

MINUTES OF MEETING  
SENATE NATURAL RESOURCES  
February 6, 1981

The ninth meeting of the Natural Resources Committee was called to order by Senator Harold Dover, Chairman, at 1:00 P.M., on the above date in Room 405 of the State Capitol Building.

ROLL CALL: All members were present with the exception of Senator Keating.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 244:

AN ACT TO AMEND THE MONTANA STRIP AND UNDER-  
GROUND MINE RECLAMATION ACT TO COMPLY WITH  
THE FEDERAL STRIP MINE ACT AND CONDITIONS OF  
THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR'S APPROVAL OF THE  
MONTANA PROGRAM

Senator Graham, District #29, sponsored this bill at the request of the State Lands Department. Last session a bill was passed to make the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act in compliance with the federal government. The State Lands Department has recommended some changes to this bill and David Woodgerd, Attorney, Department of State Lands will explain the changes proposed by this bill.

David Woodgerd gave testimony in support of this bill, explaining the changes proposed to the original Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act. (copy attached)

James D. Mockler, Montana Coal Council, supports this bill.

There were no opponents. Chairman Dover asked for questions from the committee.

Senator Manley remembered working on this bill last session and thought there was a question on the time lime, page 9, which is being changed.

Mr. Mockler explained that the changes on page 9 do not address the same time limit questions that were discussed last session.

Senator Dover asked if the amendments on page 19 would allow a shutdown of the whole operation.

Mr. Woodgerd explained that the amendment is to clarify that enforcement will apply to both prospecting and mining.

Mr. Mockler suggested that Senator Dover read section (2) on page 20 for further clarification of his question.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 278:

AN ACT TO REMOVE THE PROHIBITION AGAINST  
GRANTING A MINING PERMIT BECAUSE OF ECOLOGICAL  
FRAGILITY OF THE AREA TO BE MINED

Natural Resources Committee Minutes  
February 6, 1981  
Page Two

Senator Graham, District #29, presented this bill to the committee. The bill will delete sub-section (b) on page 2, line 14 from the Reclamation Act. The sub-section requires that the land be returned to its former ecological role before the mining occurred. Sometimes this is impossible, especially in the case of seeps. Why is this necessary, couldn't the land be returned to a more productive use. This section has been interpreted in the broadest sense and has delayed mining operations without a specific reason.

James Mockler, Montana Coal Council, invited the committee to read through the other sections of the bill to see that it does cover this area within reason. The bill has never been used by the Department of State Lands but has been used by those who oppose strip-mining.

Dana L. Christensen, Attorney, Westmoreland Resources, Inc., spoke in favor of this bill. (copy of testimony attached)

Gary Langley, Western Montana Trade Association, supports this bill in eliminating broad language that is not necessary and can be used to stop or delay reasonable development.

Pat Wilson, representing MONTCO coal company, supports this bill stating that with this language in the bill it gives certain groups an opportunity to delay projects or stop production. She questioned that the lands must be returned to the original use as opposed to a more productive use.

There were no other proponents. Chairman Dover asked for opponents.

Nick Golder, Forsyth, Montana, owns and makes a living off the land. He has a deep respect for the surface land and wants to keep it the way it is for his sons and generations to come. He has seen some reclamation of the land and is pleased with what he has seen. He is afraid that by striking this section out of the law the strip-miners will be given to loose a rein and will minewhere it could do damage to ranchers down from the mine.

Gareth Moon, State Land Department, is opposed to this bill. (written testimony attached)

Wallace McRae, Forsyth, Montana, gave testimony in opposition of this bill. (written testimony attached)

Don Snow, Montana Environmental Information Center, submitted written testimony. (copy attached)

Senator Graham stated that he is a rancher and is protective of the land. He does not feel that this part of the law is needed for reclamation.

Chairman Dover asked for questions from the committee.

Senator Manley asked Senator Graham if he knew of any cases where this part of the law was used to slow down or stop a project.

