



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR THE
PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

I have asthma — I moved To AZ.
For health Reasons — For Clean Air
Mining is not good for the
environment. Also — I love my
land/mining destroys it

NAME:

Taleric Robinson

EMAIL:

ADDRESS:

590 W. Camino del Bordo
Green Valley, AZ 85614

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one)

YES

NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether



USA FIRST-CLASS FOREVER

lp


24 MAY 08 PM 6 L

PHOENIX AZ 850

USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 West Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

Attn: Beverly Everson

TUCSON, AZ 85701
Received
MAY 27 2008
Coronado National Forest



Fold Here

How to Comment Effectively

To be effective, comments should be specific and factual. Remember, the purpose of this scoping is to identify significant issues related to the proposed operation, and issues to be considered in the Environmental Impact Process (EIS).

The format for commenting is up to you to choose. Comment forms are available, but not required. Send comments by mail, email, or hand-deliver to the Forest Service before the public scoping period ends on April 18, 2008.

Below are several tips for making effective comments.

- Be brief so the reviewer won't miss the point of your comment.
- Be specific so the reviewer clearly understands your concerns.
 - Statements such as "I am concerned about the amount of additional traffic this will cause" are useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
 - Statements such as "Don't do this" or "I like this" are not useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- The better you understand the proposal, the more focused and site-specific your comments will be.
- Your comments must be realistic and feasible.
- Remember, this is the time to identify concerns AND opportunities.

The public comment period is the beginning of the EIS process and represents the foundation of the analysis. Your comments are an important input to the analysis of the social and natural environment.

MAY 24, 2008.

Louis B. Pihl

4041 E. TIMROD ST.

TUC, AZ, 85711-4146.

SIR, I am interested in the Rosemont Copper Project, because I know that Public Lands should be open to the Public. I am a member of the Desert Gold Diggers and Fluorescent Mineral Society, Tucson Gem and Mineral Society, Arizona Geological Society, and like to Rock-Hound, field trips and prospect.

... I understand Rosemont Copper Project can have an economical business for Arizona. Keeping Rosemont Copper Project for Public Lands open to the Arizona can have our Arizona for all economy and reasonable concern for our Freedom Rights.

Yours Truly


Louis B. Pihl.

G. E. Pihl

4041 EAST TIMAROD ST.

TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701

PHOENIX AZ 850



Rosemont Copper Project

300 West Congress

Tucson, Arizona 85701

Tucson, AZ 85701
Received

MAY 27 2008

Granado National Forest

8570141371



CIENEGA WATERSHED PARTNERSHIP
P. O. Box 41003, Tucson, Arizona 85717-1003

March 30, 2008

Ms. Gayle Hartmann, President
Save the Scenic Santa Ritas
8987 Tanque Verde #309-157
Tucson, AZ 85749

Dear Gayle,

As you know, the Cienega Watershed Partnership (CWP) is a 501(c)(3) organization founded to help resource landscape stewardship initiatives for the Cienega Watershed. This is the landscape that runs from Saguaro National Park and the Rincon Wilderness south to the Canelo Hills south of Sonoita, and from the crown of the Santa Rita Mountains east to the crown of the Whetstone Mountains. Our mission is "to facilitate cooperative actions that will steward the natural and cultural resources of the Cienega Watershed while enabling sustainable human use."


The Board of the Cienega Watershed Partnership is deeply concerned about the potential devastating environmental impacts of the open pit mine proposed for Rosemont Ranch. In particular, the Board believes that:

- (1) the potential impact of an open pit mine on aquifers, both from depletion and contamination from leaks, spills, and runoff, represents an enormous threat to water supplies in the immediate vicinity of the mine and to watersheds key to supplying Tucson and surrounding areas;
- (2) an open pit mine in the area of the Santa Rita Mountains surrounding Rosemont Ranch would undermine the ecological health of the region, resulting in permanent loss of a key area for wildlife habitat and migration;
- (3) the mine would irretrievably impact prime scenic, wildlife, grazing, and recreational land used extensively by ranchers, trail riders, hikers, birders, hunters, and nature lovers from throughout Southern Arizona and beyond;
- (4) the mine site, visible along at least three miles of Scenic Highway 83, would forever change the character of the highway and its magnificent views of the oak savanna and chaparral at the foothills of the Santa Rita Mountains. Moreover, the impact of heavy mining equipment on traffic to and from Tucson to Sonoita, Elgin, and Patagonia would discourage visitors to these prime destinations for tourism, birding, and recreation.

The CWP stands ready to work with SSSR to provide support both for your efforts to develop the environmental case for preserving this sensitive and unique area, and for your larger efforts to educate the community in Pima and Santa Cruz Counties and those who represent them at the

local, state, and federal level regarding the potential impacts of mining on sensitive areas in the Canelo Hills, the Patagonia Mountains, and the San Rafael Valley.

Yours sincerely,



Martie Maierhauser, Chairman
Cienega Watershed Partnership

c.: Beverley Everson, U.S. Forest Service
Richard Ahern, U.S. Forest Service
Senator John Kyle
Augusta Resource Corporation

Attachment

CIENEGA WATERSHED PARTNERSHIP
P. O. Box 41003, Tucson, Arizona 85717-1003


RESOLUTION

The Cienega Watershed Partnership (CWP) supports the efforts of Save the Scenic Santa Ritas to prevent hard rock mining in the Rosemont area of the Santa Rita Mountains, the Patagonia Mountains, Canelo Hills, and San Rafael Valley. CWP will communicate with its membership and elected officials concerning reasons to oppose mines in these areas. CWP will participate in the campaign against mines in these areas, including public comment periods during the potential Environmental Impact Statement process. CWP will inform the U. S. Forest Service (USFS) and other appropriate agencies of our opposition to mines in the area and will request that we be placed on mailing lists so we may be kept informed of any actions taken.

Approved: February 25, 2008

CIENEGA WATERSHED PARTNERSHIP
P. O. Box 41003
Tucson, Arizona 85717-1003

Tucson, AZ 85701
APR 01 2008
Coronado National Forest



Richard Ahern, U.S. Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 West Congress Street
Tucson, Arizona 85701

James E. Pepper
P.O. Box 1326
Sonoita, AZ 85637
520.455.5106
jepepper@earthlink.net

May 12, 2008

Jeanine A. Derby, Forest Supervisor
Coronado National Forest
Forest Service; United States Department of Agriculture
300 West Congress
Tucson, AZ 85701

Re: Proposed Rosemont Mine – Status of MPO

Dear Supervisor Derby:

I write to seek clarification regarding the status of the Mine Plan of Operation (MPO) for the proposed Rosemont Mine. In your request for additional information from Rosemont Copper Company (herein “Applicant”) as set forth in your letter to Mr. Jamie Sturgess, VP Projects and Environment, dated October 19, 2007, you request specific information concerning water in and around the project area, information about land status in the project area, advise the Applicant to improve the readability of maps and diagrams in the MPO and support documents, and identify six additional data items which are presumably necessary to complete the MPO per Forest Service Regulations. Following these specific requests for additional information, you state:

“Once Augusta Resource Corporation has provided the Forest with the information requested in this letter, along with the changes to the MPO, agency specialists will review the submissions and determine whether the information is sufficient for initiating the Notice of Intent.”


As a member of the public, and a Sonoita resident with property abutting Coronado National Forest four miles south of the proposed mine, I am naturally concerned about the potential significant adverse impacts of the proposed project. I am currently reviewing the MPO in order to prepare scoping comments. I have also begun a review of the section of the Coronado National Forest website containing the Applicant’s responses to your data requests. I logically conclude that the Forest has deemed the additional information sufficient for initiating the NEPA process since the Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register on March 13, 2008 and that the formal scoping process has begun. You may not be aware of the considerable confusion within the public regarding the availability of this additional information, as a number of individuals with whom I have spoken are unaware that links to this information are available in the “Reading Room Documents” portion of your website. I am not certain when this material was posted, but perhaps a press release is in order directing the public to this portion of the website or at least a notice on the website directing the public to the Reading Room.

Your October letter also clearly states that you expected "changes to the MPO" (presumably) reflecting the information you requested of the applicant. Your statement strongly suggests that a revised MPO will be necessary. I am currently reviewing a copy of the MPO dated July 9, 2007. Since the significant amount of additional information necessary to have an adequate MPO has not been incorporated into the MPO issued in July 2007, how can this 10-month-old document possibly serve as the "MPO of record" and thus provide the statutory basis for fully informed scoping comments? I respectfully submit that the only responsible, indeed perhaps the only legally viable course of action is to require the Applicant to prepare and issue a revised MPO per your instructions to provide "the changes to the MPO." This revised MPO would then become the current MPO of record. This updated document should reflect not only the additional information you requested but all changes to the MPO resulting from ongoing consultation between the Forest and the Applicant. The revised MPO could then be published on the Applicant's website and a link to it placed on your website. To avoid any confusion, the revised MPO must be appropriately dated so reviewers are certain they are working with the current version. Such a procedure for publication and posting can also accommodate any further revisions to the MPO. I also request that the Forest provide an appropriate further extension of the formal scoping period once the revised MPO is issued and available to the public.

I urge you to take this request seriously. My fellow citizens and I, particularly those of us in the vicinity of the proposed project are seeking to provide informed and comprehensive scoping comments, and obviously cannot do so absent the complete application record. 36 CFR 228 contains provisions for a "modified" and/or "supplemental" MPO, obviously in recognition of changes occurring over time which warrant revising an approved MPO. I submit that preparation and issuance of a revised MPO at this early and key juncture of the scoping process is in the interests of all parties, particularly since the MPO issued in July 2007 was (*de facto*) determined by the Forest to be inadequate for purposes of the NEPA process.

Finally, in light of the magnitude and complexity of the proposed project as well as the rapidly approaching scoping deadline, I ask that you keep me personally informed of your action with respect to this request for a revised MPO and the associated extension of the scoping period. In my role as convener for approximately 200 Sonoita residents who are gravely concerned about the proposed project, I will make certain that these citizens are fully informed of your response to my requests. I along with many other concerned citizens have serious questions about the proposed project and do not wish to be denied the opportunity, indeed our right to review the full record prior to submitting our scoping comments.

Very truly yours,



James E. Pepper

Cc: Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords
Congressman Raul Grijalva

J Pepper
PO Box 1326
Sonita, AZ 85637

RECEIVED
TUCSON, AZ 85701
MAY 15 2008
Coronado National Forest

TUCSON AZ 857
14 MAY 2008 PM 5 L



Jeanine A. Derby, Forest Supervisor
Coronado National Forest
US Department of Agriculture
300 West Congress

85701 Tucson, AZ 85701

James M. Byers, III
8987 E. Tanque Verde
#309-378
Tucson, AZ 85749
Tel. 520-749-4214
Fax 520-760-0443
email: jamesmbyers@netscape.net

May 22, 2008

Beverly Everson, Geologist
Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

Beverly Everson:

I own a registered well in the Santa Cruz River Basin (AZ Dept. of Water Resources Registration No. 55-829830; File No. D (21-16) 8 Cdd, filed March 04, 1982). This well is on the Crown C Ranch, Dry Canyon Parcel 11, now addressed as 37 Tecopa Lane in the Santa Cruz County rural addressing scheme. The **Santa Cruz County Tax ID No. is 110-47-011**. There is no mail service to this address. [Please use the above address on E. Tanque Verde in Tucson for any and all U.S. Postal Service correspondence.]

My purpose in writing to you is to find out what possible long term adverse impact the Rosemont Copper Project might or could have on my well. This well supplies a residence and horse barn; therefore, a drop in the water level would be of great concern to me as deleterious to day to day living on the property and on possible future value of the parcel in the real estate market.

Attached are some documents relating to the history of the well including data from the original owner at time of drilling: Adobe Canyon Corporation in 1973; and the header of the document I used to register the well in 1982.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Yours truly,


James M. Byers, III

ADOBE CANYON CORP
276 S. STONE AVE NO 15
TUCSON AZ 85701

original owner purchased by Byers 1980

2. FILE NUMBER: D21016008CDDGS1 CONTROL NUMBER: 33583

3. SE 1/4 SE 1/4 SW 1/4 SECTION 08
TOWNSHIP 21.05 RANGE 16.0E
COUNTY: SANTA CRUZ

Crown Ranch
Dry Canyon
Parcel # 11
S.C.G. Tax
ID # 110-47-011

USE: DOMESTIC

WELL DATA

A. DEPTH OF WELL: 230
B. CASE DIAMETER: 06
C. DEPTH OF CASING: 0
D. TYPE OF CASING: PERFORATED OR SLOTTED STEEL CASING
E. MAX PUMP CAPACITY: REGISTRANT TO FURNISH
F. DEPTH TO WATER: 27
G. DATE COMPLETED: / /1973

current well owner's mail address



5/22/2008

James M. Byers, III
8987 E. Tanque Verde Rd. #309-378
Tucson, AZ 85749

520-749-4214

fax 520-760-0443

Jamesmbf@netscape.net

James M. Byers, III

5/22/2008

current well owners
current mail address



James M. Byers, III
8987 E. Tanque Verde Rd. #309-378
Tucson, AZ 85749

520-749-4214
fax 520-760-0443

Jamesmbyers@netscape.net
James M. Byers, III

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
99 EAST VIRGINIA AVENUE
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004



REGISTRATION OF EXISTING WELLS

READ INSTRUCTIONS ON BACK OF THIS FORM BEFORE COMPLETING
PRINT OR TYPE - FILE IN DUPLICATE

REGISTRATION FEE (CHECK ONE)	
EXEMPT WELL (NO CHARGE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NON-EXEMPT WELL - \$10.00	<input type="checkbox"/>

09

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

REGISTRATION NO. 55- 829830

FILE NO. D(21-16)8CDD

FILED MAR 04 1982 AT 12:30pm
(DATE) (TIME)

INA _____

AMA _____

- Name of Registrant: James M. Byers
6226 Camino Arco Tucson AZ 85749
(Address) (City) (State)
- File and/or Control Number under previous groundwater law:
D 21016008CDDGSI 35- 33503
(File Number) (Control Number)
SC.G. Tax ID # 110-47-011
Clayton Ranch Dry Canyon Parcel 11
- a. The well is located within the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 08
of Township 21.05 N/S, Range 16.0E E/W, G & SRB & M, in the
County of Santa Cruz

CERTIFIED MAIL™

James M. Byers, III
8987 E. Tanque Verde Rd. #309-378
Tucson, AZ 85749



7006 2150 0001 1000
Tucson, AZ 85701
Received
MAY 27 2008

Coronado National Forest

Beverly Everson bedooyist
Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ 85701



049J82033368
\$02700
05/23/2008
Mailed From 85749
US POSTAGE

Associated



Byers, III
Tanque Verde
378
AZ 85749
89-4214
80-0443
@netscape.net


May 22, 2008

(AZ Dept. of Water Resources
filed March 04, 1982). This well is on the
as 37 Tecopa Lane in the Santa Cruz
County Tax ID No. is 110-47-011. There is
address on E. Tanque Verde in Tucson for

long term adverse impact the Rosemont
supplies a residence and horse barn;
cern to me as deleterious to day to day
parcel in the real estate market.

the well including data from the original
73; and the header of the document I

MARIE DAGUCON



StraightTalk

FAX (520) 762-9891

To: FOREST SERVICE (520) 388-8305	From: MARIE DAGUCON Home Off: (520) 762-9350 Fax: (520) 762-9891 CELL: (520) 906-7039	Date: 5/5/08 Time: 2:00pm Number of Pages: 2 (including cover sheet)
--	---	---

Remarks:

RE: ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT

Please see attached letter of concern.

Information is intended solely for the use of the entity or individual named as recipient hereof and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended party, be aware that any disclosure, photocopy, distribution or any other use of the contents of this transmission is strictly prohibited and may have legal recourse. THANK YOU.

**MARIE DAGUCON / TIERRA ANTIGUA REALTY (520) 762-9350
CORONA DE TUCSON, ARIZONA 85641**

Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

May 5, 2008


To Whom It May Concern:

When we decided to move to Tucson four years ago, part of the appeal was the scenic drive up to Sonoita. There were other reasons, of course, but that pristine Southwestern landscape appealed to our souls. After moving here, we discovered the consequences of mining after hiking the various areas, visiting Bisbee's pits and viewing the destruction of a once lovely range by Phelps-Dodge in Green Valley.

