

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 No. 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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
PRESCOTT DIVISION

Grand Canyon Trust, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs,
v.
Michael Williams, Forest Supervisor, Kaibab
National Forest, *et al.*,
Defendants,
Energy Fuels Resources (USA) Inc., *et al.*,
Defendant-Intervenors.

No. CV13-08045 PCT-DGC

**REPLY MEMORANDUM IN
SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT-
INTERVENORS' MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

(Assigned to The Honorable
David G. Campbell)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	THE VER DETERMINATION DOES NOT TRIGGER NEPA OR NHPA (CLAIMS 1 & 2).	1
A.	The VER Determination is not an approval or a license.	1
B.	The VER Determination is a nondiscretionary act.	4
II.	ASSUMING IT WAS TRIGGERED, USFS PROPERLY APPLIED § 800.13(B)(3) (CLAIM 3).	5
III.	USFS'S VER DETERMINATION IS NOT ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS (CLAIM 4).	6
IV.	PLAINTIFFS HAVE NOT ESTABLISHED STANDING FOR CLAIMS 1, 2, AND 4.	7
V.	CLAIMS 2 AND 3 ARE BARRED BY COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL.	8
VI.	AN INJUNCTION IS NOT APPROPRIATE; BRIEFING ON REMEDY SHOULD BE ALLOWED.	9
VII.	CONCLUSION	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Alaska v. Thorson</i> , 83 IBLA 237 (1984).....	1, 2
<i>Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. USDA</i> , 772 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2014).....	8
<i>Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. v. Babbitt</i> , 1994 WL 836324 (D. Nev. 1994).....	4
<i>Cal. Wilderness Coal. v. Dep’t of Energy</i> , 631 F.3d 1072 (9th Cir. 2011).....	7
<i>Cameron v. United States</i> , 252 U.S. 450, 459-60 (1920).....	2
<i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. NHSTA</i> , 538 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2008).....	4
<i>Common Sense Salmon Recovery v. Evans</i> , 217 F. Supp. 2d 17, 22 (D.D.C. 2002).....	6
<i>Davis v. Nelson</i> , 329 F.2d 840 (9th Cir. 1964).....	2
<i>Friends of Payette v. Horseshoe Bend Hydroelectric Co.</i> , 988 F.2d 989 (9th Cir. 1993).....	7
<i>Havasupai Tribe v. United States</i> , 752 F. Supp. 1471 (D. Ariz. 1990).....	8-9
<i>Hydranautics v. FilmTec Corp.</i> , 204 F.3d 880 (9th Cir. 2000).....	2, 3
<i>In re Coastes-Lahusen</i> , 69 IBLA 137 (2004).....	1
<i>In re Kosanke Sand Corp.</i> , 12 IBLA 282 (1973).....	4, 8
<i>In re Wilson</i> , 35 IBLA 349 (1978).....	2
<i>In re Great Basin Mine Watch</i> , 146 IBLA 248 (1998)	4
<i>Independence Mining v. Babbitt</i> , 105 F.3d 502 (9th Cir. 1997).....	4, 5
<i>Kamilche Co. v. United States</i> , 53 F.3d 1059, 1062 (9th Cir. 1995).....	8
<i>Lands Council v. McNair</i> , 537 F.3d 981, 992 (9th Cir. 2008).....	6
<i>Marsh v. Ore. Natural Res. Council</i> , 490 U.S. 360 (1989).....	4
<i>Perry v. Vill. of Arlington Heights</i> , 186 F.3d 826 (7th Cir. 1999).....	7
<i>Nat’l Ass’n of Homebuilders v. EPA</i> , 551 U.S. 644 (2007).....	4
<i>Nat’l Mining Ass’n v. Fowler</i> , 324 F.3d 752 (D.C. Cir. 2003).....	4
<i>NRDC v. Jewell</i> , 749 F.3d 776 (9th Cir. 2014).....	7
<i>Sagebrush Rebellion, Inc. v. Hodel</i> , 790 F.2d 760 (9th Cir. 1986).....	7
<i>Sheridan Kalorama Historical Ass’n v. Christopher</i> , 49 F.3d 750 (D.C. Cir. 1995).....	4
<i>Skaff v. Meridien N. Am. Beverley Hills, LLC</i> , 506 F.3d 832 (9th Cir. 2007).....	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1	<i>Taylor v. Sturgell</i> , 553 U.S. 880 (2008).....	8, 9
2	<i>Te-Moak Tribe of W. Shoshone of Nev. v. Dep’t of Interior</i> ,	
3	608 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2010).....	8, 9
4	<i>United States v. Rice</i> , 1989 WL 112460 (9th Cir. Sept. 15, 1989).....	2
5	<i>United States v. Coleman</i> , 390 U.S. 599 (1968).....	8
6	<i>Wards Cove Packing Corp. v. NMFS</i> , 307 F.3d 1214 (9th Cir. 2002).....	5
7	<i>Wilbur v. United States</i> , 280 U.S. 306 (1930).....	1
8	<i>United States v. Martinek</i> , 166 IBLA 347 (2005).....	3
9	<i>Wilderness Soc. v. Robertson</i> , 824 F. Supp. 947 (D. Mont. 1993).....	4, 5
10	<i>Yount v. Salazar</i> , 2013 WL 93372 (D. Ariz. Jan. 8, 2013).....	3
11	Regulations and Federal Register Notices	
12	36 C.F.R. §§ 228.4, 228.5.....	7
13	36 C.F.R. §§ 800.8(a), (c).....	8
14	36 C.F.R. § 800.13(b).....	5
15	36 C.F.R. § 800.13(b)(1).....	5
16	36 C.F.R. § 800.13(b)(3).....	5, 6
17	43 C.F.R. § 3809.100(a).....	3
18	69 Fed. Reg. 40,544 (July 6, 2004).....	4
19	65 Fed. Reg. 69,998 (Nov. 21, 2000).....	2-3
20	Other Authorities	
21	AMERICAN LAW OF MINING, 2D ED. §§ 30.02, 51.10.....	1
22	AMERICAN LAW OF MINING, 2D ED. § 14.04.....	2
23	AMERICAN LAW OF MINING, 2D ED. § 50.03[3].....	3
24	BLM MINERAL EXAMINERS HANDBOOK.....	6, 8
25	USFS, FOREST SERVICE MANUAL § 2803.5.....	3

