



Registration Begins for IMCC's 2014 Annual Meeting in Reno, Nevada

The Interstate Mining Compact Commission's (IMCC) 2014 Annual Meeting will be held April 27 - 30, 2014 at the Peppermill Hotel in Reno, Nevada. Those who wish to attend are encouraged to register early. A registration form is included with this issue of the "Compact".

A welcoming reception will take place on the evening of Sunday, April 27. A General Session will kick off the day on Monday, April 28 (speakers TBD), followed by a joint meeting of the Noncoal Environmental Affairs and Mine Safety and Health Committees. An afternoon stop in the historic mining town of Virginia City and a mine site visit followed by a networking dinner are currently in the planning stages.

On Tuesday, April 29, a meeting between the states and representatives from the Federal Office of Surface Mining (OSM) is scheduled. The Coal Section of the Environmental Affairs Committee and the Abandoned Mine Land Committee will meet jointly immediately following the OSM/states meeting. The Annual Awards Banquet will take place in the evening where the IMCC 2014 National Reclamation and Minerals Education Awards will be presented.

IMCC's Finance and Administrative and Resolutions Committees will meet jointly on the morning of Wednesday, April 30 and will be followed immediately by the Executive Commission Business Meeting which will conclude the Annual Meeting.

For more information, contact: Beth A. Botsis at 703.709.8654 or E-mail: bbotsis@imcc.isa.us. Information about the IMCC Annual Meeting is also available on the IMCC website at: <http://www.imcc.isa.us/Conference.htm>.

A Newsletter Published by
Interstate Mining Compact
Commission

Upcoming Meetings:

IMCC 2014 Annual Meeting

April 27 - 30, 2014
The Peppermill Hotel
Reno, Nevada

For more information on IMCC Meetings as it becomes available, visit our website: www.imcc.isa.us and click on the "Conferences" tab. Some presentations from IMCC Meetings and Workshops can also be viewed on the website at the "Conferences" tab. Copies of IMCC's Compact Newsletter are available on the website by clicking on the "Publications" tab.

Contact Information:

Interstate Mining Compact Commission
445-A Carlisle Drive
Herndon, VA 20170
Ph: 703.709.8654/Fax: 703.709.8655
Email: gconrad@imcc.isa.us or
bbotsis@imcc.isa.us

IMCC Call for Nominations For IMCC's 2014 National Reclamation and Minerals Education Awards

The Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC) is soliciting nominations for the 2014 Kenes C. Bowling National Reclamation Awards, and the 2014 National Minerals Education Awards. The criteria, deadlines, and nomination forms for both award programs can be found on IMCC's website at the following link: <http://www.imcc.isa.us/Awards.htm>. The announcements and forms will also be sent to the IMCC member states.

The awards will be presented at the Annual Awards Banquet in conjunction with IMCC's 2014 Annual Meeting in Reno, Nevada at the Peppermill Hotel on Tuesday, April 29.

For more information, contact: Beth A. Botsis at 703.709.8654 or E-Mail: bbotsis@imcc.isa.us.

IMCC 2013 Mid-Year Meeting Held in San Antonio, Texas

The Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC) 2013 Mid-Year Meeting was held October 2 - 3 at the Westin Riverwalk Hotel in San Antonio, Texas. Forty-seven people were in attendance representing IMCC's member states and guests from Mississippi and Montana. An informal "pre-meeting" was held on October 1 during which states discussed Office of Surface Mining (OSM) budgeting issues. Due to the federal government shut-down, members of OSM were not able to attend the meeting.

To remove your name from our mailing list, please email Beth Botsis at bbotsis@imcc.isa.us.
Questions or comments? Email bbotsis@imcc.isa.us or call 703.709.8654.

On Wednesday, October 2, the Noncoal Environmental Affairs and Mine Safety and Health Committees met jointly. A luncheon was held featuring keynote speaker Alaska State Senator Cathy Giessel. Senator Giessel gave a fascinating presentation covering Alaska's entry into IMCC in 2012, and current mining issues of concern in the state of Alaska. The Committees resumed their meeting after the luncheon and, following adjournment, a joint meeting of the Coal Environmental Affairs and Abandoned Mine Lands Committees took place. A social reception was held in the evening.

