

1 Michael K. Kennedy (Bar No. 004224)  
2 Bradley J. Glass (Bar No. 022463)  
3 GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A.  
4 2575 East Camelback Road  
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225  
6 Telephone: (602) 530-8000  
7 Facsimile: (602) 530-8500  
8 mkk@gknet.com  
9 brad.glass@gknet.com

10 David J. DePippo (Ariz. Bar 028428)  
11 HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
12 Riverfront Plaza, East Tower  
13 951 E. Byrd Street  
14 Richmond, Virginia 23219  
15 Telephone: (804) 788-7304  
16 Facsimile: (804) 788-8212  
17 ddepippo@hunton.com

18 *Attorneys for Defendant-Intervenors*  
19 *Energy Fuels Resources (USA) Inc. and*  
20 *EFR Arizona Strip LLC*

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1100  
1101  
1102  
1103  
1104  
1105  
1106  
1107  
1108  
1109  
1110  
1111  
1112  
1113  
1114  
1115  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1120  
1121  
1122  
1123  
1124  
1125  
1126  
1127  
1128  
1129  
1130  
1131  
1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144  
1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1289  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298  
1299  
1300  
1301  
1302  
1303  
1304  
1305  
1306  
1307  
1308  
1309  
1310  
1311  
1312  
1313  
1314  
1315  
1316  
1317  
1318  
1319  
1320  
1321  
1322  
1323  
1324  
1325  
1326  
1327  
1328  
1329  
1330  
1331  
1332  
1333  
1334  
1335  
1336  
1337  
1338  
1339  
1340  
1341  
1342  
1343  
1344  
1345  
1346  
1347  
1348  
1349  
1350  
1351  
1352  
1353  
1354  
1355  
1356  
1357  
1358  
1359  
1360  
1361  
1362  
1363  
1364  
1365  
1366  
1367  
1368  
1369  
1370  
1371  
1372  
1373  
1374  
1375  
1376  
1377  
1378  
1379  
1380  
1381  
1382  
1383  
1384  
1385  
1386  
1387  
1388  
1389  
1390  
1391  
1392  
1393  
1394  
1395  
1396  
1397  
1398  
1399  
1400  
1401  
1402  
1403  
1404  
1405  
1406  
1407  
1408  
1409  
1410  
1411  
1412  
1413  
1414  
1415  
1416  
1417  
1418  
1419  
1420  
1421  
1422  
1423  
1424  
1425  
1426  
1427  
1428  
1429  
1430  
1431  
1432  
1433  
1434  
1435  
1436  
1437  
1438  
1439  
1440  
1441  
1442  
1443  
1444  
1445  
1446  
1447  
1448  
1449  
1450  
1451  
1452  
1453  
1454  
1455  
1456  
1457  
1458  
1459  
1460  
1461  
1462  
1463  
1464  
1465  
1466  
1467  
1468  
1469  
1470  
1471  
1472  
1473  
1474  
1475  
1476  
1477  
1478  
1479  
1480  
1481  
1482  
1483  
1484  
1485  
1486  
1487  
1488  
1489  
1490  
1491  
1492  
1493  
1494  
1495  
1496  
1497  
1498  
1499  
1500  
1501  
1502  
1503  
1504  
1505  
1506  
1507  
1508  
1509  
1510  
1511  
1512  
1513  
1514  
1515  
1516  
1517  
1518  
1519  
1520  
1521  
1522  
1523  
1524  
1525  
1526  
1527  
1528  
1529  
1530  
1531  
1532  
1533  
1534  
1535  
1536  
1537  
1538  
1539  
1540  
1541  
1542  
1543  
1544  
1545  
1546  
1547  
1548  
1549  
1550  
1551  
1552  
1553  
1554  
1555  
1556  
1557  
1558  
1559  
1560  
1561  
1562  
1563  
1564  
1565  
1566  
1567  
1568  
1569  
1570  
1571  
1572  
1573  
1574  
1575  
1576  
1577  
1578  
1579  
1580  
1581  
1582  
1583  
1584  
1585  
1586  
1587  
1588  
1589  
1590  
1591  
1592  
1593  
1594  
1595  
1596  
1597  
1598  
1599  
1600  
1601  
1602  
1603  
1604  
1605  
1606  
1607  
1608  
1609  
1610  
1611  
1612  
1613  
1614  
1615  
1616  
1617  
1618  
1619  
1620  
1621  
1622  
1623  
1624  
1625  
1626  
1627  
1628  
1629  
1630  
1631  
1632  
1633  
1634  
1635  
1636  
1637  
1638  
1639  
1640  
1641  
1642  
1643  
1644  
1645  
1646  
1647  
1648  
1649  
1650  
1651  
1652  
1653  
1654  
1655  
1656  
1657  
1658  
1659  
1660  
1661  
1662  
1663  
1664  
1665  
1666  
1667  
1668  
1669  
1670  
1671  
1672  
1673  
1674  
1675  
1676  
1677  
1678  
1679  
1680  
1681  
1682  
1683  
1684  
1685  
1686  
1687  
1688  
1689  
1690  
1691  
1692  
1693  
1694  
1695  
1696  
1697  
1698  
1699  
1700  
1701  
1702  
1703  
1704  
1705  
1706  
1707  
1708  
1709  
1710  
1711  
1712  
1713  
1714  
1715  
1716  
1717  
1718  
1719  
1720  
1721  
1722  
1723  
1724  
1725  
1726  
1727  
1728  
1729  
1730  
1731  
1732  
1733  
1734  
1735  
1736  
1737  
1738  
1739  
1740  
1741  
1742  
1743  
1744  
1745  
1746  
1747  
1748  
1749  
1750  
1751  
1752  
1753  
1754  
1755  
1756  
1757  
1758  
1759  
1760  
1761  
1762  
1763  
1764  
1765  
1766  
1767  
1768  
1769  
1770  
1771  
1772  
1773  
1774  
1775  
1776  
1777  
1778  
1779  
1780  
1781  
1782  
1783  
1784  
1785  
1786  
1787  
1788  
1789  
1790  
1791  
1792  
1793  
1794  
1795  
1796  
1797  
1798  
1799  
1800  
1801  
1802  
1803  
1804  
1805  
1806  
1807  
1808  
1809  
1810  
1811  
1812  
1813  
1814  
1815  
1816  
1817  
1818  
1819  
1820  
1821  
1822  
1823  
1824  
1825  
1826  
1827  
1828  
1829  
1830  
1831  
1832  
1833  
1834  
1835  
1836  
1837  
1838  
1839  
1840  
1841  
1842  
1843  
1844  
1845  
1846  
1847  
1848  
1849  
1850  
1851  
1852  
1853  
1854  
1855  
1856  
1857  
1858  
1859  
1860  
1861  
1862  
1863  
1864  
1865  
1866  
1867  
1868  
1869  
1870  
1871  
1872  
1873  
1874  
1875  
1876  
1877  
1878  
1879  
1880  
1881  
1882  
1883  
1884  
1885  
1886  
1887  
1888  
1889  
1890  
1891  
1892  
1893  
1894  
1895  
1896  
1897  
1898  
1899  
1900  
1901  
1902  
1903  
1904  
1905  
1906  
1907  
1908  
1909  
1910  
1911  
1912  
1913  
1914  
1915  
1916  
1917  
1918  
1919  
1920  
1921  
1922  
1923  
1924  
1925  
1926  
1927  
1928  
1929  
1930  
1931  
1932  
1933  
1934  
1935  
1936  
1937  
1938  
1939  
1940  
1941  
1942  
1943  
1944  
1945  
1946  
1947  
1948  
1949  
1950  
1951  
1952  
1953  
1954  
1955  
1956  
1957  
1958  
1959  
1960  
1961  
1962  
1963  
1964  
1965  
1966  
1967  
1968  
1969  
1970  
1971  
1972  
1973  
1974  
1975  
1976  
1977  
1978  
1979  
1980  
1981  
1982  
1983  
1984  
1985  
1986  
1987  
1988  
1989  
1990  
1991  
1992  
1993  
1994  
1995  
1996  
1997  
1998  
1999  
2000  
2001  
2002  
2003  
2004  
2005  
2006  
2007  
2008  
2009  
2010  
2011  
2012  
2013  
2014  
2015  
2016  
2017  
2018  
2019  
2020  
2021  
2022  
2023  
2024  
2025  
2026  
2027  
2028  
2029  
2030  
2031  
2032  
2033  
2034  
2035  
2036  
2037  
2038  
2039  
2040  
2041  
2042  
2043  
2044  
2045  
2046  
2047  
2048  
2049  
2050  
2051  
2052  
2053  
2054  
2055  
2056  
2057  
2058  
2059  
2060  
2061  
2062  
2063  
2064  
2065  
2066  
2067  
2068  
2069  
2070  
2071  
2072  
2073  
2074  
2075  
2076  
2077  
2078  
2079  
2080  
2081  
2082  
2083  
2084  
2085  
2086  
2087  
2088  
2089  
2090  
2091  
2092  
2093  
2094  
2095  
2096  
2097  
2098  
2099  
2100  
2101  
2102  
2103  
2104  
2105  
2106  
2107  
2108  
2109  
2110  
2111  
2112  
2113  
2114  
2115  
2116  
2117  
2118  
2119  
2120  
2121  
2122  
2123  
2124  
2125  
2126  
2127  
2128  
2129  
2130  
2131  
2132  
2133  
2134  
2135  
2136  
2137  
2138  
2139  
2140  
2141  
2142  
2143  
2144  
2145  
2146  
2147  
2148  
2149  
2150  
2151  
2152  
2153  
2154  
2155  
2156  
2157  
2158  
2159  
2160  
2161  
2162  
2163  
2164  
2165  
2166  
2167  
2168  
2169  
2170  
2171  
2172  
2173  
2174  
2175  
2176  
2177  
2178  
2179  
2180  
2181  
2182  
2183  
2184  
2185  
2186  
2

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PLAINTIFFS HAVE NOT ESTABLISHED STANDING FOR CLAIMS 1, 2, AND 4. ....	1
II.	CLAIMS 2 AND 3 ARE BARRED BY THE DOCTRINE OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL. ....	2
III.	THE VER DETERMINATION DOES NOT TRIGGER COMPLIANCE WITH NEPA OR THE NHPA (CLAIMS 1 AND 2). ....	3
A.	The VER determination is not an approval or a license.....	4
B.	The VER determination is a nondiscretionary act that does not trigger NEPA or the NHPA. ....	7
IV.	ASSUMING IT WAS TRIGGERED, USFS PROPERLY APPLIED § 800.13(B)(3) (CLAIM 3). ....	9
V.	USFS'S DETERMINATION THAT EFR'S MINE CLAIMS HAVE VER IS NOT ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS (CLAIM 4). ....	12
VI.	CONCLUSION .....	15

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

## Cases

<i>Alaska v. Thorson</i> , 83 IBLA 237 (1984).....	4
<i>Ass’n of Pacific Fisheries v. EPA</i> , 615 F.2d 794 (9th Cir. 1980).....	9
<i>Best v. Humboldt Placer Mining Co.</i> , 371 U.S. 334 (1963).....	5, 7
<i>Bowen v. Georgetown Univ. Hosp.</i> , 488 U.S. 204 (1988).....	4
<i>Cameron v. United States</i> , 252 U.S. 450, 459-60 (1920).....	1, 7
<i>Christensen v. Harris Cnty.</i> , 529 U.S. 576 (2000).....	11
<i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Salazar</i> , 706 F.3d 1085 (9th Cir. 2013).....	9
<i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Jewell</i> , 2014 WL 5703029 (D. Ariz. Nov. 5, 2014).....	13, 15
<i>Davis v. Fed. Election Comm’n</i> , 554 U.S. 724 (2008).....	1, 2
<i>Havasupai Tribe v. United States</i> , 752 F. Supp. 1471 (D. Ariz. 1990), <i>aff’d</i> 943 F.2d 32 (9th Cir. 1991).....	3
<i>Hjelvik v. Babbitt</i> , 198 F.2d 1072 (9th Cir. 1999).....	6, 8
<i>Hydranautics v. FilmTec Corp.</i> , 204 F.3d 880 (9th Cir. 2000).....	2, 3
<i>In re Ctr. for Biological Diversity</i> , 162 IBLA 268 (2004).....	5
<i>In re Goergen</i> , 144 IBLA 293 (1998).....	4
<i>In re Kosanke Sand Corp.</i> , 12 IBLA 282 (1973).....	6
<i>In re Sw. Res. Council</i> , 96 IBLA 105 (1987).....	6
<i>Independence Mining v. Babbitt</i> , 105 F.3d 502 (9th Cir. 1997).....	9
<i>Kosanke v. Dep’t of Interior</i> , 144 F.3d 873 (D.C. Cir. 1998).....	7
<i>Lara v. Dep’t of Interior</i> , 820 F.3d 1535 (9th Cir. 1987).....	6
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992).....	1, 2
<i>Nat’l Ass’n of Homebuilders v. EPA</i> , 551 U.S. 644 (2007).....	8, 9
<i>Sac and Fox Nation of Mo. v. Norton</i> , 240 F.3d 1250 (10th Cir. 2001).....	8
<i>Sierra Club v. Babbitt</i> , 65 F.3d 1502 (9th Cir. 1995).....	7
<i>South Dakota v. Andrus</i> , 462 F. Supp. 905 (D.S.D. 1978).....	7
<i>Summers v. Earth Island Inst.</i> , 555 U.S. 488 (2009).....	1, 2

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1	<i>Swanson, v. Babbitt</i> , 3 F.3d 1348 (9th Cir. 1993).....	1
2	<i>Te-Moak Tribe of W. Shoshone of Nev. v. Dep’t of Interior</i> ,	
3	608 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2010).....	3
4	<i>United States v. Boucher</i> , 147 IBLA 236 (1999).....	6
5	<i>United States v. Clouser</i> , 144 IBLA 110 (1998).....	14, 15
6	<i>United States v. Dwyer</i> , 175 IBLA 100 (2008).....	14, 15
7	<i>United States v. Garcia</i> , 161 IBLA 235 (2004).....	14, 15
8	<i>United States v. Highsmith</i> , 137 IBLA 262 (1997).....	14, 15
9	<i>United States v. Martinek</i> , 166 IBLA 347 (2005).....	6
10	<i>United States v. Shumway</i> , 199 F.3d 1093 (9th Cir. 1999).....	5-6
11	<i>Wilderness Soc. v. Robertson</i> , 824 F. Supp. 947 (D. Mont. 1993).....	7, 8
12	<i>Yount v. Salazar</i> , 2014 WL 4904423 (D. Ariz. Sept. 30, 2014).....	15
13	<b>Statutes</b>	
14	5 U.S.C. § 706(1).....	11
15	<b>Regulations and Federal Register Notices</b>	
16	36 C.F.R. § 800.13(b).....	9-12
17	36 C.F.R. § 800.13(b)(1).....	9-12
18	36 C.F.R. § 800.13(b)(3).....	9-12
19	36 C.F.R. § 800.13(c).....	11
20	36 C.F.R. § 800.16(y).....	7, 9
21	43 C.F.R. § 3809.100(a).....	5
22	43 C.F.R. §§ 3832.1, .11; §§ 3833.1, .11.....	4
23	40 C.F.R. § 1508.18.....	7, 9
24	77 Fed. Reg. 2563 (Jan. 18, 2012).....	4
25	64 Fed. Reg. 27,044 (May 18, 1999).....	10