1 Defendant-Intervenors Energy Fuels Resources (USA) Inc. and EFR Arizona Strip
2 LLC (together “EFR”) hereby file their Reply Memorandum in Support of their Motion
3 for Summary Judgment, and incorporate the U.S. Forest Service (“USFS”) reply herein.

4 **I. The VER Determination Does Not Trigger NEPA or NHPA (Claims 1 & 2).**

5 **A. The VER Determination is not an approval or a license.**

6 As EFR previously explained, the crux of Claims 1 and 2 is Plaintiffs’ assertion
7 that the Withdrawal mandated the VER Determination,¹ making it an approval or license.
8 EFR Br. at 3-7 (Doc. 147-1).² That theory is not supported by the language of the
9 Withdrawal, or the law regarding mining claims and withdrawals. *Id.* The language of
10 the Withdrawal only prohibits “location and entry”³ under the Mining Law; it does not
11 prohibit mining on existing claims. EFR Br. at 4 & n.7. There is nothing in the
12 Withdrawal mandating any action, including checking the validity of mining claims.
13 Further, Plaintiffs’ asserted mandate is not implied by the “subject to valid existing rights”
14 language. As EFR explained, such language means that the prohibition in the Withdrawal
15 is subservient to any valid existing rights. *Id.* at 4 n.8 (citing *Alaska v. Thorson*, 83 IBLA
16 237 (1984)). *Alaska* states that the effect of a withdrawal subject to valid existing rights is
17 that such rights are “not extinguished.” 83 IBLA at 250.⁴ Thus, contrary to Plaintiffs’
18 arguments (Pl. R. at 14), the effect of the “location and entry” prohibition is prospective.
19 *In re Coates-Lahusen*, 69 IBLA 137, 142 (1982); AM. LAW OF MINING, 2D ED. § 14.04
20 (through a withdrawal, “the government has prohibited the initiation of new claims”).

