

We believe Colorado is doing an excellent job of regulation on its surface mined land and the attached resolution of the board of directors of the Colorado Mining Association (exhibit 3) reaffirms our belief in local control of mining. We can handle our own problems.

The coal operators in Colorado reclaimed and reseeded 476 acres in 1967 disturbed by strip mining on a volunteer basis and the resultant vegetation is better cover for wildlife and better feed for cattle and sheep than adjacent range land left undisturbed.

This volunteer program has reclaimed substantially all the land strip mined for coal in the State. However, we cannot expect that \$400 per acre be spent to fix up land costing \$40 per acre so the choice of trees and seedlings and the grade and contouring of the land should be based only on local conditions, not national directives.

Sand and gravel operations in Colorado are usually near our metropolitan centers and zoning by counties or political subdivisions assure that these operations are neat and clean and that they do not present a hazard to the public.

Also, this assures that these mineral resources are not preempted for other surface use. In turn, the gravel operators have reclaimed the land for agriculture by distributing top soil over graded reject areas. They have also stabilized the land for end uses such as parks, ponds, industrial, home and business sites and as sanitary land fills.

Upgrading of the land following the production period has increased the value of sand and gravel land many times its raw acreage value and put it to a better end use than would have been possible if the production period had not been assured.

We believe S. 3132 section 3(b) is not a statement of fact but is a condemnation of the mining industry of Colorado and we object to its inclusion in the bill. Pollution of water is covered by very sound practices of the Colorado Department of Health; land is improved for other uses and is not destroyed; we do not counteract efforts to conserve natural resources; and we certainly do not destroy the property of citizens.

We object to section 4 as retroactive legislation. We believe section 5 contemplates expenditures by the Federal and State agencies far in excess of any amounts needed for a reasonable economic land stabilization program. We believe section 5 allows the Secretary of Interior to unnecessarily enter into the affairs of our State.

Section 6(a) puts persons opposed to mining on the advisory committee. Section 7(1)(A) does not protect mineral resource development which we believe should be the basic criteria for any regulatory agency.

Section 7(1)(C)(v) indicates that a State plan must contain criteria relating to the maintenance of access through mined areas. Does this mean the mine operator must open his property for a public road by a directive from a Federal employee or be liable as stated in section 7(1)(F) for criminal penalties?

Our position on S. 3132 is very simple: Problems of surface mining in Colorado are the problems of many years ago. Our current operators are diligent, they recognize their responsibilities and they are reclaiming the lands. Our underground miners also are good citizens for they stabilize and maintain mine dumps and tailings ponds.