It is with those eyesores in mind that I write you in protest over the proposed Rosemont Copper Project. The huge impact of big rigs on the traffic on a two-lane highway not to mention the cost of road maintenance is frightening. We currently live in Corona de Tucson and we can attest to the destruction of the Houghton corridor by all the heavy trucks that used to travel in and out of the area when home construction was still going strong, prior to the current real estate lull. Furthermore, the folks in the upper regions will no longer have easy access to Metro Tucson without taking other routes or vice-versa. With the cost of fuel seemingly unabated, those longer routes will be a hardship for anyone required to travel on 83. Who will maintain the surface of those roads once the heavy traffic creates massive potholes on that scenic highway? Who will pay for the extra fuel imposed on the people forced to drive longer routes? Will they be compensated for the time lost waiting for the traffic to clear? Then, there is the major issue of water impact which is still being debated. What about the destruction of habitat for the desert dwellers?

When my sister-in-law recently attended the Patagonia meeting, she was sorry to discover there was not to be an open forum, simply a dispensing of literature. Will the proposed discussion hearings that are scheduled for May 12, June 7 and June 30 be as constrictive? When Yellowstone or the Grand Canyon or other national treasures were preserved for prosperity, the forces then in power had vision beyond their generation. Can we say the same of the decision makers of today? Will the generations that follow be able to enjoy the beauty of the Santa Ritas or will we point to the mountains and describe what **used to be there** to our grandchildren? Your call.

Sincerely,



Marie Dagucon
(520) 762-9350



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR THE
PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

By going through with this project Businesses and the scenic Mountain Empire as we know it will be destroyed. Pollution will take over our air and water, our life. Not only will this affect Sonoita, Patagonia and the surrounding areas, Tucson will also dramatically be affected. Basically a bunch of strangers are making decisions for our community that has no affect on them. It's like cutting the foot off a child you've never met, but you heard through someone else it would be good for them and they offered you \$20 million dollars to follow through. Keep in mind "what right do you have to cut the foot off a child you've never seen and is of no concern to you"

NAME: Leigh Walker

EMAIL: leighluu@gmail.com

ADDRESS: Po Box 1202

Tucson, AZ 85702

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one) YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT: State Highway 83 is, and will be a very dangerous road to travel. Besides the huge increase in residents and visitors, this roadway is also used as a by-pass for oversized loads.

Our local emergency service is already overloaded with a huge response area and high call volume.

How does the presence of a massive toxic mine not increase the risk of accidents on the highway?

And if there is an accident @ the mine, will the fire department be prepared for such an emergency?

NAME: Krysta MontesdeOca

EMAIL: krystalhea@hotmail.com

ADDRESS: HCI BOX 52 Elgin AZ 85637

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

What impact will traffic from mine have on local residents and tourists? Bicycle riders, runners, motor cycle riders etc.

Who will pay for maintenance on State highway when usage increases (by 4-500%)??

I'm concerned about delays in travel, increased costs and decreased safety.

NAME: Deborah Fain

EMAIL: debbyfain@shhria2.com

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 33
Sonoma, AZ 85637

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES [checked] NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

**PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR THE
PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

What impact will traffic from the mine have on local residents & tourists? (Bicycle riders, runners, motorcycles riders etc.)

I'm concerned about delays in travel & safety issues.

NAME: Joy Miller
EMAIL: Kickspur@netscape.net
ADDRESS: 55 Curly Horse Rd.
Sonoita, Az 85637

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

**PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR THE
PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

How will the mine impact my water table?

NAME: *Jay Miller*
EMAIL: *Kickinspur@netscape.net*
ADDRESS: *55 Carly Horse Rd.*
Sonoita, Az 85637

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

**PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR THE
PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT: Our community is more than concerned with the proposed Rosemont mine. We are sick and horrified. This is the sonoran DESERT. WE ARE IN A SEVERE DROUGHT!

HOW DO YOU PROPOSE TO PROTECT OUR CRUCIAL RESOURCE, WATER?!?

NAME: Knysta Montes de Oca

EMAIL: Knystalhea@hotmail.com

ADDRESS: HC1 BOX 52 Elgin AZ 85611

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

\$0.83⁰
US POSTAGE
FIRST CLASS
071V00678884
85637
000003051

Tucson, AZ 85701
Received
MAY 21 2008
Coronado National Forest

USDA Forest Service
Coronado Natl. Forest
300 W. Congress St
Tucson AZ 85701

URGENT!

P.O. Box 770
Sonoita, AZ
85637



5/16/08

Rosemount Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, Az 85701

Gentlemen;

I am in favor of this
mining project.

Our economy requires
a tremendous amount of
Copper to operate and we
are very lucky to have
this source available.

Yours truly,


Richard Datz

37783 S. Spoon Dr.

Tucson, Az 85739

520 818 0419

FOREVER



TUCSON AZ 857

TUCSON AZ 85701

20 MAY 2008 PM 4 T

TUCSON, AZ 85701
Received

MAY 21 2008

Chicago National Forest

*Rosemount Copper Project EIS
Colorado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ 85701*

Richard M. Baly
3783 S. Spoon Dr.
Tucson, AZ 85739-1142



13E181023E



IN REPLY REFER TO:
L7617

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Saguaro National Park
3693 South Old Spanish Trail
Tucson AZ 85730



May 20, 2008

Ms. Beverly Everson
Geologist
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ 85701

Dear Ms. Everson,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Coronado National Forest's Rosemont Copper Project. This project would occur some 20 miles south of Saguaro National Park's Rincon Mountain District, and has the potential to impact to park resources, including viewsheds, air quality, and regional wildlife movements and habitat.

The mandate of the National Park Service is to preserve and protect natural and cultural resources for public enjoyment. Saguaro National Park was set aside specifically to protect the plants and animals of the Sonoran desert, riparian corridors, and cultural resources of the region. As urbanization and development expand in southeastern Arizona, it is increasing difficult to manage the park as part of an intact ecosystem. The Santa Rita Mountains are crucial links in both the Sonoran desert and Madrean/"Sky Island" ecosystems encompassed by the Park. They are also an important part of the larger context of the Conservation Lands System of the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan. Thus, we have concerns about impacts to wildlife, particularly from direct and indirect loss of habitat, changes to surface and ground water, traffic on new and existing roads, and noise and other impacts associated with mining activities.

The Park is also concerned about viewsheds and air quality, especially within its Wilderness, which is a class 1 airshed under the Clean Air Act amendments. Maintaining visibility and preventing pollution by particulates, sulfates and toxics are two of our most important Air Quality Related Values. We are concerned that activities associated with the proposed action may negatively impact air quality in the region.

We request that your analysis (EIS) includes in-depth assessments of the effects of the potential impacts above. If you have any questions regarding these issues, please contact me at 520.733.5101, or Meg Weesner, Chief of Science and Resource Management, at 520.733.5170.

Sincerely,

Sarah Craighead
Superintendent


U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
SAGUARO NATIONAL PARK
3693 SOUTH OLD SPANISH TRAIL
TUCSON, AZ 85730

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

SAGUARO 75 YEARS



Tucson, AZ 85701
Receiver
MAY 22 2008
Ms. Beverly Everson
Geologist
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress ST.
Tucson, AZ 85701



8570141391

Snell & Wilmer

L.L.P.
LAW OFFICES

One South Church Avenue
Suite 1500
Tucson, Arizona 85701-1630
(520) 882-1200
Fax: (520) 884-1294
www.swlaw.com

Mark E. Konrad (520) 882-1220
mkonrad@swlaw.com

TUCSON, ARIZONA

PHOENIX, ARIZONA

IRVINE, CALIFORNIA

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

DENVER, COLORADO

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

February 15, 2008

Jeanine Derby, Forest Supervisor
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ 85701

Re: *Rosemont Copper Company's Proposed Rosemont Mine: NEPA Review*

Dear Ms. Derby:

As you are aware, Farmers Investment Co., by and through its counsel Snell & Wilmer L.L.P., has made Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") requests of the United States Forest Service ("USFS") on August 29, 2007 and December 17, 2007 relating to the "Rosemont Mine" proposed by Augusta Resource Corporation ("ARC") and Rosemont Copper Company ("RCC").¹ In such letters, Farmers Investment Co. requested that it be put on USFS's mailing list on all notices relating to the Rosemont Mine, and that it wishes to participate, to the fullest extent possible, in the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") process (as well as all other phases of permitting) relating to the Rosemont Mine. As a follow up to such letters, Farmers Investment Co. and Farmers Water Co. (collectively "FICO") hereby submits additional comments regarding how its interests and the local environment may be significantly affected by the proposed project as well as certain additional information which FICO believes is germane to USFS's current review of RCC's recent submissions relating to the Rosemont Mine.

At present, FICO understands that the USFS is reviewing certain supplemental information provided by RCC in response to the USFS's October 19, 2007 letter. Specifically, USFS is presently evaluating whether sufficient information exists to demonstrate project feasibility and to allow the USFS to understand possible alternatives. As noted in the USFS's October 19, 2007 letter to RCC, however, one of the least documented (and certainly least

¹ In a recent submission to the USFS which was dated November 30, 2007 and entitled "Technical Memorandum – Rosemont Copper Project Unpatented Mining Claims and Sites," RCC identified the Rosemont Mine as including a total of 899 unpatented mining claims and sites. In this memo, RCC also noted that it "may from time-to-time" locate new or withdraw other unpatented mining claims or sites "as determined by RCC in its sole and absolute discretion" to be part of the project. For convenience sake, we will refer to such claims and sites as the "Rosemont Mine." We respectfully submit, however, that it is impossible for any party (or the USFS) to comment on or provide meaningful analysis on sites, claims, plans, or other details relating to the Rosemont Mine which have not been disclosed to the USFS by RCC "in its sole and absolute discretion."

Ms. Jeanine Derby
February 15, 2008
Page 2

understood) elements of RCC's proposed Mine Plan of Operations ("MPO") is the project's potential impact to groundwater and surface water resources. *See October 19, 2007 Letter from Ms. Jeanine A. Derby to Mr. Jaime Struggess*, at 2-3. As set forth more specifically herein, FICO respectfully submits that despite additional information being provided by RCC in response to USFS's October 19, 2007 letter, even more is needed to allow the appropriate understanding and identification of alternatives. Accordingly, the Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") process should not begin until more meaningful data and information relating to water issues has been obtained.²

A. Overview of FICO's Background and RCC's Current Disclosure of its Proposed Water Plans.

FICO owns approximately 7,000 acres of land in the Sahuarita and Green Valley areas which is presently devoted primarily to the cultivation, harvesting, and processing of pecans. FICO lands have been in agricultural use for over 100 years, and are currently overseen by the Walden family which has been farming pecans and ranching in the Santa Cruz Valley for three generations. Farmers Water Co., which is owned and operated by FICO on this land, pumps and provides water to more than 2,000 customers and maintains a service area which spans approximately 11,000 acres. FICO land is presently located in and draws water from the Tucson Active Management Area (the "Tucson AMA"). Specifically, FICO relies upon the aquifer located in the Upper Santa Cruz sub-basin for all of its water uses and needs.

FICO first became aware of the fact that RCC's proposed operations may directly impact FICO and the surrounding environment based upon its discovery of a land sale which took place adjacent to FICO's property. Specifically, ARC, using the name of another entity, bought land directly east of FICO's orchards and wells to use as a pumping site for the Rosemont Mine. At present, RCC is operating a test well which is within ½ mile of several FICO wells, including a Farmers Water Co. well and three agricultural wells. ARC's well land is also within Farmers Water Co.'s Certificate of Convenience and Necessity. It is plain from its proposed MPO that RCC plans to extract tens of thousands of acre feet of water from this location and transport it to the Rosemont Mine in order to service the water needs of its proposed mining operations. *See MPO*, § 2.8.3, at 44.

Unfortunately, in its proposed MPO, RCC ultimately offers little in terms of detail as it relates to its groundwater use or the impact which its activities will have on the environment at the point of groundwater extraction. *See MPO*, § 2.8. Rather, RCC generally states that an "ME permit is expected to be issued for the quantity of water needed for the Rosemont Project on an

² Given the lack of disclosure and information surrounding the water issues relating to RCC's proposed project, this letter is not intended to be an exhaustive list of all of the issues or concerns which FICO believe may be germane to the environmental review of the proposed Rosemont Mine. Thus, FICO expressly reserves the right to supplement or amend this letter as part of the administrative record for the proposed project.

Ms. Jeanine Derby
February 15, 2008
Page 3

annual basis, and for a term that will match the intended life of the Project.” *Id.*, at 42. Elsewhere, RCC states that it anticipates using approximately 5,000 acre feet of water per year and that “the well field will have excess capacity” to pump even more. RCC further asserts that it need not do any “well spacing” or “well interference” analysis under the Arizona well permitting statutes, and nothing suggests that RCC plans to obtain such information or conduct such studies. *Id.*, at 43. The only statement provided by RCC in its proposed MPO regarding mitigating the impacts of its potential water use is the suggestion that it may recharge water at other locations in the Tucson AMA. Such general statements, however, are not accompanied by any discussion or scientific support of the impact which such recharge would have on the location at which RCC plans to extract the groundwater it plans to use for its operations, nor how such recharge would affect subterranean water flow or quality. Furthermore, in its proposed MPO, RCC underscores the tentative nature of such mitigation measures by underscoring the fact “it has no legal obligation” to recharge any water whatsoever, and that its proposed recharge plans are subject to numerous unknowns. *Id.*, at 45.

Finally, RCC offers absolutely no discussion in its proposed MPO regarding alternatives to obtaining water for its mining operations from any source other than pumping it out of the Tucson AMA. For example, RCC does not identify the possibility of utilizing uncommitted Central Arizona Project water, treated effluent, or other sources of water for partial or complete use in its proposed operation. Such information is absolutely necessary in order to have a basic understanding of the project so that the USFS may meet its environmental mandate pursuant to NEPA.

In sum, based on the limited facts presented in RCC’s MPO, the USFS and FICO know only that RCC plans to pump whatever water it needs for its operations, which RCC will do so for as long as its operations continue, and that RCC, without any scientific basis to do so, is proposing the nonbinding mitigation measure of recharge. FICO respectfully submits that such “details” do not provide meaningful disclosure of RCC’s proposed water use, how such potential water use may impact the surrounding environment, or the development of potential alternatives for the environmental impacts related thereto.

B. The Impact of RCC’s Groundwater Pumping and Recharge on the Phelps Dodge Sulfate Plume Should Be Examined.

Another specific issue which is conspicuously absent from the materials submitted by RCC relating to its proposed water use is the potential migration of an underground sulfate plume from the nearby Phelps Dodge mine. The USFS should be aware that in the immediate area proposed by RCC for the extraction of groundwater, the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (“ADEQ”) has a consent decree with Phelps Dodge regarding a sulfate plume. *See* Mitigation Order on Consent Decree, In the Matter of Phelps Dodge Sierrita Mine located at 6200 W. Duval Mine Road, Green Valley, Arizona, June 2006, a copy of which is

Ms. Jeanine Derby
February 15, 2008
Page 4

attached hereto. The sulfate plume in question exists in the aquifer as a result of Phelps Dodge's nearby mining operations. *Id.*, at 2. The sulfate plume is located west of FICO lands, and would be subject to migration based upon any changes to groundwater flows.

FICO has been cooperating with Phelps Dodge to monitor this sulfate plume. Based on FICO's understanding of what has been submitted by RCC to date, the additional proposed pumping to occur along the eastern side of Sahuarita may very well exacerbate the migration of the sulfate plume from the Phelps Dodge mine, pull that plume further east into FICO and Green Valley's local water supply, and cause other potential negative effects to the local environment. Accordingly, care should be taken to investigate this issue, including specifically determining how various pumping scenarios may impact the movement of the sulfate plume.

C. Additional Data and Modeling is Needed to Understand the Project's Potential Impact on Local Water Supplies.

RCC's lack of substantive hydrologic data and analysis was first exposed in the Pima County Board of Supervisor's 2007 report on hydrogeology at the Rosemont site. FICO joins in the concern raised by Pima County that "[s]o far, the information Augusta has provided to United States Forest Service about groundwater conditions is deficient for developing an EIS." *See September 7, 2007 Letter from C. H. Huckleberry to J. Derby, Forest Supervisor to CNF*, at 1. Again, unfortunately, nothing contained in the most recent information submitted by RCC under cover of its December 3, 2007 letter to the Bureau of Land Management and the USFS changes this conclusion.

At the center of Pima County's concern was the report prepared by hydrologist and mining expert, Dr. Tom Myers.³ As concluded by Dr. Myers in his report, RCC's proposed mining operations would intercept most, if not all, water from the Barrel Canyon watershed that is otherwise destined for Davidson Canyon.⁴ Moreover, the estimated volume of water potentially intercepted from Barrel Canyon is about the same volume estimated to discharge from Davidson Canyon to Cienega Creek. In short, intercepting water from the Barrel Canyon watershed effectively intercepts discharge from Davidson Canyon to Cienega Creek.

