

Minerals _ Mining

Comment # Comment

- 0014-001 We are writing to urge that you immediately withdraw the list of rivers that are now on the eligibility" list and that further analysis and consideration be completed before any such list is finalized. There are several reasons to support your taking this action. We realize that once "eligibility" is determined, the next step is to determine "suitability". We also recognize, as does your staff, that during the suitability process many of the streams and rivers will be found to not qualify as W&SRs. However, including, many of the streams that are now on the eligibility list will create tremendous unnecessary burdens for many Alaskans. There is no justification for causing these burdens when there is little likelihood that the streams will be found suitable. For the USFS to include these streams when it knows they will likely be found as not suitable is arbitrary and capricious. The first reason to withdraw the list is that many of the rivers and streams listed are covered by either state, or federal active mining claims. To include these on the list will mean that the USFS will have to manage the areas in the same way as if the designation had already been established by Congress. The requirement then continues until the suitability determination is completed which will be in 1999. This will result in significantly more stringent requirements for the miners. One prime example is that small suction dredges can now obtain a NPDES General Permit (GP) for discharge water through a very simple process that does not cost the small suction dredger. However, if the area is a W&SR Study area and is being considered for "wild" designation, each miner will have to get an Individual Permit (IP) which costs \$500 and requires a 90 day public notice and comment process. The actual process from application to receipt of IP will take at least 150 days. We do not know how many miners will be affected, but this one aspect alone will force many small miners out of business. Where the areas are being considered for "scenic" or "recreational" designation it will be much more difficult, if not impossible, to develop access, settling ponds, bypasses, stockpiles, reclamation, etc.
- 0014-003 A third reason to withdraw the list is that many of the rivers and streams listed are navigable waterways and are therefore State property to the mean high water level. It is foolhardy to consider such navigable waters for designation. If such areas are designated as W&SR, what you have are two W&SR uplands on either side of the state-owned waterway. This is a sure way to create conflicts and is the current situation in the Fortymile Mining District. In that area we are now (and have been for more than 7 years) in the middle of major conflicts because W&SR designations were created over existing mining claims and other private property. Many "promises" were included in ANILCA to allow reasonable access but these specific promises have been of little value when the individual must fight with the well-financed legal apparatus of American Rivers, et. al.
- 0071-001 1. What resources have been inventoried besides those for preservation? Suggest that mineral and oil/gas resource potential be accessible for future development.
- 0073-001 Would like to have a way to get to 40 ACRES mining claim at Tin Can Creek. NW, SW, SE, 1/4 Section 18 T008N R002E Seward Baseline and Meridian Claim #2. Make trail, so I can take mining stuff to claim, permit to use 4 wheeler 2 trips per year. It take 4 hours to walk to claim. Ground is very good for 4 wheel ATV.
- 0104-002 On another note, when do you think you will get around to cleaning up the mess left up Juneau Creek? Also, have you observed the so-called mining operation on Silver Tip? I do more recreational gold panning than that. What they have is a summer home complex with 6 automobiles and a huge motorhome, and they act like its private property.
- 0159-001 Alaska is a unique place to live. However, what has already happening to lands in the S. 48, is being proposed by some in Alaska. We old timers remember when there were few or no regulations concerning our lands and rivers. Now, however, miners on the wrong rivers and streams can no longer enjoy their favorite pastimes because they selected the place that is now closed to mining. If these miners were large outfits they could afford to fight for their rights out because they are small they cannot afford to do so. Therefore, I suggest that any waters or land where mining has existed or now exists not be placed under any of the land and water headings but be left for the miners and recreationalists. In Alaska we have such land and rivers in the proper amount without adding any more. I am not a miner nor do I ever intend to mine but I do enjoy the wide open spaces reached by foot, air or vehicle or boat.
- 0168-001 These comments are based on contamination provided on Wild & Scenic River Aut. In general I do not support classification of any of the 23 rivers listed as W & SR. Why do it, CNF already controls all activity ILLEGIBLE the forest can approve or disapprove any development activity along rivers. Five of the rivers (Six-Mile, Feast ILLEGIBLE ILLEGIBLE Mile, Canyon Creek, Snow River and Palmer Creek are known to have significant amounts of gold according to USGS and US Bureau of Mines Reports. To classify Columbia Glacier as a wild & scenic river is ILLEGIBLE. There is ILLEGIBLE too much ILLEGIBLE ILLEGIBLE up in federal conservation systems in Alaska. What is this justification to further restrict these river areas? What is the threat?? I do not support this revision to Chugach
- 0180-002 Whereas a single ill conceived, mining operation may cause sufficient damage to disrupt ecological processes, the same river may be able to support thousands of private boaters each, year without measurable impacts.