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### **Other Authorities**

BLM, Instruction Memo. No. 2010-088 re Guidance on 43 C.F.R. § 3809.100(a) and its Application.....	5
BLM Mineral Examiners Handbook, H-3890-1, at V-10.....	13
BLM, Surface Management Handbook (H-3809-1), §§ 8.1.1.1 & 8.1.5.....	5
USFS, FOREST SERVICE MANUAL § 2803.5.....	5, 8
USFS, FOREST SERVICE MANUAL § 2814.11.....	1, 5, 7
USFS, FOREST SERVICE MANUAL § 2811.5.....	4, 6
USFS, FOREST SERVICE MANUAL §§ 2819, 2819.1-.2.....	7
WEBSTER’S THIRD NEW INT’L DICTIONARY (UNABRIDGED) (1986).....	9
BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY (7th ed. 1999).....	9

1 Defendant-Intervenors Energy Fuels Resources (USA) Inc. and EFR Arizona Strip  
2 LLC (together, “EFR”) hereby file their Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion  
3 for Summary Judgment (“Pl. Br.”) (Doc. 140-1) and in Support of their Motion for  
4 Summary Judgment. Per this Court’s Order, EFR coordinated its briefing with the  
5 Federal Defendants (herein after, “USFS”),<sup>1</sup> and thus, this brief incorporates the facts,  
6 statements, standards, and arguments made therein.

7 **I. Plaintiffs Have Not Established Standing for Claims 1, 2, and 4.**

8 Plaintiffs must establish standing for each claim they pursue. If they do not, the  
9 Court has no jurisdiction to resolve the claim. *Summers v. Earth Island Inst.*, 555 U.S.  
10 488, 492-93 (2009). To show standing, a plaintiff must present evidence that it has an  
11 injury in fact that is fairly traceable to the challenged action, and that likely can be  
12 redressed by a favorable decision. *Id.*; *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 561  
13 (1992) (standing must be supported by evidence consistent with the burden of proof at that  
14 stage of the case). “Standing is not dispensed in gross;” Plaintiffs must establish standing  
15 for each claim. *Davis v. Fed. Election Comm’n*, 554 U.S. 724, 734 (2008).

16 Claims 1, 2, and 4, concern USFS’s valid existing rights (“VER”) determination.  
17 Am. Compl. ¶¶ 70-83, 89-92 (Doc. 115). Plaintiffs offer five declarations to establish  
18 standing. Pl. Br. at 7. The declarants do not mention the VER determination, or anything  
19 like that process. Instead, they focus on requiring USFS to force EFR to modify its  
20 current Plan of Operations (“Plan”) for the Canyon Mine (“Mine”), or require a new plan,  
21 and the NEPA and NHPA issues related thereto. Decl. of Don Watahomigie ¶ 4 (Doc. 37-  
22 7); Decl. of Robin D. Silver ¶ 10 (Doc. 37-7); Decl. of Kim Crumbo ¶ 11 (Doc. 37-8).<sup>2</sup>

23 These declarations might support standing for claims regarding a failure to require  
24 a modification of the Plan or failure to supplement the Plan’s EIS. Such claims were filed  
25 in the Complaint (Doc. 1 ¶¶ 70-79, 99-103, & 109-113), but were dropped in the  
26 Amended Complaint. (Doc. 115). Plaintiffs have not provided any evidence of injuries in

27 <sup>1</sup> Transcript of Motion to Dismiss Hearing at 65-69 (Aug. 1, 2014) (“Tr.”) (Doc. 146-2).

28 <sup>2</sup> Mr. Tilousi’s declaration makes no mention of the VER determination, the Plan, NEPA, or the NHPA. Mr. Clark’s declaration seeks to force USFS to comply with NEPA and the NHPA, but does not identify any challenged action. (Docs. 37-7, -8).

1 fact (including procedural injuries) that are fairly traceable to the challenged action – the  
2 VER determination. *Summers*, 555 U.S. at 496 (procedural injuries must be linked to a  
3 concrete interest harmed by the challenged action). It is not enough that they may have  
4 evidence to establish standing for abandoned claims. *See Davis* and *Lujan*, *supra*.<sup>3</sup>

5 Plaintiffs also have not shown redressability. As this Court found, the VER  
6 determination (1) “does not create mineral rights, but merely confirms they already exist,”  
7 and (2) is not required by FLPMA or the Withdrawal. Motion to Dismiss (“MTD”) Order  
8 at 9-10 (Doc. 131); Preliminary Injunction (“PI”) Order at 12 (Doc. 86). In short, there  
9 are no legal consequences that flow from the VER determination. MTD Order at 10.  
10 Because of this, and because EFR’s authority to conduct mining activities stems from the  
11 Plan—not the VER determination—even if the Court were to invalidate the VER  
12 determination, it would not stop mining activities. Thus, any injuries alleged to stem from  
13 mining operations will not be redressed. Further, in its brief, USFS stated that if the VER  
14 determination were invalidated, it would or retract it, and does not plan to reissue another  
15 VER determination for the claims at the Mine. USFS Brief at 12 n.7, 27 (Doc. 146-1).<sup>4</sup>  
16 Thus, any alleged procedural injuries stemming from the VER determination would not be  
17 redressed (even assuming a relaxed redressability standard).<sup>5</sup> *Summers*, *supra*.

## 18 **II. Claims 2 and 3 are Barred by the Doctrine of Collateral Estoppel.**

19 Collateral estoppel bars re-litigation of an issue of law or fact that was litigated in a  
20 prior suit between the parties, when the issue was necessarily decided as part of the  
21 judgment. *Hydranautics v. FilmTec Corp.*, 204 F.3d 880, 885-87 (9th Cir. 2000). The  
22 sole basis for Plaintiffs’ NHPA claims is that USFS has not consulted with the Havasupai  
23 regarding Red Butte and surrounding areas or considered the impacts thereon when

24  
25 <sup>3</sup> For Claim 2, Messrs. Watahomigie and Tilousi are the only declarants identified with the  
26 Havasupai Tribe, and thus, the only declarants that could state an injury in fact with  
respect to a failure to consult with the Tribe. As noted, they have failed to do so.

27 <sup>4</sup> This decision is within the enforcement discretion under the Mining Law. *Cameron v.*  
*United States*, 252 U.S. 450, 459-60 (1920); *Swanson, v. Babbitt*, 3 F.3d 1348, 1354 (9th  
Cir. 1993); USFS, FOREST SERVICE MANUAL (“FSM”) § 2814.11 (ARDoc. 371:7284).

28 <sup>5</sup> These conclusions are not at odds with the Court’s conclusions regarding harm in the PI  
Order, as Plaintiffs suggest. Pl. Br. at 7. There, the Court was not considering the  
requirements of standing in the summary judgment context (*Lujan, supra*), or the role of  
the VER determination on continued mining and future USFS enforcement decisions.

1 approving the Plan. Pl. Br. at 25-40. That is not true. As reflected in *Havasupai Tribe v.*  
2 *United States*, USFS undertook a comprehensive environmental and cultural review of the  
3 Plan. This included consultation with the Havasupai and consideration of their religious  
4 and cultural concerns related to Red Butte and the surrounding areas. 752 F. Supp. 1471,  
5 1486-88, 1495-1500 (D. Ariz. 1990). This is confirmed by the record, and Mr. Tilousi.  
6 Record of Decision at 4, 8-12 (ARDoc. 6:919, 923-28) (USFS considered the Havasupai's  
7 concerns at Red Butte and the surrounding areas, and modified the Plan to mitigate  
8 impacts therefrom); Tilousi Decl. ¶ 3 (Doc. 37-7). These facts and actions were litigated  
9 and decided in *Havasupai*, and upheld on appeal, 943 F.2d 32 (9th Cir. 1991). They are  
10 barred from relitigation in Plaintiffs' NHPA claims. *Hydranautics, supra*.<sup>6</sup>

### 11 **III. The VER Determination Does Not Trigger Compliance with NEPA or the** 12 **NHPA (Claims 1 and 2).**

13 Plaintiffs argue that NEPA and NHPA were triggered because the VER  
14 determination acted as a required approval or license for EFR to resume mining at the  
15 Mine. Pl. Br. at 15-22, 28-31. That argument stems from the assertion that the  
16 Withdrawal automatically prohibited all mining within the withdrawn area, invalidated  
17 EFR's mining claims, and required USFS to perform a VER determination before EFR  
18 could resume active mining. These positions are inconsistent with the plain language of  
19 the Withdrawal, the legal effect of withdrawals and property rights regarding existing  
20 mining claims, USFS's and BLM's interpretation of the effect of withdrawals on existing,  
21 permitted mines, and the purposes of conducting VER determinations. In short, the  
22 Withdrawal only prohibited the location and entry of new mining claims, and had no  
23 effect on EFR's existing mining claims or its ability to mine. The VER determination is  
24 an enforcement investigatory tool that has no legal effect on mining claims. This Court  
25 agreed with EFR and USFS on these points in the PI Order (at 10-12) and the MTD Order  
26 (at 9-10). Plaintiffs have not provided any reason for the Court to change its conclusions.

27  
28 <sup>6</sup> See also *Te-Moak Tribe of W. Shoshone of Nev. v. Dep't of Interior*, 608 F.3d 592, 609-  
10 (9th Cir. 2010) (prior consultation satisfied current NHPA responsibility as long as  
tribe was given sufficient opportunity to identify its concerns). The Havasupai stated that  
it was given such an opportunity. Havasupai Reply to Responsive Statement at 4 (Feb.  
18, 1987) (ARDoc. 50:1754).

1           **A.     The VER determination is not an approval or a license.**

2           The Withdrawal states that subject to valid existing rights, certain public lands are  
3           “withdrawn from location and entry under the Mining Law of 1872.” 77 Fed. Reg. 2563,  
4           2563 (Jan. 18, 2012). The Withdrawal says nothing about automatically invalidating  
5           previously-located and entered mining claims, mandating VER determinations, or  
6           prohibiting mining. Instead, it is prospective, and forbids only the “location and entry”<sup>7</sup>  
7           of new claims under the Mining Law. It does not address any other aspects of mining, or  
8           render the withdrawal area “unavailable for mining.” Pl. Br. at 16. Withdrawals have  
9           long been interpreted as such. *See, e.g., In re Goergen*, 144 IBLA 293, 297 (1998);  
10          *Alaska v. Thorson*, 83 IBLA 237, 250 (1984) (“where land is withdrawn subject to valid  
11          existing rights or claims, the right or claim is not extinguished, and the withdrawal takes  
12          effect as to lands covered by such entries only upon their termination.”).<sup>8</sup> The prospective  
13          nature of withdrawals makes sense, as FLPMA does not provide the Interior Secretary  
14          authority to promulgate retroactive rules or invalidate rights under the Mining Law.  
15          *Bowen v. Georgetown Univ. Hosp.*, 488 U.S. 204, 208 (1988). The Withdrawal is  
16          consistent with *Bowen* by including FLPMA’s required language that it is subject to valid  
17          existing rights (not that it *prohibits or invalidates* valid existing rights unless USFS  
18          provides additional approvals, as Plaintiffs suggest).

19          BLM and USFS have interpreted the Withdrawal (and withdrawals generally)  
20          consistent with the discussion above. BLM and USFS assumed that mining at existing,  
21          permitted mines, including the Mine, would go forward despite the Withdrawal. PI Order  
22          at 3. Consistently, USFS and BLM never interpreted withdrawals as automatically  
23          invalidating claims, prohibiting previously approved mining, or requiring a VER  
24

---

25          <sup>7</sup> “Location and entry” is a term of art representing the two separate requirements of  
26          establishing a valid mining claim with BLM: (1) physically locating the claim on public  
27          land by staking the corners and posting notice thereof, and (2) entering the claim by filing  
28          it with BLM. 43 C.F.R. §§ 3832.1, .11; §§ 3833.1, .11; *see* FSM § 2811.5 (ARDoc.  
371:7279) (by performing the location and entry steps, the miner “obtains a valid mining  
claim”). Validity in this context means the establishment of a claim that triggers protected  
property rights recognized under the Mining Law that allow the miner to mine the claim  
until proven invalid by BLM in a claim contest. *See infra* discussion at 5-6 & n.9.

<sup>8</sup> The “subject to” in “subject to valid existing rights” means subordinate to or subservient  
to, contrary to Plaintiffs’ assertions. *Alaska*, 83 IBLA at 243.

1 determination for all claims. BLM and USFS have drawn a different line. BLM  
2 regulations provide that within a withdrawn area, VER determinations are required only  
3 when a miner seeks a *new* plan of operations (or material modification of an existing  
4 plan). 43 C.F.R. § 3809.100(a). BLM’s interpretation of the regulation states:

5 *[A]pproved Plans of Operations* that were in place prior to the withdrawal  
6 or segregation date *are not subject to the mandatory valid existing rights*  
7 *determination procedures at 43 CFR § 3809.100(a). These operations may*  
*continue as accepted or approved and do not require a validity examination*  
*unless or until there is a material change in the activity.*

8 BLM, Surface Management Handbook (H-3809-1), § 8.1.5 (emphasis added) (ARDoc.  
9 591:11602); PI Order at 11 n.2 (relying on same and citing § 8.1.1.1 (ARDoc. 591:11600)  
10 for the point that claims with approved plans are exempt from § 3809.100(a)’s VER  
11 determination requirements). Thus, BLM interprets the Withdrawal as *not* impacting any  
12 rights and claims held by an existing mine with an approved plan, or compelling a VER  
13 determination in order to operate under an approved plan in a withdrawn area—as is the  
14 case at the Mine. USFS’s policy tracks § 3809.100(a) and BLM’s interpretation of it and  
15 states that USFS will not “allow” (*i.e.*, approve a new plan of operations or material  
16 change to an existing plan) without ensuring the claims have VER. FSM § 2803.5; *see* PI  
17 Order at 11 n.2 (noting 2803.5, and USFS’s policy to act consistently with BLM); Decl. of  
18 Michael Linden ¶¶ 5-11 (Doc. 53-2) (same). USFS’s policy tracking BLM’s is  
19 unsurprising; BLM is the agency charged with administering the Mining Law: USFS  
20 implements it by agreement with BLM. FSM § 2814.11 (ARDoc. 371;7284).