The above analysis exposes key shortcomings in RCC's proposed MPO. First, RCC has not comprehensively modeled, let alone analyzed, the hydrologic impacts of its planned mining operations. Second, RCC has not considered the potentially devastating effects its mining

³ *See* Tom Myers, Hydrogeology of the Santa Rita Rosemont Project Site, Conceptual Flow Model and Water Balance (prepared for the Pima County Board of Supervisors, Aug. 8, 2007). It is our understanding that this report was submitted to the CNF and is presently part of the administrative record.

⁴ Myers, at 26.

Ms. Jeanine Derby
February 15, 2008
Page 5

operations would have on the "Unique Waters" and water balance of Cienega Creek.⁵ These shortcomings should be adequately addressed before the CNF initiates NEPA's scoping phase.

Last but not least, the lack of hydrological data and the nonexistence of any modeling are admitted to by RCC itself. As set forth in the November 30, 2007 Technical Memorandum from James S. Davis of Errol L. Montgomery & Associates, Inc. ("Montgomery"), to Janine Derby of the USFS, "additional data and analysis will be required to more completely define the groundwater system in the Rosemont Project area." See *November 30, 2007 Technical Memo*, at 1. In the specific section describing the status of modeling, it is plain that Montgomery has not yet created a model and has not considered any of the issues and concerns raised by Dr. Myers in his report. *Id.*, at 10-11. It is also apparent that RCC and its consultant, Montgomery, have taken a myopic view of groundwater modeling, and have limited the geographic scope of the proposed studies. Specifically, the information provided to the USFS focuses on modeling only at the mine location, not at the area where the water is to be pumped. Obviously, in order to properly understand and evaluate hydrological issues and how RCC's proposed pumping of tens of thousands of acre feet of water will have on the environment, it is necessary to develop modeling that includes the source of extraction and various alternatives to such extraction.

In short, consistent with Dr. Myers' report, the record reflects that little, if anything, has been done to evaluate or meaningfully describe the significant water issues implicated by RCC proposed MPO. Accordingly, time should be taken now to develop such information.

D. RCC's 514 Permit Did Not Require Any Environmental Impact Analysis or Support.

In its proposed MPO, RCC notes that it will secure an "ME Permit" pursuant to A.R.S. § 45-514. See *MPO*, § 2.8.2, at 42. RCC's permit, however, expressly states that the "issuance of the permit does not waive any federal, state, county, or local government ordinances, regulations, or permits for which the facility may have to comply." As the USFS may be aware, securing a water permit pursuant to A.R.S. § 45-514 does not entail any assessment, evaluation, or consideration of the environmental impacts of such water use. Indeed, as noted by RCC in its MPO, it plans to utilize its permit without doing any well spacing or well interference analysis to actually determine how the withdrawal of groundwater for its proposed project may affect surrounding wells or the underground aquifer. *Id.*, at 43. Notwithstanding such statements, FICO would submit that simply because RCC does not need to do certain testing in order to obtain a water permit under Arizona law does not mean that RCC is entitled to a free pass on the development of like information or data in order to satisfy federal environmental requirements.

⁵ Cienega Creek is designated as "Unique Waters" per Arizona Administrative Code R18-11-112(E)(7).

Ms. Jeanine Derby
February 15, 2008
Page 6

In conclusion, to date, RCC has not made a meaningful disclosure of the significant water issues which are at the heart of its proposed project. Given the obvious importance of water to the fragile environment in the area of the proposed project, such an omission should not be overlooked. Accordingly, FICO urges the USFS to require additional information and allow the meaningful collection of data before initiating an EIS. If you have any questions or would additional information regarding the issues identified in this correspondence, please do not hesitate to contact me at (520) 882-1220 or to contact Carlos Ronstadt of our office at (602) 382-6355.

Very truly yours,

Snell & Wilmer



Mark E. Konrad

MEK:mgm

cc: Keith Graves, Nogales Ranger District (via U.S.P.S.)
Beverly Everson, Coronado National Forest (via U.S.P.S.) ✓
Pam McAlpin, Bureau of Land Management (via U.S.P.S.)
Carlos Ronstadt, Snell & Wilmer L.L.P. (via email)
Richard S. Walden, Farmers Investment Co. (via email)
Nan Walden, Farmers Investment Co. (via email)



Beverly Everson
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ 85701



2008

Rosemont Mine: NEPA Review

through its counsel Snell & Wilmer requests of the United States Forest 007 relating to the "Rosemont Mine" and Rosemont Copper Company and that it be put on USFS's mailing wishes to participate, to the fullest EPA") process (as well as all other follow up to such letters, Farmers CO") hereby submits additional t may be significantly affected by which FICO believes is germane to the Rosemont Mine.

viewing certain supplemental r 19, 2007 letter. Specifically, exists to demonstrate project ves. As noted in the USFS's umented (and certainly least

ntitled "Technical Memorandum - RCC identified the Rosemont Mine as including a in this memo, RCC also noted that it "may from time-to-time" patented mining claims or sites "as determined by RCC in its sole and absolute discretion" part of the project. For convenience sake, we will refer to such claims and sites as the "Rosemont Mine." We respectfully submit, however, that it is impossible for any party (or the USFS) to comment on or provide meaningful analysis on sites, claims, plans, or other details relating to the Rosemont Mine which have not been disclosed to the USFS by RCC "in its sole and absolute discretion."

inf
USI
feasi
Octo

In a
Rosem
total of
locate n
discretio

Snell & Wilmer
L.L.P.
LAW OFFICES

One South Church Avenue
Suite 1500
Tucson, AZ 85701-1630

- DENVER
- LAS VEGAS
- ORANGE COUNTY
- PHOENIX
- SALT LAKE CITY
- TUCSON (MEK)

- TUCSON, ARIZONA
- PHOENIX, ARIZONA
- IRVINE, CALIFORNIA
- SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH
- DENVER, COLORADO
- LAS VEGAS, NEVADA



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

During my entire child raising years we spent many weekends, vacations and holidays camping, hiking and exploring on the east side of the Santa Rita mountains. Our drives to Elgin, Sanita and Patagonia were all on highway 83. I am very opposed to any mining in the Santa Rita mountains for several reasons. I am also very concerned about the wild life in those mountains as well. I recall specifically one trip we were camping in Gardner Canyon - the moon was bright all four of us were in sleeping bags - In the still of the moon lit night I heard then saw, a head of 4 deer men just a few yards in front of our heads - This I want my grand children to experience as well. mining will drive wild life away from their natural habitat. Please stop the Rosemont mining.

NAME: Patricia E Dewey

EMAIL: PPD PSD @ AOL . COM

ADDRESS: 8581 E Pomegranate Tucson, Arizona 85732

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

How to Comment Effectively

To be effective, comments should be specific and factual. Remember, the purpose of this scoping is to identify significant issues related to the proposed operation, and issues to be considered in the Environmental Impact Process (EIS).

The format for commenting is up to you to choose. Comment forms are available, but not required. Send comments by mail, email, or hand-deliver to the Forest Service before the public scoping period ends on May 19, 2008.

Below are several tips for making effective comments.

- Be brief so the reviewer won't miss the point of your comment.
- Be specific so the reviewer clearly understands your concerns.
- Statements such as "I am concerned about the amount of additional traffic this will cause" are useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- Statements such as "Don't do this" or "I like this" are not useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- The better you understand the proposal, the more focused and site-specific your comments will be.
- Your comments must be realistic and feasible.
- Remember, this is the time to identify concerns AND opportunities.

The public comment period is the beginning of the EIS process and represents the foundation of the analysis. Your comments are an important input to the analysis of the social and natural environment.

Fold Here

Pat Dewey
 8581 E Pomegranate St
 Tucson, AZ 85730-4710

TUCSON AZ 857
 15 MAY 2008 PM 4 L




Tucson, AZ 85701
 Received
MAY 19 2008
 Coronado National Forest

USDA Forest Service
 Coronado National Forest
 300 West Congress Street
 Tucson, AZ 85701

Attn: Beverly Everson

85701+1331





YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

**PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR THE
PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

5-14-08


The average citizen, which we are, has not yet been supplied with enough information to make an intelligent decision. For example:

1. The Davidson Canyon and Cienega Creek watersheds have not had the proper analysis for the effects of ground water pumping or the natural effects of drainage throughout the area.
2. Highway #83 will be impacted with heavy truck traffic, yet this has not been mentioned satisfactorily. The Transportation Department has not made any comments to my knowledge.
3. Mine tailings storage would certainly exceed the private areas and Forest Service land which is maintained by all of our taxes should not be used for the benefit of any individual company/corporation for the storage of its mine tailings. The end result will look like the tailings west of Green Valley. Furthermore, the US Forest Service is too eager to sell its land to cover budget short falls. The public isn't well served by this proposal of using Forest Service land. Public land covered by mine tailings is of no use to anyone, again referencing the tailings west of Green Valley.
4. The subject of Cap Water brought in by Augusta Resources in a larger pipe says nothing about the rightful ownership of this water. The Indian Nations involved are owed water as well as Mexico who have not taken their share. What would be the allotment for Sahuarita and Green Valley? Where is this additional water coming from to fill a 36" pipeline? The Colorado River has about reached its maximum available water for allotments. The larger pipeline is for the benefit of Augusta only, pure and simple.
5. The pumping of water in the pit is mentioned in the newspaper and states that lowering the water table 2000' is a large unknown as to total effects. The subsidence problem has not been fully analyzed. What about the Santa Cruz River flowing underground north to Tucson, and the effect of this added usage of water?

NAME: C. M. Ebert and Joanne Ebert

ADDRESS: 924 s. Las Lomas Circle, Green Valley, AZ 85614

Attn: Beverly Everson



USDA Forest Service
 Coronado National Forest
 300 West Congress Street
 Tucson, AZ 85701



Fold Here

How to Comment Effectively

To be effective, comments should be specific and factual. Remember, the purpose of this scoping is to identify significant issues related to the proposed operation, and issues to be considered in the Environmental Impact Process (EIS).

The format for commenting is up to you to choose. Comment forms are available, but not required. Send comments by mail, email, or hand-deliver to the Forest Service before the public scoping period ends on July 14, 2008.

Below are several tips for making effective comments.

- Be brief so the reviewer won't miss the point of your comment.
- Be specific so the reviewer clearly understands your concerns.
 - Statements such as "I am concerned about the amount of additional traffic this will cause" are useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
 - Statements such as "Don't do this" or "I like this" are not useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- The better you understand the proposal, the more focused and site-specific your comments will be.
- Your comments must be realistic and feasible.
- Remember, this is the time to identify concerns AND opportunities.

The public comment period is the beginning of the EIS process and represents the foundation of the analysis. Your comments are an important input to the analysis of the social and natural environment.

USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

May 8, 2008

Dear Sirs,

I am writing in reference to the proposed Rosemont Copper Mine to be put in the Santa Rita Mountains east of Green Valley. It will harm an area that has great beauty for all of us. Winter guests, and tourists in general, come here to enjoy the views of the Santa Ritas. The esthetic value of this area has great monetary value to all who are here.

I understand that a great deal of water is used during the mining process. It seems to me a failure of good planning to be relying on water from the Colorado River. There is already a great demand on this one water source and "we" would be at the end of their pipeline and therefore, I think, the first to be denied water when the demand exceeds the supply. I have enclosed an article from March 17, 2008, in the High Country News. It makes a case for the Navajo Tribe to have access to Colorado River Water. It seems to me that some accommodation should be made for their Reservation to have and use this water. It could make a big difference in the quality of life for all the Navajo. Since they live upstream from most of the others who use the Colorado River, It seems only fair that they should share in the water rights.

The local supplies of water can not sustain an industry like the proposed Rosemont Copper Mine and I do not think we should rely on long term use of Colorado River water. The scenic value, measured in dollars, will out weigh the income from jobs provided by new mining jobs, therefore I believe our area would be better off without this mine.

Please consider all of this when granting plans for use of land in the Santa Rita Mountains.

Sincerely,




Susan J. Nelson

1522 W. Calle Mendoza

Green Valley, AZ 85614

For people
who care about
the West

High Country News



Grassroots activists Ron Milford, left, and Max Goldtooth want more water for the Navajo people. LEICH T. JIMMIE

Seeking the Water Jackpot

For almost a century, the Navajo Tribe has been left out of the Colorado River water game. Now, they're ready to play their hand. By Matt Jenkins. Page 10.

READ BEFORE USING
THIS MACHINE OPERATES
ONLY ON ONE QUARTER AT A
TIME FOR 25 SECONDS. WAIT
TILL TIMER RUNS BEFORE
ADDING ANOTHER QUARTER.



The coin-operated water dispenser in Gallup, New Mexico, where a quarter will buy 50 gallons of water, if it doesn't get stuck in the slot. Facing page, Bobby Esplain, 77, has jugs for 22 gallons of water that he'll haul the 30 miles from this Tuba City watering point to his home in Cameron, Arizona.



Seeking the Water Jackpot

For almost a century, the Navajo Tribe has been left out of the Colorado River water game. Now, they're ready to play their hand.

GALLUP, NEW MEXICO

In early February, a series of fierce storms racked the Navajo Nation, which sprawls across more than 27,000 square miles of Arizona, New Mexico and Utah. At dawn, the highways were buried under an icy sheen that sent cars pinballing into ditches. As each day warmed, the misery took on a new quality: The dirt roads that crisscross the reservation melted into *hazh glish*, *di'shdi lha'*, a goopy gray gumbo that sucked pickup trucks into a death grip. By late afternoon, on the cusp of the next storm, many Navajos, still stuck up to their axles in mud, were simultaneously sandblasted with wind-driven grit.

The tribe's woes don't end with the weather. Half the Navajos on the reservation are unemployed, and that number may actually be as high as 67 percent — no one can say for sure. More than 70 percent of those who do have jobs work for government agencies. The closure of a coal mine later this year, on top of another mine shutdown two years ago, will likely reduce tribal revenues by a third. Per capita income on the reservation is a little more than \$8,000 a year.

Navajos often speak of the cosmic geography of the Four Sacred Mountains, which mark the boundaries of their ancestral homeland. But the lives of many people here are shaped by a more pragmatic geography, centered on a coin-op water dispenser in a muddy turnaround behind a city maintenance building in downtown Gallup, N.M. A water pipe with a piece of yellow fire hose hanging off the end sticks out the back of the building. Navajos load water tanks and blue plastic 55-gallon drums into the beds of their pickups and come here for drinking water. On weekends, the line can stretch around the block.

But on a bitter-cold Friday afternoon, the whole operation was seriously doxed.

Ernest Leslie, who had driven 22 miles from Tlachatli, couldn't get any water because a quarter was jammed in the coin slot. He tried to coax another coin into the machine with the tip of his pocketknife, but it popped back out like a bad joke and landed in the mud at his feet. "Huh," Leslie said. He looked down at the quarter. "Sometimes we have problems like this."

Even as the Southwest's cities have flourished with water from the Colorado River, the Navajo Tribe has stood on the sidelines, holding an empty bucket — and waiting. For decades, it seems, the tribe has been just one good plan away from prosperity. Now, however, the Navajo Nation is beginning to assert its right to claim water from the river. Many Navajos feel that the tribe could soon transform water from something that eats up their quarters at 50 gallons a pop to a virtual jackpot. But as tantalizing as the prospect of river water is, it is also opening painful rifts on the reservation.

THE CAPITAL OF THE NAVAJO NATION is a town called Window Rock, on the eastern edge of the reservation in Arizona. It is a slow-paced place with a couple of gas stations, a supermarket, and a clutch of mom-and-pop storefronts that serve up squash soup and roast mutton.

Lena Fowler lives on the other side of the reservation, but came to town in February for a tribal council meeting. A member of the tribe's water rights commission, she has a cool intensity and a vaguely sexy set of crow's-feet at the corners of her eyes.

Fowler began by explaining how the language of white-dominated water law, saddled with abstruse notions like "*qui prior est in tempore, potior est in jure*" — Latin for "first in time, first in right" — often defies translation into Navajo. Then she conceded that water may, in fact, be

a language unto itself.

"And when you speak water," she said, "people get real emotional.

"For us, for most of our Navajo people, they wake up in the morning (and) they go out and they pray. And once they're done," she said, "they turn around and have to figure out how much water they have to figure out how much water they have: Is it safe to drink the water at the windmill? Or do I have to go buy Clorox to treat it with? That's where we are today."

The Navajo Nation sits almost exactly in the center of the 244,000-square-mile Colorado River Basin, and it occupies fully one-tenth of the basin's area. Yet when the seven Colorado River states met to divide the river's water between themselves in 1922, they neglected to invite either the Navajo or any of the other Indian tribes with reservations in the basin.