Comment # Comment

- 0180-006 Canyon Creek is a frequently run whitewater river. Currently there are conflicts between miners and whitewater boaters. Mining activities are creating hazards to navigation that create a safety threat to boaters. Mining activities should be monitored more extensively for compliance with the Code of Federal Regulations. Scenic designation is needed to provide protection of this river from major impacts, but as with Sixmile Creek, additional protection from road building and timber harvest is needed in the forest plan.
- 0184-001 Mining in forest land. I feel the restriction to areas due to mining in the area is not a multiple use of the land. It is damaging to the land for the recreation or profit of only a person or only a very few people. I feel this is the public's land and restriction should not be placed on these areas. I also feel there is damage done to this land and is not in the best interest of the forest. Unless the use of the forest is equal for everyone it should not be allowed.
- 0266-002 b. Development; Natural Resource extraction - which are negatives;
- 0294-009 No new mining claims until a cumulative impacts analysis is completed for existing claims and existing mining
- 0295-004 4. MINERALS -- Many areas within the Forest have high mineral potential and good access to roads, the railroad, or tidewater. Areas with known mineralization and moderate to high mineral potential should definitely be given a minerals prescription, and no areas should be withdrawn from mineral entry unless they are included in an actual conservation system unit (CSU) that is totally incompatible with mining. Areas which are merely under study for potential inclusion in a CSU should not be closed to mineral entry. It is important that access to these areas not be restricted. The entire rail corridor, and areas bordering it in the Forest, should be available for mineral development. Refer to U. S. Bureau of Mines studies including OFR 83-81: 1979 USBM Sampling Sites and Analytical Results for the CNF and MLA 5-84: Mineral Occurrences In The Chugach National Forest, South-central Alaska for mineral potential maps of the CNF. It is important to point out that much of the CNF is very poorly explored for minerals and the level of geological mapping is very primitive in most areas. Just because an area is not rated as moderate to high for mineral potential does not mean that the area is not mineralized, it just has not been unexplored yet. The inter-disciplinary team for the CLMP plan development should include a geologist and a mining engineer. The present IDT contains no mineral professionals.
- 0296-002 As in the rest of Alaska, the value of minerals in the Chugach National Forest has not been completely realized. Mineral exploration, development and production should be encouraged. Historical mineral production is merely a small indication of the real mineral potential of the region. This phenomenon is being born out around the state. To restrict mineral development on National Forest lands would be exceedingly costly and foolish.
- 0314-003 It would be great if miners, both recreational and professional, could utilize these rivers without adversely impacting them, but on the whole, they seem to have a hard time cleaning up after themselves. I hate making generalizations but if there is a single group, that tends to be destructive and manages to leave a variety of junk, that quickly becomes a permanent feature of the river scape. A run down Canyon Creek will expose a river traveler to an incredible gauntlet of extremely hazardous mining refuse. It seems that it is the goal of the average miner, to carry a bunch of materials in to these canyons, string a rope across the river at water level, build a crude shelter out of blue, poly-tarps, dig out the river bank, turn over a few rocks, and get bored with the whole idea. The gravity, steep scree slopes and canyon walls quickly discourage the most environmentally sensitive miner and their junk gets abandoned in the bottom of the canyon and quickly finds its way into the water. Over the past twenty years I have been shot at, threaten, tangled in ropes and tarps, had boats destroyed by sharp metal junk, and friends faces cut open by the same. It doesn't take long for one single, inconsiderate miner to create a lot of long term damage and they do it on a regular basis. Personally I like the history and the idea of finding a big chunk of gold out in the wilderness, but the if the people who mine can't do this activity without trashing an area then perhaps its time for them to find a new hobby or profession. Correct me if I'm wrong but It is my understanding that it is more difficult to get a special use permit to go into these canyons and take photographs professional, than it is to mine. These are the two most used white water rivers in the state of Alaska and should be protected to ensure that their enjoyment and environment will be protected for the future. These are valuable resources that should not be allowed to be damaged by a relatively small user group. I do not object to the mining per say but rather the needless trash that gets left by its practitioners. So if these guys can't clean up after themselves than they should be denied access to the river. Look to the future and who is going to be the using these rivers and the revenues that these uses will create on a renewable basis. Unless the miners can get serious about taking care of their junk and our environment than perhaps they don't deserve to use the resource. The miners and the vendors of mining equipment, need to adopt an environmental ethic, if they expect to be able continue sharing these rivers in the future.
- 0326-004 Similarly, tourism opportunities need to be expanded, perhaps in concert with mineral development. It is interesting to note that after fifty years or so and sometimes less, many old mining developments become historic and today are popular recreational areas that also offer recreational access to the back country, It is ironic that these areas are sought out by the same environmentalist crowd that would deplore or litigate against such developments today The Copper River: railroad, Kennecott/McCarthy, Bering River coalfields and Talkeetna Mountains, are a few of these that
- 0331-002 No new mining.
- 0334-010 No New Mining Claims. No new mining claims until a cumulative impacts analysis is completed for existing claims and existing mining operations.

