 40.9% are somewhat concerned. One third (33.8%) of those who believe uranium recovery might cause unsafe roadways where uranium is transported are very concerned and 42.9% are somewhat concerned.

Table 9. Degree of Concern among Those Who Believe In Situ Uranium Recovery Might Cause Potential Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Problem</th>
<th>Very concerned</th>
<th>Somewhat concerned</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not concerned†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater contamination</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution from waste water spills</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An increased risk to public health</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe roadways where uranium is transported</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land disturbance as a result of exploration and recovery</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Not concerned equals the combined results for “not that concerned” and “not at all concerned.”
Figure 2 is a graphic presentation of the findings addressed in Table 9. The results are arranged in descending order of the percentage of respondents in the two regions who are *very concerned* or *somewhat concerned* with that potential problem. Again, the level of concern for the potential problem was only asked of those who thought ISR might cause the problem. As can be seen, the level of concern is highest for the increased risk to public health (close to 90%), followed by groundwater contamination and pollution from waste water spills (over 80%). Survey respondents appear to be least concerned with land disturbance; still, a significant majority expresses that concern (over 60%). (See Tables 22-31.)

On the item of *land disturbance as a result of exploration and recovery*, significantly more respondents in Region 2 (non-ISR) reported they were *very concerned* with the potential problem (34.7%) than those in Region 1 (16.7%). (See Table 23.)

*Chi-square test: p<.05*
As previously mentioned, the level of concern questions regarding different potential problems that could arise from ISR were only asked of respondents who reported they “thought that in-situ uranium recovery MIGHT cause [potential problem].” In an attempt to get a better representation of the level of concern of all respondents who report to have any previous knowledge of ISR, we included respondents who reported they did not think ISR might cause the problem (and subsequently were not asked the level of concern questions) in the percentage distributions for the level of concern questions; they were added to the “not concerned” response category. The results of this additional analysis are presented in Table 9a and Figure 3.

Table 9a. Degree of Concern among ALL of Those Who Report Any Prior Knowledge of ISR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Problem</th>
<th>Very concerned</th>
<th>Somewhat concerned</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not concerned*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An increased risk to public health</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater contamination</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution from waste water spills</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe roadways where uranium is transported</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land disturbance as a result of exploration and recovery</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not concerned equals the combined results for “not that concerned” and “not at all concerned,” and reflects the inclusion of all those who did not think ISR might cause the potential problem.

Figure 3. Degree of Concern among ALL of Those Who Report Any Prior Knowledge of ISR

*Not concerned equals the combined results for “not that concerned” and “not at all concerned,” and reflects the inclusion of all those who did not think ISR might cause the potential problem.
Finally, we present the results of what information would be helpful in understanding what an increase in uranium recovery would mean for Wyoming and its citizens (see Figure 4). It is evident that survey respondents deemed all topics interesting. Furthermore, there is little variation by region and none of the differences observed are statistically significant. (See Tables 32-38)

Figure 4. Percent Very or Somewhat Interested in Learning More about Select Topics Related to Uranium Development by Region
5. Summary

WYSAC collected information on the concerns and knowledge gaps of Wyoming citizens regarding in situ uranium recovery or ISR. The purpose of collecting this information was to inform a public forum on ISR to be held in the spring of 2010.

Fewer Wyoming residents support continued uranium development compared to oil and gas, coal, and wind development. However, over half (53.0%) of the respondents from the non-uranium counties indicate they know nothing about ISR, as do 31.1% of respondents in the uranium counties. Statewide, 42.1% report they know nothing about ISR. Statewide, 29% are neutral on the topic. Citizens with any reported prior knowledge of uranium recovery are more likely to support continued uranium development than those who have no prior knowledge.

We also found that the degree of support for continued uranium development is strongly associated with beliefs about potential problems that might be caused by uranium recovery. Specifically, those who are in support of continued uranium development are less likely to think that uranium recovery might cause groundwater contamination, pollution from wastewater spills, land disturbance from exploration and recovery, and increased risk to public health, than those who are neutral or opposed to continued uranium recovery.

Among those who believe uranium recovery might cause potential problems, over half are very concerned about groundwater contamination and pollution from waste water spills. These results suggest that the public considers Wyoming’s water resources, both groundwater and surface water, to be very important. We recommend these topics along with increased risk to public health be thoroughly vetted in the public forum.
6. References
7. Survey Results

Detailed results from the survey are presented below. Regional raw frequency counts and weighted percentage distributions and statewide weighted percentage distributions are presented side-by-side. The raw frequency counts and percentage distributions of responses to all questions on the survey are reported in the order and with the wording used in the survey. Frequency counts represent the actual number of responses for each survey question. Survey responses of Don’t Know, No Answer or Refused are excluded from the percentage calculations. Percentages for Check All that Apply survey items (i.e., questions for which multiple response choices are possible) may total more than 100%.

Further, the differences observed by region were tested for statistical significance. The overall Chi-square test and the Linear-by-linear test of association were used as appropriate. All instances in which either the overall Pearson’s chi-square or the Linear-by-linear or both tests came back significant (p<0.05) there is a notation in the respective table.

Hello, my name is [name] and I’m calling from the University of Wyoming and I’m NOT selling anything. Your phone number was randomly drawn for a statewide survey about energy development in Wyoming. Would you be able to help me out with this?

(Only if asked: You may call Mary Byrnes, Associate Director of Energy Outreach at (307) 766-6851.)

[If yes] Thanks! I need to ask. Have I reached you on a cell phone?

[If yes] I’m not allowed to interview you if you're driving, and I don't want to use your minutes. The survey will take about 10 minutes, may I keep going or should I call back at another time?

[If yes] First, I need to confirm. Is this a private residence in Wyoming?

[If yes] And I also need to ask if I am speaking with someone 18 or older.

[If yes] I won't ask for your name, address, or other personal information that can identify you. Any information you give me will be confidential. The interview takes only about 10 minutes. You don’t have to answer any question you don't want to, and you can end the interview at any time. If you have any questions about this survey, I will provide a telephone number for you to call to get more information.
First, in which county in Wyoming do you live?

Table 10. County Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Weighted %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Horn</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converse</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crook</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Springs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laramie</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natrona</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niobrara</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platte</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublette</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uinta</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washakie</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>935</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wyoming produces more energy resources than we use. The surplus is exported, contributing to the nation's economy. As you may already know, energy is generated from our state's coal, natural gas, uranium, and wind resources.

People have varying opinions about energy development in the state. I'm going to read you a list of possible considerations related to energy development. When thinking about whether YOU would support energy development in the state, please tell me whether for YOU each of the following is very important, somewhat important, not that important, or not important at all.

Q1a. "The cost to your household."

When thinking about whether YOU would support energy development in the state, is the cost to your household...

Table 11. Q1a. The cost to your household importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that important</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q1b. How about "Tax revenue for the state"? When thinking about whether YOU would support energy development in the state, is tax revenue to the state....

Table 12. Q1b. Tax revenue for the state importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that important</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
Q1c. What about "Environmental impacts"? When thinking about whether YOU would support energy development in the state, are environmental impacts...

Table 13. Q1c. Importance of environmental impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 1 Percent*</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that important</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q1d. How about "Job creation"?

(If needed: thinking about whether YOU would support energy development in the state is job creation...)

Table 14. Q1d. Importance of job creation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 1 Percent*</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that important</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q1e. What about "Health impacts"?

(If needed: thinking about whether YOU would support energy development in the state are health impacts...)

Table 15. Q1e. Importance of Health impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 1 Percent*</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that important</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
Q1f. "The amount of greenhouse gases produced"?

(If needed: thinking about whether you would support energy development in the state is the amount of greenhouse gasses produced...)

Table 16. Q1f. Importance of Greenhouse gases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that important</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q2. Energy development has provided major economic benefits for Wyoming, but energy development may also present potential problems. I’m going to read you a list of the kinds of energy development that occur in the state. For each kind of energy development, please tell me whether you are generally in support of, neutral, or generally in opposition to its continued development?

Q2a."Coal Mining" Are you...

Table 17. Q2a. Coal mining development support/opposition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In support of continued development</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In opposition of continued development</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
**Chi-square test: p<.05
†Linear-by-linear association test p<.01

Q2b. How about "Extraction wells for oil & natural gas?" Are you...

Table 18. Q2b. Extraction well development support/opposition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In support of continued development</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In opposition of continued development</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
Q2c. How about "Uranium extraction?" Are you...

Table 19. Q2c. Uranium extraction development support/opposition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In support of continued development</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In opposition of continued development</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q2d. And "Wind turbines?" Are you...

Table 20. Q2d. Wind turbine development support/opposition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In support of continued development</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In opposition of continued development</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
Now we would like to ask you some questions about uranium mining. Many people don't know much about uranium mining, so we will start with a brief explanation.

Uranium has been mined in Wyoming for decades typically using one of two methods. The first method, surface mining, involves digging open-pits or underground shaft-and-tunnels. This method is currently not in use in Wyoming. The second method brings uranium to the surface using a series of injection and recovery wells drilled into the uranium deposit. A chemical that dissolves uranium is mixed with the groundwater and the uranium is recovered after the groundwater is pumped to the surface. The process is known as in-situ uranium recovery.

Q3. Before this survey, how much do you feel you knew about the in-situ uranium recovery process - a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or nothing?

Table 21. Q3. Previous knowledge of in-situ uranium recovery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 1 Percent*</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
** Chi-square test: p<.001
† Linear-by-linear association test p<.001

Q4. In general, what is your opinion about this uranium recovery process?

→ See Appendix A for complete text listing of responses to Q4.

(Questions 5a to 5e2 were asked only of those respondents who stated that they have some knowledge about ISR. The rest of the respondents were skipped to question 6.)

Based on what you know today, do you believe that in-situ uranium recovery MIGHT cause any of the following?

Q5a. Land disturbance as a result of exploration and recovery?

Table 22. Q5a. Potential cause of land disturbance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 1 Percent*</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System missing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
Q5a2. [If yes to Q5a1]: And how concerned are you with this potential problem? Are you...

(If needed: Regarding land disturbance as a result of exploration and recovery.)

Table 23. Q5a2. Concern for land disturbance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very concerned</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat concerned</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that concerned</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all concerned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System missing</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>433</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.  
**Chi-square test: p<.05  
†Linear-by-linear association test p<.001

Q5b. How about "Pollution from waste water spills?" Do you believe that in-situ uranium recovery MIGHT cause this?

Table 24. Q5b. Potential cause of pollution from waste water spills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System missing</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q5b2. [If yes to Q5b]: And how concerned are you with this potential problem? Are you...

(If needed: Regarding pollution from waste water spills.)

Table 25. Q5b2. Concern for pollution from waste water spills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very concerned</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat concerned</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that concerned</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all concerned</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System missing</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
Q5c. How about "Unsafe roadways where uranium is transported?" Do you believe that in-situ uranium recovery MIGHT cause this?

Table 26. Q5c. Potential cause for unsafe roadways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System missing</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q5c2. [If yes to Q5c]: And how concerned are you with this potential problem? Are you...

(If needed: Regarding unsafe roadways where uranium is transported.)

Table 27. Q5c2. Concern for unsafe roadways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very concerned</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat concerned</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that concerned</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all concerned</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System missing</td>
<td>565</td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>566</td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q5d. How about "Groundwater contamination?" Do you believe that in-situ uranium recovery MIGHT cause this?

Table 28. Q5d. Potential cause for groundwater contamination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System missing</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
Q5d2. [If yes to Q5d]: And how concerned are you with this potential problem? Are you...

*(If needed: Regarding groundwater contamination)*

Table 29. Q5d2. Concern for groundwater contamination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very concerned</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat concerned</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that concerned</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all concerned</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know/not sure 2
No answer/refused 0
System missing 364
Total missing 366
Total 686

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q5c. How about "An increased risk to public health?" Do you believe that in-situ uranium recovery MIGHT cause this?

Table 30. Q5e. Potential cause for increased public health risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know/not sure 48
No answer/refused 2
System missing 236
Total missing 286
Total 686

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q5e2. [If yes to Q5e]: And how concerned are you with this potential problem? Are you...

*(If needed: Regarding an increased risk to public health.)*

Table 31. Q5e2. Concern for increased public health risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very concerned</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat concerned</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that concerned</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all concerned</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know/not sure 1
No answer/refused 0
System missing 469
Total missing 470
Total 686

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
Q6. Plans are in action to increase uranium recovery in Wyoming. We want to know what information would be helpful for you to better understand what this increase in uranium recovery would mean for Wyoming and its residents. I have a list of possible topics. For each topic, please tell me whether you are interested or not interested in learning more about it. (Q6a-Q6g were asked in a random order for each respondent.)

Q6a. How interested or not interested are you in learning more about the PUBLIC HEALTH EFFECTS of increased uranium recovery. Are you...

Table 32. Q6a. Interest in learning more about the public health effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 1 Percent*</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat interested</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (don’t care)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that interested</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q6b. How interested or not interested are you in learning more about how increased uranium recovery may affect the environment and environmental protection plans? Are you...

Table 33. Q6b. Interest in learning more about environmental effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 1 Percent*</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat interested</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (don’t care)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that interested</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
Q6c. How interested or not interested are you in learning more about job creation as a result of increased uranium recovery? Are you...

Table 34. Q6c. Interest in learning more about job creation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat interested</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (don't care)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that interested</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q6d. How interested or not interested are you in learning more about the effects of increased uranium recovery on the property rights of landowners? Are you...

Table 35. Q6d. Interest in learning more about property rights of landowners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat interested</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (don't care)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that interested</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q6e. How interested or not interested are you in learning more about the regulation of uranium recovery and the agencies involved? Are you...

Table 36. Q6e. Interest in learning more about the regulation and agencies involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat interested</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (don't care)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not that interested</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
Q6f. **How interested or not interested are you in learning more about the uranium recovery process? Are you...**

Table 37. Q6f. Interest in learning more about the uranium recovery process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat interested</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (don't care)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q6g. **How interested or not interested are you in learning more about uranium and nuclear power? Are you...**

Table 38. Q6g. Interest in learning more about uranium and nuclear power.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat interested</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral (don't care)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q7. **Are there any additional topics you would be interested in learning more about?**

→ See Appendix B for a complete text listing of responses to Q7.
Q8. We now have a few questions about you and your household.

Typically, what sources do you use to get your information on issues such as these?

Table 39. Q8. Sources used to gather information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 1 Percent*</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio**††</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(None of the above)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Don’t know/not sure)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No answer/refused)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
**Chi-square test: p<.05
††Linear-by-linear association test p<.05
→See Appendix C for a complete list of other sources specified.

Q9. When you want to educate yourself about issues such as these, do you do any of the following?

Table 40. Q9. Methods of self education on similar issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 1 Percent*</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend talks at professional or community organizations</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend seminars/lectures at the library or a college/university</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read the newspaper**††</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to the radio**††</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch television</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit websites</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(None of the above)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Don’t know/not sure)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No answer/refused)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
**Chi-square test: p<.01
††Linear-by-linear association test p<.01
→See Appendix D for a complete list of other methods specified.
Q10. What is the highest level of school you have completed?

Table 41. Q10. Education level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 1 Percent*</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate or GED</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or technical school (including associates)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate school</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q11. In what year were you born? (Recoded into age categories)

Table 42. Q11. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 1 Percent*</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q11a. How many years have you lived in Wyoming?

Table 43. Q11a. Years lived in Wyoming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 1 Percent*</th>
<th>Region 2 Frequency</th>
<th>Region 2 Percent*</th>
<th>Statewide Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40 years</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60 years</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ years</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Lived entire life in Wyoming‡ | 204 | 30.2% | 64 | 28.4% |

*Calculated variable (includes self-reported “entire life” and all those within one year of birth)
Q12. How many children, age 17 or younger, currently live your household?

Table 44. Q12. Children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>**</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
**Chi-square test: p<.05

Q13. Is there anyone in your household who is currently employed in the energy industry?

Table 45. Q13. Employed in energy industry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>**†</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
**Chi-square test: p<.001
†Linear-by-linear association test p<.001

Q14. Is there anyone in your household who is currently employed in extracting natural resources?

Table 46. Q13. Employed in extracting natural resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>**†</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
**Chi-square test: p<.001
†Linear-by-linear association test p<.001
Q15. Is there anyone in your household who is currently employed in uranium recovery?

Table 47. Q15. Employed in uranium extraction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer/refused</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.

Q16. That is the end of the survey. Thank you very much for your participation. Do you have any additional comments you want to make?

*(If needed: For more information about the survey you may call Mary Byrnes, Associate Director of Energy Outreach at 307-766-6851.)*

→ See Appendix E for complete text listings of responses to Q16.


Table 48. Q17. Gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valid</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Can’t tell)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages distributions are based on weighted data.
8. Appendices
Appendix A. General opinions about in situ uranium recovery. (Q4.)

