This is for all Appendices L1 through L5 even with no recommendations. Draft Implementation, Implementation MOU’s, Final Draft, Drafts, Executive Summary, volumes I-VI, the Development of Alternatives, Environmental Setting/Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences/Effected Analysis, Consultation, Coordination and Public Participation and Mitigation Monitoring and Report Plan.

Revised language For:
Locatable Minerals
Mineral Materials
Non-energy Leasables

OBJECTIVES
Allowable Uses: Strategic mineral, metal and rare earth development. Support the national and socio-economic need for reliable and sustainable domestic minerals while reclaiming the land, protecting the native flora and fauna as best as, and protecting the original intent of the mining environment according to 30 USC 21-54.

Non-Allowable (Uses) or Designations:
Renewable Energy, Mineral Withdrawals, Land Designations, Land change designations road designation projects, and ACEC’s, NLCS’s, DWMA’s expansion areas. But not limited to, in any and all historic and mineral mining areas and Mining Districts of California without the consent of Minerals and Mining.
**Revising Behind Revised Language:**

These are not considered compatible with the Multiple Surface Use Act (30 USC 611 4a-b) for the Minerals and Mining Federal Stakeholders (MMFS). DRECP, ESA, EPA, CWA, NLCS, ACEC’s, Monuments, Conservation areas, Wilderness areas, Mineral withdrawal areas and Scenic areas are not compatible with 30 USC 611 4a-b. (see Carver-Nevada Mines case, cts. 611 F.2d 12777) and 30 USC 21a-54 for the MMFS. Simply, it is illegal to close public lands, roads and entrance for mineral entry and mineral and mining development unless there has been a past congressional mineral withdrawal and any current decisions and approvals must include consulting the MMFS currently CDMC after February 25th, 2015 Minerals and Mining Advisory Council (MMAC). MMAC along with BLM are the official Federal contacts.

Secondly, besides State & Federal Administrative Actions over-stopping Federal Mining Laws and are ignoring the Rule of Law; State and Federal failed to include National Security Interests (DOD) that may exist in SCMSA 50 U.S.C. 98 et seq. & 98(c).

Thirdly, BLM has failed to recognize National Mineral and Mining Policy Act 30USC21a. BLM is violating the Federal Policy by excluding and not recognizing Minerals and Mining as Federal Stakeholders and coexisting Federal Land Stakeholders and consultants.

See Congressional Letter accompanying these responses:

Signed
The California Desert District Mining Coalition
P.O. Box 2411 California City, CA 93504
661-754-6463
tribegies@yahoo.com
http://www.cddmc.com
http://www.mineralsandminingadvisorycouncil.org
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Response to Comment Letter E128

California Desert District Mining Coalition
February 14, 2015

E128-1 Thank you for your comment. While it has not resulted in a change in the document, the BLM has taken it into consideration.

E128-2 While this comment has not resulted in a change in the document, the BLM has taken it into consideration.

E128-3 The designation of NLCS and ACEC areas are compatible with the Multiple Surface Use Act of July 23, 1955, all sections. The special designation on public lands for other uses is within the scope of the law. The withdrawal of areas from mineral entry is allowable and recognizes valid existing rights of mining claims. The process of completing withdrawals does allow for comment from all parties of interest. Notification of proposed withdrawals is completed by the publication of a Notice of Realty Action in the Federal Register. We disagree that the BLM has failed to recognize the appropriate laws and regulations that may be impacted, including the areas of concern such as Department of Defense and the Mining and Mineral Policy Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 21).
INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK