<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAKER, ANSON &quot;SKIP&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANKS, JIMMIE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAUDETTE, ED</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAKE, LESLIE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIOTT, JOHN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACEY, THOMAS H.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAHN, CARRIE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILTMER, DAVE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACOPINI, PATSY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON, VICKI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURRAY, JIM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIBI, NILS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOCKLEBY, JOHN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKER, MARK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHORT, DAN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STROBEL, KEVIN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD, PAM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARREN, MARK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURRAY, JIM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIBI, NILS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOCKLEBY, JOHN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, Scott</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg, Michael</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnham, Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, Coleen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gursky, Larry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Mark</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiltner, Dave</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hjartarson, Dan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmquist, Cary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Larry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knapp, Wayne</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leik, Jim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald, Gordon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield, Dean</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marra, Joe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mott, Dave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Francine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waugh, John</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Polly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short, Dan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomeroy, Pat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Dave</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAINED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: Feb. 25, 1976
The meeting was called to order by President John Nockleby at 7:10 p.m.

Last Week's Minutes
Iacopini asked that on page 5 in the paragraph on Student Union Board the sentence beginning "The issue concerned is . . . ." be deleted from the minutes. Minutes accepted with the change.

APPOINTMENTS
Central Board. Nockleby appointed Chris Raver to CB. PARKER MOVED TO RATIFY THE APPOINTMENT OF CHRIS RAVER TO CENTRAL BOARD FOR THE REST OF THIS SESSION. She would be serving for five weeks. MOTION CARRIED.

SAC Director. Applications are now open for Director of SAC. The deadline for turning them in will be March 12, the last day of the quarter before finals.

CB Vancancies. There are still two vacancies on CB. These seats could either be filled by perhaps two people from the new Board, or they could remain vacant until the new Board takes over. Larry Gursky and Wayne Knapp, who volunteered to sit on the Board for the remainder of the quarter, were appointed to CB. WARREN MOVED TO RATIFY THEIR APPOINTMENTS, SECONDED BY FARNHAM. MOTION FAILED. No appointments made.

BUSINESS MANAGER'S REPORT
Line Item Changes. Under the Soccer Club account, there is a line item change of $50 from Equipment to Out-of-State Travel. Another line item change in the Women's Resource Center account transfers $53.85 from Petty Equipment to Photography.

COMMITTEE REPORTS
Incorporation. Brian O'Grady reported on information he had received from Dave Warnick, President of Associated Students of the University of Idaho, regarding their incorporation. He discussed the organizational charter and two ways of incorporating, with all the students incorporated or just the business elements incorporated. Several points touched on by O'Grady were:

1. Activity fee may not be mandatory if ASUM were incorporated.
2. ASUM should decide why they want to become incorporated.
3. ASUM should set long-term goals and determine if incorporation would be advantageous.
4. One advantage of incorporation would be a clear definition of the legal status between the students and administration, via a contract.
5. General transferability of membership shares in the corporation.

6. State control regarding taxes, etc.

7. Would have bearing on state money because money would belong to the corporation.

8. Incorporation would have a bearing on students' collective bargaining because everything would be written down for reference.

O'Grady recommended more research be done on this by looking into the incorporation of schools in states whose corporate laws are similar to Montana's. The information so far collected will be put on file for future use.

OLD BUSINESS

MontPIRG. The Commissioner's Office is concerned with the MontPIRG problem, having been alerted to it by an article in the Kaimin. They're concerned with the money in the MontPIRG account and what the current status of MontPIRG is. Nockleby consulted with two lawyers and they said the important issue is not where the money would be spent but who would be spending it. Central Board was requested to reconsider giving the MontPIRG Money to SAC and set up a MontPIRG Board to carry out the original function of MontPIRG with that money. MOTION MADE BY JOHNSON TO TAKE MOTION TO ABOLISH MONTPIRG OFF TABLE; SECONDED BY STROBEL. MOTION CARRIED. The discussion followed along the same lines as last week when this subject was first introduced to CB. SAC doesn't want anything to do with MontPIRG; ASUM shouldn't go to the Board of Regents until CB has decided on a plan for MontPIRG or has definitely decided to do away with it. One suggestion was to do the same thing with MontPIRG as was done with SAC. Until a year ago, SAC wasn't very effective; but a qualified person took over then and has built it into the best thing around ASUM. Active soliciting should be done to encourage people to build and develop MontPIRG. FACEY MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO KEEP MONTPIRG, HAVE NOCKLEBY APPOINT A BOARD OF DIRECTORS TO TAKE CARE OF SPENDING THE MONEY ACCORDING TO THE PURPOSES INTENDED ORIGINALLY. The motion wasn't seconded and, therefore, died. Bowen restated the problems of organizing MontPIRG, especially the fact that it was originally intended to be a state-wide group and it has failed at the other colleges in the state because of lack of student interest. Strobel thought it should be organized with the $600 it now has and see what happens. Dr. Wicks didn't see why it should be abolished since keeping it in name only didn't cost anything and perhaps in the future it would be organized effectively. BEAUDETTE MOVED TO PUT MONTPIRG UNDER THE SAC STEERING COMMITTEE. Motion died because of lack of a second. STROBEL MOVED TO RECONSIDER PARKER'S MOTION OF LAST WEEK TO GIVE THE MONEY TO SAC; NOCKLEBY SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

Vote called for on motion to give $600 to SAC; MOTION FAILED. NOCKLEBY MOVED TO TAKE $2,000 FROM SPECIAL ALLOCATIONS, which is the estimated total amount of money collected since 1972 for MontPIRG, AND GIVE IT TO A MONTPIRG GROUP; SECONDED BY BANKS. Discussion followed. Pat Pomeroy thought that the $600 would be enough to get the program off the ground, and if there was enough interest, more money could be allocated.
Facey brought up the point that some of the $2,000 was spent on MontPIRG projects and all that money shouldn't be returned to MontPIRG. Parker moved to table this motion for six weeks; seconded by Facey. Motion failed. Warren moved to vote on the $2,000 motion; seconded by Iacopini. Motion carried. Vote on main motion; Motion failed.

Facey moved to have Nockleby appoint a 5-man board to govern MontPIRG sometime during the next two weeks; seconded by Strobel. Motion carried.

Johnson moved to let bygones be bygones and let money spent be left as is and start with $600 in MontPIRG account; seconded by Parker. Nockleby made a substitute motion to have CB go on public record as stating that in light of the intertwining nature of MontPIRG and SAC, the money was spent for the purposes for which it was intended. Seconded. Johnson withdrew her motion. Motion carried.

Ribi requested a transfer of $53.65 from the SAC account to the MontPIRG account because of a charge that was made to the wrong account. Ribi moved to make this transfer, seconded by Warren. Motion carried.

SARC Report. Patsy Iacopini, Vicki Johnson and Jim Murray have been working on the SARC report. Two new appointments will be requested by Ray Chapman on the SARC Committee. Nockleby appointed Iacopini and Farnham to the SARC Committee. Facey moved to ratify these appointments; seconded by Beaudette. Motion carried. One point covered in the report was the abolishment of the Dean of Men, and instead two students were hired; and the abolishment of several other positions which all helped to lower the expenses of the Student Affairs Office. One recommendation of the SARC report was that the University have a Student Fee Council with student members to give them a voice in the area of student fees, which is one area the students have not been involved in previously.