- A little hesitant with the groundwater situation.
- Against it, because of the water contamination.
- Against it.
- All for it.
- Anything like uranium that they bring to the surface and let that water, which is bound to not be able to be completely purified, go back into the earth, is a detriment to the state - including livestock and people. If there was a guarantee that mining for uranium would restore the land to the original terrain and would be safe for the environment - including livestock, human beings, or wild animals, I would be in support of this uranium recovery process.
- As far as jobs go it's somewhat important.
- As long as all of the necessary safety precautions are taken I'm in support.
- As long as it doesn't destroy our groundwater I'm OK with it. How much water are they using? And groundwater is more important than uranium.
- As long as it is being done in a responsible manner, no problem at all.
- As long as they do it safe, and don't contaminate the water, and there's good cleanup. For us in this area, it's good job security, so I'm for it.
- As long as they do it safely, I support it.
- As long as they keep the wells sucking the water out of the ground, you need to keep pumping so it doesn't contaminate the ground and water.
- As long as they treat the water that they are using for extracting and pulling it back out, and get it back to normal and take out all the chemicals and impurities out of the water, its fine. But if they don't get the impurities out of the water, it is not okay.
- As long as you are keeping the water clean it's ok.
- Better than open pit.
- Better than the old way.
- Better of the two methods.
- Bring it on.
- Concerned.
- Concerned about the potential for water contamination.
- Concerned about the water issue.
- Depending on how the ground water is disposed of, I would support this method. They should have a good method of disposal for ground water.
- Depending upon the ways it is done, if it's done in a safe manner and there are individuals or agencies that can oversee the process.
- Depends on how it's done and where. If it's done in geologically stable areas where it won't pollute the water, then it's fine, but if there are a lot of faults then it can spread into people's water wells or municipal water wells and I'm not in favor of that.
- Depends on how they deal with the water in the injection series, do they clean it?
- Do a very good job with reclamation and it's a very clean process.
- Do it.
- Doesn't bother me the least.
- Don't like what uranium is used for... nuclear stuff.
• Don't agree with it at all! Very bad idea to mess with radioactivity.
• Don't know enough to have an opinion.
• Don't like it. (2)
• Don't like it very much since it's mixed with the ground water.
• Don't like using ground water. Feels we should use the open pit method
• Don't want it in Wyoming.
• Fairly negative.
• Fantastic
• Favorable. (3)
• Open pit is OK.
• Fine. (2)
• For it, I think they need to what the water table.
• For it. (2)
• From what I know it's okay.
• Generally favorable.
• Go with 1st method. Leary about anything that deals with groundwater.
• Good. (2)
• Good idea.
• Good process; a little worried about ground water, drinking water etc.
• Good process that works
• Good process.
• Good way to do it.
• Good way to produce uranium.
• Good, it's an excellent method.
• Good. As long as ground water is put back clean.
• Ground water recovery is a problem.
• Hate to see it pulled out of the water.
• Have to be really careful about how this is done; every case should be carefully researched.
• Having limited information, my opinion may not be of significant value. In my opinion, anything that moves us to energy independence, I am definitely for.... Using our own resources.
• I am a miner, so I know that the regulations are put in place to protect people.
• I am concerned about by-products and storage, so forth.
• I am for it. I am a little hesitant about what happens to the water after it is done. It can saturate and pollute other things.
• I am for it.
• I am in favor of it.
• I am in favor of the in-situ process
• I am in support of it. (3)
• I am not in favor of the process.
• I am opposed to it.
• I am very interested in the effects of this process on the groundwater and the water-table.
• I am very supportive of it.
• I approve of it with proper observation of guidance.
• I couldn't care less.
I do not like it - there is too much risk of contaminating. I am for uranium mining but I do not believe the in-situ mining is the way to do it.

I do not like it, I think it is going to ruin our water.

I do not support it.

I don't agree with in-situ process.

I don't feel at all negative about it.

I don't go for the underground methods, the in-situ recovery process sounds best.

I don't know about that I don't think I like that because I don't know what they're pumping in.

I don't know about the water part of it

I don't know enough about it, so I can't really speak with any authority on it. I am in favor of nuclear energy though.

I don't know enough about it yet.

I don't know enough about it. I'd like to know what happens to water.

I don't know enough to know if it's damaging to the water.

I don't know enough to make an informed opinion about it.

I don't know if I would be in favor of that type. Being that Wyoming has a scarcity of water - to possibly pollute it, that would be a concern, but if the water could be reclaimed, I would be for that.

I don't know much about drilling and bringing it up but the open pit mining went on for years. It's a little bit dangerous, exposed radiation. I think the new process is much safer. As long as they do it safely, I support it whole heartedly.

I don't know that it's necessary.

I don't know what kind of effect it has on ground water and that kind of thing, it sounds like it may have some drawbacks that I don't quite understand.

I don't know. I don't understand enough to really give you a good answer. I'm worried about the groundwater.

I don't like it. (4)

I don't like it, it just depends on the degree in which they will do these things, I don't want the entire state torn up.

I don't like it. We have too many fan seems and when you do the induction process because of the numerous fan strata it is hard to get to full recovery to the surface.

I don't like it. I like the open mining, the strip mining better.

I don't like it; it's bad.

I don't like the in-situ process. Up near Casper there's a lot of uranium development and that area looks like the moon - it's really weird looking. I'm concerned about the contamination of the ground water with uranium.

I don't like the second method. The first is better for me because when you're done you can always recover the surface and everything. But you start getting into groundwater and you don't know where that's gonna go.

I don't like them using groundwater.

I don't mind it.

I don't really know why we're doing this because we're not building any new plants and we have enough bombs. I know there are some good medical benefits but other than that...

I don't really like it. The pollution of the water.

I don't really think it sounds like a good idea.
• I don't see a problem with it.
• I don't think it hurts too much.
• I don't think it is such a good idea
• I don't think it's a bad thing.
• I don't think it's a good deal.
• I don't think we should do it at all. Totally opposed.
• I don't think we should produce uranium at all, because it produces nuclear bombs. I was raised in a time when we were hiding under our desks because of the Russians and the bomb. I think it's too dangerous.
• I feel like it has been in poor hand over the years. The land has not been put back together well.
• I feel more comfortable with the process of it as opposed to the surface mining.
• I feel uranium is important. Just because I feel we need more power plants. I also support gas energy. I feel uranium is a good source of energy for our country. I believe in a happy medium in clean energy sources.
• I find it troubling.
• I guess am for it, because they do about the same thing with coal methane.
• I guess I don't understand the process. I would hate to ruin our water if that creates a problem. I would be more inclined to support strip mining.
• I guess I really don't have one, but probably use a lot of ground or surface water.
• I hate it...uses our water. No, no, no!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
• I have a concern about the effects on ground water
• I have a concern with the use of atomic energy.
• I have a little knowledge of it.
• I have a neutral opinion. There are probably more jobs created with underground mining but this is probably more efficient.
• I have a problem with the surface water, I don't like the contamination of the water, cause it's all we've got.
• I have concerns about it going into the groundwater that's available for drinking. I'm concerned about it causing sink holes. However, I prefer it over strip mining.
• I have qualms about the safety of this.
• I have concerns.
• I have some concerns.
• I have some question on the water table and mixing with the water supply.
• I hope in-situ uranium recovery doesn't contaminate the groundwater.
• I just really don't like any process that has water injected into our water cables in Wyoming. Especially when we're dealing with uranium.
• I know that the surface water thing is a problem. Open pits are a problem. Modern technology can make it happen. It just needs to be monitored. Even wind turbines aren't
perfect, but they're still necessary. I support all types of energy. We need all of it! We need all of the energies that we can develop.

- I know there are some health issues with it. The use of groundwater also concerns me. We don't have enough as it is.
- I know they've used it for gold - it depends on what you combine the uranium with because you could have residual problems.
- I like it.
- I need to know more about how it affects the ground and what it leaves behind.
- I only care about injecting water back in...if it's contaminated water.
- I prefer the drilling.
- I prefer the open pit due to the reclamation standards.
- I prefer the open pit. You don't get all the waste from the water injection.
- I prefer the surface mining.
- I support it. (4)
- I support it, I believe it should be pursued and fully developed to the best of our abilities.
- I support it. I think it's necessary for where they use uranium, but I believe there need to be safeguards.
- I suppose it's important to the country.
- I think a lot of the whole thing is blown out of proportion as far as the dangerousness of it. Uranium has always been in the ground and thus it contaminated the water before humans even began to mess with recovering it.
- I think any way we can develop energy without damaging the environment we should do it.
- I think if they follow the guidelines they're fine.
- I think if we can get it to the surface and use it without ruining the ground water in the process, so in-situ is our best bet. So we don't have to open pit it, or it becoming a leach field.
- I think it beats open pit mining.
- I think it beats the way we used to do it at Jeffery City, which is a ghost town today.
- I think it carries a pretty strong risk of contamination of groundwater.
- I think it could be exceptionally dangerous to our environment.
- I think it is a good deal
- I think it is a good idea how they do it now
- I think it is a good method.
- I think it is a good thing
- I think it is a good, safe thing, but there are also long term effects as far as people's health, and I know people who have worked in the mines for a long time and they've had problems.
- I think it is going to have to happen anyways so we might as well accept it
- I think it is not a good process... should use the first process.
- I think it is potentially very problematic to groundwater resources.
- I think it needs a lot of work and a lot of repair. I think it's hazardous and there's not a large enough governing body for all the amount of drilling that they do. Their cement is over PVC. They run their PVC way over the depths that it's rated for. One in every 10 wells they drill fails due to poor cement work (which isn't well supervised) and there's not enough environmental overseers. Down near Douglas there used to be 2 or 3 irrigation
systems - ever since the uranium got close to them they haven't been running. I think that they are to be subject to have their permits online and not mailed in so everyone can see what they're doing like they do with CBM. Most of their info is marked down on paper and the general public can't see what they're doing.

- I think it needs to be stopped.
- I think it sounds very interesting, and exciting and good.
- I think it would be good for the state of Wyoming but I don't agree with injection into the groundwater.
- I think it would work well.
- I think it'll be okay.
- I think it's a good deal I guess, if it helps our economy. As long as it creates jobs it would be a benefactor I think.
- I think it's a good idea.
- I think it's a good idea. Beats having open pit or underground shafts or anything like that.
- I think it's a good process. It keeps people safe and uranium coming out of the ground.
- I think it's a good thing.
- I think it's a valuable tool to recover uranium with.
- I think it's alright, we have a lot of it in Converse county.
- I think it's an awful process. You shouldn't use groundwater; it's not like we have an excess of water in Wyoming.
- I think it's an effective method, and it avoids the negative impact of an open mine.
- I think it's been proven over the world that this is the main source of power with little side effects.
- I think it's better than open mines. I live in an area where they mined uranium back in the 40s and 50s and they're still viable. I think pumping it out is better than open mines.
- I think it's better than open-pit.
- I think it's critical.
- I think it's dangerous to our water supply.
- I think it's dangerous. I wish they'd stop.
- I think it's fine. (4)
- I think it's fine. The way Wyoming mineralists do it is by drilling wells and injecting.
- I think it's foolish, environmentally very unsafe and it hasn't improved in the past 30 years. I think we're going to have major water contamination problems. I don't think it will benefit the state - only the property owners.
- I think it’s good, and it creates more power than coal.
- I think it's good, we need it and it's an excellent source of energy.
- I think it's good.
- I think it's great.
- I think it's high time. The more, the merrier.
- I think it’s important.
- I think it's important right now to have recovery. We need to do our own resources here and forget the other countries. I know with the technology today; it's no hazard to the people.
- I think it's important. We're going to have to have it. They keep making nuclear plants.
- I think it's o.k. (6)
- I think it's o.k. except for the groundwater. They really need to watch it. They're so tough
on the methane stuff but this kind of leech they’re doing on the uranium, they need to watch it closely.