21 As further evidence that withdrawals do not automatically invalidate claims and  
22 mandate VER determinations, USFS policy tracks federal case law and Department of  
23 Interior decisions holding that properly-located and entered mining claims are recognized  
24 property interests that vest the holder with the full right to develop and mine the claims  
25 unless and until the claims are invalidated through notice and a contest hearing (*i.e.*, Fifth  
26 Amendment due process), even in the face of a withdrawal. *Compare Best v. Humboldt*  
27 *Placer Mining Co.*, 371 U.S. 334, 335-38 (1963); *United States v. Shumway*, 199 F.3d

28 <sup>9</sup> BLM’s interpretation of the Withdrawal’s preceding Segregation Order is consistent  
with that position. BLM, Instruction Memo. No. 2010-088 re Guidance on 43 C.F.R. §  
3809.100(a) and its Application (Doc. 60-1 at 31).

1 1093, 1099-1100 (9th Cir. 1999); *United States v. Martinek*, 166 IBLA 347, 351-53  
2 (2005) *In re Ctr. for Biological Diversity*, 162 IBLA 268, 281 (2004); *In re Sw. Res.*  
3 *Council*, 96 IBLA 105, 118 (1987) with FSM 2811.5 (“A mining claim may lack the  
4 elements of validity and be invalid in fact, but it must be recognized as a claim until it has  
5 been finally declared invalid by the Department of the Interior or Federal courts.”)  
6 (ARDoc. 371:7280);<sup>10</sup> Linden Decl. ¶¶ 10-11 (Doc. 53-2); PI Order at 10 (following FSM  
7 § 2811.5). Absent from these authorities are statements that withdrawals render claims  
8 automatically invalid and mandate VER determinations.<sup>11</sup>

9 Plaintiffs’ also assert that a withdrawal triggers an entirely new regulatory approval  
10 regime, Pl. Br. at 20-22, yet they cite no regulations, guidance, or legal authority for that  
11 proposition. One would assume that if withdrawals carried such immediate, severe  
12 impacts and mandates, Congress, BLM, or USFS would have promulgated rules or  
13 guidance regarding them. They have not. Instead, Plaintiffs’ cited cases support EFR’s  
14 and USFS’s position. For example, in *U.S. v. Boucher*, IBLA merely reiterates that a  
15 withdrawal removed public land from “location and entry”– that is, permission to prospect  
16 for new claims. 147 IBLA 236, 243 (1999); see *Kosanke v. Dep’t of Interior*, 144 F.3d  
17 873, 874 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (claims located and attempted to be entered five months *after* a  
18 withdrawal were not valid). These cases say nothing about automatic invalidation of all  
19 existing claims, mandatory VER determinations, or new regulatory approval regimes.<sup>12</sup>

---

21 <sup>10</sup> This recognition reflects a general issue of timing regarding claim validity. While no  
22 claim is fully valid unless there has been a discovery of valuable minerals, that fact rarely  
23 is known upon the location and entry of a claim. Nevertheless, consistent with the Mining  
24 Law’s intent to promote mining, BLM and the courts have concluded that the proper  
location and entry of a claim provides miners protected property rights to use and mine  
the claim up and until BLM determines through a claim contest that the claim is not valid  
(in this sense, full validity is assumed until proven otherwise).

25 <sup>11</sup> Perhaps the point is a simple one, but if Plaintiffs were correct that a withdrawal  
automatically invalidated claims, there would be no need for claim contests in withdrawn  
areas. Yet, the IBLA reporter is replete with these cases. See *Martinek*, *supra*.

26 <sup>12</sup> Plaintiffs’ citation to *Hjelvik v. Babbitt*, 198 F.2d 1072, 1074 (9th Cir. 1999) and *Lara*  
27 *v. Dep’t of Interior*, 820 F.3d 1535, 1542 (9th Cir. 1987) for the proposition that a VER  
28 determination is required for all mines in a withdrawal area is even more off-base. The  
“at the time of the withdrawal” language in those cases simply refers to the fact that in  
order to establish VER – whenever the mineral exam is conducted – the miner must show  
that it made a discovery of valuable minerals prior to the withdrawal date. That is  
consistent with *Boucher* and *Kosanke*. See Mineral Exam at 5 (ARDoc. 525:10487) (the  
exam in this case, done in 2012, properly used the segregation date and the review date).

1 Notwithstanding the forgoing, BLM and USFS are tasked with enforcing the  
2 Mining Law, and retain the discretion to perform a VER determination for any claim at  
3 any time for any reason. *Cameron*, 252 U.S. at 459-60 (1920); FSM § 2814.11 (ARDoc.  
4 371:7284). If a VER determination suggests that claims may be invalid, BLM and USFS  
5 must initiate a claim contest in order to invalidate them. *Best*, 371 U.S. at 335-37; FSM §  
6 2819 (ARDoc. 371:7310-13). “No adjudicative power has been given to [USFS],”  
7 however. FSM § 2819. For claims on USFS-managed land, if, following a VER  
8 determination, USFS believes claims do not possess VER, it must request that BLM  
9 review and contest them. FSM §§ 2814.11, 2819.1-.2; Linden Decl. ¶ 10 (Doc. 53-2).

10 Under this scheme, the role of the VER determination is easily understood. It is an  
11 investigatory tool used by BLM and USFS when performing enforcement under the  
12 Mining Law. It assists them in determining whether rights created by Congress have  
13 come into existence. Depending on the outcome of the determination, they decide  
14 whether to bring a contest claim (with the VER determination used as evidence). PI Order  
15 at 11-12. Thus, VER determination “statements about validity are statements of belief  
16 and not formal determinations.” *Id.* at 10 (quoting FSM § 2819); *see* Linden Decl ¶ 10.

17 Based on the forgoing, the Court found that VER determinations do not create  
18 mineral rights, but merely confirm whether they exist, are not required by law or the  
19 Withdrawal, and have no legal effects. MTD Order at 9-10; PI Order at 12. Therefore,  
20 the VER determination is not an approval or a license, and thus, is not a NEPA major  
21 Federal action or an NHPA undertaking. 36 C.F.R. § 800.16(y); 40 C.F.R. § 1508.18.