Opera Workshop. The Opera Workshop requested a change in the use of the money they have allocated in their Out-of-State Travel account. They want to use the money for food and lodging to cut down on their return trips to Missoula during their tour instead of using it all on mileage. Warren moved to make a financial policy change for the Opera Workshop; seconded by Facey. Motion carried.

Committee Report Request. Johnson requested the Women's Study Committee and the Legal Services Committee report to CB next week.

CB-Elect Meeting. There will be a short meeting of the CB-elect after this to discuss the upcoming training sessions.

NEW BUSINESS

Handball Club. The Handball Club has made a Special Allocation request for $1,125.56 for an in-state and out-of-state tournament trip. This request was made before, but the means of transportation has been changed this time from plane to car. Last time the money for the plane fare was rejected. The Budget and Finance Committee recommended that $345.56
of the request be granted to them, which would exclude the meals and lodging part of the request (which amounts to $468.00 for the out-of-state trip and $312.00 for the in-state trip). WARREN MOVED TO ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATION OF B&F TO MAKE A SPECIAL ALLOCATION OF $345.56 TO THE HANDBALL CLUB; SECONDED BY SHORT. A representative of the club present at the CB meeting requested a change in mileage allowance from 14¢ a mile to 15¢ a mile. This was because they were going to drive a station wagon instead of a sedan. This would be an additional $40 added to the allocation. WARREN MOVED TO AMEND THE ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION TO ADD $40 TO THE SPECIAL ALLOCATION; SECONDED BY FACEY. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION TO ALLOCATE MONEY TO HANDBALL CLUB CARRIED 10-2.

Women's Resource Center. A Special Allocation request was made by WRC for #113 because of a mistake in social security deductions for one of the employees. B&F recommended that $43 be allocated for them for this purpose. RIBI MOVED TO ACCEPT B&F'S RECOMMENDATION FOR $43 FOR WRC; SECONDED BY WARREN. Some discussion followed concerning whether this should be a line item change or a special allocation. MOTION CARRIED 8-6.

UM Ski Team. Three skiers have qualified for the NCAA finals in Main and the Athletic Director will send only one of the skiers. Therefore, they are requesting $1,846.11 to send the three skiers, to be taken from the Special Allocation account. MURRAY MOVED TO GIVE THE SKI TEAM $0 SECONDED BY WARREN. The reasoning behind this motion was that it is felt that Harley Lewis thinks that if he doesn't give money to the minor sports teams, they can come to CB and get the money here. However, money should be budgeted in the Athletic Department's budget for the minor sports as well as the major sports, and it isn't up to CB to support teams that should be budgeted under the Athletic Department. Dr. Wicks felt that all the minor sports coaches should get together and make their plight known to a lot of people to put pressure on the Athletic Department. MOTION TO ALLOCATE $0 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Murray will draw up a resolution requesting Lewis to provide the money for the ski team to attend the NCAA conference and request that the Athletic Department in the future fund all sports, including the minor sports. MOTION MADE TO SUPPORT THIS RESOLUTION; SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

(R76-5 on back of page 5)

Because of CB's position not to fund intercollegiate athletics when such areas as the Library is suffering because of lack of funds and the Athletic Department has plenty of money to support all their teams, they cannot allocate any money to the Ski Team. CB believes in participatory sports and has shown their interest by supporting many sports clubs and Campus Recreation. The issue, however, is that the Athletic Department should support ALL of its teams.

Common Calendar. Dayle Hardy and Will Rogers represented a concerned group of students regarding the common-calendar poll. They have gone over the poll and made some changes to help clarify the questions and presented some suggestions as to how to distribute it to the students. SHORT MOVED TO RECONSIDER THE MOTION NOT TO DISTRIBUTE THE POLL; SECONDED BY BANKS. MOTION CARRIED. Several members feel the poll isn't the right way to decide on the question of a quarter or a semester system. There is a task force now working on the reasonings behind selecting a common calendar in the first place. MOTION MADE TO DISTRIBUTE POLL; SECONDED. MOTION FAILED.
Lambda. Lambda has spent $260 on stationery for which they were not allocated any money. Their print account #562 was only supposed to be used for printing a newsletter and a pamphlet entitled "What Is Lambda?". FACEY MOVED TO FREEZE $260 FROM THE PRINTING ACCOUNT #562. MOTION DIES BECAUSE OF LACK OF A SECOND. Matter will be taken up again later.

WARREN MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; PARKER SECONDED. Meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Pat Hill
ASUM Secretary


Absent: Baker.

Excused: Hahn, Ward.

CB-ELECT
Present: Alexander, Gursky, Hanson, Hjartarson, Holmquist, Knapp, Mansfield, Hiltner, Young, Berg, Waugh, MacDonald, Johnson, Short, Hill, Pomeroy.

Absent: Burnham, Clark, Leik, Marra, Mott, Smith, Mitchell.
WHEREAS sports, which emphasize individual participation, such as skiing, provide important benefits to both the participants themselves as well as the total university community; and

WHEREAS it is presently the responsibility of ASUM to fund a major portion of athletic programs stressing the maximum quantity of student participation, i.e. intramural and club sports, while it is the responsibility of the Athletics Department to provide an intercollegiate athletics program with funds from ticket sales, the university budget, contributions, etc.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Central Board of ASUM respectively requests Harley Lewis and the Athletic Department to see to the funding of the Ski Team for the NCAA Ski Meet, and

THAT the Athletic Department make attempts to fund all sports, including minor sports, equitably.

SUBMITTED BY: ASUM Central Board

DATE: February 25, 1976

ACTION TAKEN;
RESOLUTION REGARDING FUNDING OF UNIVERSITY ATHLETIC TEAMS

WHEREAS sports, which emphasize individual participation such as skiing, provide important benefits to both the participants themselves as well as the total university community; and

WHEREAS it is presently the responsibility of ASUM to fund a major portion of athletic programs stressing the maximum quantity of student participation, i.e. intramural and club sports, while it is the responsibility of the Athletics Department to provide an intercollegiate athletics program with funds from ticket sales, the university budget, contributions, etc.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Central Board of ASUM respectively requests Harley Lewis and the Athletic Department to see to the funding of the Ski Team for the NCAA Ski Meet, and

THAT the Athletic Department make attempts to fund all sports, including minor sports, equitably.

SUBMITTED BY: ASUM Central Board

DATE: February 25, 1976

ACTION TAKEN: The Athletic Department is funding Mr. Eric Kress to the NCAA National Championship in skiing. It was my opinion that Mr. Kress is the only member of our ski team who would be competitive at this level of competition, and he did show with Regional ski competitions in Utah and Colorado to be capable of skiing at the NCAA Championships. The other two skiers who qualified with a meet against only Montana State University did not perform well at these regional meets and did not win their individual events even against Montana State. Therefore, consistent with our policy that NCAA qualifiers who are capable of National competitions be allowed to compete, it is being upheld with Mr. Kress being the only member of the ski team with that ability.
REPORT FROM THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON CONDUCT

UNIVERSITY LIQUID ASSETS CORPORATION KEGGAR

ULAC IS A VIABLE UM STUDENT ORGANIZATION AS DEFINED BY ASUM BY-LAWS AND STUDENT UNION BOARD. THE MAIN PURPOSE OF THE ULAC KEGGAR IS TO COMBINE A FUN TIME WITH A FUND DRIVE FOR THE UM LIBRARY.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON KEGGAR:

It shall be held on Aber Day and not a weekend.