21
22 ¹ EFR uses the term VER Determination (Plaintiffs’ term) for consistency in briefing, but
23 that term is misleading. The so-called “VER Determination” is merely a report from a
24 mineral examination, and does not, nor is it intended to, officially determine anything, as
25 the Court previously concluded. Preliminary Injunction (“PI”) Order at 10-12 (Doc. 86);
26 *see also* USFS Reply.

27 ² Plaintiffs’ claim that EFR does not disagree with this point (Plaintiffs’ Reply at 12 (Pl.
28 R.) (Doc. 151) is absurd. EFR focused half of its first brief on the issue. EFR Br. at 3-7.

³ Expanding on the explanation of those terms from EFR’s first brief, “entry” most
formally means the issuance of a final receipt (*i.e.*, First Half of Final Certificate) in the
patent process. Informally, entry has been used as synonymous with location (although in
the case of a formal land order like the Withdrawal, such redundancy is not the likely
intent). AM. LAW OF MINING, 2D ED. §§ 30.02, 51.10; *see Wilbur v. United States*, 280
U.S. 306, 315 (1930).

⁴ Plaintiffs do not address *Alaska* on reply or refute its control over this issue.

1 The phrase “valid existing rights” is not synonymous with “valid mining claim,” as
2 Plaintiffs would have it. Location of a claim and filing it in the land records give rise to
3 property rights (such as equitable and possessory rights) that may be less than those that
4 accompany a valid mining claim (*i.e.*, a claim with a discovery), but nevertheless are
5 protected and can only be extinguished through due process (*i.e.*, a claim contest).
6 *Cameron v. United States*, 252 U.S. 450, 459-461 (1920); *Alaska, supra*; *In re Wilson*, 35
7 IBLA 349, 352-54 (1978) (“The purpose of the ‘subject to valid existing rights’ clause is
8 merely to express [DOI’s] recognition that established property rights are to be deferred to
9 at the execution of the withdrawal. A valid location gives a claimant established rights”);
10 AM. LAW OF MINING, 2D ED. § 14.04 (same). In *Davis v. Nelson*, the Ninth Circuit stated
11 that properly located mining claims create valid existing rights (such as equitable and
12 possessory rights) that “cast a cloud” on the United States’ title to the lands they embrace.
13 329 F.2d 840, 845-46 (9th Cir. 1964). This is because a mining claim is a claim of a
14 property right to use and exploit the land, recorded in the land records. That cloud cannot
15 be removed merely by public land order, but must be removed by the United States
16 (should it choose to do so) in a claim contest, which is an administrative proceedings akin
17 to a quiet title action. *Id.*⁵ Further, just as in property law, there is no requirement that
18 the United States seek to remove the cloud. See *United States v. Rice*, 1989 WL 112460,
19 at *8-9 (9th Cir. Sept. 15, 1989) (BLM and USFS have total discretion as to if and when
20 they investigate mining claims and initiate claim contests). The phrase “subject to valid
21 existing rights” means that the Withdrawal’s prohibition is subservient to all existing
22 rights at the time of the Withdrawal, even those that are lesser than the rights that
23 accompany a verified valid mining claim.⁶

24 Finding no support from the Withdrawal, Plaintiffs cite out-of-context quotes from
25 the preamble to BLM’s 3809 regulations for the assertion that the Withdrawal mandated

26 _____
27 ⁵ USFS policy is consistent with *Davis*. ARDoc. 371:7280 (“A mining claim may lack the
28 elements of validity and be invalid in fact, but it must be recognized as a claim until it has
been finally declared invalid by [DOI] or Federal courts.”).

⁶ The forgoing makes clear that Plaintiffs’ argument about having to rewrite the “subject
to valid existing rights” language is wrong, as well as their argument that such language
would be without effect if read consistent with EFR’s explanation. Pl. R. at 13-14 & n.10.