- I think it's o.k. if it’s done under control, and there are things in place to guard against any issues.
- I think it’s perfectly satisfactory as long as the tailings and waste water watch are monitored and properly processed.
- I think it's probably a better and a cheaper way to do than turning the ground over.
- I think it's probably a good idea because it's something that's needed I guess.
- I think it's the only way to do it.
- I think it's the only way. Would like to see more jobs.
- I think it's very good, I think it's worth sticking with.
- I think that I would rather go with the surface mining method.
- I think that I'm more in favor of the open-pits and mines, because it's still in its physical state, and we have to be careful with the water.
- I think that it is important.
- I think that it's good to have a variety of energy development methods, so I think it's great that we can do this. As far as I know, this is a safer method of getting uranium than digging.
- I think that it's important and should be considered.
- I think that there are better ways of getting energy.
- I think that we have to figure out the long term effect on the groundwater but other than that nothing.
- I think the residual effects need to be measured.
- I think there are some serious considerations to ground water contamination.
- I think there needs to be more known about the process and the impact it has on the environment.
- I think they're probably messing with the water. We need it though! I think should do the open pit mining. They would need to do the reclamation of the land as well.
- I think uranium should stay where it is. We have lots of problems in Fremont County because of uranium mining.
- I think we need it for a lot of things, so I moderately support it.
- I think we need more of it. My father helped develop it.
- I think we need to go for it.
- I think we should use any method necessary to extract uranium.
- I think we should use it.
- I think we should go about getting the uranium and other resources the safest way. Don’t be in a big hurry.
- I think it's o.k.
- I understand that those kinds of chemicals can be dangerous, and that method of extraction can leave a lot of messy stuff to clean up later.
- I wonder about the water situation.
- I would go for something that doesn't mess up the land.
- I would, just as soon they did not use the chemicals mixed in with the water.
- I would like to look more into renewable energy resources.
- I would say it is concerning, especially the groundwater.
- I would say it's all good. I've seen it done both ways.
• I would speculate that it is about a 50/50 deal. Chances are groundwater can get into drinking water... Lots to depend on. I think it is a positive thing but all things have hazards.
• I would support it.
• I would support that. I know that they used to have US steel here.
• I would think that the second method would be better.
• I'd rather see them do the open pits than using the groundwater.
• If it affects groundwater, it needs to be mitigated.
• If it goes into the ground water I would not be in favor of it.
• If it works, it works fine. I prefer the open pit style. I think you're wrong, I think it is still in operation in the Shirley Basin area. If it's not the wells are mothballs, but they're still in operation regularly. There used to be half a dozen mines or so in the Shirley Basin area.
• If it's done right, it's great. I definitely approve of it.
• if it's used for the right purpose it is alright; not bombs.
• If they cover the hole or the injection when they get through.
• If the process is fully followed it is safe and efficient.
• If you can watch the contamination of ground water.
• I'll go for the open pit mining. I don't think they should mess with the water.
• I'm a little concerned about what it does to the water table - contamination of the groundwater.
• I'm a little leery of it. (2)
• I'm a little skeptical about it, I guess.
• I'm against it.
• I'm all for it.
• I'm concerned about it affecting ground water and some of the aquifers in the area. I don't want it to affect water we're using. And I'm concerned about the overall safety on the technique.
• I'm concerned about it. I'd like to know more.
• I'm concerned about it. I'm concerned about anything involving groundwater.
• I'm concerned about that especially with the water injection. I think it should be studied more before used.
• I'm concerned about what it does to the water supply.
• I'm for it.
• I'm for it. They've done an excellent job.
• I'm in favor of it. (6)
• I'm in favor of it but I don't really know much about that particular process. I guess I'd like to know more about it.
• I'm in support of it. (2)
• I'm in support of it. I think we need it and it's a good way to bring revenue to the state.
• I'm in support of the mining process, not the open pits, but the in situ recovery I think is good for the economy and for the tax base.
• I'm kind of neutral.
• I'm nervous about it.
• I'm neutral on that - I would have to find out the process - how deep, how close to the aquifers, it'd almost have to be done on a case-by-case permitting.
• I'm neutral on that. I think uranium should be used in power plants safely.
• I'm neutral. (2)
• I'm not familiar enough to give a good comment
• I'm not in favor because as I understand it, there is an opportunity to infiltrate ground water and ultimately end up effecting the environment.
• I'm not opposed to it. I'm neutral. I think we could find something better.
• I'm not opposed, as long as practiced with best management practices.
• I'm not sure. I know that when people are doing it, they are not very careful.
• I'm OK with it.
• I'm probably against it.
• I'm supportive.
• I'm supportive. The biggest thing is how it affects the ground water - I'm not sure how it does.
• I'm very much for it.
• I'm very supportive of it.
• I'm well informed on this. I think it lacks appropriate ground water regulation.
• In favor. (7)
• in support (2)
• In support, I think they should continue.
• In terms of in-situ uranium recovery, it has a lot of potential, there are many groundwater issues that need to be addressed and there are land disturbances.
• It bothers me about the ground water.
• It brings jobs to our county and I am in favor to it.
• it causes a lot of problems.
• It could be better.
• It creates jobs and as long as it doesn't harm the environment it's an okay thing.
• It depends on the location, the groundwater, aquifer, and the potential external contamination.
• It depends on what they do with the water, and how dangerous the water becomes to people, wildlife, and vegetation.
• It depends upon what they do with the groundwater after they have extracted the uranium. Do they purify it or put in a holding pond.
• It doesn't matter to me.
• It doesn't sound very good to me.
• It has problems, ground water was a problem.
• It is a good deal. We need uranium and it is better than buying from overseas.
• It is according to who the groundwater would affect.
• It is favorable.
• it is important to do it.
• It is the best we have and the one we should do.
• It makes me a little more nervous.
• It needs to be done.
• It poisons the environment. I think it's dangerous and difficult to deposit of the waste water.
• It seems to be working.
• It seems to work. I am positive.
• It sounds kind of scary as to what it could do to the surrounding area.
• It sounds like it could be damaging to the groundwater.
• It sounds like it might be a good idea. It would eliminate having to go in and work over the land after when they have to go back in and put the land back the way it was before - it would eliminate some of that I guess.
• It works.
• It would have to be so carefully monitored and controlled.
• I think it is a good thing instead of digging up the earth; saves the pastures, etc. for the ranchers.
• I think it is okay.
• It's a good deal.(2)
• It's a good deal. What they do with the water after they use it is an issue. Any job creation is good though.
• It's a good idea, it's a good process.
• It's a good thing - it puts people to work - we need more nuclear power plants. I think the whole industry - gas, oil, coal - it's all good for keeping people working. I've family in just about all of those careers and they provide good for their families - medical, etc.
• It's a good thing.
• It's a lot better than what I pictured they did.
• It's acceptable.
• It's a lot safer than putting someone down in a mine putting them in harms way (harmful effects of uranium on humans). This method seems much safer.
• It's better than the old one.
• It's fairly negative - the groundwater is pretty horrifically contaminated.
• It's fine.
• It's fine - in places where they leech, I'm not worried about the environmental concerns there.
• It's fine with me. I think it's important.
• It's fine. (2)
• It's good, it keeps jobs in Wyoming.
• It's good.
• It's good. I think it's important and a very safe way of mining uranium and I think it could be a very good thing for Wyoming because it has very low impacts to the environment and people.
• It's great.
• It's important.
• It's important. I'm for it for now.
• It's kind of a touchy subject. If it's handled right I'm for it.
• It's necessary. (2)
• If it's not carefully done, it pollutes the ground water.
• It's not sophisticated enough. It worked in the past, because we didn't know better. We need to improve the methods of extraction so that the groundwater is not affected. I am absolutely against open-pit mining. Wyoming's lands do not recover fast, the way some other parts of the country do; we do not have time on our side. None of this extractive energy should be taking place without thorough geological study, especially near the towns.
- It's not used much in the U.S. and is shipped overseas.
- It's OK as long as it doesn't contaminate the ground water that livestock might need.
- It's okay. (3)
- It's potentially environmentally hazardous.
- It's probably a good deal, but I don't know much about this process.
- It's so complicated it's really hard to say.
- It's very important to the state and I'm inclined to look into open pit-mining more.
- I've heard it works well.
- I'm kind of concerned.
- Leak into the aquifer. Contamination.
- Like I said, if it brings jobs IN then that's fine. I don't know too much about it though.
- Like to see it go on.
- Lived in Fremont County and no longer in favor of it. New research needs to find a new way to deal with it.
- Lot better than surface mining.
- Make sure that it is safely done; relatives got cancer from the extraction.
- Makes me very cautious, anxious that it is done well.
- Mixed.
- Need to learn more about it.
- Negative.
- Neutral. (7)
- Neutral, conflicted, this is a tough question.
- Neutral, it has ups and downs.
- No problem with it.
- Not a fan. I know we need it but not a fan.
- Not a problem.
- Not as efficient and it can have some later inherent problems.
- Not favorable.
- Not for it; injection process contaminates the groundwater which impacts the wild life in the area.
- Not in favor of it. (2)
- Not particularly in favor of it.
- Not sure groundwater is that good after completed.
- Not that informed. I see the scars it has left and I am concerned about that.
- Nothing wrong with the way it's done now.
- Opposed. (3)
- Positive.
- Possibly problematic.
- Potential to contaminate water.
- Pretty good, but doesn't employ as many people as open pit, but it's o.k.
- Probably better than surface mining.
- Probably not too supportive. I'm not comfortable with nuclear power.
- Rather see the open pit. If that helps.
- Scary process.
- Seems feasible.
• Should be continued.
• So far, so good.
• Some support.
• Somewhat against.
• Somewhat important.
• Still think it needs further research still not sure about it.
• Support of it, concerned about water contamination.
• Support of it. (2)
• Support the mining but not the injection.
• Supportive.
• That sounds a lot better than an open pit site deal. I worked in the oil field for years. I'm in support of that instead of digging a pit and having to recover the land.
• The 2nd form of mining is scary.
• The ground table water is affected and I don't agree with it.
• The most efficient.
• The one I am not really familiar with, the water processing, my concern is the effect it has on surface waters. I have worked in the open pit, but am not familiar.
• The water part really concerns me. Any time you start dealing with the water...it's the smallest molecule, they cannot guarantee that they will get all of it; there will be some contamination. Maybe not this century but next century.
• The way they are doing it now has a lot better impact to the environment than the open pit mining they used to do.
• There are certainly groundwater issues that ranchers have, but I feel that most of those can be handled. We need to do our best to utilize the resources that we have within the state in a way that's both safe for the people involved in extraction as well as issues involving the ranchers. One of the biggest issues is what to do with the uranium after it is used, and that becomes a completely different issue.
• There are concerns.
• There needs to be more money in it; it needs to be a more stable industry.
• They both sound like they have serious drawbacks. One would be damaging to the landscape and one would be producing waste water that would need to be dealt with.
• They should pursue it further.
• Think either way is fine; doesn't matter how it is extracted.
• Think it has some promise under supervision.
• Think that we should go with the open pit method instead.
• Think it's fine.
• Typically, it's got a bad reputation of contaminating ground water. It plugs up the aquifers and porosity and contaminates the ground water.
• Um, I have issues with the fact that there is lack of a personal responsibility on the people who work in that and the owners of the industry, especially in following regulations, because I have known some people who worked there and the companies they have worked with, have been very slack. It can cause a lot of problems if you don't follow rules.
• Um, neutral.
• Very good process.
• Very important. (2)
• Very opposed.
• Very supportive. (2)
• Very worried about the quality of ground water with the injection process.
• Water contamination.
• We have to be sure that there are safeguards for both health and environment. Safety.
• We have to have it. We have no choice 100 years from now.
• We need energy from any sources available.
• We need to do it.
• We need to do that. I would like to see the latter one done and not the groundwater one.
• Well I don't like in situ recovery much.
• Well, I don't like nuclear energy and I don't like bombs so that's why I'm not really in favor of uranium mining.
• Well, I'm worried about the negative effects on our water. The water for people and animals.
• Well, the water thing I don't like at all. I support the strip mining but not the water mining.
• Well, you know the first uranium that was discovered came out of Wyoming. So, Wyoming was pretty important in the production of uranium.
• Would like to know more about what is done with water used to pump the uranium out.
• Yeah go for.
Appendix B. Additional topics of interest in learning about in situ uranium recovery. (Q7.)