IMCC's Finance and Administrative and Resolutions Committees met jointly on the morning of Thursday, October 3 and was followed immediately by the Executive Commission Business meeting which concluded the Mid-Year Meeting.

For more information, contact: Greg Conrad at 703.709.8654 or E-mail: gconrad@imcc.isa.us.

Mississippi Becomes IMCC's Newest Associate Member State

During the Executive Commission Business Meeting held October 2, 2013 in conjunction with the Interstate Mining Compact Commission's (IMCC) Mid-Year Meeting in San Antonio, Texas, IMCC Executive Director Greg Conrad presented a letter from Mississippi's Governor Bryant requesting that the state be admitted as an associate member to the Compact. The Executive Commission voted unanimously to approve Governor Bryant's request and welcomed Mississippi as IMCC's newest associate member state. Stan Thieling, Director of the Coal Mining Division of the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality was in attendance at the meeting. Mr. Thieling has been appointed by Governor Bryant to serve as his official representative to the Compact.

For more information, contact: Greg Conrad at 703.709.8654 or E-mail: gconrad@imcc.isa.us.

Ed Fogels of Alaska Testifies at Congressional Hearing Re. EPA

On October 10, 2013, Ed Fogels, Deputy Commissioner for the Alaska Department of Natural Resources, testified on behalf of the state of Alaska and the Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC) at a House Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources Oversight Hearing titled "EPA vs. American Mining Jobs: The Obama Administration's Regulatory Assault on the Economy." In his testimony, Mr. Fogels emphasized the need for EPA to refocus on a more collaborative and respectful relationship with the states. "State governments have developed effective and robust regulatory programs that should be relied on by federal agencies, not overridden by them," he said, "When federal agencies such as EPA seek to expand their mining regulation, they are often duplicating existing well-functioning programs."

Mr. Fogels highlighted examples of EPA overreach in the state of Alaska. One example is an EPA watershed assessment of the Bristol Bay Watershed which is being developed in reaction to the proposed Pebble Mine. It is a serious concern for the state because the assessment covers an area representing almost 10% of the state's land holdings. Mr. Fogels expressed concern that EPA's flawed assessment process could lead to the preemption of a thorough environmental analysis of the project under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) once the project is actually proposed. He described EPA's study as having no legal basis and being based entirely on hypothetical mining activity compounded by theoretical projects that may never develop and it ignores best practices, mitigation efforts and permit stipulations that would have to be met before the project would be permitted. Mr. Fogels said the study is of concern not only because of Pebble Mine, but that it could also result in effective loss of all beneficial use of this massive area of state land which was promised to the state as part of the Statehood Act to help secure an independent, economic existence for Alaska.

In his testimony Mr. Fogels also asserted that through the culmination of years of experience and permitting efforts, states have developed effective bonding programs for hardrock mining to ensure their ability to reclaim and remediate mines if a miner is unable to do so. He cautioned against EPA displacing these successful state programs pursuant to CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act) under a current rulemaking the agency is engaged in and stressed the need for states to be a partner in vetting any new rule before it is released.

Finally, Mr. Fogels also testified regarding the increasingly frequent tendency by EPA to elevate Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404(q) permitting decisions when the agency disagrees with a decision which has been carefully and cooperatively made with other state and federal agencies, thereby causing significant delays. When EPA determines through Section 404(q) of the CWA that a water body is an Aquatic Resource of National Importance (ARNI) it becomes very difficult for major projects to develop timelines that can predict how EPA's review will affect the project, since there is no definite standard as to what an ARNI might be.

In concluding his testimony, Mr. Fogels reiterated the need for federal regulators to respect the primacy role and responsibility of the states in managing, administering and protecting the lands and waters as is clearly stated in the CWA.

For more information or to obtain a copy of Mr. Fogels' testimony, contact: Beth Botsis or Greg Conrad at 703.709.8654 or E-mail: gconrad@imcc.isa.us or bbotsis@imcc.isa.us.