1 the VER Determination. Pl. R. at 12-14 (quoting from 65 Fed. Reg. 69,998, 70,025 &
2 70,026 (Nov. 21, 2000)). The quotes are from BLM's discussion of 43 C.F.R. §
3 3809.100(a), which only mandates a VER determination *before BLM will approve a new*
4 *plan of operations in a withdrawal area.*⁷ The preamble and the regulation do not
5 mandate VER determinations in any other circumstance or speak to the effect of
6 withdrawals.⁸ The arguments based on these quotes are wrong. Similarly, Plaintiffs ask
7 the Court to "put aside" the distinction between the agencies' treatment of existing claims
8 with approved plans of operation in withdrawn areas (like the Mine), and existing claims
9 in such areas for which a plan of operation is sought. Pl. R. at 12. This factual distinction
10 is crucial for determining whether 3809.100(a) or related FSM § 2803.5 applies. It cannot
11 be "put aside." EFR Br. at 5. This Court agreed. PI Order at 11 n.2.⁹ Plaintiffs try to
12 avoid this result by claiming that USFS did a VER determination in this case, and thus,
13 rejected the interpretation it now offers. Pl. R. at 13. That does not follow; USFS can
14 conduct a VER determination for any reason. *Rice, supra; Martinek*, 166 IBLA at 352.

15 Plaintiffs also claim that because the VER Determination was not part of a claim
16 contest, it must have been required by the Withdrawal. Pl. R. at 15. That is a *non*
17 *sequitur*, and wrong. VER determinations are investigatory tools used to determine
18 whether to *later* bring claim contests, not the other way around. PI Order at 10-12;
19 Motion to Dismiss ("MTD") Order at 9-10 (Doc. 131); EFR Br. at 7; ARDoc 331:5901.
20 Further, VER determinations do not change from investigatory tools to approvals based
21 on context. ARDoc. 359:6783, 6806; AM. LAW OF MINING, 2D ED. § 50.03[3].

22 In sum, the Withdrawal did not mandate the VER Determination. A VER
23 determination is an investigatory tool with no legal effect. Thus, it is not an approval or

24 ⁷ The block quote from the preamble at Pl. R. at 12 has no relevance to when VER
25 determinations are performed. The citation to *United States v. Martinek*, 166 IBLA 347
(2005), says nothing about withdrawals mandating VER determinations. *Id.* at 354-58.

26 ⁸ Section 3809.100(a) does not reflect some mandatory requirement that BLM conduct
27 VER determinations before allowing any mining in a withdrawn area. It is a codification
of the agencies' enforcement policy under the Mining Law. 65 Fed. Reg. at 70,026.

28 ⁹ Thus, Plaintiffs' analogy of Vane Minerals to EFR also is wrong. Pl. R. at 14.
Consistent with FSM § 2803.5 and 3809.100(a), USFS required VER determinations for
Vane's claims within the Withdrawal area *because* Vane submitted applications for new
plans of operations. *Yount v. Salazar*, 2013 WL 93372, at *9 (D. Ariz. Jan 8, 2013).

1 license that triggers NEPA or NHPA compliance. PI Order at 10-12; MTD Order at 9-10;
2 EFR Br. at 7. Plaintiffs' NHPA arguments do not change this result. Pl. R. at 21-25.
3 Even assuming the resumption of mining operations is an "undertaking" as Plaintiffs
4 incorrectly suggest, USFS does not have Section 106 consultation duties unless that
5 activity requires a federal license or approval. *Sheridan Kalorama Historical Ass'n v.*
6 *Christopher*, 49 F.3d 750, 755-56 (D.C. Cir. 1995).¹⁰ As EFR has shown, the VER
7 Determination is not a license or an approval.