- Air pollution from it, if there is any.
- All energy development and their impact.
- All of the energies would be interesting to know more about.
- All scopes of it would be great!
- Anything in this area that has become more important at this time; most anything in general.
- Anything to do with energy in the State of Wyoming, I would like to become knowledgeable enough to speak to our politicians about. I believe in Wyoming producing any form of energy.
- Are we looking at additional nuclear plants? If so why isn't wind power a priority? How will Wyoming be compensated? Who will look out for our state? Will we have our own energy committee?
- As long as it's not junk science.
- As long as uranium is transported safely I agree.
- Better understanding of how water is filtered. Simple terms.
- Carbon sequestration.
- Clean coal technology.
- Coal bed methane, I think there can be some serious ground water problems with that also. The DEQ is supposed to be regulating that, but I think they are hand strung by politics.
- Coal to fuel plants.
- Coal to liquid gas.
- Coal.
- Coal bed methane.
- Depending on how they go with the sage grouse, I feel that would be a big effect on the energy industry. Also, Obama's position on energy.
- Development of wind industry lines. Who, what, when, and where.
- Don’t really care but know in situ is a bad form of recovery.
- Economic impact. How much demand there is for uranium? How much uranium is in Wyoming?
- Economic; how it affects our economy.
- Effect this process would have on the groundwater.
- Environmental development of uranium extraction.
- Environmental impact.
- Everything in general (energy).
- Exactly what’s going on in terms of uranium development around the town of Sundance, WY, in The Northern Black Hills or Bear Lodge Hills where we get our water.
- Examine who is in partnership on this in-situ that can tell you a lot about it. The bigger the partners the more pressure politically, the less properly it is controlled.
- Exact process and possible effects on the water table.
- Find out everything about how dangerous these methods are.
- Geography in the state.
- Ground water effect.
• Ground water contamination. I live on an old uranium mine, and it is an issue with our family, and we're concerned with ground water.

• Groundwater and its effects.

• Groundwater contamination. How long will it be filtered before it reaches where humans use the water. Where mining occurs and how far from towns.

• Health issue of the ground water. Since we're pumping chemicals into the groundwater, I'd like to know what kind of damage it is possible to cause from a disinterested 3rd party. Also aware just to the south of me in Colorado. I think our energy costs in the state; like my own house energy has just about doubled in the last couple of years. Why am I as a Wyoming citizen exporting energy, can't I in some way receive energy royalties or support for our own personal energy use. I think that would be an excellent program, not necessarily motor fuel, but if you are a home owner or a property owner. Like Alaska.

• History of corporations who have done uranium extraction in the past. Hold them accountable to previous records.

• How are we going to control the prices in Canada?

• How do they reclaim the land after they have done the extraction?

• How is it transported?

• How is this going to affect the groundwater?

• How it will be determined who does the work. By the government, union, or a bidding system.

• How natural gas works and process of drilling, how leases work. Also, the government influences, BLM, laws, etc.

• How they can do it in a way that's best for the environment.

• How uranium recovery affects groundwater.

• How we are going to get the energy generated out of this country-- high voltage transmission line.

• How we could have individual wind turbines in our own back yards and what kind of benefits and regulations might come from that.

• How will this information be made available to the public?

• How Wyoming regulates these operations; who is overseeing them?

• I am curious to know why other energies are not covered in this survey.

• I am interested in learning more about oil production.

• I am interested in where the royalty rights will be distributed.

• I guess the wind towers I would be interested in learning more about that. The uranium is a big concern.

• I have a strong opinion about coal, natural gas, oil, coal-bed methane, managing natural resources and harvesting timber. I am strongly in favor of this type of energy use.

• I have concerns about wind farms health and safety close to communities.

• I have heard something about injecting water back into the ground.

• I have spent most of my life in energy production here in Wyoming and all over the united state in design and construction in nuclear fuel facilities, and all aspects of it. I believe that the topics that I heard you ask all have safeguards, I believe that if we are going to move ahead in our country and we cannot afford to abandon these concepts. We should be drilling everywhere for everything to develop these aspects. I believe as we have progressed we have established too many safeguards in spite of the risk. We can't keep importing our energy, we should move ahead with it, with every possible aspect of it. The reason I am not too interested in wind power, is that I don't believe we have the capacity
to create the amount of energy that we can with coal fueled facilities.