Senator Graham said there was a case at Westmoreland where an injunction was filed against them in general terms under this specific clause. The judge did not allow the injunction because it was too general and couldn't point to any specific thing. This harassment held up the procedure for 3 or 4 months.

Senator Elliott asked Mr. Golder if his statement that reclamation is not working is generally a true statement.

Mr. Golder said there are some serious problems with reclamation but he is pleased with what they have done with the surface in the reclamation he has seen.

Senator Elliott asked if there had been any mining on this property

Mr. Golder said not close enough to do any harm. He is concerned that there could be a problem on his property with a shallow well that is run by a windmill.

Senator Hafferman asked Mr. Golder if he owned the mineral rights on his property.

Mr. Golder said that mineral rights and coal rights are separate but that he did not own the coal rights on his land. He said if he did own them he would not sell them.

Senator Hafferman asked Mr. McRae if he owned the coal rights on his property.

Mr. McRae said no, except for about ten percent. He explained that any federal land that was a homestead prior to 1909, the coal went with the surface. After that the coal and mineral rights were retained by the federal government.

EXECUTIVE SESSION - DISPOSITION OF SB 205: Senator Brown said that Senator Manley was concerned that the Department of Health would check all the mining claims. The miners are happy with the administration of State Lands and they have no complaints. There are 1100 small miners claims.

Senator Ryan is concerned that the Department of State Lands and the Department of Health would be aggravating with this release of confidentiality.

Natural Resources Committee Minutes  
February 6, 1981  
Page Four

Senator Brown said that the problem is that the State Lands cannot report any information under the confidentiality requirements.

Senator Ryan asked if the State Lands were allowed to report it now.

Senator Brown said they cannot report any information on small miners claims.

Senator Manley said that if this bill is passed and there are 1100 small miners claims, the Health Department will inspect all 1100 of them.

Senator Ryan asked if the committee were to detect pollution on someone's land, could we report it to the Department of Health.

Senator Brown said you can report potential problems to the Department of Health. This law refers to an application that is filed with the Department of State Lands on small miners. The Department of State Lands, as relates to small miners, cannot divulge any information concerning their operation.

Senator Hafferman asked if they are reporting what the man is digging or what the man is polluting.

Senator Brown said if the State Lands thinks there is a potential pollution problem, they will tell the Department of Health to check it out.

Senator Van Valkenburg said isn't some of that information with respect to the type of operation necessary for the Department of Health to determine what kind of problem exists.

Senator Brown said that the Department of State Lands would give them information with regard to their mining plan.

Senator Ryan said that if the State Lands determines that there is a violation of air or water quality standards, then they can report it to the Department of Health.

Senator Brown said no, they would have to go to the County Attorney. They cannot go to the Department of Health.

Senator Ryan said that the State Lands doesn't have the expertise to determine if there is a pollution situation.

Natural Resources Committee Minutes  
February 6, 1981  
Page Five

Senator Elliott relayed to the committee a situation in which he had been involved with the Department of Health with relation to a sewer system for Columbia Falls. After this experience he is very reluctant to turn the Department of Health loose in this area.

Senator Brown said that the release of information would depend entirely on the Department of State Lands.

Senator Manley made a motion that SB 205 do not pass. The motion passed with a vote of 6 for, 3 opposed and Senator O'Hara and Senator Hafferman abstained from voting.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 244: Senator Elliott motioned that SB 244 do pass. The motion passed unanimously.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 278: Senator Hafferman made a motion that SB 278 do pass.

Senator Van Valkenburg said there is no problem with this law as far as the Department of State Lands is concerned. The problem is with Friends of the Earth, who have tried to delay things. If this is the attitude of Friends of the Earth, they will use any method to stop development and this bill will not stop them from doing that.

Senator Elliott agrees with Gareth Moon's statement, except for Friends of the Earth's use of this section.

Senator Hafferman's motion passed with a vote of 9 for, 1 opposed and Senator Brown abstained from voting.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 P.M.