8 **B. The VER Determination is a nondiscretionary act.**

9 Plaintiffs argue that the VER Determination is discretionary because USFS had
10 discretion in gathering and evaluating costs (including environmental compliance costs).
11 That argument was rejected in *In re Konsake Sand Corp.* 12 IBLA 288, 286-99 (1973)
12 (recognizing some discretion in the process of calculating costs (including environmental
13 compliance costs), but holding that the determination of a discovery is nondiscretionary
14 (and does not trigger NEPA));¹¹ *see infra* note 21. Plaintiffs' cases are not to the contrary.
15 They state that environmental compliance costs must be considered in a VER
16 determination, *In re Great Basin Mine Watch*, 146 IBLA 248, 256 (1998), and discuss the
17 Interior Secretary's discretion to review (and re-review) a patent application (including
18 the mineral examination) before a patent issues. *Independence Mining Co., Inc. v.*
19 *Babbitt*, 105 F.3d 502, 508-09 (9th Cir. 1997); *Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. v. Babbitt*,
20 1994 WL 836324, at *4-6 (D. Nev. 1994). They do not speak to the issue of whether a
21 mineral examination is discretionary.¹² Thus, Plaintiffs' renewed claim that *Independence*
22 overruled *Wilderness Society v. Robertson*, 824 F. Supp. 947 (D. Mont. 1993) is wrong.

23
24 ¹⁰ *Nat'l Mining Ass'n v. Fowler*, 324 F.3d 752, 759-60 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (following
25 *Sheridan*). *Fowler* prompted the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to amend its
Section 106 program to conform therewith. 69 Fed. Reg. 40,544, 40,550 (July 6, 2004).

26 ¹¹ Plaintiffs' argument also was rejected in *Nat'l Ass'n of Homebuilders v. EPA*, 551 U.S.
644, 668-73 (2007). EFR Br. at 8-9. Plaintiffs did not address *NAHB* on reply or refute
27 its control over this issue.

28 ¹² Plaintiffs' citation to *Marsh v. Ore. Natural Res. Council*, 490 U.S. 360 (1989), is
misplaced. That case addresses when to supplement a NEPA analysis. The citation to
CBD v. NHSTA, 538 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2008), also is misplaced. There, the statute at
issue provided NHSTA authority to impose higher standards based on impacts learned
from a NEPA analysis; the Mining Law provides no such latitude. *Kosanke, supra*.

Pl. R. at 151 at 18; Doc. 63 at 14. This Court rejected that argument when it relied on *Wilderness Society* and should do so again. PI Order at 12; MTD Order at 9-10. *Independence* addressed whether the issuance of a patent is ministerial. 105 F.3d at 508. The court concluded that the Secretary does not have a ministerial duty to issue a patent prior to making his/her own final determination that all of the Mining Law's patent requirements have been met, including a discovery (the court called this determination the Secretary's "validity determination" – not to be confused with a mineral examination alone). *Id.* at 507-09. *Independence* does not address whether a mineral examination is nondiscretionary (or triggers NEPA), the question presented in *Wilderness Society*.

II. Assuming It Was Triggered, USFS Properly Applied § 800.13(b)(3) (Claim 3).

Plaintiffs do not address EFR's argument that 36 C.F.R. § 800.13(b) was not triggered because the designation of Red Butte as a TCP was not a "discovery." EFR Br. at 9-10. Instead, they agree with EFR, Pl. R. at 26, but still conclude that 800.13(b)(1) applies. Doc. 140-1 at 35. That is contrary to the plain terms of 800.13(b), which requires a discovery for any of the section to apply. Claim 3 should be rejected.

Assuming 800.13(b) was triggered, USFS did not err in applying 800.13(b)(3). Aside from one argument noted below, on summary judgment, Plaintiffs do not present any arguments the Court has not rejected. PI Order 14-17.¹³ Plaintiffs have given the Court no reason to change course. EFR Br. at 10-12.¹⁴ The only new argument is Plaintiffs' claim that USFS has not "approved the undertaking," as required for 800.13(b)(3) to apply. Pl. R. at 26. That is contrary to Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and the record, both of which identify the relevant *approved undertaking* as USFS's approval of EFR's plan of operations ("Plan"). Doc. 115 ¶ 85; ARDoc. 553:10601-603. USFS's determination regarding the approved undertaking is controlling unless arbitrary and capricious. Doc. 146-1 at 9.