- I just think that the entire process needs to be better explained.
- I know that if you have frozen hydrogen granules, you can create enough nuclear energy to create power, but I don't know that it's perfected. I believe that it might be a possible solution for inexpensive power. I would like to see us work on something like that.
- I think it would be interesting to know how we are going to make wind energy a reliable source here in Wyoming.
- I think it's very expensive to stop one thing and start another, so I'm not sure how that's supposed to work out.
- I think maybe some of the coal side of it. Most of it is all open pit.
- I think that the coal that Wyoming is using and burning is potentially contaminated with uranium.
- I think we need to start focusing on solar and wind resources.
- I would be interested in knowing if the forum or results would be aired on WPB, or how the information would be made public.
- I would be interested in knowing more about the natural gases in Wyoming. And more about the tax.
- I would be interested in learning how in-situ uranium recovery affects the land.
- I would be interested in learning more about the different groups involved in promoting or dissuading the government from agreeing to production. It would be nice to know what different groups are involved in making a case for or against this process.
- I would be interested in solar and wind power.
- I would be interested in wind energy.
- I would have interest in knowing more about the wind turbines.
- I would like to hear more science and not jargon about energy.
- I would like to know how that affects how close you live to a site.
- I would like to know more about all of these "energy people" in Wyoming.
- I would like to know more about how this process is divided up between private and public land.
- I would like to know more about its proximity. I'm not against it but I'd like to know where it's gonna be. I would not like to see more dams. I think that the water should flow freely. I don't like windmills - I don't like the electric generation of electricity by the wind. I think those windmills are unsightly.
- I would like to know more about the contamination of the underground water and what effect that really has.
- I would like to know what they have in mind to teach the public.
- I would like to learn about how the state plans are changing the severance tax caps so that the additional severance tax from development can be distributed to local government.
- I would like to learn more about the wind - what effects it has or would have on property owners and how would they get this out to people?
- I'd be interested in learning about wind power.
- I'd be interested in learning in what it does to the surface water.
- I'd be interested in learning more about the extraction costs between in situ and surface.
I'd like to hear their plans for the other energy resources in Wyoming. I think Wyoming's residents should be getting more of a boost! Gas is more expensive here than in Colorado and that just doesn't make sense. All of the resources are leaving the state. If we're producing it, it should be less expensive and it should be more readily available within the state. I know there are a lot of political complications but still. It really seems like we're last on the list when we should be first! The extra's we don't need, we are more than willing to share; take care of our state first.

I'd like to know if the in situ process pollutes the groundwater.

I'd like to learn about who is regulating this and if it's an independent place or the government, because in the past the government is getting paid off, like the Love Canal, where they turn their head. If they get someone in there who can look over their shoulders, I wouldn't have a problem. We've got a lot of it, so we need to consider wind! We can actually use it and it's free stuff out there! I'd be more than happy to give my wind away.

I'd like to learn more about wind power or any kind of mining or wind generators. Anything with the green effects. Any type of mining we can do without disturbing the earth. Without mining or burning coal. Energy saving to help with the cost on the environment.

If it affects our water supply and things like that it needs to be checked out pretty good before it is done.

If it could be processed here as well. I know it has to be enriched before it's used as a fuel.

If someone were to come and give a class on it, I'd be interested in taking it. It's important to have the facts to pass on.

If the water can be reclaimed.

If there is more research on the effects of ground water recovery.

If they're going to continue to do the mining of coal and using our resources.

I'm concerned about the method in which they draw it out of the ground. I think they need to develop a better method.

I'm deeply involved in natural gas, so no.

I'm interested in anything that is learning; but why should I pay money to learn. That's what the government is there for! If they have money to send people to the moon they should have money for education for children AND adults. Especially for adults! They should consider providing for the 4 years of college with an 'at cost' fee rather than an exuberant amount. Why do international and out of state residents pay more? It's really a form of discrimination! It's simply not fair to discriminate against low income and international and out of state citizens.

I'm interested in disposal of uranium.

I'm not a big fan of pumping stuff down into the ground, or any other chemical trying to dissolve stuff be it CO2 and the effects could be there 1000 years from now. Like what we're doing with natural gas and C02 what's going to happen when we have an earthquake and it's all released.

In situ.

Information on wind power.

Interested in whether uranium falls under the heading of "mineral rights". How do other states deal with the same problem?

Is this energy staying in the state?

Is this going to affect our water?
• It would be helpful to have a brochure on all of the different types of energy to help make the public aware of how it works and what's going on. Keep people informed.
• It would be worth knowing within the state where the uranium mining would take place and is it suitable.
• I've heard that the French are the one that will control our uranium. Is that true? What countries will control it?
• Job creation.
• Job creation and keeping people working.
• Job creation and the revenue that should be kept for the state.
• Just the Uranium! I could use some more information on the coal stuff as well.
• Know more about the groundwater and what we are doing to it in this process.
• Knowing if there is a relationship between lymphoma and uranium in Wyoming.
• Learn more about wind power.
• Learn more about what areas are going to be mined. I think some areas should not be disturbed. Areas around Rock Springs and places like that should be left alone.
• Locations of uranium mines.
• Long term potential for economic development in Wyoming. How is uranium taxed in comparison to other energy sources and minerals in the state?
• Long-range effects on environment, especially around Lander. Had a friends who lived there and moved away due to health hazard.
• Lots of them, but can't specify.
• Mainly the health and the environment is number one.
• Make sure processes are carefully managed.
• Maybe possibility of building more nuclear plants.
• Maybe wind turbines very interested in that.
• Methane production.
• Methane. How much water are you depleting from the aqua in the ground?
• Mining part of uranium. More about the enrichment process.
• More interested in other mining projects. Uranium is just going to take a short space. Give some good jobs, and that's good.
• More interested in solar power and wind power.
• Mostly the in situ recovery and what happens to the groundwater after it is used.
• My major concern is with all the development, is the sagebrush and environment going to be safe? Inform the public with information.
• Natural gas, how it will it be affected. I work in natural gas and we'd like to see revenue from other natural resources as well.
• Natural gas impact going out of the state and why should we have to pay more for it when we have it in the state.
• No, but I do think that they do need to be open and straightforward. I know in this day and age there are rules and regulations in place to keep this type of thing safe.
• No, probably but can't think of any.
• Not really, but I know if Wyoming doesn't have all those things, we're in trouble.
• Not really. That industry has come and gone as far as I'm concerned.
• Nothing but wind.
• Nuclear energy.
• Oil and gas exploration.
- Oil, gas.
- Oil, gas, owners’ property rights.
- On putting our oil wells back online that was shut down during Jimmy Carter and Ronald Regan administrations - getting our pipelines back up and running, we could be employing about 100,000 people. We kind of forgot about them. Why they're not talking anymore about the wells that were shut down.
- Overall use of uranium.
- Possibly the stability of the companies developing the field.
- Potential groundwater pollution.
- Potential revenue generation.
- Power lines.
- Public information should be there for those that are interested.
- Recover contracts.
- Renewable energy - wind, geothermal, solar.
- Safe as far as health issues go.
- Safety and clean up.
- Safety, and safeguards to make sure we don't contaminate the land and water. Safety is the biggest factor.
- Safety and economical way of doing things.
- Since I didn't know anything about it, I would like to know everything about it. I would be interested in the ground water aspect and property rights.
- Solar power, wind power. (2)
- Solar power.
- State vs. federal regulations.
- Studies out about nukes coming to Wyoming.
- Surface ownership rights. (2)
- Tax revenue to the state. (2)
- The biggest issue is where they are going to put these plants, where are they going to get the water?
- The chance of the in-situ recovery technique contaminating ground water.
- The coal gasification process. A hundred million dollar project sponsored by General Electric and the state. I'd just like an update.
- The coal.
- The cost of uranium recovery.
- The effect of the state government being financed by mineral severance, it has a destructive effect on political integrity.
- The effects of the groundwater. Water used in recovery.
- The effects on ground water are my largest concern.
- The one with groundwater.
- The only thing that concerns me is how they protect the groundwater.
- The potential revenue stream and impact in relation to other energy sources.
- The research into residual effects, again.
- Transporting it.
- The transportation and the water; how it affects us and how they drill for it. The effects on the wildlife; the holding ponds.
• The use of water flooding to bring gas up and I'd like to know what's going to happen to that water they're bringing up.
• The water extraction you were talking about - I'd like to know more about that.
• The water run offs.
• The wind turbine deal interests me.
• The wind. I want to understand how they work and how it affects things.
• They should just mine it here and build a big nuke plant.
• The uranium mining process.
• Uranium mining long term effects on groundwater.
• Water and its contamination for many types of mining and extraction. They should be very cautious and not lose oversight in the field for protection.
• Water recovery process.
• Water use in industry I think is something that's extremely important and we have to really consider that among all of the impacts.
• We need to make some jobs in this country.
• We should learn about everything we can and how it affects us.
• What are the estimated economic benefits to the state and how would the revenues be distributed across the state? And who owns the property that is anticipated to be developed.
• What are they going to do with all the ground water after the in-situ recovery?
• What chemicals are used in extraction?
• What do they use the uranium for?
• What does uranium do for us, what is the benefit?
• What happens to the water after the uranium is pulled out.
• What is going to happen to nuclear waste since Yucca Mountain has been closed and why has 38 billion been spent, and Yucca Mountain has just been shut down.
• What stipulations are put on the companies to reclaim the Wyoming ground?
• What the specific plans are on where they're going to do this type of thing. I think they should advertise it. I suppose they'll probably have to go in and do the environmental impact surveys and talk to people before they do anything.
• What they actually do with uranium, what is it used for?
• What would uranium be used for. How much would our state benefit from mining uranium.
• What wildlife will be affected? What hunting and fishing is going to be affected? What water will be affected?
• When it comes to nuclear there is a waste issue, and I thought we were running out of places to put that waste. I would be interested in that.
• Where does Wyoming stand on the cap and trade stuff? Why so many of the oil wells have stopped in Wyoming since Obama came into office?
• Where in the state are the sites that they're looking at for uranium recovery.
• Where it's going to be.
• Where the proposed locations are.
• Which agencies regulate what areas of energy development?
• Which Wyoming politicians are in favor of increased uranium development? I would love some honesty. Which politicians are getting campaign funds from uranium?
• Who is doing the research on this and who is opposing it.
• Who is profiting from this and how long term is the research for the impact. How much worst-case scenario planning is involved?
• Who is sponsoring and funding this survey? Are they neutral?
• Whole plan for Wyoming.
• Who's behind it? Who wants to increase uranium recovery?
• Why are we buying wind turbines from other countries instead of having people in our country make them so they can have the jobs.
• Why don't we build more nuclear power plants?
• Why on Federal lands; why can't we use biomass as a useable energy?
• Why surface mining is not used to recover uranium.
• Why are we so far behind other countries?
• Wind energy. (7)
• Wind energy and clean coal energy.
• Wind energy! I would love to put a turbine on the house but it's so expensive and you never know who or what can help you. We have a constant breeze, so it would be advantageous for us to have this.
• Wind farms/energy.
• Wind turbines, and they shouldn't be taxed to death.
• Wind, wind, wind. Solar, solar, solar. Particularly home and small business wind and solar energy development. I am a retailer, with the first eco-green store in Laramie. I am the only Wyoming distributor of vertical-access wind turbines. We have one on our roof, plus solar panels, and together they cut our electrical consumption by 80%.
• Yes, how are the companies that are going to mine the uranium going to deposit the mill tailing and are they going to be sold as in the past for back sale for construction sites as they were in Riverton and on the Indian reservation and will there be strict legislative and federal regulations? Indiscriminate deposit of waste.
Appendix C. Other sources of information specified. (Q8.)