Advance ticket sales and the busing of patrons to the keggar site shall be duly considered as alternatives in assisting traffic control before the event.

All news releases and advertising shall be confined to within the State of Montana.

All regulations of the Missoula County Health Board and professional advisement from the Missoula County Sheriff's Office shall be strictly adhered to in all matters.

Any staged musical production for the event shall be terminated two (2) hours before dusk to assist traffic control after the event.

Since the Keggar is considered a Student Activity of the University, it should be treated as any similar venture would be treated if held on the Campus proper; i.e., as a concert situation under University supervision.

The Keggar should be reviewed annually, immediately after the event, by the appropriate University of Montana and Missoula County authorities.

FURTHERMORE, IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT IF ULAC IS TO HAVE THE ADVANTAGES OF OTHER UM STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS, THEN IT MUST OPEN ITS FINANCIAL RECORDS AS DEEMED NECESSARY BY ASUM.

Gary Bogue, Chairman

February 26, 1976

Equal Opportunity in Education and Employment
SKI TEAM REQUEST

1976 BUDGET FOR NCAA SKI MEET
BATES COLLEGE, BETHEL, MAINE

Travel:  Air Fare (Round Trip for three persons) $1,068.66
        $356.22/person  
        Car Rental (six days) $93.45  
                        93.45  
                        $1,162.11

Lodging:  4 people (six nights) $8.00/night/person  
            $37.00/night  
            $8.00/night/person  
                        222.00

Food:  4 people (7 days $9/day/person)  
        252.00

Entry Fees:  $60 (includes lift tickets)  
             60.00

Miscellaneous:  
                150.00

$1,846.11

02/25/76
SPECIAL ALLOCATION

Handball Club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>B&amp;F Recom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Travel (additional money to drive car to Memphis tournament)</td>
<td>$71.48 $71.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Travel (meals and lodging, Memphis tournament)</td>
<td>$468.00 -0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Fee (Memphis tournament)</td>
<td>$60.00 $60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Travel (State tournament in Billings)</td>
<td>$94.08 $94.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Travel (meals and lodging in Billings)</td>
<td>$312.00 -0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Fee (State tournament in Billings)</td>
<td>$120.00 $120.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Handball Club was allocated $500.00 for Out-of-State Travel by CB during Spring budgeting. In order to drive to Memphis the additional $71.48 is needed. No money was allocated for the entry fees, or the state tournament in Billings.

02/25/76
We are a group of concerned students who have come together to speak to you about a decision that you made at your last meeting concerning the poll that was to be run about semester and quarter preferences. We agree that there are certain points about the poll that may lead to some confusion and for this reason we have come up with a few minor changes that we feel will clarify the poll and the results derived from it. It is our hope that the results will be used as input for the Task Force that has been established to look into the common calendar question. This information could serve as a representation of our student body's opinion. We also feel it will better aide you in representing the students of the University of Montana.

We hope you will look objectively at the changes and consider them in your vote.
A seven-member inter-unit committee for the development of a common calendar has voted to evaluate the alternative of a uniform early semester calendar for the six-unit Montana University System by fall term 1977-78.

It is necessary to gather opinion on the subject from students, faculty and administration in order to insure full participation.

Following the results of the questionnaire, the information along with the committee's recommendation will be forwarded to the Commissioner of Higher Education Dr. Lawrence K. Pettit. He will, in turn, forward his recommendations to the Board of Regents.

Students ... we are asking your preference concerning dates you attend your institution. When you answer the questionnaire, consider your summer employment, your vacation periods, your studies. Faculty and Administration ... consider the effect on your teaching duties, your outside employment, the costs of conversion.

We believe that one of the major advantages of the early semester calendar is that it would provide a longer vacation period during the winter months, allowing the colleges and universities to cut back on energy use. In the early semester calendar there is a one month vacation between mid-December and mid-January.

Implementation of the early semester calendar would affect spring athletics, length of courses and possibly summer employment. Should the system go to the early semester calendar, numerous changes will be required since all of the system's units except the Law School at the University of Montana and Montana Tech operate on the quarter system.

Help the Montana University System with this important decision. Determine your needs. Voice your opinion.

Montana University System

Questionnaire
Please check the appropriate boxes on the questionnaire below:

**Indicate Institution & Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check one:</th>
<th>Sequence No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>U of M</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>MSU</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Tech</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>WMC</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>NMC</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <em>EMC</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Check one:**

| 1. _Faculty_ | 2. _Student_ | 3. _Classified Staff_ | 4. _Administrator_ |

My preference for the academic term at the units of the Montana University System is:

1. _Early Semester calendar of approximately 150 days (75 days for each semester) beginning about the first day of September and ending in mid-May._

2. _Quarter System with approximately three fifty-day quarters, beginning in late September and ending in early June._

My preference is based on the following reasons. Please check those that apply. 

*Only one check (__) per question:*

1. The beginning and ending dates:
   - prefer semester, __ reject semester, __
   - prefer quarter, __ reject quarter, __

2. Potential depth of course work:
   - prefer semester, __ reject semester, __
   - prefer quarter, __ reject quarter, __

3. Potential diversity of courses:
   - prefer semester, __ reject semester, __
   - prefer quarter, __ reject quarter, __

4. Difference in costs of books:
   - prefer semester, __ reject semester, __
   - prefer quarter, __ reject quarter, __

5. Compatibility of dates with colleges outside the Montana University System:
   - prefer semester, __ reject semester, __
   - prefer quarter, __ reject quarter, __

6. Compatibility of dates with public schools in Montana:
   - prefer semester, __ reject semester, __
   - prefer quarter, __ reject quarter, __

7. Potential impact on employment:
   - prefer semester, __ reject semester, __
   - prefer quarter, __ reject quarter, __

8. Potential impact on athletic programs:
   - prefer semester, __ reject semester, __
   - prefer quarter, __ reject quarter, __

9. Administrative considerations (i.e., number of exams, registrations, grades)
   - prefer semester, __ reject semester, __
   - prefer quarter, __ reject quarter, __

10. Administrative costs:
    - prefer semester, __ reject semester, __
    - prefer quarter, __ reject quarter, __

11. Necessity for curriculum revision:
    - prefer semester, __ reject semester, __
    - prefer quarter, __ reject quarter, __

12. Potential energy savings:
    - prefer semester, __ reject semester, __
    - prefer quarter, __ reject quarter, __

13. Requires too much effort to change the present system:
    - prefer semester, __ reject semester, __
    - prefer quarter, __ reject quarter, __
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OIL & GAS-LEASING
IN FLATHEAD DRAINAGE

By Don Schwennesen
Missoulian

The state Department of Lands Thursday [Feb. 12] moved into the spotlight in the Flathead oil and gas-leasing controversy as both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management reportedly agreed to defer leasing action until a U.S.-Canadian agreement can be reached on Cabin Creek coal mining.