"Agreements were being made before we even knew how to speak English," Fowler said. Indians weren't recognized as United States citizens until two years after the Colorado River Compact was signed in 1922. It wasn't until almost three decades after the Indian Citizenship Act was passed that Navajos were finally allowed to vote.

When they excluded tribes from the Compact negotiations, however, the seven states disregarded an important fact. In 1908, the U.S. Supreme Court had — paradoxically — dealt Indians a powerful trump card. In what is known as the Winters decision, the court granted Indian tribes the right to retroactively claim water sufficient to create what would later be termed a "permanent homeland."

Water rights are ranked by chronological priority, and the priority date of a tribal claim is tied to the year that a particular tribe's reservation was established. In the Navajos' case, that was 1868. If the Navajos received so-called Winters rights, their water rights during

continued on next page

STORY BY
MATT JENKINS

PHOTOGRAPHS
BY LEIGH T.
JIMMIE

Navajo Water

continued from previous page

times of drought would take priority over those of the West's more recently established urban centers.

Qui prior est in tempore, as the saying goes, *potior est in jure*.

The seven states' negotiators acknowledged the Indians' dormant power in one small way: They added the "wild Indian article" to the water Compact. The article — whose name came from then-Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover, the facilitator of the negotiations — reads: "Nothing in this compact shall be construed as affecting the obligations of the United States of America to Indian tribes."

With those 20 words, the negotiators punted all their gnarly Indian problems sometime into the future. "The states have basically ignored that there are Native claims to the river," Fowler said. In the 86 years since the Compact was signed, the downstream cities of Los Angeles, San Diego, Phoenix and Las Vegas have boomed, while the Navajo have been left parked in a dusty time warp high on the Colorado Plateau.

"Even today, it's like there's a curtain," she said. "The seven states) are over there, making decisions, knowing full well that we're here. They can see our silhouette."

Hoover's wild Indian clause put off the Indian water rights question for as long as possible. But the costs of that delay, compounded over time, are now coming due. The Navajo Nation is moving to claim its water rights in New Mexico, and may soon do so in Arizona and Utah as well.

Indian tribes can sue for water rights — or they can negotiate settlements with individual states, and then take them to Congress for approval. That's the path that the Navajo Nation has taken in New Mexico. In 2004, the tribe and the state announced a settlement agreement that would award the Navajo 326,000 acre-feet of water from the San Juan River, a major tributary of the Colorado. (An acre-foot is

enough for about two families in Phoenix or Las Vegas for a year.) The settlement also authorizes more than \$800 million in federal and state money to build a pipeline that will take the water to the east side of the reservation and to the city of Gallup. The Navajo Nation is now seeking congressional approval of the deal, the tribe's first step toward asserting its rightful claims on the Colorado.

"We have learned the language. We have learned the laws. We learned the court system," Fowler said. "Now we're saying, 'Hey! We're back. We're here to reclaim our water rights.'"

IN WINDOW ROCK, the tribal government operates out of a cluster of rustic-looking buildings a stone's throw from the towering sandstone arch after which the town is named. There's a **BEWARE OF FALLING ROCKS** sign next to the stone-and-timber hogan where the tribal council meets.

Stanley Pollack, an assistant attorney general for the Navajo Nation's Department of Justice, works out of an unprepossessing, barracks-style building nearby. Pollack exhibits definite left-leaning sensibilities, but he also observes the staid rituals of water lawyering. He keeps a turquoise bolo tie and a gray tweed jacket ready for tribal council briefings. He is also a *biłagáana* — a white — and, as a result, occupies a very complicated place in the Navajo water cosmology.

Pollack, who is 54, arrived here in 1985. Four years later, he suddenly found himself preparing legal briefs for the prosecution of the tribal chairman, Peter MacDonald, on corruption charges that would eventually land MacDonald in federal prison. It was a turbulent time: At one point, MacDonald's supporters rioted in Window Rock and tribal police shot two of them dead.

Pollack is reticent about the experience, but it was obviously a bracing one for him. He worked around the clock, protected by bodyguards from the American Indian Movement, better

known for its 1973 standoff at Wounded Knee on the Pine Ridge Reservation. At night as they stood watch outside, the guards warmed themselves by setting fires in empty oil drums. Whenever Pollack took a break, he says, "I'd go out and talk to them and look at the stars. It was really cool."

Compared to the MacDonald drama, you'd think the process of defending the tribal water rights, which now absorbs all of Pollack's time, would be a pretty humdrum affair. But it's not. He's had rocks thrown through his office window, and been called the Navajos' Number One Enemy. And, in 2001, a flier appeared in chapter houses — the reservation's equivalent of town halls — with Pollack's likeness X-ed out and "Osama bin Pollack" written underneath.


Pollack keeps a lot of this stuff in a ring-bound binder in his office. One flier calls him — with more vehemence than orthographical precision — a "water rights saboteger" and "one of the lawyer oppressors of the Navajo people who's helped cheat us out of hundreds of millions of water rights that is rightfully ours." Another reads: "Pollack infiltrated our government and has us on the path to a form of water rights holocaust."

After I read that one aloud, Pollack — who is Jewish — looked a little chagrined and said, "Oh yeah, genocide."


Pollack would really rather not talk about any of this. "It was just 100 percent libelous crap," he says. "Just totally reckless." But the homegrown opposition he has faced attests to the depth of emotion that water inspires — and to local unhappiness with Pollack's role as a compromiser and, to a large extent, a realist.

One wall of Pollack's office is lined with mean-looking filing cabinets, and the rest of the room is filled with steel bookshelves packed with court documents and all manner of hydrologic divination. It is from this mass of paper that Pollack is slowly assembling a Colorado River claim.

A year and a half ago, as the water settlement with New Mexico was work-



12 High Country News March 17, 2008



Lena Fowler of the Navajo Nation Water Rights Commission says states have ignored Native American rights to Colorado River water.

ing its way toward Congress, Pollack put the federal government and the seven states on notice that the tribe could also justifiably use 336,856 acre-feet in Arizona. When we talked, Pollack indicated that the tribe might claim 80,000 to 100,000 acre-feet in Utah, as well. If you throw in the water from tributaries, that would put the total size of the Navajo Colorado River water right at somewhere around 800,000 acre-feet.

That is a lot of water — one-and-a-half times more than Las Vegas has rights to. And, because much of the Navajo water would have an 1868 priority date, several big, powerful water users would be booted to the back of the line behind the tribe during a drought. The city of Las Vegas and the Central Arizona Project, or CAP, whose massive canal supplies water to Phoenix and Tucson, already have the worst water-rights priorities on the river. With the Navajo ahead of them in the hierarchy, they'd face an even more serious risk of being cut off.

Pollack has been steadily making it harder for the seven states to continue ignoring the tribe. In 2003, the Navajo Nation filed a lawsuit against the states and the U.S. secretary of the Interior to prevent any further water allocations until the Navajo claims are resolved.

Pollack and a team of Navajo negotiators have been in ongoing talks with representatives from Arizona, Las Vegas and Southern California over that lawsuit.

But Arizona, in particular, has been pushing back. Because the CAP is so vulnerable to water shortage, the state has been pressuring the Navajo Nation to reduce the size of its water claims. Last fall, the director of the state's water-resources department appeared before Congress to testify against the Navajo-

New Mexico settlement, saying it shouldn't be approved unless the tribe also settles its claims with Arizona.

"Arizona's playing the leverage game," Pollack said — seeking to get a deal that the tribe might not otherwise make "on the assumption that because Navajo wants this New Mexico settlement, they'll make concessions to benefit Arizona."

The Navajo Nation's decision to seek water through a settlement, rather than by going to court, reflects a broader trend in Indian Country. Over the past decade and a half, tribes have increasingly turned to settlements, in part because the U.S. Supreme Court has become increasingly hostile to Indian rights. Still, the Navajo are keeping their options open. Last summer, Navajo President Joe Shirley traveled to Washington, D.C., to warn Congress that "if the (New Mexico) settlement were to fail, and the Navajo Nation were forced to pursue the litigation of its claims, the United States would still be exposed to horrific liabilities even if the Navajo Nation were to obtain only modest water rights."

Back on the reservation, however, Pollack was being dogged by critics who accused him of selling out the tribe. Some insisted that the Navajo Nation should settle for nothing less than every last drop of water in the Colorado River.

PETER MACDONALD WAS RELEASED FROM PRISON and

returned to the reservation in 2001. Many Navajos see him as a folk hero, a sort of leader-in-exile, and he seems to be constantly on the road. When we talked by phone, he was headed to Phoenix for the dedication of a Navajo veterans' memorial there.

In the late 1970s, when MacDonald was tribal chairman, he commissioned a

study that, he hoped, would form the backbone of a Navajo water claim. Water-rights studies tend to be pretty tedious things, but this one conjured up a vision that was positively messianic.

Rather than focus on the 18-million-acre Navajo reservation to determine what water the tribe might claim, MacDonald directed his engineers to consider the entirety of what he calls "the Navajo holy land": An area roughly twice the size of the reservation itself that lies between the Four Sacred Mountains, which stretch from Flagstaff, Ariz., to the San Luis Valley in Colorado. That territory includes not only the Colorado River and two of its main tributaries — the San Juan and Little Colorado — but the Rio Grande as well.

"Navajos were there even before the states were created," MacDonald said. "So by the Winters Doctrine, Navajo has first and primary right to all that water within the Four Sacred Mountains." (He neglected to mention that the area also includes the ancestral territory of the Hopi, Utes, Zuni, Jicarilla Apache and the 19 Indian pueblos on the Rio Grande.)

MacDonald's engineers began figuring out exactly how much water the tribe could claim, by calculating its "practically irrigable acreage," or PIA. In 1964, the U.S. Supreme Court had endorsed PIA as a way to determine the size of water-rights claims made under the Winters Doctrine. A PIA determination evaluates how much of a tribe's land can be "practically" — meaning economically — irrigated, and then uses a formula to derive a total water right for the reservation.

There can be a big difference between what's irrigable and what's *practically* irrigable, but the engineers didn't get too hung up on observing that distinction. They ultimately determined that, as MacDonald put it, "Navajo has claim to every drop of the water that's presently being used by New Mexico, Arizona, California, Nevada, Utah, Colorado and Wyoming." As he said this, I suddenly had a vision of the world turning upside down: the *bilagáanas* forced to drive to the watering point with 55-gallon drums in the backs of their Volvos and Range Rovers, a roll of quarters in their pockets to fill up their backyard swimming pools and keep their lawns lush.

On a roll, MacDonald instructed the engineers to draw up plans for a Navajo version of the Central Arizona Project. But for all the talk about creating an irrigated agrarian utopia in the desert, the real idea, he allowed, was this: For decades, all the thirsty cities downstream had been using water — *Navajo* water — for free. Once the tribe won its water-rights claim, the cities could keep using the water — but only if they finally started paying the Indians for the use of what was rightfully theirs.

"We were ready to go to court" to win that water, MacDonald said. But the

continued on next page

**Some
insisted that
the Navajo
Nation
should settle
for nothing
less than
every last
drop of
water in the
Colorado
River.**

Navajo Water

continued from previous page

dream faded with his own arraignment, and the blueprints for the project apparently vanished into thin air. And now that he was out of prison, all this business about a settlement with New Mexico was pissing him off. "It's like you had a hundred head of sheep, and somebody stole them from you," MacDonald said. "Finally, you find your sheep in somebody else's corral. So you go and say, 'Hey, these are my sheep! Look at the brands, look at the earmarks: They're all mine.' And the guy who stole them says, 'Let's have a settlement here. I'll give you three of these sheep back.'"

But even though the blueprints for an Indian GAP have gone missing, the *idea* still casts an enthralling spell over more than a few Navajos.

"When we talk about breach of trust, we talk about breach of trust within our own tribal organizations."

—Norman Brown, Diné Nationalists

THE RUMORS FIRST CAME ROARING UP eight years ago with the appearance of a mimeographed pamphlet, an open letter entitled "Lawyers, Water Rights, Betrayals and the Fate of the Navajo Nation." It was written in the name of a group called the Diné Sovereignty Defense Association, or DSDA. (Diné is the Navajo word for Navajo, and the group's acronym is pronounced "DEZ-duh.") Thanks to the fury of its leafleting campaign, I came to think of DSDA as a sort of Irish Republican Army, minus the bombs and kneecapping.


The letter, which did not mention Pollack by name, alleged that "one or more of the Nation's lawyers are secretly working for outsiders." The water rights issue "amounts to a national emergency for the Navajo people," it said. It asserted — with a phrase that recurred like the come-on in a Nigerian Internet scam — that a Navajo water claim "has a potential value of 100s of \$millions and more." The author of the letter was a guy

named Jack Utter, another *bilagáana* who is a hydrologist for the Navajo Nation's Water Resources Department in Fort Defiance, a couple miles north of Window Rock. Utter works out of a cramped office in the back of a mobile unit parked behind the water resources building — a forbidding spot that feels a little like Antarctica's McMurdo Station. Utter is animated by the thrill of conspiracy, and he keeps a copy of Paulo Freire's anti-imperialist screed *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* — which largely draws its inspiration from the British colonization of India — close at hand.

In the years since he wrote the letter, Utter has become circumspect to the point of silence, but his theme of colonial victimization resonates deeply on the reservation. During the 1960s and 1970s — call it the high era of Western natural resources treachery — the tribe was cheated in a massive royalty deal with a company called Peabody Coal. Indian Country has also long grappled with the federal government's failure to honor its trust responsibility to the tribes. Elouise Cobell, a Blackfeet Indian woman, has doggedly fought for years to prove that the federal government mismanaged as much as \$176 billion in oil-and-gas royalties owed to Indians across the country.

But there was an added dimension here. Navajo grassroots groups like DSDA were also fighting against what they saw as a breach of trust at home. In 2003, Norman Brown, who was then president of a group called Diné Nationalists, told me that "when we talk about breach of trust, we talk about breach of trust within our own tribal organizations" — by which he meant the tribal government.

Not long after the Lawyers-and-Betrayal letter appeared in 2000, DSDA — as part of a broader grassroots coalition called Diné Bidzil, or Navajo Strength — called for major reform in




the Navajo government. The groups weren't going after anyone with AK-47s, but they did seem to constitute a genuine insurgency.

Much of their wrath focused on the tribal council, but DSDA also targeted four white lawyers, including Pollack. The group placed an ad in the *Navajo Times* that called the tribal government "a colonial government that is run by WHITE POWER" — this one *did* mention Pollack by name — and bumper stickers began to appear that read "Four Lawyers Out / Diné Freedom In."


People on both sides of the fight reported having their tires slashed and the lug nuts on their wheels loosened. There was an allegation that someone had slipped poisoned cough drops into a tribal council member's desk drawer. There were dark rumors that the *vallánis* — the notorious Navajo drunks — had been recruited into the fight. Several people made mention of witchcraft and "evil way" ceremonies secretively held in the remotest reaches of the reservation.

Finally, when the votes were counted in the 2000 tribal election, more than half of the council's 88 delegates were unseated. Pollack survived. After weathering subpoenas to appear before two tribal council subcommittees, he was exonerated from the charges in the Lawyers-and-Betrayals letter. The three other white lawyers left, however. Then DSDA and Diné Bidzil melted back into the shadows.

THE ANNUAL TRIBAL FAIR, held each September in Window Rock, is one of the few times when Navajos from across the reservation come together in one place. Last year, some of the old DSDA hands ran into each other there and shared concerns that their government had again grown complacent. Not long



The Navajo's traditional holy land is roughly twice the size of the current reservation and is bounded by the four sacred mountains, noted in green on this map. SHAWN C. GIBSON



Water pipes stop just short of these homes on the Navajo Nation, which lie between Tuba City and the Colorado River, 50 waterless miles in the distance.

make it even more valuable for the tribe. There was a certain Red Power strain to Milford's argument, but he was also starting to sound an awful lot like a water broker. In fact, by this point he had thought his way pretty well into a supply-and-demand graph. "Two factors will raise the price of that water," Milford said: "Global warming. And drought."

His eyes lit up, and the slot machine in my head went nuts. But after we paid for the meal, we went outside to discover that the world had turned to ice. Neither Milford nor Goldtooth had an ice-scraper in his truck, and Goldtooth snapped his I.D. card in half trying to scrape the frozen spackle off his windshield.

HERE IS AN APHORISM that occasionally bobs up in water circles and goes like this: The Navajos would rather have 100 percent of nothing than 50 percent of something. It is an uncomfortable thing to hear, but it may hold some truth.