- Any brochures, flyers, or advertisements.
- Articles
- Articles and mining industry literature.
- Associates.
- At work.
- BLM
- Books. (8)
- Books and journals. (4)
- Books, discovery/history channel.
- Books, magazines, other publications.
- Businesses.
- Coffee shops
- Colleges. (3)
- Computer.
- Conference in Casper.
- Contacts in the business.
- Conventions from own oil business dealings.
- Daughter is science teacher.
- Direct contact with politicians, scientists.
- Discovery magazine.
- Education resources.
- Employees of the industry (energy).
- Enemies.
- Engineering books.
- Environmental research, academic journals
- Family. (11)
- Farm Bureau meetings.
- Field work from teaching Anthropology.
- Flyers.
- Formally in the legislature.
- From college work and degree.
- Get the trade magazines and read them.
- Government publications.
- Governmental documentation, DEQ reports, etc.
- Grandkids look it up on internet.
- Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Other legal organizations.
- Husband.
- Husband works for federal government.
- Husband works in energy development.
- Husband works in the oil business, so directly.
- Husband’s job.
- I work for the federal government.
- Industry connections.
• Information from everywhere.
• Information fairs in Gillette.
• Internet.
• Job and coworkers.
• Job; work at a coal mine.
• Lawyer who is dealing with that.
• Legislative system.
• Legislators.
• Library.
• Library/research.
• Listen to opinions from wherever they come from.
• Local city council.
• Local experts.
• Magazines. (17)
  • Magazines - TIME, Newsweek, National Geographic.
• Magazines and employment in the industry.
• Magazines and other print media.
• Mail.
• Meetings. (2)
• Memberships in non-profit organizations.
• Mining bulletins.
• Mining journal.
• More informed people, parents.
• Mostly at work.
• My father helped develop the process.
• Newsletters and relatives.
• Open meetings.
• Other published methods.
• Pamphlets or something, usually radio or TV.
• Pamphlets put out by interested parties.
• People involved in the process.
• People that we know, we know people in the field.
• Periodicals.
• Periodicals, regulations.
• Personal research of periodicals.
• Professional associates.
• Professional journals
• Professors and educators, senators.
• Public hearings. (2)
• Public meetings.
• Public presentations (university).
• Publications. (2)
• Publications by the federal government.
• Read books. Husband used to be in legislature.
- Read pamphlets in the mail.
- Reading articles.
- Reading, magazines and stuff.
- Reputable research and education.
- Research.
- Resources for universities and colleges.
- Science magazines.
- Scientific journals.
- Seminars and discussions.
- Social interaction with industry professionals.
- Some research in library.
- Someone in this industry.
- Talk to people I know.
- Talks at community organizations.
- The library.
- The University of Wyoming.
- Through job, teacher. Husband is coalminer.
- Through work.
- Time or Week magazine.
- Town Hall meetings.
- Trade magazines. (2)
- Trade magazines, bulletins on in situ.
- Trade magazines
- Was part of my job.
- Word of mouth. (2)
- Work. (7)
- Work and flyers.
- Work in the industry.
- Worked in the industry and had family that did.
- Workers in the industry.
- Work related. My dad was in the uranium field.
Appendix D. Other methods of education on the subject specified. (Q9.)

- Acquaintances.
- Ask a professional.
- Ask my husband.
- Ask people that work there.
- Ask someone to check it out online for me.
- At work.
- BLM employees.
- Books. (4)
- Books and articles. (3)
- Books, quizzes on the internet
- Brochures in the mail or can be picked up.
- Brother at uranium mine.
- Brochures.
- Call local public relations.
- Check out a library book.
- Comment on Federal register notices.
- Contact my senator.
- Converse with professionals, and journals.
- Direct contact with professionals.
- Discussion with someone in industry or with knowledge.
- Discussions with people I know.
- Email lists, environmental organizations.
- Emails.
- Environmental magazines.
- Face to face contact.
- Family. (5)
- Family in the business.
- Family members.
- Finding magazines.
- Friends. (6)
- Friends and family.
- Friends that know something about it.
- Friends who are in the business.
- Go to library and read about it
- Go to the library.
- Gossip.
- Government publications.
- Government websites.
- Husband, because he works in oil field.
- Husband’s job brings him in contact with issues.
- I don't pay that much attention.
- I talk to the people that work at these places.
- In contact with regulators.
• Individuals in the industry.
• Industry trade journals.
• Info from work-UW.
• Info from family that is in the oil business.
• Involved in the industry.
• I’ve seen it.
• Job, boss, people in community.
• Journals.
• Library. (2)
• Look at the federal registers.
• Magazines regarding public problems.
• Magazines. (13)
• Mailings. (2)
• Mining journals & professionals in the field.
• News magazines.
• Open a dictionary.
• Participate in seminars and public info groups.
• People we know.
• Periodical reviews.
• Political action work.
• Public interest environmental groups.
• Publications. (2)
• Publications, brochures, bulletin boards.
• Question my representatives and company owners.
• Read books. (3)
• Read books and articles.
• Read pamphlets (2).
• Read scientific papers on the topic.
• Real estate people.
• Relatives.
• Research at the library.
• Scientific journals.
• Seek someone out who has info.
• Seminars that are work related. Employment.
• Speak with BLM employees.
• Speak with professionals well informed.
• Talk it over with peers.
• Talk to family.
• Talk to friends and get opinions and ideas.
• Talk to local politicians.
• Talk to others about it.
• Talk to people at work.
• Talk to people involved on both sides.
• Talk to people.
• Talk to someone I might know that's involved.
• Talk with friends and community members.
• Talk with friends or other people.
• Talk with family.
• Talk with legislatures.
• Talking to community people and involvement.
• Talking to neighbors/friends.
• Talking with friends. (2)
• The information the university sends out.
• The Wyoming livestock roundup.
• Talk to people in the know.
• Town Hall phone discussions with Senators.
• Trade fairs. (2)
• Visit with people involved in industry.
• Word of mouth. (2)
• Work
• Work in the industry.
• Work related individuals.
• Wyoming Public Radio.
Appendix E. Additional comments. (Q16.)

- A lot of my responses are based on Star Valley, which is substantially different than the rest of the state. Our main concerns are our mountains and forests. We don't deal with these issues nearly as much as others. My answers are based on what I currently know about our area here in Star Valley. I would be more concerned if they wanted to start a coal mine here that would affect our air quality.
- A lot of the questions concerned with coal mining and all that depends on where they put it. I'm not going to say I'm against drilling for gas and oil as long as it's not in my front yard or Yellowstone or something. What you should be asking is at what point would you draw the line and say no - you can't drill in our private or protected areas. Don't make it a black and white question because it's not a black and white world anymore.
- Albany county is the poorest county in the state and our schools are suffering. Albany county has their minds closed to possibilities and compromise.
- Any type of energy improvement here in Wyoming; we handle it very well.
- Anything to build the economy back up I'm for.
- Believe in extracting natural resources but doing it right and responsibly.
- Don't think wind energy should be taxed.
- Due to the strong regulations that we have I have seen places look better after the fact than they did before the people came in. Especially the oil and gas industry. Concerns me that the survey was about uranium. I think that we need to focus more on becoming independent and breaking away from foreign countries. It bothered me that one of the first questions or statements didn't use the work oil in it.
- Feels nuclear power is a good thing as long as it is not used for bombs.
- Go Wyoming!
- Have been the responsible on site principal on major construction companies, responsible for [names erased]. All of these have impacts on the environment, some more than others. I have spent my entire career with these projects, and I am aware how the safeguards affect this industry. I have been around the horn on those kinds of activities, so I understand we must improve the safeguards, but our nation can be great again if we move ahead in this production.
- Hope and expect something to be done(better) on the wind power situation. Wind power is a risk to health, wildlife, property value.
- Hope they put out accurate information.
- How are they going to transport the uranium?
- How the coal mines are contributing to global warming.
- I am always glad to have information from different sources, and I think it's great that we're doing this survey.
- I am interested in nuclear energy.
- I appreciate the opportunity to express my opinions!
- I do believe that anything will work for our energy needs and to keep our state and national economy going is good. I support all energies! I believe we need all of these energy resources as long as it's done safely.
- I don't have a problem with uranium. I'm in the oil and gas business. We deal with that [explicative] everyday.
- I don't see any reason why there's any opposition to nuclear energy. They have a good safety record.
I enjoyed the survey. It was interesting. And I'll probably take some more time to learn about uranium now.