Rep. Max Baucus said in Missoula Thursday that the BLM has agreed to defer oil and gas leasing in the upper Flathead drainage until the State Department decides the Cabin Creek issue has been resolved.

Meanwhile, Gene Albert of Rollins, co-chairman of the Flathead Coalition, said he's received word that the Forest Service will not object to a leasing delay by the BLM.

He said notification came in a letter written for Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz and signed Jan. 28 by Forest Service Deputy Chief Rex Ressler.

At present, he said, opening U.S. lands in the Flathead drainage for oil and gas exploration will potentially signal to Canada that the U.S. is not really very concerned about environmental degradation immediately west and south of Glacier National Park.

But State Lands Commissioner Ted Schwinden said his agency still plans to publish Friday a final environmental impact statement that would pave the way for oil and gas leasing on some 7,759 acres of state lands in the upper Flathead.

Schwinden said his tentative plan is to advertise the state Flathead lands for lease later this month in the Montana Oil Journal and to offer them for lease, along with other state lands, at an oral auction now scheduled March 2.

But Schwinden emphasized that the state Board of Lands must make any final decision to accept, reject or defer any leases. The board reserves the right to reject any and all bids, he noted.

Any lease bids received March 2 would be reviewed by the lands board at its regular March meeting, tentatively scheduled for March 15. Lands board members are the governor, attorney general, secretary of state, auditor and superintendent of schools.

Schwinden said his obligation is to manage state lands so that they raise money to support state schools.

"The offering for sale is one way to quantify what we may be gaining or losing" from the 14 Flathead tracts, he said.

He said "there's a possibility" the BLM decision might change his plan to offer the state lands for lease. But he said first he wants to review the written version of the BLM decision.

Meanwhile, Albert sharply criticized Schwinden for being "in such a sweat to let the leases."

"He's development oriented," Albert charged. "The only thing he's thinking about is the school money."

He said Flathead Valley citizens have demonstrated their opposition to the proposed oil and gas leases and that Schwinden's mandate should be to reflect the wishes of the people and recommend the leases be denied.

If recommendations and decisions on oil and gas leasing are finalized in favor of selling the leases by the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the Commissioner of State Lands prior to a decision on the Cabin Creek project, the U.S. negotiation strength would be greatly eroded. How can the U.S. assert that the mine drainage in British Columbia would pollute the Flathead waters and violate the treaty, when we pollute the rivers ourselves. Should this company succeed in this case before the Cabin Creek issue reaches the International Joint Commission we are confident the United States will be accused of inconsistency in permitting the Canadian company development on U.S. soil while objecting to Canadian development on Canadian soil. Further, the coalition feels that it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the corporation currently developing Cabin Creek in Canada could have engineered the whole Coal Creek situation to expose U.S. and Montana inconsistency in the North Fork area.

We urge all concerned citizens to write and express their opinion to the sale of oil and gas leases. Letters may be addressed to members of the State Land Board. Members are governor Tom Judge, Commissioner Ted Schwinden, Dolores Colburg, Frank Murray, Robert Woodahl, and E. V. "Sonny" Omholt. Their address is as follows: Department of State Lands, State Lands, Helena, MT 59601.
PROPOSED CABIN CREEK PROJECT — An artist's rendering of the proposed Cabin Creek open pit coal mines taken from the "confidential" Rio Algom Ltd. report "Flathead Valley Coal Mine Briefing Document" shows the two open pit mines in the background, Cabin Creek running between them, and the plant facilities and water treatment facilities in the left foreground. This view is looking west.
The Garrison Diversion Unit is a mammoth irrigation project being developed in North Dakota. The project has a long and baffling history that goes back as far as 1889 (the year of statehood for North Dakota) when a scheme was brewed up to irrigate northern North Dakota. That initial attempt was branded "impractical" by the Geologic Survey, and the project did not receive congressional approval until 1965 when the swell of popular emotion overwhelmed legislators. Even yesterday (1965) when construction costs were less, the project was on feeble economic footing when the Bureau of Reclamation estimated the Garrison Unit cost as $212 million. Today, with the characteristic inflation of the 1970s, construction costs have gone out of sight. As of March 1975, the cost to irrigate one acre of the 255,000 acre project was estimated at $1,370, and costs keep multiplying. The U.S. taxpayer is expected to foot the bill.

In the last edition of this newsletter, there was mention made of this Garrison Diversion Unit project and its relationship to the Coalition's efforts at Cabin Creek. Both Cabin Creek and Garrison Diversion involve potential trans-boundary water pollution; but whereas Cabin Creek threatens American waters primarily, Garrison is a threat to both U.S. and Canadian waters.

Saline pollution, pollution of water with salt residues, threatens the Canadians. In any irrigation project, of any size, water used for irrigation leaches salts and mineral nutrients from the soil as it travels slowly through the man-built canals.

In North Dakota, the huge canals the Bureau of Reclamation constructed (some up to 114 feet in depth!) will carry large quantities of saline pol-
luted waters into major natural waterways. In particular, the Red and Souris Rivers which flow north into Canada will be the "dumping ground" for the maze of Garrison Diversion canals. The impact on the rivers can only be estimated, but in general, the temperature of the water would be raised, fish populations would be affected, the suitability of the water for agriculture in Canada markedly reduced. The predicament the Canadians face in these matters is remarkably like our own in relation to Cabin Creek.

In 1973, the Canadian government made public its concern over the Garrison project and its potential impact on Canadian livelihood. The Canadians (like ourselves) pointed to the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 and desired to know what measures the U.S. would take to guarantee the quality of the waters in the Red and Souris Rivers. A meeting of officials from the Bureau of Reclamation and State Department followed which turned out unsatisfactorily for the Canadians. Then in October of 1973, the federal government in Ottawa requested a moratorium until an understanding could be reached insuring "that Canadian rights and interests have been fully protected."

Our Bureau of Reclamation and State Department, however, gave the Canadians the old run-around: The Bureau conducted hasty water quality studies and the State Department assured the Canadians that all current projects would have no adverse effect on waters flowing into Canada.

Since the Bureau's water report was published, the Canadians have doubted the accuracy of the material; and the State Department's assurance was completely misleading. In other words, in arbitrating with the Canadians in the Garrison dispute, the U.S. State Department and Bureau of Reclamation have been less than fair.

Garrison Diversion Unit is only secondarily related to our Cabin Creek concern. It is an example of past U.S. federal policy and acts in dealing with trans-boundary water pollution, reflecting at large U.S. disregard for international waters and the Treaty of 1909. Presently, there is an organized effort attempting to force or persuade the Bureau of Reclamation to abandon its Garrison project. President Ford looks for a curtailed federal budget while Garrison Diversion remains a gross waste of the National Treasury's resources. The Garrison project has been praised with emotion — and condemned with a battery of facts and reason, as well as emotion. It has been called a boondoggle, the biggest mistake of committed national funds. In the end, (if it gets to that point) it will cost over a half-billion dollars. We must realize that past and present U.S. policy with regard to trans-boundary water pollution (particularly with Canada) has been insincere and evasive. It is necessary, therefore, to convince our State Department of our (Montana's) commitment to prevent pollution of international waters in the future. It is also necessary, by the way, to convince the Canadians that all of the United States is committed to maintaining or restoring clean waters along our common boundary.
INCLUSION IN WILD & SCENIC RIVERS THREATENED

The following resulted from an interview with Dr. Mark Weber, steering committee member and Geologic Advisor to the Flathead Coalition.