---

HAROLD L. DOVER, Chairman

ROLL CALL  
NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

47th LEGISLATIVE SESSION - - 1981

Date 2/6/81

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Harold Dover, Chairman	✓		
Mark Etchart, Vice Chairman	✓		
Thomas Keating			✓
Roger Elliott	✓		
Larry Tveit	✓		
Jesse O'Hara	✓		
John Manley	✓		
William Hafferman	✓		
Steve Brown	✓		
Dave Manning	✓		
Patrick Ryan	✓		
Fred Van Valkenburg	✓		

Each day attach to minutes.

## TESTIMONY

## SB 244

In passing the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Congress set forth minimal procedures and reclamation standards which a state must adopt in order to continue to enforce its coal strip mine reclamation program. In passing SB 515, the 1979 Legislature made those changes in the Montana Strip and Underground Mine Reclamation Act which the Department of State Lands determined were necessary in order to obtain permanent program approval from the Secretary of Interior. On April 1, 1980 the Secretary of Interior approved SB 515 provided one statute change be made on or before July 1, 1981. In addition, the Secretary requested that several clarifications of SB 515 made by the Department of State Lands during the Secretary's review be incorporated into the Act. These amendments merely clarify the intent of the last Legislature in adopting SB 515.

The changes and reasons for those changes are as follows:

1. Page 3, line 21 - In order to comply with the Federal Strip Mine Act, SB 515 replaced the term "strippable coal" with "minable coal." The purpose was to apply coal conservation requirements to underground as well as strip mining operations. The former term was inadvertently left in section 82-4-203(12). This amendment corrects this oversight.
2. Page 9, lines 9-10 - The amendment of time frames allows the permittee to make earlier permit renewal application and thereby avoid the possibility that, due to public comment periods required by the federal act, the decision on the renewal application could not be made till after the permit expiration date.
3. Page 17, line 11 - This amendment is expressly required as a condition of the Secretary of Interior's approval of SB 515. The subsection deals with the Department's responsibility to assist small operations in hydrologic studies for permit applications. The deletion of the word "federal" allows the Department to assist small operators to the extent it has received funds for that purpose from any source rather than from the federal government only. The amendment in no way obligates the Legislature to appropriate money for small operator assistance.
4. Page 19 lines 6-8, 16-17, 22-23; page 20 lines 17-18; page 22 lines 16-17; page 23 lines 8-9 - Use of the terms "operator" and "strip and underground mining" before the term "operation" in 82-4-251 create an ambiguity as to whether the enforcement mechanism of the act apply to mining operations only or to both prospecting and mining operations. The amendment clarifies that the enforcement mechanisms apply to both prospecting and mining.
5. Page 24, lines 23-24 - Elimination of the comma and the addition of the words "of a permit" clarifies that terms and conditions are permit terms and conditions. There are no terms and conditions that are not permit conditions.

NAME: David W. Windegar DATE: 3-6-81

ADDRESS: Dept. of State Lands  
Capitol Station, Helena MT

PHONE: 449-2074

REPRESENTING WHOM? Dept. of State Lands

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SB 244

DO YOU: SUPPORT? X AMEND?        OPPOSE?       

COMMENTS: prepared testimony to be passed out.

TESTIMONY OF:

Dana L. Christensen  
Attorney at Law  
Moulton, Bellingham, Longo & Mather  
P. O. Box 2545  
Billings, Montana 59103

Before the Senate Natural Resources Committee  
Senate Bill No. 278

Submitted on behalf of:

Westmoreland Resources, Inc.  
February 6, 1981

# I.

## INTRODUCTION

Westmoreland Resources, Inc. (WRI), a Montana partnership located in Billings, Montana, operates the Absaloka Coal Mine in Big Horn County Montana. Because the coal is held by the United States in trust for the Crow Tribe of Indians, and the surface is fee land located off the Crow Reservation, the mining operation is subject to regulation both by the Montana and by the federal Office of Surface Mining. The mine has not only been subject to overlapping federal and state rules, but also it has been confronted with a series of environmental lawsuits brought to challenge the legality of the state and federal mining and reclamation permits which have been issued to WRI.

