Filed: 11/16/2016 5:26:12 PM WEQC

Thomas L. Sansonetti (Wyo. State Bar # 43354)
Isaac N. Sutphin, P.C. (Wyo. State Bar # 6-3711)
Jeffrey S. Pope (Wyo. State Bar # 7-4859)
HOLLAND & HART LLP
2515 Warren Avenue, Suite 450
P.O. Box 1347
Cheyenne, WY 82003-1347
Telephone: (307) 778-4200
tlsansonetti@hollandhart.com
insutphin@hollandhart.com
jspope@hollandhart.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER BROOK MINING COMPANY, LLC

BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COUNCIL STATE OF WYOMING

IN RE BROOK MINE APPLICATION)	
)	Civil Action No. 16-1601
)	

BROOK MINE'S RESPONSE TO BIG HORN COAL COMPANY'S COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED ORDER

As a courtesy, this Council gave Brook Mine and Big Horn Coal Company a chance to comment and object to the Council's Order granting Brook and Order in Lieu of consent under Wyo. Stat. Ann. § 35-11-406(b)(xii). Brook had no comments or objections to the order that Mr. Ruby circulated. But Big Horn did, arguing that the Council's finding of fact about Brook's mining methods and legal conclusion about the final element for an order in lieu exceeded the Council's authority. As a practical matter, the Council has no legal obligation to consider these objections. Even so, the Council should reject them for three reasons.

First, Big Horn's objection that the Council does not have the authority to "adjudicate private property rights" relies on a false premise. Big Horn assumes that the Council has no statutory authority to decide if Brook can mine coal by surface mining methods. The

¹ Should the Council want more detailed briefing on this issue, please see Brook's Motion to Confirm Jurisdiction, filed on May 23, 2016.

Environmental Quality Act, however, empowers this Council to decide all of the elements for an order in lieu of consent, including if Brook has that authority. That gives the Council the power to apply the language in Brook's 1954 Deed and decide if Brook has the right to mine using surface mining methods. Big Horn's arguments to the contrary have no legal support.

Second, Big Horn's claim that the order would prejudice the Sheridan litigation is untrue. Big Horn can argue whatever it would like in that case. The district court can then make its own findings. This Council has a duty to decide the elements for an order in lieu of consent. But the Council has no duty to either Brook or Big Horn in any other litigation.

Finally, Big Horn's objections aim to disconnect the Council's findings of fact and conclusions of law on the fifth element of an order in lieu, making the Council's order more vulnerable on appeal. The Council has a statutory duty to make findings of fact and conclusions of law that logically flow from each other. Big Horn would have the Council eliminate one of the grounds supporting the Council's decision on the final element. That final element requires the Council to find that Brook has the legal authority to extract coal by surface mining methods. The Council should not accept an objection designed to give a party a tactical advantage on appeal by diluting the Council's findings.

Therefore, Brook requests that the Council enter the order that Mr. Ruby circulated on November 15, 2016 without any changes.

/s/ Isaac N. Sutphin

Thomas L. Sansonetti (Wyo. State Bar # 43354) Isaac N. Sutphin, P.C. (Wyo. State Bar # 6-3711) Jeffrey S. Pope (Wyo. State Bar # 7-4859) HOLLAND & HART LLP 2515 Warren Avenue, Suite 450 P.O. Box 1347 Cheyenne, WY 82003-1347

Cheyenne, WY 82003-1347 Telephone: (307) 778-4200 tlsansonetti@hollandhart.com insutphin@hollandhart.com jspope@hollandhart.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER BROOK MINING COMPANY, LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on November 16, 2016, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing by email and addressed to the following:

Lynnette J. Boomgaarden Crowley Fleck, PLLP 237 Storey Boulevard, Suite 110 Cheyenne, WY 82009 lboomgaarden@crowleyfleck.com

/s/ Isaac N. Sutphin

9353025_1