Land is a structure that is totally integrated and very complex. Many of us who enjoy it for its aesthetic quality are very grieved when a part is tampered with that causes subsequent changes in a chain of reactions. To some, these changes destroy the aesthetic qualities, and may certainly destroy the natural purity of the land. An example is what could possibly occur if the Cabin Creek mine site is developed.

At present, the area around the proposed Cabin Creek mine is undeveloped and virtually unpopulated (by humans). If the mine site is developed, it could possibly affect the studies being made for the inclusion of the Flathead River area in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. All the development activities such as pit mining, road building, urbanization, sewage disposal, etc., are each activities that may give rise to large changes in the local environment biophysically, socially, and aesthetically, possibly disqualifying the Flathead drainage for protection. Any watershed change affecting soil, vegetation, ground water or precipitation, generally causes changes in runoff (directly affecting the creek), resulting in a temporary lowering of the efficiency of the stream channel and causing bank erosion or flooding. The present plans of the Sage Creek Coal Ltd., a subsidiary of Rio Algorn Mines Ltd., include the digging of a pit mine in two hills on either side of the Cabin Creek, which flows into the North Fork of the Flathead River. This type of mining creates a great amount of overburden, and, if not handled right, could possibly pollute the Cabin Creek with too high of a sediment load. There are four impacts, of which each alone could possibly have damaging effects on the lower part of the Flathead River: mining, urbanization, water appropriation/diversion, and roadway and railway construction.

To begin with mining, the area must first be stripped of tree cover, which regulates the continual flow of the stream. Forest cover protects the quality of water by checking erosion, flooding, sedimentation, leaching of the soil nutrients, and heating of the water. There are large deposits of high quality, coking grade bituminous coal just north of Montana’s border in the foothills of the Rockies. By the time mining at the Cabin Creek site ceases, Sage Creek Coal Ltd. hopes to have taken at least 63 million tons and at most 780 million tons of coal. Pit mining is comparable to the contour strip mines popular in the Appalachian Mountains, only with pit mines, there is a much larger amount of overburden (soil and rock between coal layers). Since the two hills on either side of Cabin Creek have a slope of 20° - 30° with respect to the horizontal, two huge pits may result from mining. "As with any hillside mining, serious problems exist with site erosion and stream siltation as well as possible leachate (soil nutrient loss) production and the resultant pollution of surface and ground waters. The weak nature of British Columbia’s Strip Mine Reclamation Law insures that any adverse impacts which do arise from the proposed Cabin Creek mining will be long-lived" The type of coal that will be mined is highly fractured and susceptible to wind erosion. It is possible that during shipping, a large amount of coal dust could be spread and organically pollute the local environment and the North Fork of the Flathead River, eventually reaching Flathead Lake. This pollution source could have serious implications for the fisheries habitat in the North Fork and Flathead Lake.

"With coal development, Cabin Creek will become a new urban center with a potential population of 3,000 to 7,000." (Bill Schneider, 1974). This area is presently totally undeveloped. A 40MW, coal-fired, electric generating plant would be built, causing a potential air pollution problem. All the
construction, water supply, sewage disposal, and thermal and atmospheric pollution due to the generator, may possibly cause a greater impact on the environment than the mine itself.

Water will be needed to wash coal, cool the generating plant, supply mining activities and 200,000 cubic feet of water will be needed each day for domestic use alone. This is a significant fraction of the low flow in the North Fork. All the principal species of fish, the west slope Cutthroat Trout, Dolly Varden, Grayling, and Mountain Whitefish need water with a high amount of dissolved oxygen and temperatures below 20° C. None of these species tolerate pollution. The British Columbia Fish and Game Officials have shown that similar coal washing activities in the Elk Valley region have had a bad effect on the quality of the water in that region.

Approximately fifty miles of a new railroad spurline and many more miles of access roads may be constructed, accompanying the development of the Cabin Creek mine site. Transportation route construction is one of the principal disrupters of a watershed.

Changes in land-use in one portion of a drainage basin may result in widespread changes in the stream channel pattern, magnitude of flooding, rate of stream channel erosion, the suitability of the stream for aquatic organisms, the suitability of the water for human consumption, and even the ground water level. With the four adverse impacts, the area of the Flathead drainage basin in Montana will have some long-lasting changes if the site is mined...

Mark Weber summarized our obligation to the Flathead Drainage, "Only when we as individuals are willing to examine our own relationship with the land — our land ethic — will we be able to live in harmony with the carrying capacity of our natural surroundings."
NEED FOR SOLITUDE AND CLEAN WATER SHARED BY PEOPLE, GRIZZLIES AND WOLVES

There are two developments in the Flathead drainage of which we are all aware and so much concerned with: the Cabin Creek coal development and the proposed oil and gas leasing in the Flathead National Forest. Both developments are a threat to the environmental quality of the drainage which is the home of men and wolves and grizzly bears as well. All three species are in trouble, but the latter two are in a particularly difficult situation: the wolf is an "endangered" species and the grizzly bear is a "threatened" species as defined by the Endangered Species Act of 1973. This Coalition's interest being the maintenance of the Flathead's high water quality, it is not too difficult to extend our concern to these species that use the same water resource. It is important, at any rate, to look at these species and ascertain what their future might be and what correlation, if any, there might be with man. The grizzly and wolf need our attention.

The Border Grizzly Project

In the summer of 1975, the Border Grizzly Project began research on the grizzly bear along the international border of Canada and the United States. The purpose of the project is to locate concentrations of grizzlies in the bordering provinces and states, and to ascertain the types of habitat the bears require, their seasonal movements, and those areas that can be classified as "critical habitat." That is, habitat that is essential for the maintenance of a viable grizzly population. In the long run, the project will make management recommendations for land use planning purposes that would benefit the grizzly bear. The Border Grizzly Project is a cooperative investigation involving the Northwest states and British Columbia and Alberta.

Cabin Creek

Presently, the Border Grizzly Project is too young (and too poorly funded) to have made a study of grizzly habitat, density and population in the Cabin Creek area. However, the Project, during the summer of 1975 studied the grizzly in the Whale Creek drainage of the Whitefish Range, just four drainages south of Cabin Creek, on the same (East) slope of the range. According to Charles Jonkel, pro-
ject coordinator and biologist, Whale Creek is similar to Cabin Creek in many ways: moisture, vegetation, terrain, etc. Whale Creek is probably representative of Cabin Creek in number of grizzlies and the density of the animal relative to certain types of habitat. The Whale Creek report is to be published this winter. And yet, as much as Cabin Creek may be similar, the total removal of the two “mountains” would destroy or reduce grizzly habitat in the area. It would have a severe adverse affect on a much broader area if a mining community (its human population) is established, and the large coal washing facilities are built. Human-grizzly encounters would increase, and this, coupled with the obliteration of habitat, would lead to the grizzly bear’s certain demise.