The most unpredictable aspect of the mining and reclamation requirements applicable to the mine arises from the continuing uncertainties surrounding the application of Montana's selective denial provisions, found in §82-4-227 (2) MCA of the Montana Strip and Underground Mine Reclamation Act. One subsection of §227 (2) does not conform to the legislature's narrow purpose of selectively denying mining to protect truly unique Montana resources. To the contrary the non-conforming subsection has been seized upon by those opposed to mining in general as a device to stop mining on lands which are in fact not unique, but rather lands which are entirely typical of lands found throughout southeastern Montana.

The non-conforming subsection of § 227 (2) (§227 (2) (b)) should be repealed because it strays beyond the legislative purpose of §227 (2) and because the other subsections of §227 (2) adequately protect truly unique lands. Once the repeal is accomplished, §227 (2) will read as follows:

The department shall not approve the application for a prospecting, strip-mining, or underground-mining permit where the area of land described in the application includes land having special, exceptional, critical, or unique characteristics or that mining or prospecting on that area would adversely affect the use, enjoyment, or fundamental character of neighboring land having special, exceptional, critical, or unique characteristics. For the purposes of this part, land is defined as having such characteristics if it possesses special, exceptional, critical, or unique:

(a) biological productivity, the loss of which would jeopardize certain species of wildlife or domestic stock'

~~(b) ecological fragility, in the sense that the land, once adversely affected, could not return to its former ecological role in the reasonable foreseeable future;~~

(c) ecological importance, in the sense that the particular land has such a strong influence on the total ecosystem of which it is a part that even temporary effects felt by it could precipitate a system-wide reaction of unpredictable scope or dimensions; or

(d) scenic, historic, archeologic, topographic, geologic, ethnologic, scientific, cultural, or reactional significance. (In applying this subsection, particular attention should be paid to the inadequate preservation previously accorded Plains Indian history and culture.)

## II.

### DISCUSSION

Reading §227 in its entirety suggests that the Montana legislature was intent on protecting on and off site resources directly affected by mining, but only under those circumstances where the lands affected have special, exceptional, cultural, or unique characteristics. Unfortunately the statute as currently written permits the triggering of the selective denial provision even where mining operations will not, in fact, affect unique lands. Here is the problem.

Subsections (2) (a) through (d) define those lands which are deemed to have special, exceptional, critical, or unique characteristics. Subsection 227 (2) (a), (c), and (d) each require as a condition to finding unique status, that mining trigger a unique injury independent of an injury to the land itself.

Subsection 227 (2) (a) identifies lands whose unique quality lies in its biological productivity. The subsection provides that if the lands support unique biological growth which if destroyed would jeopardize certain species of wildlife or domestic stock, then the lands may be characterized as special, exceptional, critical or unique. The independent injury in §227 (2) (a) occurs then when unique biology on the land is threatened and a

specific class of wildlife or livestock may be lost as a result.

Subsection 227 (2) (c) identifies lands whose unique quality arises because of the land's special ecological connection to a broader ecosystem. §2 (c) is like §2 (a) in that both envision the uncommon situation where the loss of land, water and/or vegetation would give rise to serious and far-reaching repercussions affecting the survival of wildlife or the preservation of a larger ecological system.

Subsection 227 (2) (d) selects lands whose critical characteristics are defined by the presence on the lands of areas of special scenic, historic, archeologic, topographic, geologic, ethnologic, scientific, cultural or recreational significance.

Subsections 2 (a), 2 (c), and 2 (d) all identify lands that possess a special characteristic so that mining it or adversely affecting it will trigger some greater injury independent of an injury to the land itself. In §2 (a) the independent injury is to a species of wildlife or livestock, in §2 (c) the independent injury is to a total ecosystem and in §2 (d) the independent injury is to a special cultural or aesthetic presence on the land.