Comment # Comment

- 0370-002 1. A. Deal with mining abuse in Hope looking at the issues from a systems point of view, fast, work with MAPC
- 0370-011 3. A. Ed Ellis EIS and Crescent road shouldn't happen again.
- 0370-020 Allowing mining abuse was wrong. Ed Ellis, Red Smith issues a waste of our tax money.
- 0395-001 I'd like to see that goldminers don't act like their claim is their land. (i.e. free passage, wood harvest) and I would like to require them to prove that their working it. Not just sitting on it and giving people a hard time.
- 0398-003 Minerals: There are many areas within the Chugach National Forest which may have moderate to high mineral potential. Areas with known mineralization or moderate to high mineral potential should be given a minerals prescription. It is vital that access to these areas is not restricted. Moreover, no areas should be withdrawn from mineral entry unless they are in a specifically designated conservation system unit where mining is considered incompatible. Areas that are merely being considered for inclusion into a conservation system unit should not be closed to mineral entry. Much of the Chugach has yet to be adequately explored for its mineral values. Closing an area to mineral entry forecloses future exploration and development opportunities, even if the specific area is later found to be mineralized. Given the importance of mining to Alaska's economy and the region's mineral potential, RDC requests that a geologist and a mining engineer be recruited to serve on the inter-disciplinary team for the Chugach
- 0400-009 Wild and Scenic Rivers: All eligible rivers and glaciers (23 total) already identified by the Forest Service should be recommended for "Wild and Scenic" designation. All wild rivers should be managed as wilderness. All Wild and Scenic rivers should be closed to new mineral entry.
- 0404-023 MINING Any new recreational or commercial mining permit applications should be examined through the Environmental Assessment process of NEPA rather than granting categorical exclusions. Environmental Assessments give the public a chance to comment, more thoroughly examines cumulative impacts and impacts on other forest resources.
- 0408-006 MINERALIZATION Areas of high to moderate mineral potential should be reserved for development. These area should have designations that allow for activities compatible with mineral development. Wild and Scenic Rivers designation must be avoided in areas of high to moderate mineral potential.
- 0425-008 Mining Claims: When reviewing mining claim for permits, address them in an environmental assessment. Currently, they are permitted under categorical exclusions which gives the public no information about how their resource is managed or what impacts are expected. Please do a watershed cumulative impacts analysis which includes mining.
- 0427-008 Mining Claims: When reviewing mining claims for permits, address them in an environmental assessment. Currently, they are permitted under categorical exclusions which gives the public no information about how their resource is managed or what impacts are expected. Please do a watershed cumulative impacts analysis which includes mining.
- 0435-003 3) Mining. However it is worded, the plan must prevent another fiasco from ever happening like the mess the people of Cooper Landing are still fighting. Mining must be financially viable and environmentally sound or not done at all.
- 0438-008 When reviewing mining claims for permits, address them in an environmental assessment. Currently, they are permitted under categorical exclusions which gives the public no information about how their resource is managed or what impacts are expected. Please do a watershed cumulative impacts analysis which includes mining.
- 0439-003 Save the purity of our water. No mining and pollution of air quality.
- 0444-008 MINING Any new recreational or commercial mining permit applications should be examined through the Environmental Assessment process of NEPA rather than granting categorical exclusions. Environmental Assessments give the public a chance to comment, more thoroughly examines cumulative impacts and impacts on other forest resources.
- 0445-007 Seventh, I would like to recommend that applications for mining permits should be subject to the environmental assessment process, with an opportunity for public input.
- 0446-003 3. Minerals. Minerals are one of the key topics that should be studied and should have a separate chapter in the Revised Plan. Many areas within the Forest have high mineral potential and access to roads, the Alaska Railroad, or tidewater. Areas with known mineralization or moderate to high mineral potential should be retained for minerals exploration and development and no areas should be withdrawn from, mineral entry unless they are included within an already existing conservation unit. Areas which are under study for inclusion in a conservation unit should not be closed to mineral entry until such time as the area becomes a conservation unit. Geologic and minerals information can be obtained from US Bureau of Mines reports and consultation with the BLM minerals staff. At least one member of the Planning Team should be an experienced economic geologist.
- 0448-006 Mining should continue to be allowed, with reasonable regulations, where it has been historically carried out and in future locations where there are significant and valuable mineral deposits.
- 0449-005 For all these facilities GRAVEL and MATERIALS SOURCES should be identified and designated and multiple use planned for (example: gravelpit can be developed into a campground).