22 **B. The VER determination is a nondiscretionary act that does not trigger**  
23 **NEPA or the NHPA.**

24 Courts have long held that VER determinations do not trigger compliance with  
25 NEPA because they are nondiscretionary, ministerial acts. *Wilderness Soc. v. Robertson*,  
26 824 F. Supp. 947, 953 (D. Mont. 1993); *South Dakota v. Andrus*, 462 F. Supp. 905, 906-  
27 07 (D.S.D. 1978); *In re Kosanke Sand Corp.*, 12 IBLA 282, 286-99 (1973); *see Sierra*  
28 *Club v. Babbitt*, 65 F.3d 1502, 1512 (9th Cir. 1995) (nondiscretionary or ministerial

1 actions do not trigger NEPA). The same is true under the NHPA. *See Sac and Fox*  
2 *Nation of Mo. v. Norton*, 240 F.3d 1250, 1262-63 (10th Cir. 2001).<sup>13</sup>

3 VER determinations are nondiscretionary because when conducting a VER  
4 determination USFS is not approving or denying a privilege (such as a permit), but is  
5 verifying only “whether rights conferred by Congress [under the Mining Law] have come  
6 into existence.” *Wilderness Soc.*, 824 F. Supp. at 953; PI Order at 12. To make this  
7 verification, USFS determines whether there has been a discovery of a valuable mineral  
8 deposit under the prudent person and marketability tests. *Hjelvik*, 198 F.3d at 1074; FSM  
9 § 2811.5 (ARDoc. 371: 7279). Because a miner cannot mine without an approved plan,  
10 this test necessarily and specifically considers the miner’s reasonably foreseeable costs of  
11 implementing an approved mine plan, including reasonably foreseeable costs of  
12 compliance with environmental laws associated with implementing the approved plan.  
13 The test does not include an additional layer of environmental or cultural review as part of  
14 the validation process to determine whether additional changes to the approved plan  
15 should be made (or other changes or mitigation required in some other fashion) under  
16 FLPMA or other environmental laws. Doing so would be adding new requirements for  
17 the establishment of mining claims to those Congress established in the Mining Law.  
18 USFS has no authority to do that in a VER determination. *Nat’l Ass’n of Homebuilders v.*  
19 *EPA*, 551 U.S. 644, 668-73 (2007) (“*NAHB*”) (agencies have no authority to add or  
20 subtract from Congressionally established criteria that give rights (*e.g.*, adding  
21 environmental consultation requirements); their duty is nondiscretionary and ministerial;  
22 in such circumstances, agencies have no power to act on any additional information such  
23 environmental consultation might yield in concluding whether the Congressional right is  
24 established). Without the discretion or authority to act on any additional information  
25 NEPA or NHPA may yield, or otherwise withhold a Congressionally provided right,  
26 Plaintiffs’ claim of discretion in the VER process fails.

27 Plaintiffs also argue that USFS has discretion in gathering and evaluating costs and  
28

---

<sup>13</sup> Contrary to their summary judgment brief, at the Motion to Dismiss hearing, Plaintiffs asserted that VER determinations are nondiscretionary, and urged the Court to follow *Wilderness Society*. Tr. at 53 (Doc.146-2). EFR agrees.

1 whether VER exists, the VER decision is discretionary. Pl. Br. at 24.<sup>14</sup> That argument  
2 was rejected in *NAHB*. 551 U.S. at 671 (discretion in gathering and evaluating a statutory  
3 test does not create discretion to add criteria to that test).<sup>15</sup>

4 Beyond the issue of discretion, the VER determination also does not trigger NEPA  
5 or the NHPA because, as discussed above, a VER determination is an investigatory tool  
6 that is part of a potential enforcement action (*i.e.*, a claim contest). Enforcement actions  
7 are excluded from the definition of major Federal action, and also do not meet the  
8 definition of undertaking. 36 C.F.R. § 800.16(y); 40 C.F.R. § 1508.18.

9 **IV. Assuming it was Triggered, USFS Properly Applied § 800.13(b)(3) (Claim 3).**

10 For the NHPA's post-review discovery obligations in 36 C.F.R. § 800.13(b) to be  
11 triggered, there must be a discovery of an historic property potentially impacted by a  
12 previously-approved project, or unanticipated effects to a historic property. Neither of  
13 these triggers is met here. The term "discovery" is not defined in the regulations. Its  
14 common meaning is "the act, process, or an instance of gaining knowledge or ascertaining  
15 the existence of something previously unknown or unrecognized."<sup>16</sup> The existence of and  
16 characteristics that make Red Butte eligible for a TCP designation long have been known  
17 to all parties involved. Mine Review at 7-24 (ARDoc. 533:10600-17). Assigning a  
18 different legal status (TCP) in 2010 to Red Butte does not make known anything new  
19 about Red Butte. The context of § 800.13(b) makes clear that the regulation is focused on  
20 finding new facts, not new legal labels, and identifying reasonable steps to mitigate  
21 adverse effects that a previously-approved action actually may have on a property. The

22 <sup>14</sup> Assuming gathering costs and performing the test involved some discretion, the amount  
23 would be minimal. USFS gathers the costs of operations under the approved plan  
24 applying BLM guidance, calculates the metal price based on BLM guidance, and inserts  
25 the information into a computer program. Mineral Exam at 17-23 (ARDoc. 525:10499-  
505). The activity is ministerial and similar to BLM's calculation of a reclamation bond,  
which also involves the evaluation of costs under an existing plan, and does not trigger  
NEPA. *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Salazar*, 706 F.3d 1085, 1096 (9th Cir. 2013).

26 <sup>15</sup> Plaintiffs' reliance on *Independence Mining v. Babbitt*, 105 F.3d 502, 509 (9th Cir.  
1997), is misplaced. There, the court only noted what has been discussed here: BLM has  
27 minimal discretion in gathering and evaluating information related to performing a the  
nondiscretionary statutory test. Plaintiffs' reliance on *Ass'n of Pacific Fisheries v. EPA*,  
28 615 F.2d 794, 805 (9th Cir. 1980), also is misplaced. That case is about EPA discretion in  
cost and benefit analyses regarding Clean Water Act control technologies.

<sup>16</sup> WEBSTER'S THIRD NEW INT'L DICTIONARY (UNABRIDGED) 647 (1986); *see also*  
BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 478 (7th ed. 1999) (same definition).

1 designation of the Red Butte area as a TCP is not a discovery under 800.13(b). For the  
2 same reasons, it cannot be said that operations at the Mine have created “unanticipated  
3 effects” on the area. The Mine was authorized under the Plan long before the TCP  
4 designation, and USFS considered and mitigated possible effects therefrom in the  
5 approved Plan after consultation with the Havasupai. USFS cannot be said to have erred  
6 in applying § 800.13(b)(3), when the entire subsection had not been triggered.

7 Assuming § 800.13(b) was triggered, USFS did not err in applying § 800.13(b)(3),  
8 instead of § 800.13(b)(1), as Plaintiffs argue. Pl. Br. at 34-39. The Court addressed and  
9 rejected this argument in the PI Order, and should do so again. PI Order 14-17. As the  
10 Court found, § 800.13(b)(1) applies when there has been an approved undertaking and  
11 construction has not commenced, and § 800.13(b)(3) applies when there has been an  
12 approved undertaking and construction has commenced. *Id.* at 14. Here, the relevant  
13 undertaking was USFS’s approval of the Plan. *Id.* at 15. The only question is whether  
14 “construction has commenced.” Because construction at the Mine had commenced in the  
15 past, the Court found that USFS reasonably determined, based on its plain terms, that §  
16 800.13(b)(3) applied to this case. *Id.* at 15-17.