Back in the 1980s, after Peter MacDonald's engineers drew up the plans for an Indian Central Arizona Project, he spent several years trying to persuade the federal government to fund it. The Bureau of Reclamation repeatedly lowballed the cost estimate and, finally, Sen. Pete Domenici, R-N.M. — who is now co-sponsoring the Navajo-New Mexico settlement legislation — asked MacDonald to accept the lowball figure. MacDonald refused: "I said, 'If that's the case, we may have to do it ourselves.'"

That was roughly two decades ago, before MacDonald's trip to prison and everything that followed. When MacDonald and I talked in February, I asked how him how, exactly, he had planned to finance the project without federal help.

for the tribe. But, Milford said, "All that power goes right to those big pumps (on the Colorado River) that pump water into the canals" — the Central Arizona Project's mainline — "and down to Phoenix and Tucson."

The tribe's quest to build its economy has been fitful, at best. Last year, the tribal council approved the Navajo Nation's first casino and began negotiating a \$100 million loan from JPMorgan Chase to finance the project. But the deal became controversial when the bank asked the tribe to pledge \$125 million worth of its assets as collateral.

"They have money here if they assert their water rights," Goldtooth said. "We're sittin' on a national treasure here."

When he said that, I could pretty well imagine the sound of a slot machine pumping out streams of quarters.

"If we had receipts from leasing water and stuff like that, we would be investing in our infrastructure," Milford continued. "We could pump a lot of money into different things."

But instead, they watched as more and more of the river's water rolled away downstream. Just last year, the seven Colorado River states negotiated a new round of drought-protection agreements for themselves. "Now that global warming and everything has spanked them in the butt, they're over here divvying up what's left," Milford said. "I bet they're just smiling from ear to ear because Navajo is not gonna file this big ol' claim for the water that we said we were entitled to."

Milford had, however, thought his way forward through the bitter paradoxes of the situation to a position of strategic advantage. Water demand from the seven states has been growing steadily since 1922. If the Navajo ever *did* get the water, that mounting demand would

afterward, a tribal member named Ron Milford resurrected the fight with a letter to the *Navajo Times* that insisted, "We must maximize Navajo water rights now."

A low-level war in the local newspapers followed, and I'm pretty sure Lena Fowler rolled her eyes when I happened to mention it. "They give an open mic to people like Ron Milford, and somehow he becomes credible enough for you to interview him," she said. "I'm tired of these one-sided stories where it's all about" — she switched to the Navajo word for "rumor" and repeated it like an incantation — "*jiní, jiní, jiní.*"

On a sloppy, miserable day, I went looking for Milford. He was in Tuba City, three hours from Window Rock, on the reservation's west side. I had just reached the ramshackle houses on the edge of town when another storm hit, and the world went *leechi lichí go' bhin'yo!* — a bloody maelstrom of red dust.

Half an hour later, I sat with Milford and another DSDA organizer named Max Goldtooth at a table in the back of a restaurant called The Hogan. Outside, the weather had turned again. Now it was *chít bhin'yo!*: blowing snow like a mother. Forty minutes into our conversation, all the lights went out.

The three of us sat huddled in the back of the restaurant as the storm raged outside. "Our starting point should be 5 million acre-feet of water," Milford said. That was considerably less than Peter MacDonald's idea of a winning number, but it was still more water than the entire state of California is entitled to, and nearly twice as much as Arizona gets.

As Milford and Goldtooth talked, I could appreciate their resentment about water getting sucked away to fuel prosperity everywhere but on the Navajo Nation. Fifty-five miles north of us was the Navajo Generating Station, which burns Navajo coal and provides royalties

continued on next page


Susan Nelson
1522 West Calle Mendoza
Green Valley, AZ 85614-1228



USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

attn: Rosemont Copper Project

Postage & Fees Paid
Permit No. 1000
Tucson, AZ 85701
May 09 2008
Coronado National Forest



SOUTHERN ARIZONA HANG GLIDER ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 43722
Tucson, AZ 85733

May 16, 2008

Ms. Jeanine A. Derby
Forest Supervisor
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ 85701
ATTN: Rosemont Copper Project EIS

Dear Ms. Derby:

I am writing you on behalf of the Southern Arizona Hang Glider Association regarding the proposed Rosemont Copper Project. While there are a large number of negative impacts that this mine will have on the National Forest and surrounding communities, I will address just one issue that specifically affects our members as recreational users of the Coronado National Forest.

As you may know, we maintain a special use permit with the Forest Service for several flying sites within the Coronado National Forest. For over three decades we have been responsible users and stewards of the National Forest environment from which we fly. As participants in silent, foot-launched, motor-less flight, we have had the opportunity to experience the beauty of our forest lands from a unique perspective. It is our understanding that we will lose one of our flying sites, Box Canyon, if the mine goes ahead as proposed. Our review of the most recent layout of the mine and its facilities shows that the fence line cuts the road to the Box Canyon launches, making the site inaccessible for hang-gliding. While Augusta has proposed building a new forest road around the fence on the south and east sides to provide access for off-road vehicles, there is no plan to connect the portion of the road that leads to the hang-gliding launches.

We do not think that the proposed mine is consistent with the Coronado National Forest Plan. As that plan states, "Extraction of minerals has a potential to disrupt other Forest values, if not carefully regulated. In a few sensitive areas it is necessary to exclude mineral activity." We believe that this is clearly one of those areas. This proposed private, for-profit operation utilizing Coronado National Forest Land will permanently preclude other historic uses of the forest and have aesthetic, environmental, recreational impacts that will never be remediated.


Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,


Fred Leonard, President
Southern Arizona Hang Glider Association

Southern Arizona Hang Glider Association
P.O. Box 43722
Tucson, AZ 85733

TUCSON AZ 857
19 MAY 2008 PM 11




LOUIS COMFORT TIFFANY

Tucson, AZ 85701
Received
MAY 20 2008
Coronado National Forest

Ms. Jeanine A. Derby
Forest Supervisor
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ 85701
ATTN: Rosemont Copper Project EIS

85701+1331



Ms. Beverly Everson, Geologist
Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ 85701

My water is pumped from well number 565705

The legal description of my property is:

19S Township 16E S-Range 21 E-Section

Pima County 307 Book 20 Map 0026 Parcel

I would like to know what impact the Rosemont Mine would have on my well.

Can I expect the water table to be lowered, if so, will my well run dry?

If my well runs dry, who will pay to get the water to my home?

If I cannot get water to my property, who will compensate me for the total loss in value of my property, loss in livestock and emotional damage?

What will the quality of my water be compared to what it was before Rosemont operations began?

What do you estimate the future ground water table to be?

Will a trust be established securing funds for wells that will be directly or indirectly effected by Rosemont Mine?


Will a surface and ground water study be completed describing impacts of the Rosemont Mine on the East Side of the Santa Ritas?

For how long can a sufficient supply of CAP water be guaranteed?

I look forward to receiving a written answer to these concerns.

Thank you,

Cheryl Rennie
Cheryl Rennie




my water is pumped
 The legal description
195 Township
Pima County 3
 I would like to know wh
 Can I expect the water ta
 If my well runs dry, who
 If I cannot get water to m
 my property, loss in livesto
 that will the quality of m
 gan?
 at do you estimate the fu
 a trust be established se
 ted by Rosemont Mine?
 a surface and ground wa
 on the East Side of the Sa
 w long can a sufficient su
 rward to receiving a w
 ou,
 Cheryl Rennie
 Rennie



U.S. POSTAGE
 \$4.90
 MAY 20 2008
 SONOITA, AZ
 85637
 000-4908-05



TUCSON AZ 857
 20 MAY 2008 PM 3 T



7008 0150 0001 3149 0775

*Ms Beverly Everson, Geologist
 Rosemont Copper Project EIS
 Coronado National Forest
 300 W. Congress Street
 Tucson, AZ 85701*

USA
 Ms. Cheryl Rennie
 HC 1 Box 1055
 Sonoita, AZ 85637

RETURN REQUESTED
 Tucson, AZ 85701
 Received
 MAY 21 2008

85701
 25701+1371 0004

e of
 ons

PHOENIX AZ 850


19 MAY 08



Forest Supervisor
AT&T: Rosemont Copper SLS
Coronado NF, SO
300 W. Congress St
Tucson, AZ 85701

Tucson, AZ 85701
Received
MAY 20 2008
Coronado National Forest

© 2007 USPS recycled



3rd Request

please change my address

To: Robert Oldfield 188129
Southern Unit
ASPC - Florence Bx 8400
Florence, AZ 85232-8400

I have sent comments and
assume you have received them.

Thank you!



Robert H. Oldfield
Retired Geologist

**Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 Congress St.
Tucson, Az 85701**

My water is pumped from well number 55-638004
Legal description for this property is,
Township 18S Range 16E Section 12
Pima County Book 305 Map 91 Parcel 0530

I would like to know what impact the Rosemont mine will have on my well. Can I expect the water table to be lowered, if so will my well run dry? If my well runs dry who will pay to get water to my home?

What do you estimate the future groundwater table depth to be? Will a trust be established securing funds for wells that directly or indirectly affected by Rosemont Mine?

Will a surface and ground water study be complete describing the impact of Rosemont Mine on the East side of the Santa Rita?

Thank you for answering these questions.

Sincerely

Robert & Gail Evanoff


Robert Evanoff
G. Evanoff

5-8, 08

5-8-08

EVANOFF'S
20421 S. SONOITA HWY
VAIL, AZ 85641


TUCSON AZ 857
03 MAY 2008 PM 2 F



Rosemont Copper Project
Coronado National Forest
300 Congress St
Tucson Az
85701

Tucson, AZ 85701
Received
MAY 00 2008
Coronado National Forest

8570189999



Forest Service
Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson AZ. 85701

June 2, 2008

Dear Sirs

As a resident of Tucson AZ. I want to express my feelings on the Rosemont Copper Project EIS, as hard as it is to agree with the proposed escalation of mining in such a scenic Mountain area I have to agree it is the thing to do, We are dependant on our Oil from foreign countries because we did not want to have Oil wells off our coast and are paying dearly for it lets not let the same thing happen to our Copper.

Thank you

Virgil Dinius
3600 W. Orange Grove Rd.
Tucson AZ. 85741

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Virgil Dinius".

Virgil Dinius
3600 W. Orange Grove Rd.
Lot 217
Tucson, AZ. 85741

Thank you
Virgil Dinius
3600 W. Orange Grove
Tucson AZ. 85741
Virgil Dinius

As a resident,
I agree with the
state and local
officials who are
paying dearly for
this project.



Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ. 85701

Received
MAY 16 2008
Coronado National Forest



8570181371

as hard as it is to
the thing to do, We
coast and are

2, 2008


Why I am opposed to mining in the Santa Ritas

Impact on quality of life —

1. Water → lack of contamination
2. Clean Air → pollution from mining dust
3. noise, dust + lighter pollution → blasting
4. Loss of wild life habitat
5. Serious Traffic problems
6. Cost to State of Arizona - police, road repair - haz mat situations,
7. Impact on the general health of people in Sonora, Palajuno, Green Valley, etc —

Water is far more important than
copper, silver, etc to the people
of Arizona —


Vote "no" - please to mining



Clare Journey
PO Box 755
Sonora AZ
85637

Mining in

of life -
+ Contamination
pollution from mining dust
dust + heavy pollution -> blasting



Ms. Claire C. Downing
PO Box 755
Sonoita AZ 85637
MAY 2008 PM 17

USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St
Tucson, AZ

570141374

police,
sons,
the g
Dean

at than
people

mining

Rosemont Copper project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St
Tucson, AZ 85701

My water is pumped from well number 55-598408

The legal description for the property is:

S $\frac{1}{2}$ of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$
Township 19S-Range 18E-Sec 28

PIMA COUNTY BOOK 306 MAP 34 PARCEL 0097

I would like to know what impact the Rosemont mine would have on my well.
Can I expect the water table to be lowered, if so will my well run dry?
If my well runs dry who will pay to get water to my home?
What do you estimate the future groundwater table depth to be?
Will a trust be established securing funds for wells that are directly or indirectly
affected by Rosemont Mine?
Will a surface and ground water study be completed describing the impacts of the
Rosemont mine on the East Side of the Santa Rita's?

Thank you for answering these questions.


Sincerely,

Norman & Lois Krumholz

 Bud & Lois Krietemeyer
HC 1, Box 674
Elgin, AZ 85611

TUCSON, AZ 857

16 MAY 2008 PM 3 L



Rosemont Copper Project EIS

Coronado National Forest

300 W. Congress St


Tucson AZ 85701

TUCSON, AZ 85701
Received

MAY 19 2008

Coronado National Forest

8570141371 0004



I hope that someone will read and consider all of my words here.....I write as one trained as a holistic health professional.....however, I will form the following thoughts for easy assimilation:

NO THING HAS CHANGED SINCE 2004.....THERE IS INSUFFICIENT WATER FOR AN OPEN PIT MINING OPERATION.....I SEE NO REASON NOR ROOM FOR DISCUSSION!

CONTINUING TO TAP THE COLORADO IS UNACCEPTABLE, SHORT SITED, AND FRANKLY DANGEROUS.....AUGUSTA'S UNDERHANDED METHODS THUS FAR HAVE SPOKEN VOLUMES

FURTHER CONTAMINATION OF OUR AIR AND WATER WILL ONLY ADD TO THE CONTINUING DEGRADATION OF OUR IMMUNE SYSTEMS.....FOR THE LOSS OF HEALTH AND ABILITY TO THRIVE IN THE DESERT, THERE IS NO REPARATION!!!!



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

I come from the holistic health community - am well versed in helping people detoxify their bodies from contaminants. Through testing - improved testing, we are able to isolate via ex: hair analysis exactly what is making us sick - via chelation. Point: we are degrading - our immune systems are overloaded. I am also a Certified Equine Specialist & work with vets. We are seeing more & more tumors, immune system disorders - ALLERGIES in our animals. An environmentally ill man was standing with his cane on my porch when the wind shifted from the West (already existant from Phelps/ploage mine.) This man's nervous system is so compromised that his body went into a severe attack like palsy. I could not detect any smell - this guy has lost his olfactory sense - yet his nervous system told the tale. An environmental engineer from Phoenix who

NAME: Miriam A. Ellison

EMAIL: miriamellison@yahoo.com

ADDRESS: P.O. 1483 7284 E. Wilderness Trail Sahuarita AZ 85629

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

Memo re: Rosemont issue (cont.)

manages construction sites throughout Arizona, confirmed for me that there are organisms being released into the air now, that heretofore have been unrecognized....seemInly in herent solely to this desert. There are studies being done to ascertain how much humans, etc are being impacted.

You must note the following FACT: there hs been a 300% increase in deaths from lung cancer in the last two years, and these being non-smokers.

Can Augusta provide assurance that further mining will not be responsible for futher compromising the health of our citizens and our animals via increased contamination of our air.....our water supply...quality, let alone quantity???

Another issue that must be considered. Why is it assumed that the Colorado is an inexhaustible source of water by every entity, in every state that wishes to tap it???? We can no longer afford to develop plans that do not take all into consideration. There is plenty of information out there now to demonstrate the fragility of the Colorado system. How generous of Augusta to offer to pay the price of piping in the Colorado to appease the sheep. Outrageous arrogance. The minipulation of our locals by invitations to dine prior to the scheduled meetings here....offers of jobs, etc.....just underhanded and speaks volumns about Augusta's true colors. (Green being the operative color).

When I moved to AZ in 2004, a news ariticle read.....(paraphrased)....."insufficient water for open pit mining".....**NO THING has changed!**

My well will be impacted as I live just north of the Santa Ritas.....I want to know why all the discussion is about what they will do to ensure we have water, when in fact our water table will be sucked backwards to their operation in time.....or so it is thought. Why are we having this discussion?????

There is insufficient water for an open pit mining operation.

The CDC conducted testing of my water and urine to determine the impact of the already existing mining operations here in the Tucson Area.....High arsenic.....beryllium.....to mention two.

My final statement is this:

DO NOT GO ON WITH THIS MINE.....THERE WILL BE TOO MANY COMPROMISED IN TOO MANY WAYS TO HAVE ANY AMOUNT OF REPARATION MEAN A THING TO ANY OF US.

.....sincerely.....Miriam A. Ellison
HTP/LMT/HOM.

TUCSON AZ 857

16 MAY 2008 PM 2 T



USDA Forest Service
 Coronado Natl. Forest
 300 W. Congress St.
 Tucson, AZ 85701

Tucson, AZ 85701
 Received
 MAY 19 2008
 Coronado National Forest

Beverly Evenson

85701\$1371



Please protect our Coronado National Forest

Marcia Patrao 5/10/08

More hard facts about Rosemont mine

ugusta Resource, the Canadian company that wants to develop a copper deposit in the Rosemont Valley of the north-eastern Santa Rita Mountains, has stated recently that it may explore and possibly mine on the north-eastern side of the mountains as well.