Subsection 227 (2) (b) creates a fourth basis for selective denial. §227 (2) (b), as presently written, does not conform to the three subsections previously discussed,

because §227 (2) (b) does not require an independent injury. Subsection 2 (b) identifies land as having unique characteristics if after mining the land cannot return to whatever ecological role it had prior to mining. Because §2 (b) does not provide standards for determining what ecological roles should be protected, the subsection permits selective denial upon the showing that any ecological role will be substantially affected.

Environmental groups have sought to influence the Montana Department of State Lands to prohibit mining by WRI on certain lands because the environmentalists claim that mining will eliminate certain springs and neighboring coulees. The groups have seized upon §2 (b) because they know that it, unlike §2 (a), §2 (c), and §2 (d) does not require a showing of a substantial independent injury. They claim that §2 (b) as it is presently written operates to prohibit mining whenever it can be shown that mining will result in the land having a different ecological role once mining is completed. WRI, like all other coal companies, is presently vulnerable to this contention because §2 (b) only requires that the land's ecological role be changed. There is no requirement in the first instance that the ecological role of the lands be special, cultural or unique. Unless §2 (b) is deleted or altered, it will continue to be utilized not to protect unique Montana resources, but rather to harass mining companies who have otherwise complied with the selective denial provisions.

Subsection 2 (a) protects injury to wildlife and livestock and §2 (c) protects valuable ecosystems affected by mining. Any lands with a truly unique ecological role will be protected by these provisions. We are unaware of any realistic situation where truly critical lands could not be protected under §§227 (2) (a), (c) and (d). Further, the repeal of §2 (b) will not eliminate the long list of mandatory state and federal reclamation standards which presently exist in the Reclamation Act. Thus, for example, coal mining companies in the future will still have to satisfactorily revegetate and reclaim the mined areas, (§227 (1)), protect the areas' hydrologic balance and alluvial valley floors (§227 (3)), avoid mining on prime farmlands (§227 (5)), and eliminate mining on any areas otherwise designated as unsuitable for mining (§227 (9)). To conclude, this proposal to repeal §277 (2) (b) merely corrects a legislative oversight. Hence the repeal will not lower the level or intensity of environmental control which Montana currently exercises over coal mining.

TESTIMONY-GARETH MOON

IN OPPOSITION TO SB 273

Sen Graham

- State Lands Department was selected by <sup>The Legislature</sup> law (Section 82-1-227) to be the enforcement agency for this section of law.
- Since I'm new in this job, I wondered why this amendment was felt to be necessary.
- So looked at history of how we've handled it. *Listened to group.*
- This provision applies to coal and uranium mining as well as prospecting permits.
- Since passing of Act in 1973 - 75 coal mining permits  
*Dynegy* - 166 coal prospecting permits  
- 116 uranium prospecting permits
- 357 opportunities to invoke the proposed amended section (Repeat 357 opportunities)
- On 4 occasions - only 4 - have we used it.

Once Commissioner Schwinden, in 1974, on a permit to Westmoreland deleted 13 acres of a potential drainage problem.

(Commissioner Schwinden again in 1974 on a permit to Western Energy deleted 33 acres -  
(acres determined to be unusually scenic and not necessary to be lost in production of co

Another time Commissioner Berry in 1977, in a permit to Decker Coal Company modified their permit to avoid dumping spoils in Deer Creek and in doing so increased the volume of coal mined.

(Again, Commissioner Berry, in 1978, on a permit to Westmoreland deleted 65 acres )  
(to avoid destroying a significant game habitat. )

- On one other occasion we raised a question but later dropped it when we were satisfied the concern was not serious enough to invoke the section.
- My point is the history shows no glaring need to amend this section.
- I believe we've prudently exercised our options. *"ABLE to return to" "Have to" "not there"*
- I believe we should continue to administratively handle this option.
- We should have this option in the event it is needed (as it was in 4 cases out of 357 opportunities) to prevent serious ecological damage.
- I do not believe this amendment is necessary or desirable. *ferrow*
- I believe the state should have this option to stop unnecessary damage before it happens.