17 To make their case, Plaintiffs urge the Court to overlook the facts and terms of §  
18 800.13(b)(3), and focus on the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s (“ACHP”)  
19 alleged intent behind that section, which they claim is focused on applying only to  
20 ongoing construction. Pl. Br. at 34-35 (claiming this intent is found in preambles to prior  
21 iterations of ACHP’s regulations, and in the preamble to the current regulations). What is  
22 clear from these sources is that, when promulgating the current regulations, ACHP  
23 focused on ensuring the clear distinction between construction commencement and non-  
24 commencement in §§ 800.13(b)(1) and (3). According to ACHP, this distinction provides  
25 the flexibility to complete full consultation under (b)(1) when construction has not started.  
26 Contrary to Plaintiffs’ suggestion, the preamble does not address whether construction is  
27 ongoing (or has stopped and restarted), and does not reference an alleged intent from prior  
28 rules. 64 Fed. Reg. 27,044, 27,058, 27,068 (May 18, 1999).

1 Plaintiffs also again urge the Court to look to ACHP’s alleged interpretation of §§  
2 800.13(b)(1) and (3) in letters to USFS, and ask the Court to afford “substantial  
3 deference” thereto. The Court reviewed and rejected these arguments, finding that  
4 800.13(b) was not ambiguous, and that 800.13(b)(3) plainly applies where “construction  
5 has commenced” and (b)(1) where “construction has not commenced.” PI Order at 16.  
6 Contrary to Plaintiffs’ and ACHP’s assertions, the regulations do not contain the word  
7 recommence, or require construction to be ongoing for 800.13(b)(3) to apply. *Id.* The  
8 Court rejected any deference to ACHP’s alleged interpretations because 1) the regulation  
9 was not ambiguous, and 2) its interpretation otherwise was at odds with its plain language.  
10 *Id.* To give ACHP deference would impermissibly allow it ““to create a *de facto* new  
11 regulation.”” *Id.* (citing *Christensen v. Harris Cnty.*, 529 U.S. 576, 587-88 (2000)).  
12 Plaintiffs have not given the Court any reason to revisit these conclusions.

13 Plaintiffs also argue that § 800.13(b)(3) should not apply because USFS has not  
14 “approved the undertaking” at issue, and therefore, full consultation is required. Pl. Br. at  
15 36. For the first time, Plaintiffs claim the relevant undertaking with respect to Claim 3 is  
16 the *VER determination*, and not the approval of the Plan. That is inconsistent with the  
17 Amended Complaint, which identifies the approved undertaking as the approval of the  
18 Plan. Am. Compl. ¶ 85 (Doc. 115).<sup>17</sup> Plaintiffs also suggest that § 800.13(b) does not  
19 apply because that section applies to historic properties found after consultation was  
20 completed and, because USFS never completed consultation with respect to Red Butte,  
21 none of § 800.13(b) applies. Pl. Br. at 37. That also is at odds with the Amended  
22 Complaint, that states that consultation was completed, and that Claim 3 focuses on duties  
23 under §800.13(b) in light of the Red Butte TCP designation. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 85-86 (Doc.  
24 115). Plaintiffs cannot amend their claim at this late date in their brief.

25 Finally, Plaintiffs change the focus of their claim to whether USFS completed  
26 consultation under § 800.13(b)(3) properly. Pl. Br. at 37-39. This claim is well outside  
27 the Amended Complaint. Claim 3 is limited to a 5 U.S.C. § 706(1) claim that USFS  
28 withheld and delayed consultation under 36 C.F.R. § 800.13(b)(1) & (c), and contains no

---

<sup>17</sup> In any event, that claim is presented in Plaintiffs’ Claim 2.

1 allegations regarding USFS's application of § 800.13(b)(3). Am. Compl. ¶ 88 (Doc. 115).  
2 The Court should reject this line of argument out of hand.

3 In any event, Plaintiffs argue that USFS failed to meet § 800.13(b)(3)'s time lines  
4 and purposely evaded full consultation under NHPA. That is not true. The record makes  
5 clear, as the Court acknowledged, USFS properly implemented § 800.13(b)(3). PI Order  
6 at 15. It notified the Havasupai and others of its assessment of the situation and its plan of  
7 action, consistent with the regulation. *Id.*<sup>18</sup> Given that this case did not involve an actual  
8 discovery of an historic property (such as coming across an artifact with a bulldozer), but  
9 rather the change of a known area's legal status, the 48-hour timing mechanisms were not  
10 perfectly fitted to the occasion, as the Court noted. *Id.* Therefore, USFS gave the Tribe  
11 far more time and process than 800.13(b)(3) required (30 days to respond instead of 48  
12 hours).<sup>19</sup> Thereafter, USFS worked for months trying to complete a memorandum of  
13 agreement, despite § 800.13(b)(3) containing no requirement to do so. Williams Ltr.  
14 (ARDoc. 579:11394-95); Email from M. Hangan, USFS, to K. Harris (Jan. 18, 2013)  
15 (ARDoc. 651:12320); *see* 36 C.F.R. § 800.13(b)(3) (agencies only must "make reasonable  
16 efforts to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects" to historic properties through  
17 "appropriate actions."). In light of this lawsuit, USFS concluded that an agreement was  
18 unlikely, and that a voluntary arrangement with EFR was an appropriate path forward.  
19 ARDoc. 668: 12394-95; Hangan Decl. ¶¶ 2-10 (Doc. 53-4). Plaintiffs' claim that USFS  
20 attempted to avoid compliance with the NHPA is baseless.

21 **V. USFS's Determination that EFR's Mine Claims Have VER Is Not Arbitrary**  
22 **and Capricious (Claim 4).**

23 Plaintiffs argue that USFS failed to consider certain costs when it determined that  
24 EFR's mining claims had VER. Pl. Br. at 11-15. These costs are related to: (1)  
25 radionuclide and water monitoring; (2) mitigation related to potential radionuclide

26 <sup>18</sup> Plaintiffs argue that USFS waited a year to tell them EFR's plan to resume active  
27 mining. Pl. Br. at 38. That is not so. ARDocs. 448-50, 464 (USFS immediately began  
contacting tribes and the SHPO to discuss the resumption of mining and Red Butte).

28 <sup>19</sup> Plaintiffs' complaint about USFS's implementation of § 800.13(b)(3) is confounding.  
They admit the 48-hour time periods therein are for the protection of operators and their  
projects. Pl. Br. at 38 n.25. Apparently, Plaintiffs would have been happy to have had just  
two days to review the circumstances, gather their thoughts, and relay them to USFS.

1 contamination; (3) compliance with the NHPA; and, (4) implementing wildlife  
2 conservation measures. Plaintiffs are mistaken. EFR provided USFS costs to implement  
3 its Plan and operate in compliance with applicable laws, which included the costs  
4 Plaintiffs reference. The Court’s review of the VER determination is highly deferential;  
5 USFS’s action is presumed valid, and must be affirmed if a reasonable basis exists for it.  
6 *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Jewell*, 2014 WL 5703029, at \*5 (D. Ariz. Nov. 5, 2014).

7 EFR submitted comprehensive capital and operating cost information regarding the  
8 development and operation of the Mine under the Plan, in compliance with law. Ltr. from  
9 D. Rykman, EFR, to M. Linden, USFS (ARDoc. 670:12426). Consistent with guidance,<sup>20</sup>  
10 USFS independently verified these data and inserted them into a “well-accepted”  
11 computer program, known as APEX, “specifically designed for the economic evaluation  
12 of mining projects.” Mineral Exam at 18, 22 (ARDoc. 525:10500, 10504-05). Using  
13 APEX, USFS determined that after all costs and taxes were considered, the net sum of  
14 cash flow at the Mine –i.e., the profit–was \$29,350,736. *Id.* at 23 (ARDoc. 525; 10505).  
15 That results in an internal rate of return (“IROR”) of 78%, which is 6.5 times greater than  
16 the USFS conservatively estimated minimum mining industry IROR of 12%. *Id.* In short,  
17 the Mine is very profitable. Based on USFS’s calculations, the Mine likely could  
18 withstand a drastic increase in costs (or decrease in uranium price) and remain  
19 profitable.<sup>21</sup> Plaintiffs do not disagree with these conclusions, except to make the  
20 unsupported statement that the Mine has a “slim profit margin.” Pl. Br. at 15.

