

the most obvious. Areas of Ohio, having for several years been subjected to indiscriminate mining practices without proper control at the State level, will never be the same. We must preserve some of the natural beauty of this hill area of Ohio for posterity, and it must be acted upon now or be forever lost.

Some coal companies and power companies who engage in open mining activity are responsible and have made a genuine effort to reclaim mined lands. These companies naturally resist further governmental control of their industry, and have resisted it on the local, state and federal level and by appealing to the general populace through paid advertisements in large circulating magazines (see enclosures). While I commend these companies for their attitude toward land reclamation, I strongly oppose their efforts to limit legislation for the control of open mining activities, because I have personally witnessed the great need to control those companies who do not responsibly reclaim the land which has been subjected to open mining practices.

I have reviewed the bill prepared and submitted by you and it is my feeling that this bill and the one introduced by Senator Jackson and submitted to the Department of the Interior would be a great step forward in protecting our land. Legislation of this nature is desperately needed by the people of the United States.

Yours very truly,

VICTOR R. MARSH, Jr.

J. L. SHIELY Co.,
St. Paul, Minn., March 26, 1968.

Re S.3132.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The J. L. Shiely Company is a sand, gravel and crushed stone producer operating principally in the Twin Cities Metropolitan area. We wish comment on our position regarding the "Surface Mining Reclamation Act of 1968."

We do not believe that the sand, gravel, crushed stone and related industries should be included in the provisions of this bill. Our reasons are as follows:

(1) The right to extract sand, gravel and crushed stone should be granted by the lowest governmental unit that is directly concerned with the extraction from an environmental standpoint. This is being done through local planning boards and zoning commissions on an individual case basis. We feel that this is beneficial to both the community and the producer.

(2) In most cases, the products mined are being used within a relatively small area surrounding the pit or quarry. These products become an integral part of the economy of the community and the surrounding area. We feel that the community should have jurisdiction.

(3) Rehabilitation should be accomplished on a best use basis. In many cases there is no predictable best use at the outset of operations, and trying to come up with a plan would be a useless drawing board exercise.

(4) The economic considerations are important. We think that the provisions of this bill will cost the producer an unreasonable amount of money. This will have to be passed on to the consumer. The cost will be reflected in such projects as the Interstate Highway System.

You might be interested in knowing that our company voluntarily has developed a rehabilitation plan for our Grey Cloud Island complex. Public relations and community responsibilities prompted us to undertake this project. The engineering and planning cost was over \$6,000.00. This Spring we are planting over 10,000 trees on reclaimed land at a cost of another \$6,000.00.

We feel that our industry is responsible and not in need of inclusion in the provisions of S. 3132.

Very truly yours,

J. L. SHIELY, Jr., President.

WEDRON SILICA Co.,
Chicago, Ill., April 9, 1968.

Re S. 3132, Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1968.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have read with interest the very commendable provisions of this bill. We, however, would like to voice our most strenuous objection to the bill for the following reasons:

1. It is a duplication of already existing state plans that are in operation and which are most successful.