U.S. District Court Decision in North Dakota Lawsuit Re. Use of Policy Memoranda

Judge Hovland of the United States District Court for the District of North Dakota Southwestern Division handed down a decision on September 3, 2013 in *Dakota Resources Council vs. North Dakota Public Service Commission and Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar, in his official capacity*. Dakota Resources Council brought the lawsuit against North Dakota regarding the states' use of policy memoranda. The Court rejected the environmental plaintiffs' challenges on three separate grounds: standing, ripeness and timeliness (statute of limitations). The Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC) submitted an amicus brief in the case supporting the position of North Dakota and the Interior Department.

The plaintiffs argued that the North Dakota Public Service Commission's (PSC) Policy Memoranda are amendments to North Dakota's surface mining and reclamation program which have not been submitted to or approved by the Director of the Office of Surface Mining (OSM) as required by the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA). The plaintiff was seeking judicial review of final agency decisions by the PSC pursuant to the "Administrative Procedures Act" (APA) and the citizen suit provision of SMCRA. The Court said that a state agency's actions are not reviewable under the federal APA as it does not grant federal courts jurisdiction to review actions of state or municipal agencies. Rather, the APA may be used to guide a court where another federal statute, such as SMCRA, authorizes judicial review but does not provide standards for review. Further, the Court said the APA specified that agency action, including an alleged failure to act, may be overturned only where it is found to be "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law" and this standard of review forbids a court from substituting its own judgment for that of an agency. The APA provides for judicial review in cases where an agency has allegedly failed to act, such as pursuant to a mandatory, non-discretionary duty.

The Court also explained that under the "doctrine of standing" merely alleging an injury related to some cognizable interest is not enough. A plaintiff "must make an adequate showing that the injury is actual or certain to ensue." The Court determined that the Dakota Resource Council did not meet that requirement by not having "identified, in either the complaint or the summary judgment motion, a specific permit request, application, amendment, or termination decision as the basis for any alleged injury." Instead the Court found the Plaintiff's arguments to be based on "hypothetical future harms that are untethered to any site-specific action concerning any of the challenged Policy Memoranda issued by the PSC since 1977." The Court determined the Plaintiff "has not asserted a concrete injury-in-fact sufficient to invoke this Court's Article III jurisdiction."

The Court also found the policies described in the memoranda are not ripe for judicial review until the facts are more fully developed during OSM's 2013 annual performance review of North Dakota's program, during which an administrative review of the PSC Policy Memoranda is planned, as well as in the context of some site specific action. The Court decision stated "Judicial review at this stage will interfere with the regulatory process for oversight in the spirit of cooperative federalism" and intervention now could short-circuit further administrative action being taken by OSM and PSC. The Court stated it would also benefit from the factual development resulting from OSM's review of the Memoranda and from further factual development in the context of a challenge to site-specific action applying the procedures described in the Memoranda. Once PSC has applied the policies to a site-specific action and the Plaintiff has had ample opportunity to comment on those actions, the Plaintiff may bring a challenge to any alleged improper policies at that time. The Court also determined that Policy Memoranda and other state guidance documents do not warrant submittal to OSM as state program amendments under the provisions of SMCRA. Regarding the Plaintiff's allegations that PSC failed to follow the notification procedures under SMCRA, the Court said since Policy Memoranda simply provide further explanation and clarification and do not substantively change the operation of PSC's program, they do not necessarily require notification under the federal regulations. The Court also stated that OSM is afforded the discretion to determine whether a state program amendment is required in every case in which one or more of the criteria are met under the law. Since PSC's Policy Memoranda do not alter the language or overarching principles of the state laws and regulations, the Court said they do not automatically require formal OSM review and approval as state program amendments.

The Court also found that the three-year statute of limitations applicable to claims brought against the state had passed, since the issuance dates of the Policy Memoranda range from 1977 to early 2009, and in the absence of any identified site-specific applications of the policies described in the memoranda, the challenge is time barred. Since only two of the Policy Memoranda identified by the Plaintiff were revised within the three years preceding the filing of

the complaint, and the Plaintiff has made no attempt to identify any specific harm or violation resulting from those two Memoranda, nor has the Plaintiff shown how the recent updates may have created a meaningful change from the policy described at the time, the Court determined there is no justification to reopen the statute of limitations. The Court said, "The mere act of revising, reissuing or updating a policy, without more, is not sufficient to reopen the statutory period."