This would have a huge effect on Green Valley, Quail Creek, Sahua-Ita and Corona de Tucson.

In view of the depressing and harmful effects caused by the existing copper mines at Green Valley and Sahuarita, people from these communities deserve to know some facts* about the Rosemont mine:

- How it came about
- Whether or not it is the large mine Augusta claims it is
- What it could do to the environment all Arizonans treasure
- What huge amounts of our forestland could be lost forever
- The Rosemont copper deposit is located within the old Helvetia mining district, once the site of several small underground mines.
- Since these mines closed down in 1951, the district has experienced exploration efforts by some of the largest mining companies in the

Guest Comment

By Fred Tohse

CNW Homeowner Lot 29

United States—Banner Mining Co., American Exploration and Mining Co., Anaconda Mining Co., Anamax Mining Co., and ASARCO.

These companies have drilled hundreds of exploration holes throughout the district and made several boisterous estimates of copper resources. None of them attempted a mine in this area. Augusta, too, launched an exploration program, focusing on the Rosemont area. Where large, experienced U.S. mining companies had failed, Augusta, an unproven Canadian mining company, now tells us they have drilled out a "world class" copper deposit.

Augusta's Web site states that they have about 617 million tons of reserves, but only 134 million tons—22 percent—are proven. The rest—78 percent—are only estimated.

It seems very risky for the U.S. Forest Service to approve a Plan of Operations for an unproven mining camp, mining mostly unproven re-

serves, when the consequences of the mining process could be so devastating. Here is what probably would happen:

1. The Forest Service could grant Augusta the right to mine and dump waste onto as many as 850 un-patented mining claims that may ultimately total an area in excess of 25 square miles—more than twice the size of the entire communities of Green Valley and Quail Creek combined.

2. The mine would have an impact on the hydrology and water quality of the Davidson Canyon drainage system, important to the City of Tucson. If Augusta mines or dumps waste onto the northern tier of un-patented mining claims, this probably would alter the hydrology and water quality of the Sycamore Canyon drainage system, too, thus affecting Corona de Tucson also.

3. The mine would use enormous amounts of water from the Santa Cruz River aquifers—an estimated 5,000 to 7,000 acre-feet per year, an amount equal to that used annually by 20,000 to nearly 30,000 household members.

Augusta claims that the water it uses will be replaced by CAP water,

though it does not have a CAP guarantee for the full life of the mine.

Furthermore, CAP water, with its very high content of dissolved solids, is not the same fresh, potable water that Augusta would pump from the Santa Cruz River aquifers. The trade-off of CAP water for groundwater is a bad deal.

4. The nearly pristine beauty of the Santa Rita Mountains would be destroyed forever. Mine reclamation procedures, though promised by Augusta, can never restore such beauty. One simply needs to look at the mine dumps at Green Valley to see this. Will real estate values be the same if large mining operations are carried on at residents' back doors, with nighttime lights, rock blasting and truck noise?

5. Mining profits would flow to Augusta investors and at least some of the copper concentrates may be shipped overseas—Augusta is talking about shipping concentrates by rail to the deep-water port at Guaymas, Mexico. Sumitomo Corp., one of the three largest trading companies in Japan and a major stockholder of Augusta, may dictate where the concentrates go.

6. These are some of the facts about mining operations in the San-

ta Rita Mountains. Is it worth allowing Augusta to proceed when there are so many potentially devastating consequences?

We Arizonans could be left with one or more huge holes in the ground, a ravaged and possibly contaminated countryside, and contaminated groundwater. Our tourists would certainly shun the areas they used to love for hiking, camping and other soul-enriching activities.

* The facts cited are from documents published by Augusta Resource or their consultants to satisfy information requests by the U.S. Forest Service or are from Augusta's reports to its stockholders, both written and verbal.

Fred Tohse and his wife Carol have lived in Green Valley for six years. He received a Bachelor's degree in geology from Yale University, and a master's in Geology from the California Institute of Technology. His career was in the West, including California and Arizona with Chevron, Kennecott Copper briefly, and for many years, his own geological consulting firm. The views expressed are the author's and not necessarily his newspaper's. Comment on this story online at www.gnews.com

5/14/08
Green Valley News

Ms. Marcia Natrass
2032 W Vista Ridge Dr
Green Valley, AZ 85614



TUCSON AZ 85701
Received
MAY 14 2008

TUCSON AZ 857
12 MAY 2008 PM 3 T



ATTN: Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300W Congress St
Tucson AZ 85701

85701412 0005



ATTN: ROSEMONT TEAM LEADER



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

* WATER - ARIZONA'S MOST PRECIOUS + VITAL RESOURCE THE U.S.F.S. MUST do exhaustive + thoroughly comprehensive studies to ASSURE that the water supply will not be contaminated or diminished for our children + future generations. The concern for WATER must be PARAMOUNT.

* ECONOMICS of the communities directly impacted. U.S.F.S must PRIORITIZE the local residents who will suffer the most. U.S.F.S. must consider seriously the full scope of the economic threat if the BEAUTY + LIFESTYLE of our communities are so significantly impaired (DEVASTATED) by this mine. TOURISM + REAL ESTATE are the primary economic contributors * both will be totally "blown out of the water" - DESTROYED along with the landscape + lifestyle.

NAME: ANNE M. CARLSON

EMAIL: anne@annecarlson.com

ADDRESS: HC 1 Box 148 Elgin AZ 85611

Cont'd on Pg 2

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

Pg. 2



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

**PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR THE
PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

How COMMENT:

- * Does the U.S.F.S. justify the rape of our local landscape to profit Foreign Capitalists who will export our resources and devastate our public lands? Who wins ??? who is served ?? Who benefits ???
- * WHAT OBLIGATION does the U.S.F.S. have to the local residents to manage the Public lands ???

The U.S.F.S. must thoroughly examine the environmental + economic + social impacts the potential of this mine will incur forever.

Have a look at Bisbee Mine + Copper Valley mine. does the U.S.F.S. really feel the American public can suffer further rape of our amazing landscape + lifestyle ??

NAME: ANNE GIBSON

EMAIL: anne@annegibson.com

ADDRESS: HC1 Box 140
Elgin AZ 85611

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.



I LIVE NEAR SONOITA AND DRIVE TO TUCSON
5 DAYS A WEEK TO PRACTICE MEDICINE.

IF THIS MINE IS OK'ED, I MIGHT NOT BE ABLE
TO GET TO TUCSON BECAUSE OF ALL THE TRUCKS ON
THE ROAD - BUT, IF I COULD - WOULD I WANT TO
SEE A SCENE LIKE THE ONE ABOVE - OR THE BEAUTIFUL
SCENE THERE

NAME: WILLIAM N. DATES, M.D.

EMAIL: _____

ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 504, SONOITA, AZ.
85637

NOW? YOU
GUESS

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

The public comment period is the beginning of the EIS process and represents the foundation of the analysis. Your comments are an important input to the analysis of the social and natural environment.

- Remember, this is the time to identify concerns AND opportunities.
- Your comments must be realistic and feasible.
- The better you understand the proposal, the more focused and site-specific your comments will be.
 - Statements such as "I am concerned about the amount of additional traffic this will cause" are useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
 - Statements such as "Don't do this" or "I like this" are not useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- Be specific so the reviewer clearly understands your concerns.
- Be brief so the reviewer won't miss the point of your comment.

Below are several tips for making effective comments.

The format for commenting is up to you to choose. Comment forms are available, but not required. Send comments by mail, email, or hand-deliver to the Forest Service before the public scoping period ends on May 19, 2008.

To be effective, comments should be specific and factual. Remember, the purpose of this scoping is to identify significant issues related to the proposed operation, and issues to be considered in the Environmental Impact Process (EIS).

How to Comment Effectively

Fold Here

TUCSON AZ 857
 11 13 2008 PM 1 T



USDA Forest Service
 Coronado National Forest
 300 West Congress Street
 Tucson, AZ 85701

Tucson, AZ 85701
 Received
 MAY 13 2008
 Coronado National Forest

Attn: Beverly Everson

85701+1341



JENNIFER A. WHITE

15515 E. Hillton Ranch Road
Vail, AZ 85641

May 11, 2008

Ms. Beverley Everson
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ 85701

Dear Ms. Everson,

I have written to your office prior to this, to make known my objections to potential mining activity in the Santa Rita Mountains. As a taxpaying citizen who lives within 5 miles of the proposed Rosemont site, mining in our area is simply unacceptable for so many reasons.

The reason that I am writing again today has to do with only one of those concerns. I strongly feel that my water supply will be negatively impacted by mining activity nearby.

If my well goes dry as a result of the mine, I will not be able to live on my property, but neither will I be able to sell it. This is not an acceptable scenario, unless the Forest Service or Augusta Resources plans to reimburse me for the current value of my property plus another 10% or so to cover the costs of moving my household and my animals.

My well registration number is 55-584992.

I sincerely hope that the people who are charged with the administration of the Coronado National Forest, and the National Forest Service, are listening to the citizens of this area and taking their concerns and fears very seriously.

Sincerely,



Jennifer A. White

Jennifer A. White
15515 E Hilton Ranch Rd
Vail, AZ 85641-9118

TUCSON AZ 857

13 MAY 2008 PM 2 L

Tucson, AZ 85701
Received
MAY 14 2008
Coronado National Forest



Ms. Beverly Everson
Coronado Nat. Forest
300 W. Congress
Tucson AZ 85701

8570141371

5/12/08

To Whom it may concern

I am in favor of developing the Rosemont Copper mine

1. I am also against taking all of the Coronada National forest off, limits for mineral claims who knows what minerals maybe needed in the future
2. Arizona is a mining state, it has been, and is, and will be.

Sincerely

Edward Madson


360-E Hillcrest Place

Tucson, AZ 85704

cell 520-250-9626

home 520-887-7338

Mr. Edward Madson
360 E Hillcrest Pl
Tucson AZ 85704



TUCSON AZ 85701
13 MAY 2008 PM 4 T

TUCSON, AZ 85701
Received
MAY 14 2008
Coronado National Forest

*Government Copper Project ELD
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St*

*Tucson
AZ 85701*



85701+1371

May 12, 2008

Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ 85701

To Whom It May Concern:

I support the Rosemont Copper Mine 100%. I am a native Arizonan in my fifties. I remember going to grade school and having to learn the Arizona's five "C's", Copper, Cattle, Cotton, Citrus, and Climate. In those days the mining industry gave tremendous support to the local schools.

Arizona is a highly mineralized state. I believe we should make the best of it. If we don't utilize these minerals we could end up being dependant on nations for these resources.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kenneth R. Summers". The signature is written in black ink and includes a long horizontal flourish at the end.

Kenneth R. Summers
4881 S. Lantana Pl.
Tucson, AZ. 85730

May 12, 2008

Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ 85701

To Whom It May Concern:

I support the Rosemont Copper Mine 100%. I am a native Arizonan in my fifties.

Arizona is a highly mineralized state. I believe we should make the best of it. If we don't utilize these minerals we could end of be dependant on nations for these resources.

I have traveled on the back roads in the area of where the mine will be. The area is already covered with mining activity from days gone by.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cynthia J. Summers". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name and address.

Cynthia J. Summers
4881 S. Lantana Pl.
Tucson, AZ. 85730

Cindy Summers
4881 S Lantana Pl
Tucson, AZ 85730

TUCSON, AZ 857
13 MAY 2008 PM 4:1

CLASS FOREVER



ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT EIS
CORONADO NATIONAL FOREST
300 W CONGRESS ST,
TUCSON, AZ 85701

Tucson, AZ 85701
Received

MAY 14 2008

Coronado National Forest



8570181371



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT After perusing Augusta Resource Corporation's "Mine Plan of Operations" and "Reclamation and Closure Plan" for the Rosemont Project, I feel any comments of mine would be inconsequential. I do not have the resources to hire experts to rebut their findings and suggest alternatives, but I strongly believe the impact of mining on the surrounding area would be intolerable for people, plants, and animals. What alternatives can be put forth for the following other than denying Augusta's mining plans:

- A. noise pollution - from blasting operations
B. air pollution - dust from digging, blasting, and truck traffic in and out of the pit
C. light pollution - from 24 hour mine operation
D. surface degradation of Highway 83 from heavy truck traffic, and the increased danger to school buses and smaller vehicles traveling this narrow, twisting mountain road.
E. depriving the public of the use of 3390 acres of PUBLIC LAND for 20 YEARS. Augusta is already constructing new roads, putting up fences and other obstacles preventing access to National Forest Land.
F. destroying wildlife habitat for untold number of years after mining operations cease - reclamation does not take place overnight.
G. water consumption by the mining operation is the most significant impact of all. Local wells are already drying up as a result of the current drought, and Lake Meade and Lake Powell water levels are being reduced drastically by the demands of the CAP as well as the drought. Augusta has already applied for and been given permission to use CAP water.

Augusta is proceeding with its plans for the Rosemont Mine as if approval of the EIS by the Forest Service is a mere formality.


NAME: SYLVIA M. HAMEL

EMAIL:

ADDRESS:


PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.



USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 West Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

Attn: Beverly Everson



Fold Here

How to Comment Effectively

To be effective, comments should be specific and factual. Remember, the purpose of this scoping is to identify significant issues related to the proposed operation, and issues to be considered in the Environmental Impact Process (EIS).

The format for commenting is up to you to choose. Comment forms are available, but not required. Send comments by mail, email, or hand-deliver to the Forest Service before the public scoping period ends on April 18, 2008.

Below are several tips for making effective comments.

- Be brief so the reviewer won't miss the point of your comment.
- Be specific so the reviewer clearly understands your concerns.
 - Statements such as "I am concerned about the amount of additional traffic this will cause" are useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
 - Statements such as "Don't do this" or "I like this" are not useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- The better you understand the proposal, the more focused and site-specific your comments will be.
- Your comments must be realistic and feasible.
- Remember, this is the time to identify concerns AND opportunities.

The public comment period is the beginning of the EIS process and represents the foundation of the analysis. Your comments are an important input to the analysis of the social and natural environment.

15551 E. Adobe Mesa Place
Phone: 520-762-9115
Fax: 520-762-9014



Fax

To: Rosemont Team Leader	From: Barbara & Johnnie R. Raley
Fax: 520-388-8305	Date: May 12, 2008
Phone: 520-388-8300	Pages: 3
Re: Proposed Rosemont Mine	CC: [Click here and type name]

Urgent **For Review** **Please Comment** **Please Reply** **Please Recycle**

•Comments: [Click here and type any comments]

+ e-mailed 5/12

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Regarding Rosemont Mine

HEALTH: *Too many issues to discuss, but a part of each and every point against Rosemont/Augusta Resource Corporation...*

WATER: *There is a **great potentiality** that toxic heavy metals and other chemicals leach into ground and surface waters draining into Tucson area water supplies, and impacting nearby riparian areas such as Davidson Canyon. This would also imperil important wildlife habitat and future drinking water sources for residential use. Right now, our private well produces a high quality of water, but that can change in an instant! **More health issues here ...for us all!***

AIR: *Air quality in the National Forest and surrounding residential areas will be degraded by both dust, airborne particulates and truck exhaust associated with mine operations. **MORE health issues.***

NOISE: *Daily blasting is required to remove rock (or overburden) covering the ore body. The impact to nearby residences, wildlife and recreational users in our National Forest will be equivalent to daily sonic booms....**HEALTH again!***

LIGHT POLLUTION: *We no longer have the peaceful black skies our ancestors so enjoyed, due to the light wasted up into the night sky. It provides no useful lighting, wastes significant amounts energy, and threatens astronomical research. All of our observatories will suffer with another 24/7 mining operation! It is estimated by the International Dark Sky Association (IDA) that Astronomy, our observatories, contributes over 100 million dollars annually to the State's economy. Pima and Coconino Counties have previously declared that dark skies are a natural resource to be protected along with other natural resources, such as air and our water quality. **Dark Skies are also a significant component of the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan** currently being developed to accommodate future growth while preserving the environmental features of Southern Arizona that are such a vital part in the quality of life in our area. **Economic Health!***

SCENIC VIEW: *Travelers along Scenic Hwy 83 are currently treated to a sweeping panoramic view of the Rosemont Valley at an overlook spot. The mine site dominates this view which currently consists of rolling hills of grasslands, dotted with oak trees and backed by a rugged ridge line. There is one Scenic outlook on "Scenic Hwy 83" and that would become a Mine Viewing turnout! **Mental health!***

TRAFFIC: *Mine traffic, including ore trucks and vehicles carrying heavy construction equipment and explosives for blasting, will share the narrow, winding Highway 83 with school buses, commuters, motorcyclists, bicyclists, and tourist traffic. Highway 83 is a precarious little two lane road in the first place, not designed for the type of traffic a 24/7 mining operation will entail. It will fall apart within weeks and guess who fixes it? Not Augusta, but us the taxpayers of Pima County! **Dangers to health not only for residential and recreational traffic, but our School Children, every single day of the school week x two!***