Comment # Comment

- 0451-001 1. Please don't withdraw any streams for wild & scenic that have multiple mining claims on them.
- 0451-003 3. Leave all mineralize zones/land multiple use
- 0453-003 If mining is to be taking place let it take place under close supervision and a guarantee that the area will be restored to its original condition - free of acid leechings and complete with vegetation - within a reasonable amount of time.
- 0456-004 III. THE REVISED FOREST PLAN SHOULD IDENTIFY LANDS WITH HIGH POTENTIAL FOR MINERAL DEVELOPMENT, AND PRESERVE ACCESS TO THOSE LANDS FOR FUTURE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT 4
Areas with known mineral potential should be given a minerals development prescription and should be designated by the plan for mineral development. Mineral development opportunities must be evaluated in the EIS, and a full range of alternatives which include opportunities to explore for and develop mineral deposits in the CNF should be considered. Areas where mining occurred in the past should be given the minerals prescription unless significantly outweighed by other factors. The USGS and the U.S. Bureau of Mines should be consulted to help define mineralized areas.
- 0464-015 MINERALIZATION: Areas of high to moderate mineral potential should be reserved for development. Mineral reserves should allow activities compatible with mineral development. Areas withdrawn from mining through land designations must have like areas open to equal a no net loss of mining resources.
- 0466-001 I found that there serious conflicts in management when Congress designates a river as Wild and Scenic in an area of active or historical mining works. This conflict becomes acute if the river is navigable, and there are claims in the river bed being worked with suction dredges.
- 0466-004 The second reason was that some designations seemed to be used to prevent mining projects. The designation is used as a tool, without regard to whether the river is truly suited to designation.
- 0466-007 Finally, there should be no suggested designations for navigable waters, or for waters near potential mining, as designations impede access for economic development and result in costly management objective conflicts.
- 0475-010 While the Forest Service may have no voice on patented mining claims, it can have one in approving, modifying, or disapproving what is done in the rest of the project area. Congress gave the Forest Service authority to regulate mining under the Organic Act which allows for rules to preserve the forests from destruction and the National Forest Management Act, which directs the Forest Service to prepare forest plans. Thus the Chugach Plan should include a standard that requires an Environmental Assessment or Impact statement to be completed for each claim.
- 0476-009 Seventh, I would like to recommend that applications for mining permits should be subject to the environmental assessment process, with an opportunity for public input.
- 0479-071 Mining: At this time, mining is permitted in virtually every watershed in the Chugach National Forest. TWS would like the Forest Service to do a cumulative impacts analysis regarding mining on the forest during the revision process. This would dovetail nicely with the watershed cumulative impacts analysis suggested above. TWS recommends that the Forest Service review all mining activity on the Forest to determine which areas should be withdrawn from any further mining claims to protect wilderness and wildlife values on the forest, and which claims should be acquired to
- 0483-009 and perform a full EIS on any future mining claim or expansion.
- 0488-002 2. Mineral Activities - The Chugach is home to extensive mineralization. Areas of known mineralization or potential should be given a minerals prescription. Mining is one of the oldest commercial and recreation uses of the Chugach, establishing many of the roads, trails and communities. This historic relationship needs to be continued.
- 0490-010 Mining is an important activity and does not need further Restrictions.
- 0491-008 No new mining claims until a cumulative impacts analysis is completed for existing claims and existing mining
- 0491-013 Do not allow the mining project to occur on the Resurrection Creek near Hope. This area is far to important already to the local economy in terms of fish and wildlife, particularly salmon, which generate millions of dollars for the Kenai Peninsula. To jeopardize the health of these watersheds would be a mistake.
- 0495-009 No mining claims should permitted without a detailed oversight plan, environmental assessment studies and a review of watershed impact analysis.
- 0649-001 Mining should only be permitted with double the rules, restrictions, supervision & check ups if allowed. I am opposed to mining in this area because "you" have foolishly allowed this commercial job without a cumulative impact assessment already.
- 0655-003 I also support sensible mining in Chugach NF.