21 With respect to the cost of implementing the Plan in compliance with law, USFS  
22 considered: mining and site general and administrative (“G&A”) costs (i.e., the cost  
23 operating under the Plan at \$110.42/ton, which is \$9,298,136.94; indirect operating costs  
24 at \$3,078,607.92 (\$36.56/ton) (which includes costs for permitting and land related  
25 issues); capital costs related to required surface facilities at \$508,000; capital costs of  
26 permitting and engineering at \$218,000; and, reclamation costs at \$450,000. In addition, a

27  
28 <sup>20</sup> BLM Mineral Examiners Handbook, H-3890-1, at V-10 (ARDoc. 374:7436).

<sup>21</sup> USFS ran a sensitivity analysis using a price per pound fourteen dollars less than the amount used for the standard analysis and concluded the Mine would remain very profitable with an IROR of 36%. *Id.* at 23 (ARDoc. 525:10505).

1 contingency of \$1.7 million was included. Mineral Exam at 17-20 (ARDoc. 525:10499-  
2 502). These costs total \$15,252,744.86. Plaintiffs do not disagree with these costs.

3 Plaintiffs assert that USFS failed to include costs in the four categories noted  
4 above. Regarding monitoring and wildlife conservation measures (categories 1 and 4),  
5 these costs were included. Decl. of Harold Roberts ¶¶ 8-9 (Ex. 1). Costs related to the  
6 construction of the monitoring well and powerlines were excluded as sunk costs, because  
7 they were built before the VER determination. *Id.* ¶ 12; Mineral Exam at 18 (ARDoc.  
8 525:10500). The powerlines were made with crossarms, insulators, and adequate spacing  
9 so that condors<sup>22</sup> or other birds could not be harmed. Roberts Decl. ¶ 12.<sup>23</sup> Further, filled  
10 trucks on the haul roads will be covered to prevent leakage or wildlife access. *Id.* ¶ 13.  
11 Assuming monitoring and conservation costs were not accounted for, they were calculated  
12 in the EIS at a total of \$131,060. (ARDoc. 3:538). At triple that amount (\$393,180),  
13 overly accounting for inflation, those costs are well within the \$1.7 million contingency.

14 Regarding potential radionuclide contamination (category 2), Plaintiffs assert that  
15 monitoring will invalidate assumptions about regional groundwater and impacts thereto  
16 from the Mine, and in turn, USFS will require EFR to modify its Plan to incorporate new  
17 mitigation measures. Pl. Br. at 13. These assertions have no basis in fact or the record,  
18 and are speculation about the future. As of the dates considered in the Mineral Exam (the  
19 segregation date (July 21, 2009), and the exam date (April 17, 2012)), such measures were  
20 not required, and were not (and still are not) reasonably foreseeable. Mineral Exam at 5  
21 (ARDoc. 525:10487). USFS is not required to speculate as to unknown, and potential  
22 future costs when preparing a mineral exam. *U.S. v. Dwyer*, 175 IBLA 100, 118 (2008);  
23 *U.S. v. Garcia*, 161 IBLA 235, 257 (2004); *U.S. v. Clouser*, 144 IBLA 110, 130 (1998);  
24 *U.S. v. Highsmith*, 137 IBLA 262, 278 (1997); *see* Linden Decl. ¶ 12 (Doc. 53-2).

25  
26 <sup>22</sup> The Arizona condor population is “nonessential and experimental.” Therefore, USFS  
27 rightly concluded only to make recommendations to EFR regarding the condor. Mine  
28 Review at 26-27 (ARDoc. 533:10619-20). These recommendations post-date the VER  
determination, and thus, could not have been considered. Nevertheless, any costs would  
be covered by the contingency. Roberts Decl. ¶ 10.

<sup>23</sup> Plaintiffs’ reference to mitigation measures in ARDocs. 582 and 628 post-date the VER  
determination, and could not have been considered by USFS. Pl. Br. at 14. Regardless,  
the cost of replacing foraging habit was included as wildlife conservation, as noted.

1 Plaintiffs' citation to the 2010 USGS report does not support their position. That is  
2 natural background/baseline information (*i.e.*, prior to mining) about the Mine. It has  
3 been known to USFS since at least 2010, and has not compelled changes to EFR's Plan.  
4 Mine Review at 31 (ARDoc. 533:10624). Further, in the Withdrawal EIS, BLM and  
5 USFS concluded there was "a low probability of groundwater contamination from  
6 uranium mining," and that they needed additional sampling to make conclusions regarding  
7 such impacts. *Yount v. Salazar*, 2014 WL 4904423, at \*15-17 (D. Ariz. Sept. 30, 2014).

8 Regarding NHPA compliance (category 3), Plaintiffs assert that someday "serious  
9 measures" to minimize impacts to Red Butte will be required. Pl. Br. at 14. This also is  
10 speculation as to what, if any, measures might be put in place. Any additional mitigation  
11 measures regarding Red Butte have not been required and were not (and still are not)  
12 reasonably foreseeable as of the date of the Mineral Exam. *See Dwyer* and related cases,  
13 *supra*. Despite this, potential future costs related to these issues that are not covered as  
14 indirect costs, would be covered by the contingency. Roberts Decl. ¶ 11.

15 USFS performed a comprehensive cost analysis of EFR's claims. This accounted  
16 for all known and reasonably foreseeable costs related to the operation of the Mine under  
17 the Plan and applicable environmental laws, and provided a contingency for unexpected  
18 costs. Based on these conservative estimates, the Mine was well above the threshold for  
19 establishing VER. USFS did not entirely fail to consider an important part of the  
20 problem, and a reasonable basis exists for its decision. *Jewell*, 2014 WL 5703029, at \*5.

## 21 **VI. Conclusion**

22 For the forgoing reasons, EFR's and USFS's Motions for Summary Judgment  
23 should be granted, and Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment should be denied.

24 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 19th day of November, 2014.

25 GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A. and  
26 HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

27 By: /s/ David J. DePippo

28 Michael K. Kennedy (Bar No. 004224)  
Bradley J. Glass (Bar No. 022463)  
GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A.  
2575 East Camelback Road

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225  
Telephone: (602) 530-8000  
Facsimile: (602) 530-8500  
mkk@gknet.com  
brad.glass@gknet.com

David J. DePippo (Ariz. Bar 028428)  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
Riverfront Plaza, East Tower  
951 E. Byrd Street  
Richmond, Virginia 23219  
Telephone: (804) 788-7304  
Facsimile: (804) 788-8212  
ddepippo@hunton.com

*Attorneys for Defendant-Intervenors  
Energy Fuels Resources (USA) Inc. and  
EFR Arizona Strip LLC*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 19th day of November, 2014, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to Clerk's to all CM/ECF registrants in this case.

By: /s/ David J. DePippo