PROPERTY VALUES: The areas south of the mine site have developed into high-end rural residential ranches and gorgeous homes. An open pit mine will severely impact the quality of life and reduce property values in those areas. We have worked long and hard, finally putting our life's savings and much time into our slice of heaven and for what??? To live next to, hear, see, be inconvenienced by, not just a mine, but an Out of Country group that will leave their damage behind when the price of copper falls, and then...we lose everything and they take their gains, and leave a disaster that will never heal! **Mental as well as financial health!**

RECREATION: The Rosemont Valley is heavily used by mountain bikers, hikers, off-highway vehicles, bicyclists, hunters, camping families, beautiful trees and places for our children to run and know nature. Would you take YOUR family to camp and hike by an open pit mine? Already, the Rosemont crews are blocking access to our once heavily used beautify camping and recreational areas. Places we took our own Daughter to run free and explore in...the area will **NO LONGER** be "Family Friendly" on top of taking away a valuable asset to our State. **Economic & Mental health here!**

WILDLIFE AND WILDLIFE HABITAT:

The Santa Ritas are recognized for the biological values and are an Important Birding Area (IBA). In addition, the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan lists part of the area around Rosemont as part of the Biological Core. And what about our priority vulnerable species including two Endangered Species: the Lesser Long-nosed bat, & the Pima Pineapple Cactus? More species are known to occur there: Chiricahua Leopard Frog, listed as threatened, and the Yellow-billed Cuckoo also a candidate for listing. According to the AZ Game and Fish Department, also the Mexican Long-tongued Bat, Western Red Bat, Lowland Leopard Frog, the Giant Spotted Whiptail Lizard, Rufous-winged Sparrow and Bell's Vireo, are all in danger. The Mexican Spotted Owl may also occur there, based on its habitat requirements. **Health again...have we no respect for the wonderful creatures God has blessed us with?!?!?**

ECONOMICS: The USDA Forest Service is a caretaker of our beautiful forest lands. **ARE YOU LISTENING? We DON'T WANT tons of tailings (overburden) piled on our public lands!** You are supposed to be protecting our public lands, not selling us out. Shameful! A recent study by the Sonoran Institute shows that a mine at Rosemont would have serious economic impacts to the surrounding communities. **Mental, physical and financial HEALTH!**

The report found: "...if the proposed Rosemont mine operations displaced only one percent of travel and tourism-related spending in the region, the economic loss would be greater than the entire annual payroll of the mine," Joe Marlow, senior economist with the Sonoran Institute. Most of the benefits would go to the Tucson area, while most of the costs, such as decreased tourism revenue, **would be borne by communities near the mine**" and that means ME! **Once again, Mental, physical and financial HEALTH!**

Respectfully submitted, Barbara & Johnnie R. Raley, 15551 E. Adobe Mesa Place, Vail, AZ 85641 520-762-9115 (bdarlin@earthlink.net)

May 12, 2008
Team Leader
Rosemont Copper Project
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

FAX: 520.388.8305

I have many concerns about the mine and its impact on the land, the water and the quality of life of the people, plants and animals in its path, and as a commuter to Tucson, I am also concerned about Highway 83. How will local traffic, the ore trucks and the oversize loads we now suffer compete for the road? Will the mine's high voltage power lines and the towers necessary to carry those lines be located near the highway, and how will they alter the nearby landscape and environment? With the road damaged from constant heavy traffic, who will pay for repairs and maintenance? Will Highway 83 lose its scenic highway designation?

Another concern is the viability of the mine and Augusta Resource Corporation, a Canadian company headquartered in Vancouver, BC. History teaches us that copper prices will eventually fall. If Augusta abandons the mine for economic reasons, can you guarantee that Augusta will cure the devastation left behind?

Finally, Vancouver is a beautiful city with its mountains and the winter-sport paradise of Whistler nearby. I believe that Vancouver's citizens would be outraged if an American mining company planned to dig a copper pit in the foothills of their city. The hostile reaction you've experienced regarding this proposed mine should be easily understood.

Rosemont Valley is beautiful and precious to the people here. Please protect the valley and do the right thing by stopping the mining activity in the area until the questions and concerns of the people are answered.

Thank you.



Diana Holmes
PO Box 1305
Sonoita, AZ 85637
dsholmes@q.com

CC: Save the Scenic Santa Ritas



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

**PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR THE
PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

Aside from all of the environmental hazards, particularly the release of chemicals into our water supply in an arid land, the blatant waste of that same water, the blight on the landscape along a designated "scenic highway", the threat to the "dark skies" that make the U of A one of the most sought after Astronomy Departments in the world, the significantly diminished air quality, etc., etc. each of which by itself should condemn this project... there is the very practical, day to day matter of Hwy 83. It is not unusual for me to be stopped 2-5 times during my 24 mile journey from Sonoita to I-10 to allow for the passage of a wide load. This is one-way! The same can occur on my return. There are narrow spots, recently made more dangerous by the installation of guard rails which do not give the bike riders an emergency "get out of the road" escape route. This is a "scenic route" bringing to our small towns the tourists who keep our few restaurants and shops afloat and provide us with a livelihood. More wide and fast traffic on our fragile scenic highway is simply unacceptable - please - one more truck every 15 minutes 24 hours a day!!!!!! Absolutely unthinkable!!!

NAME: ELEN I. KENTNOR

EMAIL: elen@kentnor.com

ADDRESS: 307 Vaughn Loop Rd. Elgin AZ
P.O. Box 717, Sonoita, AZ 85637

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): **YES** **NO**

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

Attn: Beverly Everson

Coronado National Forest
MAY 12 2008
Tucson, AZ 85701
Received

USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 West Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701



Fold Here

How to Comment Effectively

To be effective, comments should be specific and factual. Remember, the purpose of this scoping is to identify significant issues related to the proposed operation, and issues to be considered in the Environmental Impact Process (EIS).

The format for commenting is up to you to choose. Comment forms are available, but not required. Send comments by mail, email, or hand-deliver to the Forest Service before the public scoping period ends on July 14, 2008.

Below are several tips for making effective comments.

- Be brief so the reviewer won't miss the point of your comment.
- Be specific so the reviewer clearly understands your concerns.
 - Statements such as "I am concerned about the amount of additional traffic this will cause" are useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
 - Statements such as "Don't do this" or "I like this" are not useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- The better you understand the proposal, the more focused and site-specific your comments will be.
- Your comments must be realistic and feasible.
- Remember, this is the time to identify concerns AND opportunities.

The public comment period is the beginning of the EIS process and represents the foundation of the analysis. Your comments are an important input to the analysis of the social and natural environment.



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT: IS THIS WHAT WE HAVE TO LOOK FORWARD TO? ->

GREEN VALLEY NEWS - Fri, 4-25-08 Pena Blanca Lake will be cleaned

By Dick Kamp Wick News Service

The Nogales Ranger District will hold an open house at 4 p.m. Wednesday at the Forest Service office for input on the "engineering valuation cost analysis" of how to clean up mercury, lead and arsenic in the sediment of Pena Blanca Lake, about 30 miles southwest of Green Valley.

The cleanup is being carried out under the federal super-fund CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act) program that oversees the cleanup of old hazardous waste.

A comment period on the subject — including whether to drain the lake and what to do if it's drained — began April 16 and ends May 16.

"We're thinking of draining the lake completely at the start of 2009, removing the fish, the sediments with the methyl mercury and other organics and pollutants," said Coronado National Forest Environmental and Transportation engineer Eli Curiel.

The EECA document, available for public comment, suggests eight alternatives in-

cluding no-action, capping the sediment at the bottom of the lake, partially draining and dredging.

The authors of the document, Phoenix-based Westco, recommend that the lake be completely drained, entire lake bottom sediment dredged and excavated, "euthanizing" the fish and later restocking over a 6.5 month period plus the unknown time necessary for rainfall to refill the lake.

The cost is estimated at more than \$11 million although the exact amount of sediment is unknown.

District Ranger Keith Graves said that approximately 350,000 cubic yards of sediment would need removal, some as deep as 60 feet with a 21 foot average depth at the bottom of the lake.

The contamination is present beyond the site of the present lake and more sampling will be needed.

Information: The complete study can be read at the Nogales Ranger District office. Call 281-2296 or request the basic document by e-mail from Eli Curiel (ecuriel@fs.fed.us).

Dick Kamp is Wick Communications environmental liaison. Contact him at hepdick@att.net

NAME: ROGER L. HOGERWERF

EMAIL:

ADDRESS: 730 W. RIO SAN PEDRO

GREEN VALLEY AZ 85614

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).


Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

730 W. RID SAN PEDRO
GREEN VALLEY, AZ.
85614



USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 West Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

Attn: Beverly Everson



Fold Here

How to Comment Effectively

To be effective, comments should be specific and factual. Remember, the purpose of this scoping is to identify significant issues related to the proposed operation, and issues to be considered in the Environmental Impact Process (EIS).

The format for commenting is up to you to choose. Comment forms are available, but not required. Send comments by mail, email, or hand-deliver to the Forest Service before the public scoping period ends on April 18, 2008.

Below are several tips for making effective comments.

- Be brief so the reviewer won't miss the point of your comment.
- Be specific so the reviewer clearly understands your concerns.
 - Statements such as "I am concerned about the amount of additional traffic this will cause" are useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
 - Statements such as "Don't do this" or "I like this" are not useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- The better you understand the proposal, the more focused and site-specific your comments will be.
- Your comments must be realistic and feasible.
- Remember, this is the time to identify concerns AND opportunities.

The public comment period is the beginning of the EIS process and represents the foundation of the analysis. Your comments are an important input to the analysis of the social and natural environment.



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

**PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR THE
PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

To allow a greedy Foreign company with no actual mining experience to destroy forever our truly beautiful northern Santa Rita mountains would be a tragedy almost beyond comprehension. Future generations would have good reason to curse the stupidity & shortsightedness of those who permitted such devastation to occur. Allowing this pseudo-mining company to turn 3,670 acres of our National Forest into a worthless wasteland seems intolerable - a crime really. The critical water shortage here alone should stop this invasion. All life depends on water; mines use quantities of water & pollute the run-off. The Colorado River (CRP) water is quite limited and uncertain, also rather poor quality. The obsolete 1872 mining law should have been repealed long ago. New laws are needed now to protect the entire Santa Ritas & other valuable areas from any further destruction. New technology such as fiber optics may reduce the need for copper wiring in the future, but by then our beautiful land would be ruined forever. Recreation areas of this sort are scarce near Tucson's rapidly growing population, are much needed, not miles more of ugly, useless tailings such as west of Green Valley.

NAME: Frances C. Carter

EMAIL: none

ADDRESS:



Mrs Frances Carter
1801 S Abrego Dr
Green Valley AZ 85614-1401

I have studied the proposal for the Rosemont project carefully - & noted the tremendous size & impact. It is absolutely intolerable & must be stopped NOW.

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES

NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

**PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR THE
PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT: Also consider:
light pollution harms Mt Hopkins telescopes world class research.
Valuable wildlife habitat destroyed forever.
Dangerous heavy traffic on hilly, winding Route 83, sure to
cause serious accidents.
Dust & air pollution.
Tourism would suffer. Birders, hikers, campers etc would never
again enjoy this prime landscape.
I speak from experience:
University of Arizona graduate 1948 (Geology minor)
Husband: chief geologist in the Mining Dept, C.F. & I Steel
Co. Pueblo, Colorado - his entire career.
Leader in the Green Valley Hiking Club almost 17 years. The majority
of our hikes are in the Santa Ritas.
Stood on top of all peaks between Gunsight Pass & Box Canyon &
have seen copper deposits there.
First woman to reach the highest point in all 50 states, the
last being Ohio in 1980.

Recently I visited Helvetia on the west side & Rosemont on the east
NAME: side & observed moving machinery hi up on both sides doing
damge to the environment, plus Augusta signs.

Mrs Frances Carter
1801 S Abrego Dr
Green Valley AZ 85614-1401

This prosed project would take out part of our
spectacular mountain skyline & the Helvetia part
would show from Green Valley. Allowing this psedo-mining company
to turn 3,670 acres of N.F. & other public land into a worthless wasteland

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES seems **NO** intolerable & stupid

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.





Other Forest Service observations & Suggestions

YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

All my long life I have hiked in our National Forests from Maine to California & Florida to Alaska & seen once beautiful forests turned into ugly stumps, usually subsidized by the taxpayer. Cutting trees under nesting song birds such as the hermit thrush during their nesting season is unspeakable cruelty - as are trapping, poisoning & killing other wildlife that I have observed seems horribly wrong. Stop "chaining" attractive piñon-juniper forests leaving ugly desolation. "Thinning" ponderosa forests allows sunlight to get in which permits thick, inferior growth for a greater future fire danger. Draining Pena Blanca Lake to remove mercury from mines upstream would be very harmful to plants & animals - birds, especially during nesting season, fish, frogs & other wildlife. Future rains might bring down more mercury. Possibly could you suck up the mercury or cover it with dirt? At Pena Blanca boat ramp, repair the Pine Bridge Rudy built several years ago, not block access to the lake trail & 10 table picnic area there. Pyromaniacs in the F.S. set "Controlled burns" that tend to get away. (has Alamos & many others) The huge 2007 fire south of Alpine along Route 191 destroyed many miles of once handsome fir & spruce that with global warming may never recover. Allowing fires to get a strong start before spending millions on a mostly futile effort to control them. Example: the "Florida" fire.

ADDRESS:

Florida Peak. Several neighbors saw lightning strike a pine on top of but nothing was done until much later (after the fire had spread dangerously, much destruction & waste of money followed - then serious floods which came after heavy rains put out the fire. Quick action should have stopped this

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

Mrs. David A. Carter 1801 S Abrego Dr Green Valley, AZ 85614

Other National Forest comments

In 2007 I visited Morenci and could compare it with previous visits up to 25 years ago. An engineering marvel to be sure, but gone forever a large area of once fine mountain country.

Don't let it happen here. The tailings west of Green Valley are more than enough for this populated area. For many years I have observed these many miles of huge tailings grow higher each year utterly destroying once valuable land. In 2007 I toured Phelps-Dodge, also ASARCO about ten years ago so am aware of the tremendous scale of their operations. PhelpsDodge recently had to provide two new water wells - one next door to my home - to escape the spreading sulfate plume from their mine which was affecting our drinking water. A serious problem & Augusta no doubt would cause the same problem.

A recent Colorado visitor who once manned a F.S. fire tower summers in the Cascades in Oregon thought the five piles of ugly concrete beside the trail above Whitehouse in Madera Canyon were disgusting. They have been there for many months. Get rid of them NOW.

Fire breaks here are destructive where rapidly growing scrub oak thickets increase the future fire danger compared to the original well-spaced mature trees.

Elaborate city-type concrete structures detract from the simple natural rustic beauty of the forest.

Government bureaucrats rather than naturalists who understand and appreciate the forest, seem to predominate in the Forest Service.

Sending our copper to China (which is likely) that would return it in lead-covered toys, poisoned pet food and contaminated drugs is not in our best interest.

Stop Japanese- backed Augusta right now before they do further damage to our environment. Let them look elsewhere. There is copper in Mexico, Africa, Peru etc. Their economies no doubt could benefit from copper mining there.

Water is more important to all life than copper.

Protect, not destroy our precarious water sources.


Frances C. Carter



Frances Carter
1801 S Abrego Dr
Green Valley, AZ 85614-1401

May 8, 2008

111°01.750' W 111°00.250' W 110°58.750' W 110°57.250' W 110°55.750' W 110°54.250' W NAD27 110°51.500' W



31°51.750' N 31°53.000' N 31°54.250' N 31°55.500' N 31°56.750' N 31°58.000' N 31°59.250' N 32°00.500' N 32°01.750' N 32°03.000' N

111°01.750' W 111°00.250' W 110°58.750' W 110°57.250' W 110°55.750' W 110°54.250' W NAD27 110°51.500' W

0 0.5 1 1.5 2 2.5 3 3.5 miles / 0 1 2 3 4 5 km

Printed from TOPOI ©2001 National Geographic Holdings (www.topo.com)

I-19
11°
OVER

ROSEMONT INTENDS MAJOR MINING OF OUR GROUNDWATER

Read this

I would like to share with you today some alarming information about Rosemont Copper Company's proposed mine to be located in the Santa Rita Mountains south of Tucson. This information is from the public records of the Arizona Department of Water Resources. The Rosemont Mine will impact residents of the northern San Cruz river valley. Please bear with me.

