

# *SAR - DEIS - Chapter 3 - Production - Minerals*

## *Comment #      Comment*

---

- 0029059-002      The CLMP Forest Plan indicates that the categorization of the Spencer Material Site as a '521-Minerals Management Area-Category 5' is intended, however, the designation should be applied in fact in the final plan. For example, the first Errata sheet accompanying the DEIS notes that under Appendix A, p, A-3, the following sentence should be inserted between lines 30 and 31; 'The Spencer Glacier Material Site will remain a material source.' The second Errata sheet notes that at Appendix H, p. H-5, lines 30-31 the same language will be inserted.
- Volume I of the DEIS at page 3-402, lines 1111-1113, notes that production at Spencer is expected to resume in the near future. Page 3-412 of Vol. 1, lines 1377-1383 notes that Spencer is a very important material source for South Central Alaska.
- 0029063-058      Page 3-392, Line 690-91 The Final EIS should clarify that there was some limited exploration for copper deposits in the CNF during the early to mid- 1970s (Jansons and others, 1984). More recently, on private (Native) lands within CNF, there has been some evaluation of copper and other deposits (Kodosky and Teller, 1989, and Chugach Alaska Corporation, 1999). Presently CILv Ct: copper deposits are being promoted for joint venture options by the land owners.
- Page 3-392, line 695 The Final EIS should clarify that increased activity in the area is not CG. O ( necessarily restricted to placer gold deposits. All potential deposit types and unrecognized resources could receive increased attention if metal prices rise (Nelson and Miller, 1999). c: ~ c.-c k
- Page 3-395- line 808 The Final EIS should state that copper production included minor amounts of lead and zinc, as well as precious metals, such as gold and silver ~-G L
- Page 3-395, line 813. Table 3-93: Mineral production and reserves on CNF A reference is C-o O(~ needed in the Final EIS for the values presented in this Table. In addition, we suggest the figures reported be more clearly discussed in the text. Under "Placer Gold" for both "Past Production" ~-L and "Current Production," the reported numbers are given in ounces and yet the reserves are a,- reported as 22,750,000 cubic yards. An agreement of units is needed in the Final EIS. The Ca.v~ L number for "Reserves" is incorrect and should read 11,750,000 cubic yards of gold-bearing gravels. No grade is available. Under "Load Gold, Reserves," it is important to note that the average grade of the ore is not available. Under "Base Metal, Reserves," the number "greater C 1~ ~ c than 7,246,000 should show that this is tons of ore with the average grade of 2% copper.
- Page 3-398, line 940: Potential Foreseeable Development The reference should read Steve C~c-a L Nelson (not Melson), USGS contract (not USFS contract). e r
- C6v ctC
- Page 3-406, line 1185, Cumulative Effects There is a published evaluation (Goldfarb and others, 1996) that discusses the impact of copper mining on acid mine drainage. If any of the old copper deposits go back into production or new ones are developed, acid mine drainage would be of concern. This should be elaborated upon in the Final EIS.

*Comment #    Comment*

---

- 0034897-006    10. You have used embarrassingly outdated data to assist you in recommending these preservation options. The Kenai Peninsula Timber data is 13 years old, the Forest-wide timber data is 22 years old, the minerals data, as stated above, is from the 1930's and is based on locations of past development and not on the locations of developable deposits. The interagency Minerals Coordinating Group recommended in April 1999 that a modern airborne geophysical survey be completed for the CNF before completion of the CLMP. No such survey was requested much less completed. Why? That's a rhetorical question because the obvious bias in this plan answers that question. The NFS knew where it wanted to go and it has built a road of paper with this CLMP and Draft EIS to get there.
- 0034898-008    10. You have used embarrassingly outdated data to assist you in recommending these preservation options. The Kenai Peninsula Timber data is 13 years old, the Forest-wide timber data is 22 years old, the minerals data, as stated above, is from the 1930's and is based on locations of past development and not on the locations of developable deposits. The interagency Minerals Coordinating Group recommended in April 1999 that a modern airborne geophysical survey be completed for the CNF before completion of the CLMP. No such survey was requested much less completed. Why? That's a rhetorical question because the obvious bias in this plan answers that question. The NFS knew where it wanted to go and it has built a road of paper with this CLMP and Draft EIS to get there.
- 0036324-004    Volume I of the DEIS at page 3-402, lines 1111-1113, notes that production at Spencer is expected to resume in the near future. Page 3-412 of Vol. 1, lines 1377-1383 notes that Spencer is a very important material source for South Central Alaska.
- 0036324-007    Because the hypothetical recreation complex would be a 'new recreation facility', it would clearly be an incompatible use at the site. Volume 1 of the DEIS notes this incompatibility on page 3-412, lines 1383-1388,
- Although the complex and quarry could co-exist side-by-side physically, there would likely be conflicts because the quarry would be considered to be a visual impact to the glacier scene and the natural quiet would be disrupted in the vicinity by blasting and heavy equipment operating at the quarry.
- Designating a recreation complex at the site introduces a new activity at the site that is incompatible with mining the resources at the site. This would also be incompatible with the DOI and Forest Service's rationale for the mineral withdrawal of 1997.
- There is no developed public access to the site except by railroad, and the railroad right-of-way is an illegal and unsafe access for hikers. The Alaska railroad discourages foot traffic along the railroad right-of-way, yet that is the only pedestrian access to the proposed site. Upon reaching the site, there are no hiking trails for recreationists to use.