

Date submitted (UTC-11): 10/14/2018 1:00:00 PM

First name: Anon

Last name: Goldendale

Organization:

Title:

Official Representative/Member Indicator:

Address1: United States

Address2: WA

City: 98620

State:

Province/Region:

Zip/Postal Code:

Country:

Email:

Phone:

Comments:

I, Deborah "Katherine" Cramer, am disappointed to note that EO 13377 and its requirement to reduce regulatory burden on the American people is not part of the stated mission of this regulatory change that presents as an effort to clarify regulations and to increase consistency with BLM surface management. The USFSs proposals fails to meet the requirement of EO 13377 nor does it even mention the order or offer intent to comply.1) Classification of Locatable mineral operations. As a Casual Use, mineral collector I have concerns regarding the need to further define significant disturbance of surface resource. The lack of definition could allow arbitrary requirements of plan proposals and approvals by the USFS if not outright eviction. I agree that the USFS should adopt the three classes of locatable mineral operations as established by the BLM. No, certain environmental concerns should not be determinative of the classification of proposed locatable material.2) Submitting, Receiving, Reviewing, Analyzing and Approving Plans of Operations. I suggest to increase the quality of information through specificity in detail as regards environmental protection be accomplished through not only the opportunity for meetings with staff for review but through USFS supplying sample proposals and / or forms that simplify the process by check boxes, multiple choice and comment. I am surprised that there is a need to codify the opportunity for meetings with USFS. Does this imply that without codification Govt employees had previously denied assistance to the operator in this process?3)

Modifying Approved Plans of Operations. No comment.4) Noncompliance and Enforcement. I want to remind the Forest Service that it is not a police force nor should it morph into an armed one. NO further comment.5) Reasonable incident use and Occupancy. I do not agree with the approach that in effect would limit camping or occupancy to 14 days because there have been some who have abused mining laws. All should not be penalized because of the few!6) Financial Guarantees. I do not agree with a requirement for bonding or financial guarantees for activities that have been exempt until now.7) Operations on Withdrawn or Segregated lands. The casual use operator should not be infringed upon due to segregations or withdrawals. Since casual use is an activity resulting in no or negligible disturbance a casual use collection activity should not be outlawed due to lands being segregated or withdrawn as, for example, in the case of Monument status.8) Procedures for Minerals or Materials that May Be Salable Mineral Materials, not Locatable Minerals. Since the authority to determine the validity of mining claims lies with the Department of the Interior amendments to current regulations would cause a need for the Forest Service to ask the BLM to initiate contest proceedings in the case of suspected impropriety in use of mining laws to appropriate salable mineral materials. How often do we find Federal agencies willing to offer this level of interagency cooperation when ask(ed)? Agencies are most covetous of their budgets and related activities that would infringe upon said budget is not realistic. The proposed changes inflate and complicate the regulatory burden on the people. In final comment I must add that the USFS needs to remove obstructions to access; all gates, berms, ditches, boulders etc. Said obstructions infringe on the right of use and access by the people to the peoples public lands.