For more information, contact: Greg Conrad at 703.709.8654 or E-mail: gconrad@imcc.isa.us.

U.S. District Court Decision in North Dakota Conflict of Interest Lawsuit

Judge Hovland of the United States District Court for the District of North Dakota Southwestern Division handed down a decision on October 22, 2013 in *Dacotah Chapter of Sierra Club and Dakota Resource Council vs. Secretary of the Interior Sally M.R. Jewell, in her official capacity, and North Dakota Public Service Commission*. Judge Hovland rejected the challenge by the two western environmental groups in litigation regarding conflict of interest requirements under the North Dakota regulatory program. The Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC) submitted an amicus brief in the case supporting the position of North Dakota and the Interior Department. The environmental plaintiffs asserted that North Dakota's implementation of the state surface mining program resulted in exempting North Dakota Public Service Commissioners from the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) conflict of interest requirements. More specifically, the Plaintiffs argued that North Dakota's conflict of interest provisions are less stringent than the letter and spirit of SMCRA and that, as a result, the Secretary of the Interior failed to perform the resulting mandatory, non-discretionary duty of substituting a Federal program for North Dakota to remedy the state's failure to properly implement its program. In rejecting the challenge, the court first noted that the plain language in SMCRA is dispositive of the question of whether the Secretary has a mandatory duty to substitute a federal program in North Dakota. Citing Section 504(b) of SMCRA, the court stated that the command "may" providing for Federal enforcement does not impose on the Secretary a mandatory, non-discretionary duty to provide for direct federal enforcement of a state program. "The command in Section 504(b) is clearly discretionary and permits the Secretary of the Interior to consider a wide array of enforcement tools in the event a state is failing to enforce any part of its own program," the court ruled. The court also cited language in Section 521 of SMCRA to confirm the Secretary's discretionary authority by referring to the "reason to believe" standard related to enforcement action. "The Court finds that whether the Secretary of the Interior has 'reason to believe' a violation has occurred is a matter committed to her discretion by law. More important, because the decision whether to exercise such enforcement discretion is committed to the Secretary by law, it is presumptively unreviewable by this Court." The Court goes on to discuss the role of the states versus the federal government under SMCRA and the grant of "exclusive jurisdiction" to a state once it is granted primacy. "The Plaintiffs argue that despite the federal government's conditional grant of 'exclusive jurisdiction' to North Dakota, the national minimum standards set forth in SMCRA retain operative force against the North Dakota Program. To construe SMCRA in the manner urged by the Plaintiffs would circumvent the carefully designed balance Congress established between the federal government and the states. The effect of a citizen suit to enjoin federal officials in a primacy state to comport with the *federal* provision establishing the core standards for surface coal mining would end the exclusive state regulations and undermine the federalism established by the Act. Thus, rather than advancing the federal interest in preserving this statutory design, the Plaintiffs' interpretation would arguably frustrate it," the Court stated. As a result of all the above, the Court concluded that the authority to undertake an enforcement action of the state program is discretionary and unreviewable and, as such, the Court lacks jurisdiction.

For more information, contact: Greg Conrad at 703.709.8654 or E-mail: gconrad@imcc.isa.us.

IMCC Submits Amicus Brief in MT Supporting State Primacy

In September, the Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC) submitted an *Amicus Curiae* brief to the Ninth Circuit supporting the decision of the U.S. District Court for the District of Montana in *Montana Environmental Information Center and Sierra Club v. Stone-Manning*. The decision protects the sovereignty of state regulatory programs under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) by requiring that legal challenges be brought in state courts under state law rather than in the federal courts, and overall holds that those wishing to bring challenges use the existing administrative channels in the state. The essential argument is that once a state has achieved "primacy", the state program is afforded exclusive jurisdiction in the regulation of coal mining, meaning that the provisions of the state program take precedence over federal statutes and regulations. Lawsuits seeking to require state compliance with federal regulations are contrary to the carefully designed balance between the federal government and state regulatory authority, according to the District Court. The Ninth Circuit is expected to deliver its decision sometime in early 2014.

For more information, contact: Greg Conrad at 703.709.8654 or E-mail: gconrad@imcc.isa.us.