¹³ The Court's conclusion that the unambiguous language of 800.13(b)(3) controls, and its rejection of Plaintiffs' regulatory history and deference to Advisory Council for Historic Preservation interpretations arguments are well founded. *See, e.g., Wards Cove Packing Corp. v. NMFS*, 307 F.3d 1214, 1219 (9th Cir. 2002).

¹⁴ Plaintiffs' suggestion that 800.13(b)(3) is an emergency procedure to protect historic properties is only half correct. It also protects projects. ARDoc. 533:10603.

1 Finally, Plaintiffs' extra-complaint claim that USFS did not complete consultation
2 under 800.13(b)(3) properly should be rejected. Pl. R. 28-29. As EFR detailed in
3 response, EFR Br. at 12, and USFS's reply, USFS provided the Havasupai more process
4 and consideration than 800.13(b)(3) requires or envisions.

5 **III. USFS's VER Determination Is Not Arbitrary and Capricious (Claim 4).**

6 If the Court finds that the VER Determination is not mandated by the Withdrawal it
7 need not address Claim 4 because the outcome will have no impact on any party. In any
8 event, Plaintiffs ask this Court to hold that the VER Determination was arbitrary and
9 capricious because they have set forth (in some cases completely speculative) cost
10 categories at the Mine for which they cannot find a line item in USFS's mineral exam. As
11 detailed by USFS on reply, courts defer to agencies as to what level and specificity of
12 evidence is necessary to support their analyses and decisions. *Lands Council v. McNair*,
13 537 F.3d 981, 992 (9th Cir. 2008). For mineral examinations, that level (and the overall
14 level of detail) is dictated by the amount of resources at issue. ARDoc. 374:7436 (when
15 resource values are high, it is not necessary to delineate in detail minor costs). Examiners
16 also may rely on cost estimates from nearby, similar mining operations to verify costs. *Id.*
17 Here, at USFS's direction, EFR (expert miners who have mined similar projects, such as
18 the nearby Arizona 1 Mine) prepared conservative costs to mine, mill, and market in
19 compliance with all laws and the Plan. USFS independently verified those costs. EFR Br.
20 at 13-14. In so doing, it also verified those costs against the costs EFR experienced at
21 Arizona 1. ARDoc. 525:10500. EFR notes, however, that the VER Determination, as
22 well as its Appendix C and the Excel document referred to in the Roberts Declaration
23 (Doc. 147-2),¹⁵ do not contain the level of specificity Plaintiffs seek. Therefore, EFR
24 provided the Roberts Declaration to explain that the applicable costs noted by Plaintiffs

25
26
27 ¹⁵ Contrary to Plaintiffs' position, Appendix C and the Excel document were before USFS
28 when it made its decision (and thus in the record), but Plaintiffs failed to inform the Court
that the parties agreed to keep those documents out of the public record because they
contain confidential business information. Plaintiffs' request for their disclosure now
should be rejected due to that agreement, and because they do not provide the information
Plaintiffs seek. The documents are available for *in camera* review upon request.

1 were included in the analysis provided to USFS, and where they were included¹⁶ (despite
2 specificity not being required by USFS).¹⁷ Faced with a mine with very high value
3 resources (*i.e.*, \$29.3 million in profit), USFS was not arbitrary and capricious.

4 Assuming USFS failed to account for Plaintiffs' costs as alleged, the error would
5 be harmless because it would not change USFS's conclusion that the claims were valid.
6 *Sagebrush Rebellion, Inc. v. Hodel*, 790 F.2d 760, 765 (9th Cir. 1986). USFS found that
7 the profit at the Mine is \$29.3 million. EFR Br. at 13. Conservatively adjusted for
8 inflation, the cost of monitoring and conservation measures is estimated at \$393,180. *Id.*
9 at 14. Even if those costs were ten times that amount, USFS's conclusions would not
10 have changed. Plaintiffs have not made any attempt to demonstrate otherwise, as is their
11 burden. *Cal. Wilderness Coal. v. Dep't of Energy*, 631 F.3d 1072, 1091 (9th Cir. 2011).