I feel that we ought to get a better severance tax rate.

I feel wind energy would not be a very good resource.

I hope people get this right with Congress, because I'm tired of being out of work and seeing Wyoming starve.

I hope that Wyoming continues extracting the natural resources that we have and doing it environmentally sound.

I hope this is beneficial.

I just don't know that much about any of this.

I just wished I knew more about things in this regard.

I know where there is uranium recovery and you can hardly tell it is there.

I like to make sure that all the EPA guidelines and environmental guidelines are being followed. People doing the job should be skilled and moral enough to do the job.

I support energy development in Wyoming if it's done in a responsible way and a balanced effort. I wish some of the leaders of Wyoming would take into more consideration what other natural scenic, wildlife, recreational, cultural, and paleo resources Wyoming has to offer than just energy development and to allocate appropriate uses.

I think all the issues are needed and both sides need to be there, both anti and pro-uranium. Both need to be able to put in their 6 cents worth, both need to have resources available to back up their information. If someone is going to make a controversial statement, it needs to be backed up by more than one source. It would be nice to have at least three sources. This will validate the other statement.

I think energy resources are important, if it can be extracted safely and use the information that we have for doing it.

I think that this is a good survey.

I think that we need to explore more the wind and solar power areas.

I think that Wyoming should charge larger extraction fees for all of the minerals such as coal, oil, natural gas, and for soda ash, and uranium. They should raise the extraction fee. They give the oil companies a break which I think is a bummer and I'm not sure about coal but I know that the people are always after our legislature to keep the tax lower. I think that's a bummer. I think we should be rich.

I think the more uranium and mining in natural resources benefits Wyoming, and it creates jobs. I'm all for any development. I also believe that the reclamation and the mining process have it down to almost an exact science that protects the environment and creates jobs. I'm all for it.

I think this was a good way to approach the subject. I think it's a very interesting topic. Could you please fax more of this information to me at the same phone number? My phone number is also a fax number. I love quizzes and wish there were more in mainstream media. Could you send me a quiz as well?

I think this was really a pretty good survey.

I think Uranium recovery is great for the world and Wyoming.

I think we need to invest more in our future, not just in jobs for today. We need to think of tomorrow and the next day instead of killing our earth for energy. We can't just do it for the sake of jobs.
• I think we need to use all of our resources to get the U.S. self sufficient and not dependent on foreign countries. The federal government regulatory agencies like BLM are making decisions that are not good and preventing drilling. I think companies do a really good job of protecting the environment and I see no abuse as I am in the methane industry. I think we need to pursue it with a full head of steam.

• I think wind farms, if you're going to have them, should be way out and tax them. Wind farms should not be let go, they should be taxed just as much with no lee way.

• I think Wyoming is going the right way with energy development. We need to keep the government out of it.

• I think Wyoming's got uranium. They need to get after it and get to using it.

• I think most people aren't well informed. There are a lot of issues involved with job creation. The information should be more widely available. Things should be more transparent. Preventive measures are important and we can save a lot of trouble in the long run by being well informed. Government needs to be more transparent.

• I wish we didn't have to worry about this wind energy and how cost effective it is.

• I work in it every day. I don't need to research anything more on it.

• I would be interested in attending an open forum here in Laramie.

• I would like a notation that I went out and experienced uranium production, drilling on my own. I went and did the job myself, so it makes a lot of difference. The experience I got was from going out and doing the job myself. I was really not happy with the governing bodies that keep an eye on uranium.

• I would like to see more of the jobs go to local people and youth that would like to stay in Wyoming. I would like to see more of the profit margin come back to good causes in this state.

• I would personally like to see more wind energy and solar energy.

• I would really like to see the oil, gas, coal, and uranium or any of these sources, open back up again for our general well being in Wyoming. I hope that we get something going soon. In Buffalo, I see people that had jobs related to oil and gas losing their homes.

• I'd like to find out more info about uranium mining, because it is something I've never heard about.

• I'd like to see the nation become independent, so I'm all for the development of resources that will help us achieve that.

• If jobs are created that's good.

• If they're going to do it, they need to use their heads. None of this rape and pillage business.

• I'm a coal miner.

• I'm opposed to wind energy because I feel it's too expensive. The people in Converse County are forced to use some of this energy, even though most of the energy is exported. My power bill has gone up. I think this company is exploiting government grants. I think county commissioners are not looking at the bigger picture.

• I'm so glad that you are doing this survey and asking these kinds of questions.

• Interesting, I don't know much about it.

• Interesting.

• It would be good to see solar as a field listed here along with wind power.

• It would be nice to be able to explain why I feel the way I feel about many of these questions.

• It's a bad survey, too general.
• It's an interesting topic.
• It's pretty interesting. I am going to call this phone number. I have lived here all my life and have not heard of any of this stuff.
• All you have to do is travel and realize how well we have it in Wyoming. We need to educate the public on this, but the public has lost credence in what they read in the newspaper. There is no credibility. If they do read something you have to wonder what they’ve left out. I hate to be negative but they can't tell the whole truth. Nobody wants to talk for example for how long it takes to permit an oil well. I'll bet you today that you can't get an oil permit in the state of Wyoming in less than 9 months. Probably even 12. Lastly, the revenue, all we need to do is collect the taxes that are on the book right now. Just get what is legitimately owed and thoughts such as toll highways will be a thing of the past.
• Let the people do what they need to do to get the economy back on its feet. Get the environmentalists out of it.
• Let’s get a lot more oil and gas and production going on in the state it is really affecting those of us working in the field.
• Let’s get the birds mating again, so that we can get the coal bed methane going again.
• Need to pursue in development of all natural resources.
• No, no, it was quite interesting. I discovered how ignorant I really am.
• Nothing, it is interesting.
• Nothing. I lost my husband in the uranium mines (underground) years ago.
• On the wind energy, I think that a percentage of it should come to the people of Wyoming directly, before it leaves the state at a largely reduced fee.
• One of the things that really concern me is the power lines that are going up throughout the state. If there is some sort of electromagnetic event the entire system would be useless. Storms seem to be getting worse as of late. Hurricanes, tornadoes and other natural disasters could have a big impact on this.
• Personally, I feel that mining is a vital part to life in Wyoming and that it can be done safely.
• Who is sponsoring the survey? Whoever put this survey together did a very good job; you asked all the right questions.
• Safety of uranium mining.
• The federal government has so much control that they will do anything they want to do, and if they want to push through uranium recovery, they will do it without thinking of the consequences. My concern is my son, who is a soldier. I don't really care what's going on with energy. All I care about is that my son and the other soldiers get what they need. All of this politics is taking away from that, and I disagree with it.
• The gas companies should be required to let us know what is being injected into the wells during the injection process. I think there could be wells that should not be drilled. Where I live I am more concerned with drilling than I am will coal and uranium process.
• The only thing I'm concerned about is groundwater contamination.
• Too many questions on the survey, it needs to be shorter.
• The questions on the survey were somewhat ambiguous, and I would have preferred more precisely-worded questions.
• The state needs more jobs. Young people are having to leave the state to find new jobs.
• There’s a lot that could be done all the way around. Instead of the big companies coming in and scooping up everything and then taking off. They need more control on them.
• They need to do more wind energy development in the state.
This global warming, I really don't buy into it. My kids live in the big cities and when I go there it bothers me (environmental) when I notice how deadly the environment can be for humans. Feels that something needs to be done to fix the ozone, but feels global warming is a political "thing."

This information needs to be made readily available to the public.

This was a very easy and nice survey. I didn't mind doing this at all.

This was interesting. It makes you think about wanting to know more about it.

Uranium is a concern for me; I had an uncle work in Shirley Basin for years and years.

Uranium scares me and I think the green houses gases are overdone. Resources in Wyoming and the USA could be used without depending on overseas. They can probably do more to clean it up, but not the radical way that is proposed now.

Used to work for the light company so this is why I know so much about this topic. Very sad to see the uranium plants shut down.

Very concerned that the University's School of Energy Resources has been doing favorable business for certain types of energy.

Very thankful we are doing this survey. Uranium should stay in the ground.

Visit the rural towns that do not have colleges or universities to go to get information so they can express their concerns.

Want to know more about the clean coal technology.

Was happy that I was called.

We just built a home in Wyoming and we put solar panels on it and geothermal heat and air conditioning in it. We are trying to make Wyoming a better place.

We need to address how uranium is going to be mined and what the future will be like. With regards to disturbances to landowners.

We need to do more for our people. We have the resources here. We just need to get out there and find them. Instead of overseas imports we need to be self reliant. Just hire our own guys.

We need to start looking at nuclear/uranium production in the future.

When I was talking about the different energy resources, it has to be good for the environment, not tearing apart the land.

Where is most of the uranium mined? Private land or BLM/Federal land?

Will we be a national dumping ground like Utah and Nevada?

Wind and solar power isn’t going to be enough.

Wind energy will probably be a major concern for Wyoming and I'm opposed to it.

Wish nuclear power would come back.

Yeah, get rid of the ugly windmills.

We have 360 sunny days in the year. We have a ton of sun here so we should be using this resource as well!