

[Mining and Reclamation Plan of Operations Submittal Review]

To BLM Reviewers:

Please complete the MSWord comment matrix (a template is provided at the end of these instructions) by saving this file with a new file name including your last name (for example, name your comment matrix “Cmt-Matrix_SDNM-RMPA-Monger.doc”), and then fill out your comments in the document.

The deadline for comments is [INSERT DATE AND TIME].

How to Provide Valuable Feedback

Commenting:

For each comment, please fill in the following information under the appropriate column heading in the matrix:

- ✓ Page and line number on which you are commenting. **The page and line numbers MUST be used!**
- ✓ Your comments:
 - Your comments should be specific and provide exact changes to the text. Please be unambiguous, clear, and directive, with exact, proposed wording changes. Ambiguous comments, such as “What?,” “Poor,” or “Is this right?,” are not clear, so please be specific.
 - If you have the same comment more than once, please copy and paste your comment to a new row in the matrix and provide the specific page number, instead of just referring back to a previous comment. This will help us to more efficiently address the comments and make any necessary changes.
 - If you need additional space for comments, click in the table cell where you would like to comment, select the *Table* menu, *Insert*, and either *Rows Above* or *Rows Below*.

Comments on [Kirkland Mining and Reclamation Plan of Operations]

Cmt #	Page #	Line #	BLM Commentor	Comment	Response
1.	BE	-	Buttazoni	<p>Page 1, paragraph 2 & 3 under “Methods” The term “Project area” is not described in terms of acres or referred to in a Figure. Page 1, paragraph 2 and Table 1 on Page 2 uses “Study Area.” Are these the same areas? Be consistent.</p> <p>The survey tracks shown on Figure 24 largely missed the vegetated part of the area. Given that there is a portion of the area that is vegetated and appears to connect to more contiguous vegetation to the NE, it seems likely that BLM SS animals with potential for occurrence could forage there.</p>	
2.	3	Table 1	Buttazoni	Does Kirkland hold all the unpatented mining claims listed in Table 1?	
3.	14	8 & 10	Buttazoni	We need to provide the context that the off-site facility is not a part of this Mining Plan and not subject to BLM approval as that would occur on private lands. If the off-site facility is reasonably foreseeable, the BLM may have to include the impacts associated with it as part of non-federal actions in cumulative effects.	
4.	15	11	Buttazoni	“The report assumes...” Do you mean this Plan?	
5.	16	26	Buttazoni	Clarify “...within an existing access easement...” I assume that is the private land portion of the access road (we don’t use the term ‘easement’) and that approval of Kirklands use of the public land portion of the road would occur with this Plan.	
6.	20	6	Buttazoni	Clarify “...an existing well on private land located...”	
7.	20	7	Buttazoni	Tense use. “There is no chemical...” “There <u>would be</u> no chemical...”	
8.	25	27	Buttazoni	“Where a notice or a plan of operations is required...” I am not sure if I follow, all roads needed for this Plan would already be approved/included in this approved Plan.	
9.	26	14	Buttazoni	“...would add 30 to 50 truck round trips per day,...” Is this for the initial and full development, or just initial phase?	
10.	26	17-18	Buttazoni	“...would use about 20,000-35,000 gallons per day (gpd) during time of peak production.” Of fuel?	

Comments on [Kirkland Mining and Reclamation Plan of Operations]

Cmt #	Page #	Line #	BLM Commentor	Comment	Response
11.	34	8	Buttazoni	The specific location and supporting map (Figure 8) of inventoried historic properties needs to be removed from the Plan. Only a general description can be retained. The Plan will be made available for public comment and the location of the sites cannot be disclosed to the public.	
12.					
13.					
14.					
15.					
16.					
17.					
18.					
19.					
20.					
21.					
22.					
23.					