IMCC/NAAML P Distributes AML Accomplishments Report to Congress; Addresses “Undelivered Orders”

The Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC), in conjunction with the National Association of Abandoned Mine Land Programs (NAAML P), recently conducted outreach to Capitol Hill concerning the accomplishments and effectiveness of state abandoned mine land (AML) programs. An NAAML P Accomplishments Report (available at the NAAML P website: <http://naamlp.net/index.html>) and accompanying cover letter were delivered to congressional offices, seeking to clarify certain misconceptions concerning the current state of AML programs. Specifically, the information distributed addresses heightened concern expressed by the Obama Administration over the expenditure of AML fund moneys.

From the perspective of the federal Office of Surface Mining (OSM), there appears to be a substantial balance of “undelivered orders”, money that has been allotted by the federal program but has not yet been “spent” by the state or tribe. The information provided by IMCC and NAAML P argues that this is a mischaracterization of the current state of these “undelivered” AML moneys for two reasons. First, the apparent lag in spending of funds is largely due to the influx of expanded grant funding under the 2006 amendments to the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA). Second, the fact is that the vast majority of allotted AML fund money is already exclusively committed to projects at various stages. Therefore, while the money has often not yet been withdrawn from the Treasury, it is committed and unavailable for any other purpose and should therefore be considered *effectively* spent.

The NAAML P Accomplishments Report goes on to outline the excellent work that state AML programs have done and continue to do in reclaiming and restoring AML sites, showing that these programs are in fact administered very efficiently and effectively by the many states represented by IMCC and NAAML P.

For more information, contact: Greg Conrad at 703.709.8654 or E-mail: gconrad@imcc.isa.us.

Congressional Budget Negotiations May Include Mining Law Reform

As part of the House and Senate bipartisan deal to end the government shutdown in October 2013 and avert the potential debt ceiling crisis, a Budget Conference Committee was formed and assigned the task of identifying cost savings and new sources of revenue via development of a unified budget resolution by December 13. One topic which may arise for debate by the Committee is reform of the nation’s mining laws. President Obama previously proposed several mining reform measures in annual budget requests to Congress. The House Budget Committee’s fiscal blueprint advocated by Paul Ryan (R-WI) and supported by other Republican leaders also includes reforms, though not as extensive.

Earthworks and other environmental groups would like to see royalties charged on hardrock mining along with fees for the cleanup of abandoned hardrock mines similar to those the coal industry pays to help clean up abandoned coal mine sites through the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act’s (SMCRA) Abandoned Mine Land (AML) Program (Title IV). They also advocate for the federal government to have a greater ability to reject mining and exploration on federal land. Policy Advocate Aaron Mintzes of Earthworks acknowledged that the cost of remediating the abandoned noncoal mines throughout the country would be in the tens of billions of dollars. He expects the Conference Committee to raise revenues and reduce spending on AML cleanup.

Coal AML (Title IV) fees are paid into a fund administered by the federal government and are passed to states through grants for the cleanup of AML. Payments to states certified as having already cleaned up their priority coal AML sites are often funded by taxpayers as the result of the 2006 amendments to SMCRA. These certified states, such as Wyoming and Montana, have been targeted by the President and some lawmakers who have called for ending payments to those states. They also support raising the industry fee for reclamation and funneling the money to top priority coal AML sites in states like Pennsylvania and West Virginia. The Ryan budget proposal also calls for reforms to the coal AML program. According to Ryan’s panel’s report on the proposal, “This program authorizes millions of dollars paid from the Treasury for projects unrelated to abandoned coal mine cleanup. The budget recommends reforming this program to target expenditures to its intended purpose.” The Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC) wants to keep the 2006 SMCRA amendments in place. The 2012 Surface Transportation Bill already cut hundreds of millions of dollars in payments to Wyoming’s AML program as an offset to secure rural schools.

Then-Representative Ed Markey (D-MA) urged the 2011 Supercommittee to include mining reform measures in its compromise plan. He suggested that a seven cent per ton fee on hardrock mining would generate \$200 million per year over the next decade for AML remediation. He also wanted to establish a hardrock royalty rate comparable to

onshore oil and gas drilling, which at twelve and one-half percent, would generate at least \$300 million per year. A similar royalty payment has been proposed by President Obama.