The Wolf

Much as the case of the grizzly bear, no one really knows how many wolves there are in the North Fork basin, or the Cabin Creek area; although, there is evidence of wolf populations in Glacier, Waterton, and Jasper Parks. Biologists seem to agree that wolves number less than grizzly bear in all these areas, and are less stable, as populations, than the grizzly, coyote or cougar.

Wolves were once common throughout North America and in the plains east of the Divide, as grizzly bears. But both species were driven from their former open ranges and gradually forced to seek refuge in the forested and mountainous country of the Rockies. Today, the three centers of wolf populations south of the international boundary and in Montana occur in the North Fork valley (Glacier Park and the Whitefish Range), the Gravelly Range and the Bob Marshall Wilderness. (Wolves are a highly mobile animal and require large areas to maintain themselves.) Wolves are often the symbol of wilderness to those who enjoy the out-of-doors, and appropriately so, for wolves require undisturbed habitat and are intolerant of human activity (which invariably disturbs habitat.)

In 1975, the Fish and Wildlife Service designated a “Northern Rocky Mountain Wolf Recovery Team” to help establish viable populations of the timber wolf in the three areas mentioned above. As an endangered species, the wolf is given physical protection, and all habitat designated as “critical” is protected from destruction. Montana is currently putting together a rare and endangered species act of its own to provide for cooperative management of endangered species.

Oil and Gas Development and Cabin Creek

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 provides those concerned for the preservation of the wolf and grizzly bear with a powerful political weapon. The Endangered Species Act was made specifically to protect those animals threatened with extinction; the wolf and the grizzly bear were placed on the list as “endangered” and “threatened” species, respectively. The stringent wording of the Act guarantees the protection of the habitat and the animal from any further encroachment and destruction. And yet, the proposed oil and gas leases on both Federal and State land would work directly against the designs of the national act. The Montana Wilderness Association, Flathead Chapter, has been critical of the U.S. F.S. Environmental Impact Statement concerning oil and gas exploration leases. In particular, their statement is weak in its discussion of the wolf and grizzly bear. The Flathead Coalition has also talked with Governor Judge about the many implications of State oil and gas leases. However, it is most important that citizens and citizen groups advocate the proper implementation of this Endangered Species Act, and that they see to it that the intentions of the Act are lived up to.

One of the bigger concerns over the oil and gas leases is that the interior of the forest will be opened and the areas of greatest wolf and bear populations thus exposed. Any accompanying development, such as work camps, roading and hunting would be detrimental to the wolf and bear. A report by Francis Singer on the wolf of Northern Glacier Park and the immediate area north and west emphasized the destructive effect of increased human populations on wildlife populations and success.

The threat of more humans and greater accessibility in the North Fork drainage of the Flathead Forest is the same threat facing wildlife at the proposed Cabin Creek mine site and surrounding area. It is not the mining itself that is a threat to wild populations, but increased human activity—such as that which resulted from the proposed Kishanehn-Alkamina highway through Southeastern British Columbia.

Conclusion

Oil and Gas leasing and Cabin Creek coal strip-mining will have similar effects on the wolf and grizzly bear. In both cases, the single element of having established human populations in these unsettled areas is the severest threat. The questions are: How do we curtail the destruction of wildlife habitat? How do we preserve the wolf and grizzly bear—both of which are on the farthest limits of their range? In the Flathead drainage, the answer may be: Postpone the oil and gas leases until well detailed plans can be made for the preservation of the animals and their habitat, and an international agreement is reached on the Cabin Creek issue.

The wolf and grizzly bear require solitude and undisturbed habitat; we humans share their need for solitude and clean water.
James Cumming, the lawyer from Columbia Falls who heads the legal committee for the Flathead Coalition, has been furnished with a document that further demonstrates the need for an international decision on the Cabin Creek issue.

The document Mr. Cumming has been furnished with was drawn up by members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). This group was formed by a multi-lateral treaty in 1960, with the United States, Canada, and the Western European countries as charter members. The new organization was formed to promote economic growth of its member countries, help lesser developed countries, and expand trade all over the world. All acts of the OECD are derived from its Council, which has representatives of all member countries. One aspect of the OECD's work is their attempt to contribute to the solution of the problems of transfrontier pollution.

The particular document that has special relevance for the Cabin Creek issue is the "Recommendation of the Council on Principles Concerning Transfrontier Pollution (adopted November 14, 1974)." Part of the document recommends that "member countries should be guided in their environmental policy by the principles concerning transfrontier pollution contained in this Recommendation and its Annex, which is an integral part of this Recommendation."

A very broad definition of pollution is contained within the principles of this Annex:

Pollution means the introduction by man, directly or indirectly, of substances or energy into the environment resulting in deleterious effects of such a nature as to endanger human health, harm living resources and ecosystems, and impair or interfere with amenities and other legitimate uses of the environment. Unless otherwise specified, these principles deal with pollution originating in one country and having effects within other countries.

This definition certainly would encompass any environmental degradation that could affect the Flathead drainage from the proposed Cabin Creek mine.

The Annex goes on to say that "countries should define a concerted long-term policy for the protection and improvement of the environment in zones liable to be affected by transfrontier pollution." In working out this joint plan, countries are urged to take account of "levels of existing pollution and the present quality of the environment concerned."

The Flathead Drainage, with the designation of an International Biosphere by the United Nations, has one of the most unique and pristine environments left to be protected. Member countries are also advised to take account of "the assimilative capacity of the environment, as established by mutual agreement by the countries concerned, taking into account the particular characteristics and use of the affected zone." With the possibility of the Flathead River becoming part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, the use of the area will have been partially determined.

The document further urges that "member countries should endeavour to prevent any increase in transfrontier pollution, including that stemming from new or additional substances and activities . . . ."

Title E, Principle of Information and Consultation, has a strong bearing on the Coalition's position that the Cabin Creek issue should be placed in front of the International Joint Commission. The article says that a country should provide early information to other countries that might be affected by developments in the first country's borders. The
first country should “provide these countries with relevant information and data . . . and should invite their comments.” Rio Algom has not, up to this date, fulfilled our demands for information and data. The Coalition respects the British Columbian government for having the July 31, 1975, hearing in Fernie, but hopes that further hearings will involve much more questioning, analysis and discussion of the mining proposal with relevant information and data accessible to the public well in advance of the hearing date.

“Countries should enter into consultation on an existing or foreseeable transfrontier pollution problem at the request of a country which is or may be directly affected and should diligently pursue such consultations on this particular problem over a reasonable period of time.” This section of the document advises the use of discussion and dialogue in joint meetings of the countries affected. The Coalition welcomes the planned February meeting in Victoria, B.C., as a necessary step in a joint solution of the Cabin Creek issue. We feel the need for many such meetings in the future.

The last article that has special relevance to the Cabin Creek issue states that “countries should refrain from carrying out projects or activities which might create a significant risk of transfrontier pollution without first informing the countries which are or may be affected and, except in cases of extreme urgency, providing a reasonable amount of time in the light of circumstances for diligent consultation.” This part of the document brings up the question of whether a moratorium ought to be declared in the mining activity of Rio Algom. Rio Algom has informed us about their initial intentions (though major details were lacking in the actual mining plan); we have not, as of yet, engaged in diligent consultation. It would seem then that a moratorium could indeed be asked on the Rio Algom project. With all the coal mining already going on in British Columbia, along with the many coal-mine proposals, there is hardly any sense of extreme urgency about the Cabin Creek mine.