12 **IV. Plaintiffs Have Not Established Standing for Claims 1, 2, and 4.**

13 When this case started, Plaintiffs did not state a personal interest in, or allege harm
14 related to, the VER Determination. EFR Br. at 1-2. On reply, two declarants filed
15 "supplements" to add such personal interests and injuries.¹⁸ Standing must exist at the
16 commencement of a case and not be made up later; the supplements should be rejected.
17 *Skaff v. Meridien N. Am. Beverley Hills, LLC*, 506 F.3d 832, 838 n.5 (9th Cir. 2007);
18 *Perry v. Vill. of Arlington Heights*, 186 F.3d 826, 830 (7th Cir. 1999). Without them,
19 Plaintiffs have no injury in fact traceable to the VER Determination.¹⁹ Further, Plaintiffs
20 cannot show that the NEPA or NHPA processes for the VER Determination *could* protect
21 their procedural interests, as they must. *NRDC v. Jewell*, 749 F.3d 776, 783 (9th Cir.

22 ¹⁶ USFS need not include in the record raw data behind documents it reviews and relies
23 upon if it did not rely on such data for its decisions. *Common Sense Salmon Recovery v.*
Evans, 217 F. Supp. 2d 17, 22 (D.D.C. 2002).

24 ¹⁷ The Court can consider this extra-record evidence because it explains a technical issue,
25 and is provided by a person involved in the preparation of the document at issue. *Friends*
of Payette v. Horseshoe Bend Hydroelectric Co., 988 F.2d 989, 997 (9th Cir. 1993).

26 ¹⁸ The declarants simply added language to previous declarations to now claim an interest
in the VER Determination. Compare Doc. 37-8 ¶¶ 10-11 with Doc. 151-2 ¶¶ 10-12.

27 ¹⁹ The Havasupai declarants did not file supplements. Their declarations do not mention
28 an interest in or injury related to the VER Determination. They do not have standing for
Claim 2. EFR Br. at 2 & n.3. Plaintiffs' claim that the challenged action in Claim 2 is a
failure to act (and not the VER Determination) is contrary to their focus on the VER
Determination – the alleged trigger for any NHPA obligations. Doc. 115 ¶¶ 79-83; Pl. R.
at 2, 3, 21-23.

2014). Plaintiffs' injuries are tied to mining, which is authorized and controlled by EFR's Plan, not the VER Determination. 36 C.F.R. §§ 228.4, 228.5; PI Order at 10-12 (a VER determination has no legal effect); MTD Order at 9-10 (Doc. 131) (same). Thus, any NEPA and NHPA processes for the VER Determination could not change the Plan, and thus, mining operations.²⁰ They have not shown causation or redressability.²¹

V. Claims 2 and 3 are Barred by Collateral Estoppel.

Plaintiffs argue that the Court's prior ruling on USFS's claim preclusion argument makes collateral estoppel (issue preclusion) inapplicable. Pl. R. at 20-21. Unlike claim preclusion, issue preclusion applies even "in the context of a different claim." *Taylor v. Sturgell*, 553 U.S. 880, 892 (2008). Plaintiffs also argue that the issue here was not previously litigated because this case involves a different claim than in *Havasupai Tribe v. United States*. Pl. R. at 20. Plaintiffs' NHPA claims here are based on whether USFS consulted with the Havasupai regarding Red Butte and considered the impacts thereon. Doc. 115 ¶¶ 79-88; Doc. 140-1 at 28-40. That issue was litigated and decided in *Havasupai*. 752 F. Supp. 1471, 1486-88, 1493-1500 (D. Ariz. 1990). These issues are the "same" under the test in *Kamilche Co. v. United States*, 53 F.3d 1059, 1062 (9th Cir. 1995). The evidence is the same record regarding USFS's consultation and decision on the Plan,²² and the argument is the same—failure to consult and consider impacts to Red Butte. While this case involves an NHPA claim and *Havasupai* involved a NEPA claim, these statutes require essentially the same procedures and considerations. *Te-Moak Tribe*

²⁰ Plaintiffs' reliance on *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. USDA* is misplaced. There, the court found that USFS's NEPA compliance for a bison management plan could protect plaintiffs' interests in grizzly bears because the plan *authorized and controlled* the bison hazing activities that impacted the bears, *and* the plan and hazing activities *might be changed* during that process. 772 F.3d 592, 599 (9th Cir. 2014).

