

only Jacqueline Buchanan, Regional Forester, Objection Reviewing Officer  
Pacific Northwest Region, USDA Forest Service  
Attn: 1570 Objections  
1220 SW 3rd Ave.  
Portland, OR 97204

August 26, 2-24

Re: Objection Powder River Mining FEIS-Chad Williams, Return Placer Operation

Dear Ms. Buchanan:

My Objection concerns new information about my claims and my proposed operation, which I was not able to comment on previously. My objection is filed pursuant to 36CFR Part 218. The 45-day objection period began July 17, 2024, so my objection is timely filed.

**Objection #1:** on page 4 of the DROD it states "*I have decided to authorize the approval of only the placer testing and exploration activities.*" On page 5 the DROD states that approval of only placer testing is going to be approved based on the Rosemont Decision.

**I object to this decision to only approve placer testing and exploration only at sites #3, #4, and #5 on the Return Placer Operation.**

**Details of this objection.** The Return is a placer operation, but the DROD, does not approve testing at Placer Site #2. My Plan of Operation clearly states: on page 1, "*A temporary access route up the old trench on the Return claim onto the Lady Dragon claims will be utilized during testing at site #2.*" The Rosemont case decided that "*discovery of valuable minerals is essential to the right to occupancy-temporary or permanent-beyond the occupancy necessary for exploration*".

The Return operation's occupancy at Site #2 is not "***beyond the occupancy needed for exploration***". Site #2 is in the exploration phase.

**Resolution of objection #1:** When the Record of Decision is finalized, include Site #2, as the Plan of Operation clearly states this site is in the exploration phase. Change the chart on page A-16 to include Site #2. The Rosemont Decision applied only to production, not exploration.

When I have completed exploration at the Return claims, and am ready for a production operation, I will inform the Forest Service and provide assays and other proof as required of a valid discovery.

Sincerely,

Chad Williams