Thus, the OECD document has laid down a set of principles that both the United States and Canada have adopted. These principles were drawn up by experts from the member countries. This document is not a treaty; yet, this document indicates a serious intent to deal with problems that may arise on the basis of these principles. The Canadians were instrumental in developing the articles on transfrontier pollution; we hope that they carry through with their ideas as stated in this document.
WATER IS OUR MOST PRIZED ASSET

What do the waters of the Flathead mean to the future of the valley? The Flathead Drainage 208 Project considers these waters and their quality vital to a unique way of life that Montanans enjoy. Perhaps a way of life that we, too often, take for granted.

The original intent of the 208 projects was to clean up the industrial and municipal waste problems of the urban areas of the nation. Realizing the potential problems some of the recreation areas in the nation face, the EPA included study areas such as the Flathead to preserve the pristine water that remains and clean the problem waters.

This has resulted in the study of point and nonpoint sources of pollution in the Flathead area.

In the point source category, (an obvious source of pollution) several towns in the study area have inadequate waste treatment systems, or none at all, which eventually leads to the effluents draining into the lakes and streams. The towns with the most severe problems are having facility plans done in order to evaluate the waste treatment systems and determine if they are adequate to meet future water quality standards. Hot Springs, Polson, Ronan, St. Ignatius, Charlo and Arlee will be funded by 208 grants for facility plans.

Nonpoint sources of pollution are of indirect source. For example, commercial land does not represent a major contributor to point pollution, but can be a major nonpoint problem because large parking areas, roofs, and other impervious surfaces generate large increases in runoff.

Concerning the North Fork of the Flathead River, the 208 project received a strong mandate to study the river. We are concerned with the physical, chemical and biological components of the river ecosystem and are gathering the baseline data on the river.

Considering the impending Cabin Creek coal development and the proposed oil and gas leases in the Whitefish Range, 208 will document the status of the North Fork. To date, the data gathered has shown the river to be of superior quality and should there be an introduction of sediment and chemicals as a result of mining, we are endangering one of the last pristine rivers remaining in the United States.

Recently, Allen Tudor, (208 staff) visited with B. R. Hinton and Associates, the environmental consultants for Rio Algom Ltd, the Canadian mining company. The purpose of the meeting was to establish a communication with the consultants in order that a transfer of data might follow. The meeting was cordial and it is hoped this will begin a period of meaningful exchange of information allowing planning based on facts rather than assumptions. Hinton indicated that exploratory work is proceeding in the Cabin Creek area and that coal mining within the next five to eight years is inevitable.

The 208 Project is concerned with the effects of forest practices on water quality and what different logging practices have the greatest impact on water quality. The result of this study will be used so that environmentally sound decisions can be made regarding timber management. We will have the factual and scientific data in order to make the most wise use of this valuable resource.

Another area of concern is the use of herbicides and pesticides. Realizing the need for some of the chemicals in the valley, it is important to know what effects they have on the quality of our water and research the possibilities of using alternative methods for control of weeds, insects, etc. With the aid of applicators and users of pesticides, we will be able to document the amounts of pesticides being used and determine the extent of the problem. Perhaps different pesticides, not as detrimental to forms of life, can be used as a replacement for these
This dried-up stream bed on the Blackfoot Reservation is an example of the poor land and water resource practices the 208 project wants to bring to public attention.

Two researchers with the 208 Project conduct an insect study count in the waters of the North Fork of the Flathead. The cage is weighted down with rocks in the stream bed and insects are gathered for a count.

toxic chemicals.

Concerning the lakes and streams of the Flathead area, we have had many comments on the severity of the problems with water quality. We plan to address these troubled areas in detail, once again, gathering data in order to determine and pinpoint the contributing factors to degradation. Streams and lakes selected for this study will be a matter of priority with the most severe areas being addressed immediately.

One study that will be addressed in the spring and summer months will be irrigation return flows. Because of the salts and sediments that are carried and introduced into a stream as a result of flood irrigation, the aquatic life in many of the streams in the Flathead has declined. As a result of this introduction, the temperature of the river rises, also harmful for fish. Hopefully we will see that water is better managed in the future.

In the final analysis, an informed public will decide the success or failure of the Flathead's water pollution control problems. In the recreation area of the Flathead, water is the public's most highly prized natural asset.

We all face a challenge in reversing the abuses of the past through water management programming and only with the aid of the public will this vital resource survive.

Too often, programs such as the 208 integrate the public at the end of the study, asking for approval. It is time now for citizens to become involved in the 208 planning process. Help make the decisions that will effect the residents of the valley and play an active role, rather than a reactive one.

We have set advisory committees on each study and soliciting your inputs now. Become a part of the future of the Flathead, the bright future of quality water.
B.C. WEAK ON ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT

Bill Otway, President of the B.C. Wildlife Federation, submitted a brief to the public hearing on Cabin Creek in Kalispell on Dec. 2, 1975. We feel the text of the brief contained many warnings and words of caution for Montanans involved in the issue. In presenting parts of his speech, we want to thank Mr. Otway and his fellow Canadians for their continuing help and concern on the Cabin Creek issue.

The B.C. Wildlife Federation, in a brief submitted to a public hearing in Kalispell, Montana with respect to proposed mining development in the Canadian section of the Flathead Valley by Sage Creek Coal, has termed another mining proposal, that of Elco in Elk Valley, as "infamous".

The Federation termed the actions of the B.C. government in allowing the company approval to proceed as "an insult to the intelligence of an imbecile," and urged that the International Joint Commission "consider the possible impact on Montana of all coal developments in southeastern B.C."

A partial text of the presentation appears below:

"The B.C. Wildlife Federation is a province wide conservation organization based in the province of British Columbia. We are composed of some one hundred and forty-five member groups, representing over fourteen thousand individuals.

"You must be made fully aware that under present conditions in British Columbia that if the Sage Creek Coal Company mine proposal on Cabin Creek goes ahead, heavy pollution of the Flathead River system is a certainty. You have been told by our former Minister of Mines that British Columbians have strong pollution and reclamation laws. This we presume was an attempt to allay the fears of Montanans and try to convince you that present application British Columbian legislation would protect you from pollution. We are here to tell you that British Columbians presently receive little more than lip service in protection from pollution, particularly from the mining industry and you in Montana can except no better.

"Every open pit coal mine presently operating in British Columbia is polluting its attendant watershed on a continuing or intermittent basis and despite continued complaints over the years no action has been taken by our government. Everyone of these operations promised a "pollution free" operation before they opened. Rio Algom has repeatedly promised to "live up to the letter of British Columbian legislation" — it was most interesting to note that on our tour of their Cabin Creek operation in September of 1975, that their heavy equipment was using the local streams for roads — a direct violation of British Columbian laws — so much for the promise of the mining industry.

"How well our pollution laws are enforced can perhaps be best demonstrated by the documented record of Cominco Ltd. one of our largest mining companies.

"At their operation in Salmo, B.C., there have been at least seventeen reported spills from their tailings pond in the past two years and evidence of at least twenty-four.