Comment # Comment

- 0663-001 Mining - I wish there was a way to have miners clean up after themselves. Take a look at the Peterville mining area. It's really a mess. Junk, oil - you name it.
- 0696-005 Mining: Yes do mining - the economy needs it. However, miners shall restore the land to near original conditions.
- 0775-008 Do not allow the mine to happen on the resurrection River. Please halt new mining permits until there is a better understanding of the existing operations. Require an Environmental Assessment for mining operations.
- 0781-028 Mining: Most watersheds on the Chugach have current mining claims, yet the public has no information in which to gage what potential risks these claims pose to fish and wildlife habitat, to watershed health and viability, or to biological diversity. Negative visual impacts are the only way in which the public may gage the impact of a mining operation. Many streams and rivers within the boundaries of the Chugach have extremely high fishery values and high visual and/or recreation values, yet these are not taken into account when mining permits are granted. This process is incongruous with how other uses are analyzed. A cumulative assessment of watersheds, as outlined earlier, should be conducted to include past and present mining operations and its impacts. ACE would like to see the Forest, Service include recommendations in its alternative's for mineral withdrawals.
- 0781-029 ACE would also like the Forest Service to review, by way of environmental assessments, all mining claims prior to them, being permitted. This will give the public the opportunity to be involved in the determination of an activity which impacts their resource.
- 0783-004 4. Minerals Prescription Areas, with known mineralization should be given a specific minerals prescription and designated for mineral development. Minerals opportunities should be given a specific chapter in the Revised Plan. The minerals prescription areas should also include all areas where mineral production has occurred in the past. USGS and US Bureau of Mines publications will be of major value in defining both mineralized areas and past production areas. The BLM historic mining claim records will also provide a source of this information. Specific items that need to be included in the chapter on minerals include: - geologic maps showing all mineralized areas; - maps showing all identifiable past mining areas; - a narrative description of past mining for each general area/drainage; - a narrative description of past mining for each of the specific mine for which such information can be found; - a bibliography listing all known published material on the Chugach Forest area. 5. Minerals Representation - At least one member of the USFS Planning Team must be a certified minerals geologist or a registered mining engineer. Additionally, at least one minerals geologist from the USGS and one mining engineer from the UAF School of Mineral Engineering should be engaged to participate in development of the minerals prescription and the minerals chapter. Minerals are an important aspect of the Chugach Forest and it is essential that someone on the Planning Team have personal education and experience with minerals development.
- 0785-001 Our family owns the Katalla Oilfield property located within the Chugach National Forest, east of the Copper River. Our property is located at Mineral Survey 599 and 1425, and consists of 466 acres. It has been our plan to develop the oil and timber resource to provide opportunity to our surrounding communities as well as future generations. We have studied alternative transportation methods for the oil and timber resource for several years. Our most viable option is to build a road on the existing rail bed, north from our property along the Katella River and connecting to the Chugach Alaska Corporation proposed roadway. We have reviewed the proposed land management plan and object to the Chugach National Forest "locking up" all lands surrounding private land owners. The proposed plan virtually eliminates any possibility for access or development of private property in the area east of the Copper River. The representation of the proposed plan lead us to believe little or no concern has been given to the adverse effect to private land owners or future economic development. We feel our constitutional rights are being taken away along
- 0787-012 No new mining claims should be issued. They definitely should not be exclusions, but rather open for public comment and input.
- 0794-007 We need to curtail the extent to which mining operations occur in the forest. Some recreational mining sites are a permanent taking of public resources when shelters and equipment are present year round.
- 0801-002 2. Mineral Activities - The Chugach is home to extensive mineralization. Areas of known mineralization or potential should be given a minerals prescription. Mining is one of the oldest commercial and recreation uses of the Chugach, establishing many of the roads, trails and communities. This historic relationship needs to be continued.
- 0802-012 Mining Claims: When reviewing mining claims for permits, address them as part of an environmental assessment. Currently, they are permitted under categorical exclusions, which gives the public no information about how their resource is managed or what impacts are expected. Please do a watershed cumulative impacts analysis which
- 0809-008 ADDITIONAL RESOURCE EXTRACTION The petroleum and mining industries will also have a future stake in the outcome of the CLMP. For this reason, these industries should be noted as future stakeholders and added as a factor. What will be the 2 impact of these two industries, both environmentally and socio-economically? We believe that a subsurface analysis of mineral and petroleum reserves should be conducted prior to a CLMP decision being