~~-- Comments to effect that we have been doing a good job of handling this emphasizes and enforces my points.~~

~~If it is ecologically fragile then it is SPECIAL, EXCEPTIONAL, CRITICAL and UNIQUE~~  
~~if it cannot be restored, it must be denied.~~

IF PASSED - ATTORNEYS TELL ME  
-- SERIOUSLY WEAKENS OUR ABILITY TO PROTECT THE AREA. If it's not necessary -  
then that worries the miners then probably wouldn't be here.

WALLACE D. McRAE

ROCKER SIX CATTLE CO.  
FORSYTH, MONTANA 59327

Testimony before Senate Natural Resources Committee on S.B. 278 2/6/81

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee: My name is Wallace D. McRae. My address is Rocker Six Cattle Company, Forsyth, Montana.

In the few years since strip mining for coal began on a large scale in our state, those of us who are concerned that mined lands may not be returned to their former agricultural productivity have been constantly reassured, by even the most vocal proponents of coal-oriented industrialization, that they were merely advocating reasonable and responsible development. These advocates of exploitation have been quick to tell us that Montana not only had an obligation to provide energy for other domestic regions, but for foreign energy consumers as well. This is fine only as long as those proponents of exploitation try to protect Montana's agricultural interests by assuming some obligation and responsibility for insuring that mined land will not be an agricultural waste land.

It seems, however, that advocates of coal development, despite their reassuring rhetoric, will seldom assume the responsibility that their advocacy should dictate. In fact, rather than demanding that development be responsible, and accountable, industrial proponents often want not only development, which is fine, but would cause ~~the~~ or allow this development to be irresponsible, unreclaimable, and unrestrained. This is not fine.

I believe that there is no doubt in any mind in this room that coal is going to continue to be stripmined in Montana for quite a few years. But any reasonable, responsible person must insist that the coal be mined in the best place, in the best manner, with responsibility, and with the idea in mind that there must be an effort made to leave something of value after

the coal is gone; even if this means leaving some unreclaimable, and fragile areas undisturbed. Every responsible person, be they citizen, corporate developer, or elected official<sup>s</sup> should insist that any industrial development be conducted with a minimum of damage, destruction, and disruption.

Surely in our quest for industrial development, we have not yet sunk to the depths of encouraging it at any cost.

It seems to me that this piece of legislation is ill advised, irresponsible and therefore unacceptable.



## The Montana Environmental Information Center

February 6, 1981

• P.O. Box 1184, Helena, Montana 59601 (406) 443-2520  
• P.O. Box 8166, Missoula, Montana 59801 (406) 728-2644

Statement Concerning SB 278  
before  
The Senate Natural Resources Committee

EIC stands opposed to SB 278. It is a clear example of how special interests can invade the intent of good laws for the purpose of specific exemptions. The purpose of this bill is clear: one mine is having a little problem with the "ecological fragility" section of the law, so the law must be amended. Specifically, Westmoreland Coal at its Absaloka mine near Sarpy Creek has run afoul with the fragility clause. EIC opposes this kind of narrow, special interest legislation.

The fragility clause has existed since the enactment of the law. The state has been, in our opinion, exceedingly cautious and responsible in exercising the clause. EIC believes that the fragility clause must remain in the Act because it is critically important to protect fragile lands in our state. This part of the Act has not been abused.

The special-interest intent of this bill should be dealt with summarily by a fair legislature. Passing this bill is tantamount to saying that ecologically fragile lands in Montana, which perhaps cannot be reclaimed, are not worth protecting. We hope that the Committee would not write off the few lands that this clause protects. EIC urges DO NOT PASS on SB 278.

Respectfully submitted by

NAME: Nick Golder DATE: 2-6-81

ADDRESS: Forrest, MT

PHONE: 477-6684

REPRESENTING WHOM? NPRC

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SE 178

DO YOU: SUPPORT? \_\_\_\_\_ AMEND? \_\_\_\_\_ OPPOSE? ☒

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME: Wallace McFar

DATE: 2/6/81

ADDRESS: Rocky Six Ranch Forsyth 1074. 59527

PHONE: 347-5363

REPRESENTING WHOM?

