

MOUNTAIN GOLD CLAIMS, LLC

Thomas E. Callicrate, Geologist/Manager

P.O. Box 21146, Reno, Nevada 89515

775-849-1985 phone/fax; 775-843-8835 cell; tom@mtngold.us

April 25, 2015

BLM Carson City District Office
Attn: CCD RMP
5665 Morgan Mill Rd.
Carson City, NV 89701

RE: Substantive Comments on BLM Carson City District, Draft Resources Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement

Mr. Ralph Thomas BLM Carson City District Director
Colleen Sievers BLM Project Director
Amy L. Lueders State Director
Colleen Sievers, Carson City District RMP Project Lead
Telephone: 775-885-6000

Dear BLM and all Concerned;

I am writing this letter to submit Substantive Comments and Factual Information with what I believe are relevant and new information with sufficient detail in strong opposition to the Carson City District Draft Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS) that is “**too restrictive for multiple uses**”, including precious metal and critical and industrial mineral exploration and development, as well as recreation, ranching, farming and other public multi-uses. Based on the lack of being contacted regarding these very extensive RMP/EIS documents, lack of completeness of Inventory documentation and short time frame period to comment, I suggest and request the comment period to be extended 60 days to allow the public to investigate this incomplete Inventory Issue and allow the BLM to conduct a more thorough Inventory and review of the RMP/EIS.

My background is I am a Professional Geologist with over 30 years of experience primarily conducting mineral exploration in Nevada and specifically in portions of the BLM Carson City District. My company holds unpatented mining claims in Mineral County and currently is conducting mineral exploration within several portions of the Carson City District and has plans to conduct future and continuous exploration activities.

The concerns with this (RMP/EIS) is that this plan presented to the public is very complicated and confusing with numerous new, revised Alternative Maps per various land-use categories, missing continuity of information between maps, and lacks complete inventory information that was collected in verifying and documenting the true, current present land activities and critical-strategic mineral inventories.

First, I'd like to thank the BLM for forwarding the “Guide to Commenting” on the RMP/EIS so I could follow your recommendations on the best way to express my concerns and provide substantive comments, present errors or omission of information and provide constructive, alternative solutions.

FIRST CONCERN AND SOLUTIONS

Concern: My first concern and constructive solution I'd like to present is with Figure 2-19, Alternative C: Lands Managed to Maintain Wilderness Characteristics (LWC) that are colored in blue. After extensive research and field work in several of these designated areas, I was able to compile additional Inventory data information on the 12 Lands Managed to Maintain Wilderness Characteristics. I believe the BLM failed to conduct a thorough and complete field Inventory documenting the true past and present land uses, disturbances and features. Find attached detailed maps for each of the 12 Lands Managed to Maintain Wilderness Characteristics, where based on the layers of data on the maps, all or portions of the designated

areas should be eliminated and dropped from the Alternative C Map and all other maps in the RMP/EIS. The reason for eliminating and dropping the 12 MMWC Areas is based on the “**EVIDENCE**” shown on the attached maps that include: documented existing roads, defined Mining Districts and known mineral occurrences and deposits with potential for current and future exploration, development and mining, past and current exploration and mine workings and disturbances, 43-101 Technical Reports that document in detail mineral occurrences and exploration and development work, exploration prospect pits, trenches-excavated workings, adit and shaft workings and historical and modern buildings and cabins. This existing disturbance described and presented clearly presents evidence that the majority of the LWC areas do not qualify as current or future Lands Managed to Maintain Wilderness Characteristics. Until all of the Inventory information is presented to the public, I believe the only choice of the Alternatives is Alternative A., no change.

Suggested Solution: The BLM needs to extended the comment period for an additional 60-90 days to allow the BLM to review the attached map data, and conduct its own research, collect and present to the public additional information, such as unpatented mining claims and any Plan of Operations and Notice of Intent permits that were or are being conducted within each of the LWC areas. The BLM should include selected professional personnel from all aspects of the public, such as ranching, farming, recreations, exploration/mining, etc., so they will have input of the characteristics of the LWC’s and are represented in the decision making. Then all of the public needs additional time to review this new information.

If you have any questions, please call me at: 775-849-1985 home office or 775-843-8835 cell.
Also, please e-mail me back that you received this e-mail and attachment information.

Thanks You

Thomas Callicrate
Manager