Comment # Comment

- 0811-009 Chugach Land Management Plan Scoping Page 3 ADDITIONAL RESOURCE EXTRACTION The petroleum and mining industries also might have a future stake in the outcome of CLMP. For this reason, they should be noted as future stakeholders and added as a factor. What will be the impact of these industries, both environmentally and socioeconomically?
- 0811-010 We believe that a subsurface analysis should be conducted.
- 0811-011 In addition will there be a conflict with local native corporations and their subsurface rights to certain areas of the Chugach National Forest?
- 0812-020 MINERALIZATION: Areas of high to moderate mineral potential should be reserved for development. Mineral reserves should allow activities compatible with mineral development. Areas withdrawn from mining through land designations must have like areas open to equal a no net loss of mining resources.
- 0820-049 Mining: Most watersheds on the Chugach have current mining claims, yet the public has no information in which to gage what potential risks these claims pose to fish and wildlife habitat, to watershed health and viability, or to biological diversity. Negative visual impacts are the only way in which the public may gage the impact of a mining operation. Many streams and rivers within the boundaries of the Chugach have extremely high fishery values and high visual and/or recreation values, yet these are not taken into account when mining permits are granted. This process is incongruous with how other uses are analyzed. A cumulative assessment of watersheds, as outlined earlier, should be conducted to include past and present mining operations and its impacts. ACE would like to see the Forest Service include recommendations in its alternatives for mineral withdrawals. ACE would like the Forest Service to review, by way of environmental assessments, all mining claims prior to them being permitted. This will give the public the opportunity to be involved in the determination of an activity which impacts their resource.
- 0821-020 The Forest Plan must evaluate and consider areas appropriate for permanent withdrawal from mineral entry.
- 0827-008 Mining Claims: When reviewing mining claims for permits, address them in an environmental assessment. Currently, they are permitted under categorical exclusions which gives the public no information about how their resource is managed or what impacts are expected. Please do a watershed cumulative impacts analysis which includes mining.
- 0829-008 When reviewing mining claims for permits, address them in an environmental assessment. Currently, they are permitted under categorical exclusions which gives the public no information about how their resource is managed or what impacts are expected. Please do a watershed cumulative impacts analysis which includes mining.
- 0832-004 Mining Claims: When reviewing mining claims for permits, address them in an environmental assessment. Currently, they are permitted under categorical exclusions which gives the public no information about how their resource is managed or what impacts are expected.
- 0832-005 Please do a watershed cumulative impacts analysis which includes mining
- 0860-144 Mining allowed without requirement to return area to natural state
- 0880-008 ? Look at minerals withdrawals at Cooper Creek, Resurrection Creek, Stetson Creek, North Fork of Snow River. Widen the Russian River withdrawal ?
- 0880-011 ? Designate sites for recreation mining (gold panning)
- 0881-006 P Will rec. mining be affected by W&SR designation? Sixmile. Where on river?
P How will W&SRs effect other legal mining operations?
- 0881-010 P Will there be a minerals prescription in plan?
- 0892-009 Mining: When reviewing mining claims for permits, address them in an environmental assessment. Currently, they are permitted under categorical exclusions which gives the public no information about how their resource is managed or what impacts are expected. Please do a watershed cumulative impacts analysis which includes mining.