DOJ Asked to Investigate EPA CWA Enforcement Action in Alaska

The Department of Justice (DOJ) has been asked to look into an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Clean Water Act (CWA) enforcement investigation which occurred in Alaska in August. The top Republican on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator David Vitter of Louisiana, requested the DOJ investigation following an armed raid carried out by EPA and involving the Bureau of Land Management and other agencies on small placer mines in the remote community of Chicken, Alaska. EPA claimed environmental enforcement officers are always armed in such situations. He also claimed the officers only conducted the raids on public lands. However, the miners claim the surprise armed raid was an attempt to intimidate them and that it would have been safer for all involved if they had just shown up at the door as in the past and said they wanted to check the water.

"Recent events in Alaska suggest that EPA agents may be abusing their discretion during criminal investigations, perhaps encouraging excessive intimidation, and I am concerned that EPA is reluctant to address this serious issue," Senator Vitter wrote in a letter to Attorney General Eric Holder. On October 10 the House Natural Resources Committee discussed the situation at a hearing. A special counsel has also been appointed by Alaska Governor Sean Parnell to look into the state's involvement.

The House Committee on Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation also conducted an oversight hearing on "Threats, Intimidation and Bullying by Federal Land Managing Agencies" on October 29 featuring testimony from Americans across the country regarding personal experiences on what they consider ongoing and abusive conduct by federal land management agencies taken against private property rights.

Nomination of Janice Schneider for Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management in DOI

On November 6, 2013, President Obama nominated Janice Schneider for Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management in the Department of the Interior (DOI). Ms. Schneider is a partner in the Environment, Land and Resources Department of Latham & Watkins LLP, a position she has held since 2005. She is co-chair of Latham & Watkins' Energy and Infrastructure Project Siting and Defense Practice as well as local department chair of the Environmental, Land & Resources Department. Previously, Ms. Schneider was a senior associate with Latham & Watkins LLP from 2001 - 2004. She served as Counselor to the Deputy Secretary of the Interior from 2000 - 2001. From 1993 to 1998, Ms. Schneider was an Attorney-Advisor with the U.S. Department of the Interior in the Office of the Solicitor. She received a B.S. from the University of Miami and a J.D. with a Certificate in Environmental and Natural Resources Law from the Northwestern School of Law of Lewis and Clark College. As Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Ms. Schneider will have oversight responsibility for the Office of Surface Mining and the Bureau of Land Management.

House Passes Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act; Legislation Introduced in Senate

In September the House passed H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act. The 246 - 178 member vote included fifteen Democrats who supported the bill, down from the twenty-two Democrats who supported a similar bill in the last Congress. House Republicans claim that the U.S. has been forced to rely on imported strategic minerals for defense and other applications because the federal government is known to hold up mining permits for several years. H.R. 761 is intended to speed up the federal approval process for mineral mining and exploration, which is necessary to ensure the U.S. has domestic sources of strategic minerals. The bill gives federal agencies only 30 months to decide on whether to approve or reject permits for exploration and mining. It also limits the ability for mining to be stopped by parties via the courts.

House Natural Resources Committee Chairman Doc Hastings (R-WA) cited delays that could last more than 10 years of new mining projects due to "red tape, frivolous lawsuits and onerous regulations." He said these delays cost American jobs and promote U.S. dependence on foreign countries for these raw materials. Democrats who oppose the bill claim it will erode environmental protections and say the bill's definition of "strategic minerals" is too broad, even including such materials as sand and gravel.

On the Senate side, during the week of October 30, Senators Lisa Murkowski (R-AK), Ron Wyden (D-OR), Mark Udall (D-CO), and Dean Heller (R-NV), along with 13 other senators, introduced their "Critical Minerals Policy Act of 2013." Overall, the legislation seeks to buttress U.S. mineral supply chains against dependence on imported raw materials by, in the words of Senator Murkowski, "providing clear direction to keep the United States competitive and begin the

process of modernizing our federal mineral policies.” More specifically, the bill establishes a list of minerals deemed critical to the domestic economy, and sets forth a comprehensive set of public policies to address a myriad of issues related to domestic mining, including discovery, production, use and re-use, and federal permitting.

Registration Form

Interstate Mining Compact Commission 2014 Annual Meeting

The Peppermill Hotel, Reno, Nevada – April 27 - 30, 2014

Last Name:	First Name:
Title:	State/Org. & Dept.:
Street Address:	
City:	State:
Telephone:	Postal Code:
Email Address:	Attending Spouse/Companion's Name (if applicable):

Registration Fees:	\$350.00 Delegate	\$175.00 Spouse/Companion	
Social Events: PLEASE READ AND FILL OUT COMPLETELY			
IMPORTANT:			
<i>The following events are included in the delegate and spouse/companion registration fees. Please indicate your intention to attend the banquet events by CIRCLING EVENTS you WILL attend. This will allow us to provide accurate counts for banquet functions.</i>			
INDICATE ATTENDANCE BY CIRCLING:		INDICATE ATTENDANCE BY CIRCLING:	
Delegate:		Spouse/Companion (if applicable):	
Welcome Reception (Sunday p.m.)	Monday Mine Site Visit/Excursion	Welcome Reception (Sunday p.m.)	Monday Mine Site Visit/Excursion
All Breaks	Awards Banquet (Tuesday p.m.)		Awards Banquet (Tuesday p.m.)

Important Note: Early registrations are helpful for our planning purposes. Please register with IMCC by April 4, 2014 or sooner, if possible. Payment does NOT have to be received with your registration form. CANCELLATIONS RECEIVED AFTER April 10 are NON-REFUNDABLE.

HOTEL RESERVATION INFORMATION: Make your room reservations directly with the Peppermill Hotel by using the online Passkey Reservation System here (Preferred Method):

https://resweb.passkey.com/Resweb.do?mode=welcome_ei_new&eventID=10706222

or by calling: 1.775.826.2121 or 1.800.282.2444. Be sure to identify yourself with the "Interstate Mining Compact Commission block of rooms" to obtain the government rate of \$94/night plus taxes, single or double for rooms in the Peppermill Tower. Rates must be obtained at the time of reserving – adjustments cannot be made at check-in or check-out. **The cut-off date for room reservations is March 26, 2014.** The hotel will honor the rates for 3 days prior and 3 following the meeting dates based on availability.

Registration fees should be made payable to the Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC) and mailed to:
IMCC
445-A Carlisle Drive
Herndon, VA 20170

We are happy to invoice you for the fee and payment does NOT have to be received by IMCC prior to the meeting. The registration fee will automatically be invoiced for any registrations received without payment. (Provide the invoice address if different from registrant's address.)

We cannot accept credit card payments.

Questions? Contact Beth Botsis at: 703/709-8654, fax: 703/709-8655, or email: bbotsis@imcc.isa.us.

2014 Annual Meeting

Of The:

Interstate Mining Compact Commission



Hosted By:

The State of Nevada



April 27 - 30, 2014

The Peppermill Hotel, Reno, Nevada

**For More Information Call IMCC at: (703) 709-8654
or Visit <http://www.imcc.isa.us> (“Conference info” tab)**

Preliminary Program*

Sunday, April 27, 2014

*Registration Begins, 5:30 p.m.
Welcoming Reception, 6:00 p.m.*

Monday, April 28, 2014

*Registration
General Session, 9:00 a.m.
Noncoal Environmental Affairs Committee
and Mine Safety & Health
Committee Joint Meeting, 10:30 a.m.
Afternoon Mine Site Tour/Virginia City
Excursion Event in Planning –
Details TBD*

Tuesday, April 29, 2014

*States/Office of Surface Mining Meeting,
9:00 a.m.
Coal Environmental Affairs Committee and
Abandoned Mine Lands Committee
Joint Meeting, 10:30 a.m.
Awards Reception and Banquet, 6:30 p.m.*

Wednesday, April 30, 2014

*Finance & Administrative Committee and
Resolutions Committee Joint
Meeting, 9:00 a.m.
Annual Commission Business Meeting,
10:00 a.m. (Expected to Adjourn no
later than 1:00 p.m.)*

** Times are subject to change.*