²¹ Plaintiffs' suggestion (Pl. R. at 4) that NEPA and NHPA processes could cause USFS to reach a different validity conclusion is wrong. The Mining Law does not compel compliance with other laws in order to definitively determine mining costs; it requires a reasonable estimate of costs based on known circumstances at the time of a mineral exam. *E.g.*, ARDoc. 374:7429, 7436; *see United States v. Coleman*, 390 U.S. 599, 602 (1968); *Kosanke*, 12 IBLA at 286-99 (NEPA is not required when processing a VER determination (even for informational purposes). Further, the argument that such processes could result in USFS requiring conservation measures or precluding mining was rejected in *Kosanke*. 12 IBLA at 286-99.

²² ARDocs 1-257: 001-5287. The additional evidence is USFS's consultation with the Tribe about Red Butte and the Mine since *Havasupai*. *See, e.g.*, ARDoc. 666:12387-389.

1 of *W. Shoshone v. Dep't of Interior*, 608 F.3d 592, 607 (9th Cir. 2010); 36 C.F.R. §§
2 800.8(a), (c) (authorizing and urging agencies to merge NEPA and NHPA compliance).
3 Trial preparation in *Havasupai* covered the same matters presented here because the
4 claims in each case are so closely related. *Te-Moak, supra*. Plaintiffs had a “full and fair
5 opportunity” to litigate this issue, *Taylor, supra*; ARDoc. 50:1754. They are foreclosed
6 from doing so again, particularly when the project has not changed. ARDoc. 443:8611.

7 **VI. An Injunction Is Not Appropriate; Briefing on Remedy Should Be Allowed.**

8 Regardless of the outcome of the case, EFR’s Plan will remain valid, and is the
9 sole approval necessary from USFS to conduct mining operations, and as EFR has made
10 clear, its mining claims remain valid until invalidated through a claim contest. An
11 injunction is not appropriate. If the Court is inclined to consider some form of injunctive
12 relief, EFR joins USFS in urging the Court to order briefing: no party has addressed the
13 issue fully; and, contrary to Plaintiffs’ assertions (Pl. R. at 30), EFR has commenced
14 preparations to be able to restart active mining (*i.e.*, shaft sinking) at the Mine in mid-
15 April/early May 2015. Being able to restart the Mine at that time is critical to EFR’s
16 overall business plan, which depends on this work for: 1) the retention of its skilled crew
17 (currently at EFR’s Pinenut Mine until it is mined out in early to mid-April 2015, and then
18 moving to the Canyon Mine); 2) meeting EFR’s planned production schedule; 3) the
19 planned operation of EFR’s White Mesa Mill (and employee retention at that facility);
20 and, 4) meeting future (2016 and 2017) revenue projections, that if not met would
21 severely limit EFR’s ability to maintain cash flows sufficient for ongoing operations.
22 Decl. of Harold Roberts ¶¶ 6-11 (Jan. 29, 2015). In preparation for the restart, since
23 December 2014, EFR has spent or committed \$575,000 for capital equipment to perform
24 upgrades at the Mine, as well as for other operational equipment. *Id.* ¶ 12.

25 **VII. Conclusion**

26 For the forgoing reasons, EFR’s and USFS’s Motions for Summary Judgment
27 should be granted, and Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment should be denied.

28 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 29th day of January, 2015.

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

By: /s/ David J. DePippo

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

David J. DePippo (Ariz. Bar No.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*

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 29th day of January, 2015, 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