"Their permit calls for a maximum copper content in their effluent of .12 parts per million. On March 17, 1975, a test revealed .56 p.p.m., almost five times the allowable limit.

"There were, and still are we presume, numerous other irregularities, however the foregoing should give you a general idea of how well the "strong" pollution laws in B.C. work. In spite of all these violations only one charge was ever laid. In March, 1975 our Fish and Wildlife Branch had to force the Pollution Control Branch to take even this minimal action. The end result: the company pleaded guilty to one charge, paid a $400,000 fine and went right on polluting and the judge criticised the Fish and Wildlife Branch for taking action against the Company.

"This is the type of protection you can expect for the Flathead and this is why it is imperative for you to insist the Sage Creek mine development is referred to the I.J.C. if you wish to insure some degree of protection for your environment.

"For one thing it is obvious to us that we will never know the true scope and possible impact of the Sage Creek proposal without the intervention of the international body. Rio Algom has steadfastly refused to release their reports and studies to the public, and our own government will not even give us the terms of reference for any studies being done. The only way to ensure protection for both British Columbians and Montanans is to have the whole process subject to international scrutiny.

"There are too many questions unanswered..."
for them to be left to the present and possible future B.C. systems, where will the town site be? We are told now it will be located outside the Flathead Valley in one of the existing towns, this will mean something in the order of five hours a day travelling time for the workers. Will the workers or their union accept this? We think not. The number of workers dictates the size of town we will have. Rio Algom says they will have around 600 workers. This is about half of what the other presently operating coal mines are using to extract an amount of coal similar to what Rio Algom proposes. We should be made aware of what secret process Rio Algom has to allow them to operate with half the men other companies need or else we must assume their figures are wrong and we are then looking at a town site twice the size they indicate and therefore having twice the impact.

"Rio Algom proposes to install a coal burning thermal plant on the site to produce electricity. We know of no studies done or planned to ascertain the amount of heavy metals emmission from this proposed plant. Will such emmissions meet B.C. standards and more important from your view will they meet Montana standards and who will monitor these emmissions? There is a great deal of concern today about Nuclear pollution, you should be aware of our continual discharge of heavy metals into the environment poses almost as great a threat with nearly as long a lasting effect.

"While the Sage Creek mine proposal poses the most immediate threat to Montana we feel it imperative you recognize that this is just one proposal of many for coal development in southeastern British Columbia and all on watersheds that end up in Montana."
"It's not nice to fool with (hack! cough!) Mother (cough!) Nature!"

Yes, I want to help save the Flathead.
I wish to support the Flathead Coalition.
Enclosed is my check for $
Membership dues for 1976-77 are $5.00

Donation $

NAME

STREET

CITY, STATE, ZIP

Mail to Flathead Coalition, Mrs. Ginger Agee
351 Hilltop Dr.
Kalispell Mt. 59901

Newsletter Staff: Tim Sweeney, assisted by Dave Hadden, Peter Ford,
Liz Merrill, Dale Gundersen, and the staff of the Borrowed Times (Box 1311,
Missoula. The story material was supplied by members of the Flathead Coalition.
TO: Central Board-Elect

FROM: John T. Nockleby, ASUM President

RE: Plan for remainder of Transition Period

The following is a brief synopsis of several issues the elucidation of which may be helpful, and ultimately time saving, to your upcoming year of hard work. I propose to hold two sessions the week of March 8-12, on Monday, Wednesday, or Thursday evening. As you can see, the sorts of issues you'll deal with this next year as well as the topics that ought to be covered are extensive, so there's no way we can cover everything in two sessions. Whatever special topics you want prepared may have to come Spring Quarter. Whichever problems you choose will require that I compile information and obtain qualified speakers, so we need to choose tonight.

Following is a proposed general outline. Please feel free to comment, delete, or append.

General Outline

I. History

II. Internal Office Procedures
   -- Administrative Budget
   -- How to call or cancel meetings, how to schedule rooms, how to use the secretaries, how to use office equipment, what's in the files, office hours, how to help out when you're in the offices, key cards, how to travel, etc.

III. Agencies of ASUM
   -- Day Care
   -- Student Accounting Office
   -- Program Council
   -- Student Action Center
   -- Montana Student Lobby
   -- Non-Agencies - Kaimin, Gilt Edge, Cut Bank

IV. Internal ASUM (Standing) Committees
   -- Legislative
   -- Day Care
   -- Budget and Finance
   -- Student Union Board
   -- Pub Board
V. University Organization

VI. Governance Structures shared with Faculty, Students, Staff through Committees
--Explain briefly Faculty Senate and Staff Senate, their structures, functions - how what they do meshes with what CB does
--Advisory Committees
--New Concepts in Governance: faculty union; student union (See #19)

VII. Financial Operations of the University
--Operations → Approx. 25% Students
    → 75% State
--Student fees → List and examine in detail

VIII. Particular Problems (Choose some or all)
1. Faculty Unionism: (if collective bargaining passes) (See #19)

2. Title IX → implications for hiring
    → the law
    → the regulations
    → how it affects students

4. ASUM Independence
    → Woodahl ruling
    → financial
    → incorporation
5. Legal Services

6. Montana Kaimin
   Lawsuit ($102,000 against several parties, including ASUM and CB)
   Relationship to ASUM: Freedom of the press vs. financial accountability

7. Student Control over Student Fees
   Activity Fee
   All Other Fees

8. Program Council: Its inner workings, churn-out $300,000 worth of programs every year.
   --Are we getting our money's worth?
   --Student control vs. are we losing too much money because of incompetence or ignorance?

9. The Regents and their new-found power: Do they deserve it?
   The Commissioner's Office: what it is, how it works, and is it a lot of bureaucracy or a needed expenditure?

10. ASUM Accounting
    How it began
    What it means
    Who runs it

11. Faculty/Student Committees
    -- A waste of time or a valuable opportunity?

12. The Montana Student Lobby


14. The Day Care Program

15. The SARC Report

16. Campus Recreation
    --The concept
    --Who runs it
    --How to get the most for your bucks

17. The Buckley Amendment
    --Some call it a boon.
    --Those who work with it every day call it a pain in the rear and ineffective.
18. Due Process for Students
   -- Neglected, but integral to students' daily lives, protection of their rights as students and as citizens, discussion of students' collective rights (rights held by the entire group) (See #19)

19. The Future of Students' Collective Rights
   -- The concept of a contiguous and continuing student interest
   -- The inability of students to adequately protect their collective interests
   -- The "Devil Theory" of administration
   -- Faculty unionism and its effects on student rights
   -- The concept of a student union, including incorporation, university trusteeship and contracts, student cooperative ownership of businesses and university facilities
   -- Student control of all student fees
   -- Student control over student lives

20. The Faculty Senate, its operations and how it affects student lives.

21. Faculty evaluation

22. The concept of a "Free School"

23. The administrative problems of the Library. How strong is the heartbeat of the University?


25. The University Center: A White House sitting on a White Elephant.

26. Any other special problems or areas of interest.

Each of the above can be modified to suit time restraints, but keep in mind that while a cursory examination of collective bargaining could be made, many books and articles have been written on the subject, plus we have already sponsored a two-day conference on it, plus we have an entire file cabinet full of information. Bargaining and several other issues are so complex that anything less than an hour would be superficial.