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SB 278

DO YOU: SUPPORT?

AMEND?

OPPOSE?

COMMENTS:

NAME: Garrett C Moor DATE: 6 Feb 81

ADDRESS: Helen - Land Commissioner

PHONE: 2074

REPRESENTING WHOM? State Land Dept

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 278

DO YOU: SUPPORT? \_\_\_\_\_ AMEND? \_\_\_\_\_ OPPOSE? X

COMMENTS: See attached

NAME:

DATE :

2/6/81

**ADDRESS:**

5301 Colonial Dr

PHONE:

442-6223

## REPRESENTING WHOM?

Mr. Coal Council

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL:

SB 278 SB 244

DO YOU:

**SUPPORT?**

✓ ✓

AMEND?

**OPPOSE?**

**COMMENTS:**

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY

NAME: JOHN W. WILSON DATE: 10/10/54

ADDRESS: 10071 53

PHONE: 442-1100

REPRESENTING WHOM?

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: \_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY

NAME: DANA L. CHRISTENSEN DATE: 2-6-81

ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 2545 BILLINGS MT

PHONE: 248-7731

REPRESENTING WHOM? WESTMORELAND RESOURCES, INC.

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SB 278

DO YOU: SUPPORT? X AMEND? \_\_\_\_\_ OPPOSE? \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY

NAME: Pat Wilson DATE: 2-6-81

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 31572 Billings, Montana

PHONE: 252-5706

REPRESENTING WHOM? Monten

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SR 278

DO YOU:    SUPPORT?    ☒    AMEND?    OPPOSE?

COMMENTS:

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY

NAME: Mary A Langley DATE: 2/6/81

ADDRESS: Helena

PHONE: 442-3420

REPRESENTING WHOM? WETA

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SB 275

DO YOU: SUPPORT? ☒ AMEND? ☐ OPPOSE? ☐

COMMENTS: THIS SHOULD DELETE JARGONY, BROAD

LANGUAGE THAT IS NOT NECESSARY & INDEED

PROVIDES OBSTRUCTIONISTS WITH YET ANOTHER TOOL

TO STOP OR DELAY REASONABLE DEVELOPMENT.



# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

February 6,

31

19.....

**PRESIDENT**

MR. ....

We, your committee on **NATURAL RESOURCES** .....

**SENATE**

having had under consideration ..... Bill No. **273**

**SENATE**

Respectfully report as follows: That ..... Bill No. **278**

DO PASS

*H.C.*

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

February 6, 1981

**PRESIDENT**

MR. ....

**NATURAL RESOURCES**

We, your committee on .....

**SENATE**

having had under consideration ..... Bill No. **205**

**SENATE**

Respectfully report as follows: That ..... Bill No. **205**

~~DO PASS~~  
DO NOT PASS

*H.C.*

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

February 6, 1901

MR. **PRESIDENT**

We, your committee on **NATURAL RESOURCES**

having had under consideration **SENATE** Bill No. **244**

Respectfully report as follows: That **SENATE** Bill No. **244**

DO PASS

*H.C.*

SENATE COMMITTEE Natural Resources

Date 2-6-81 Bill No. SB205 Time 2:30 P.M.

NAME	YES	NO
Harold Dover, Chairman	✓	
Mark Etchart, Vice Chairman	✓	
Thomas Keating	Absent	
Roger Elliott	✓	
Larry Tveit	✓	
Jesse O'Hara	abstained	
John Manley	✓	
William Hafferman	abstained	
Steve Brown		✓
Dave Manning		✓
Patrick Ryan	✓	
Fred Van Valkenburg		✓

AGNES HAMILTON  
Secretary

HAROLD DOVER  
Chairman

Motion: SB-205 DO NOT PASS

(include enough information on motion--put with yellow copy of committee report.)