I am a resident of Sahuarita heights area, which is located south of Tucson and north of Green Valley. My wife was born and raised in Tucson. She met me in northern California where we lived for over 20 years and raised our family. She had always wanted to move back to Arizona. In 2003, while on vacation, her brother took us to Sahuarita to see some property that was for sale. After only one look, I could see how beautiful it was and what a fabulous view of the Santa Rita Mountains it had. I knew that this was the place for our family to build our dream home. In 2004 I moved my family to Arizona to live on our newly acquired property. While living on the property in a trailer, we built our dream home to all of Pima County's 2006 building codes.

Rosemont Copper Company has acquired a parcel of residential property (about 50 acres) near my home and plans to put in several wells, at depths of 1,300 feet, to continuously pump 6,000 acre-feet of groundwater (our drinking water) each year for the next 20 years. They will transport this water 15 miles up to and over the crest of the beautiful Santa Rita Mountains to its mine for processing copper ore. The pumping of so much water will dry up as many as 200 domestic wells in my neighborhood, at depths of only 200 to 300 feet, which supply the drinking water for up to 400 families. It also has come to my attention that there is already a land subsidence issue in my area of up to 2.4 inches from groundwater depletion, excessive pumping of groundwater, in a 8 month period between 02/23/2007 and 10/26/2007. I believe that if Rosemont Copper Company is allowed to transport 1,955,226,000 gallons (which is the same as 6,000 acre feet) of our ground water away from our area each year, the land subsidence will get even more severe at even a faster rate, and this will drastically affect our communities for years to come. I'm hoping that something can be done immediately to protect the communities of Sahuarita and Green Valley from the same fate as Pinal County, where the subsidence issue is measured in tens of feet instead of inches.

It is grossly unfair that our community is required to follow twenty-first century building codes, while mining companies can use an antiquated, nineteenth century mining law to destroy our homes. But the issues I have described here are far more important than complying with the intent of the 1872 Mining Law, which was to encourage mining exploration and development, perhaps necessary in the 1800's. These issues go to the core of the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), the intent of which is to protect our environment, our properties, and our way of life.

National Environmental Policy Act Section 101 paragraph B pertains to Rosemont's activities of transporting groundwater away from Sahuarita would interfere with the natural balance of the environments ability to maintain critical water levels for the overall development and welfare of the our community. Rosemont's transportation of groundwater from Sahuarita, which is already suffering from a groundwater depletion and land subsidence, may cause a risk to health and safety of the residents with undesirable consequences to the community and Rosemont's transportation of our groundwater could dramatically affect future growth in our communities.

When a company applies for a permit which will impact waters of the United States, the agency that is being asked to issue the permit must evaluate the environment effects of the permit decision under NEPA. The Federal agency can require the private company to pay for the preparation of analyses, but the agency remains responsible for the scope and accuracy of the analyses. With this being said, Rosemont should be made to pay for a hydrologic study for the environmental impact of the transporting of groundwater away from Sahuarita heights and how their activities could affect the land subsidence.

Sahuarita Heights is a low income community and needs to be included in the NEPA process; this may bring an alternative action such as the Environmental Justice Executive Order. I request a meeting to be held in Sahuarita Heights to inform the community of Rosemont's activities and how their actions could affect our community's groundwater, infrastructure, land subsidence, and traffic issues related to the uses of the proposed secondary access road.

Pima County Administrator Chuck Huckleberry stated earlier this month his concerns about the over use of the groundwater and that the aquifer in Green Valley is falling at the rate of 4 feet a year.

Water is the most precious resource Arizona has and should not be wasted for the profits of others, especially foreign companies. Also, it should not be allowed for the Rosemont Copper Company to trade Central Arizona Project water that they have been recharging into the ground in Marana for drinking water (groundwater) in Sahuarita, 30 miles or more to the south of Marana, especially since Marana groundwater is flowing away from Sahuarita. This defies logic, boggles the mind and is a great misuse of taxpayers' money.

The water of Arizona is the life blood of the communities in this great state and should never be wasted in such a foolish manner. I hope that our politicians will be better stewards of the taxpayers' money and stop the wasteful use of Arizona's ground water. In so doing, they will be protecting the lives of our communities. The water belongs to the citizens of Arizona. It's time to use common sense for the common man for the common good of Arizona.


Robert Robuck -Arizona Homeowner
Published in the Green Valley Newspaper March 23, 2008

OVER

OVER

Mrs. David A. Carter
1801 S. Arreago Dr.
Green Valley, AZ 85614-1401

08



USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 West Congress St.
Tucson, Az. 85701

Tucson, AZ 85701
Received
MAY 12 2008
Coronado National Forest

Attn: Beverly Everson

2665 East Genevieve Way
Green Valley, AZ 85614
April 11, 2008

Ms. Beverley Everson
United States Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 West Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

Dear Ms. Everson:

Thank you for returning my phone call of April 10, 2008 and informing me of the status of the proposed reading for the Rosemont Copper Mine Project. This letter is a follow-up to the call.

I am a resident of the area, and I have determined that without mitigating measures built into this project which currently do not exist, I will be personally impacted and suffer personal as well economic damages, and so will all other residents of this area. The Rosemont Copper Mine project has the strong potential to turn the air quality of the region into CANCER ALLEY. The geochemistry of the mines in Pima County have documented trace amounts (that is, not economically desirable to extract but which will be environmentally released by mining processes and operations) at levels known to have adverse health effects of nickel, beryllium, cadmium, and arsenic, which are established airborne human carcinogens both under EPA rules, as well as analyses by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). Copper mines spew arsenic onto the landscape, and such evidence shows up in several areas of Pima County. I have not been able to determine from currently available public documents any indications or provisions that this problem has even been mentioned, no less discussed.

The letter is in two parts. The first part is to assure myself that I understand the things we discussed about the reading room, various documents related to the Rosemont Copper Mine Project, the nature of contract for the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for the project by SWCA and the role that the Forest Service plays in that contract through its Memorandum of Understanding with the Augusta Mine Corporation, and selected aspects of the public commentary period and upcoming "forums" and "public hearings."

The second part of this letter provides specific comments on some of the items we discussed on the phone, notably major deficiencies I see in the staffing of the team which will assemble the information and provide the analyses in the Environmental Impact Statement. I have tried to provide specific rationales for each of the comments. My motivation for this is that I am a resident of the area, and have determined based on my professional experience that I could be personally adversely impacted including injury, both economically as well as physically, by the proposed mine project unless certain mitigating measures are taken. In such cases, building into the activity the need for such measures, and providing information on those components that contribute to this effort, is a better plan than trying to correct mistakes after the fact.

In addition, I indicated that I would provide a CD-rom of power point presentation I made in Grand Forks, ND on the Red River of the North, to give a limited idea of my and interests. I have also included on that CD-rom a curriculum vita to give you an idea of my credentials.

Part I:

1. The Reading Room and Its Documents: You have indicated that delays in establishing the reading rooms at the Forest Service Tucson Office and the Ranger Office in Nogales stem mainly from having an inadequate number of copies available of all of the documents to be placed in the reading rooms. You have further indicated that it was your hope that the reading rooms would be operational by the week of April 14, 2008, and to contact you at that time for the latest status. I shall do that.

You have also indicated that the specific documents listed in my email to you, namely the consultant reports from Vector LLC, and Tetra Tech, etc. will be placed in the reading rooms, but if I wish specific copies, I will need to submit a FOIA application. I intend mainly to read the documents and take notes, but I need to know if copying of specific pages of these documents deposited in the room would also require a FOIA application. I do not need to build more bookcases for my technical library, nor increase the number of file cabinets in my office, at this stage of my life.

2. I was somewhat disappointed to learn from "blogger website" that the contract to SWCA was being funded by the proponents of the contract. My past experiences with the preparation of Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) for projects requiring a federal permit and on federal land were usually sponsored by written by the federal agency. You confirmed this arrangement, which basically places that contract out of the public purview, and raises in my mind serious questions about the transparency and openness of government processes. The Forest Service already has received considerable bad publicity about its handling of all public actions on the project, and that does not bode well for citizen oversight or for that matter for Congressional oversight of the Forest Service.

3. I have read the Memorandum of Understanding (hereafter referred to as MOU) between Forest Service and the Rosemont Copper Company. The MOU is a rather complex document. In this item of my letter, I specifically refer to item 15 of Section E, which details actions that the Rosemont Copper Company must accomplish, and states: "At No Time, direct the Prime Consultant in matters related to the NEPA review and or EIS/analyses and preparation." This is immediately followed by Item 1 in Section F, which indicates mutually agreed upon and understood accomplishments, and states: "The Prime Consultant will be under the supervision of the Forest Service, and the Forest Service will make the final determination concerning the scope and contents of the Consultant's work. The contract between the Proponent and the Prime Consultant will specify compliance with all legal requirements." I next refer to Attachment I, item III on "Consultation Staff Requirements." Together, these three items give the Forest Service the authority to require that those who work on EIS have met certain levels of credential and accomplishment.

4. With regard to public forums, public hearings, and public comments, you indicated that the formal commentary period prior to NEPA work has been extended to June 19, 2008. At the same time, the nature of the NEPA process will entail discussions back and forth among the Forest Service, SWCA and Rosemont Copper Company. As these discussions progress, there will be opportunities for public inputs on various issues. That needs a formal public announcement.

Part II

This part of the letter includes comments on specific documents as well as aspects of the MOU with respect to staffing to produce an Environmental Impact Statement.

1. My first concerns are the appointments of the Consultant Team in the MOU. I have referenced the classical handbook, Federal Handbook X-118 which is used to evaluate positions in the federal service to see what some of the experience and educational requirements are for selected positions at selected levels. It is my understanding from our discussions that the Forest Service, in evaluating these credentials and experience, may undertake reference checks, background checks, and interview directly possible candidates.

I want copies of the credentials of those persons who were appointed to produce the EIS, suitably redacted to avoid any compromising personal information (specially redacted for dates of birth, SSN, and contacts for personal and professional references to protect under privacy regulations), but assuring that the following information is present without redactions: names, educational background, experience, publications, memberships in professional learned societies, and licensures. Once these people are appointed, their credentials become public information, and their curricula vitae are public documents. Consider this an FOIA request for that information.

2. The listing of consultant staff qualifications includes fourteen specific specialties. The first position listed is the Team Leader, who is to have ten years minimum experience in that capacity could be equivalent to anything from GS 13 to Senior Executive Service, depending on education and other factors associated with the experience. I think the level should be specified.

The preparation of EIS materials is considered among many in environmental circles as the lowest level of consulting services, and the GS-13 is probably what you will get. However, to give greater assurance of a quality product, amaze me and appoint someone who could clearly be a GS-15, using as a guide line the credentials of senior research and supervisory people at USGS or NIH.

I met the incumbent to this position at one of the public forums that the Forest Service held. I was not impressed with him or his associate. The Team Leader tended to pander to my comments, and his associate basically denigrated them. They played a bad act of "good cop/bad cop." The combination of false charm and controlled irritation in the two bodes poorly for my future examination of their efforts.

2. Of the thirteen other listed specialties, I find the following deficiencies:

(a) a GS-12 geologist with at least 10 years of experience emphasizing hard rock geology is not sufficient. You have also asked for a GS-12 equivalent hydrogeologist who specializes in remediation hydrogeology. If this specialist is to consider geological integrity of the groundwater source because of possible problems of subsidence, karst formation, and related factors, then that is fine and necessary. However, if the hydrogeologist is looking mainly at other concerns, you need to indicate these other concerns.

(b) a GS-12 geochemist with at least 10 years of experience emphasizing mining, mineral exploration and extraction, is not sufficient. A second geochemist is necessary at a comparable level who specializes in the geochemistry of groundwater. Outside of the USGS, such geochemists are rare. I worked many years in Canada, and the Canadians made dreadful mistakes when they decided that ground geochemists were an expendable specialty. The two greatest groundwater geochemists in North America, Alan Freeze and John Cherry had to relocate and begin again.

(c) A GS-12 biologist, either terrestrial or aquatic, with at least five years experience in wildlife biology. What kind of experience? Some wildlife biologists are basically game managers, others do research on migratory patterns and habitat issues, and some do other things. A person with wildlife experience who has both aquatic and terrestrial capabilities is hard to find. Biologists tend to be either terrestrial or aquatic, unless they are ornithologists, and most aquatic biologists seem to be fisheries types. I am not sure what aquatic wildlife of mammalian nature reside in the area, although the

Sonoran Desert Museum does have river otters from desert regions among its live animal specimens. You may need two such biologists, one for fishes and lower vertebrates, and one for birds and mammals. Given the low level of regard for many people who do EIS preparation in some circles, I would expect that all biologist appointments have thorough taxonomy training with their ecology training, even to the point of requiring museum experience. It is necessary to test this capability specifically and directly with prospective appointments.

(d) A GS-12 air quality specialist, with at least five years of NEPA experience in air quality. What exactly do you have in mind here? Some air quality specialists are strictly meteorology and "fate and transport types," others deal monitoring systems. Industrial development in the vicinity of national forests calls for experience in both air pollution "fate and transport" and monitoring. The air quality legislation calls for two kinds of air pollution controls, primary controls based on human health, and second controls based on welfare and environmental considerations. The latter is the "visibility" and scenic vista concern, but nothing in any of this covers the former, public health. The copper mine is a potential emitter of "Priority Pollutants," several of which are on the EPA list of 129 because of their adverse health effects. Air pollution specialists who can handle these materials are often much more experienced than the GS-12 level person you have called for.

(e) Notably absent from the list are the following: human health specialists in epidemiology, cancer risk assessment, pulmonary physiology, occupational safety and health, exposure analysis, advanced statistics. Since the geochemistry of the region shows that airborne carcinogens will be emitted from the mining project, the absence of these specialties in the EIS committee is immediate grounds to reject any acceptance of the EIS and any decision approving the project.

(f) Notably absent is a chemical engineer, GS-13 or equivalent, to review the material and energy balance calculations for all the mining processes, and point out the points of emission and loss of materials, pollution discharge opportunities, process limitations for closed loop technologies, and evaluation of their effects. Further such a specialist is probably better able to communicate with the other team members with respect to air quality issues. For reasons I have never understood, air quality is primarily in chemical engineering, and water quality is primarily in civil engineering. I make no comments about modern curricula in "environmental engineering."

(g) The proposed post-project monitoring as given in a consultant report from Westland Resources (also briefly discussed in a later item) talks about a "flow and solute model." Who produces this? What experience does that person have with large computer models of groundwater? Is a standard model to be adapted to the Rosemont Copper Mine situation? If so, it will depend on the comprehensiveness and appropriateness of the groundwater monitoring plan and the monitoring data, and who comments on the design of this plan in the EIS? And even, there are problems in adapting "off the shelf" computer models in hydrology.

3. Public Documents Available at the Green Valley Branch of the Pima County Library: On April 11, 2008, I reviewed the Plan of Operation document for the proposed Rosemont Mine prepared by the Westland Resources Company, dated July 31, 2006. This was the only document on the project deposited with the library. If there are others, they were missing.

My concerns with the document were the environmental issues, including various kinds of monitoring. The entire environmental section of interest was less than ten pages. The document lists a relatively complete listing of possible regulatory needs for this project, but it is short on specifics and full of platitudes about appropriate plans and considerations to occur down the road without any indication that anybody really knows anything about such considerations. The information provided on "sustainable principles" is laughable. I am not going to worry about the problems of paper clips when I need to examine closed-loop technologies.

The document did not address the needs listed below, and I hope the documents to be provided in the reading rooms do address these issues.

(a) Air pollution. The major discussion was control of fugitive emissions. There was no indication that air emissions related to the mining operations or processing of ores or other activities were considered.

(b) Human health aspects of air pollution. Many of the trace materials in the strata of mines in Pima County, when exposed through a mining operation and released airborne are established human and animal CARCINOGENS, notably nickel, cadmium, arsenic, beryllium, and under some special conditions iron oxides and cobalt oxides. Nickel, cadmium, arsenic and beryllium are Priority Pollutants under the Toxic Substances Control Act. No consideration of the health impacts of other trace constituents present, notably lead and tungsten, were discussed either. Lead is a well known neurological and developmental toxicant.

(c) Risk assessment methodologies. When dealing with carcinogens and neurotoxins, the regulations use a risk assessment paradigm. The science of risk assessment for toxic chemicals has evolved considerably since first proposed in 1974 by then Administrator of EPA, Russell Train. No provision for a risk assessment of a single carcinogen is present in the planning document, and now one has to consider the risk assessment possibilities of multiple air pollutants because of the nature of the materials being processed. It is this situation which puts me in personal jeopardy with respect to health and welfare.

(d) Groundwater recharge waters. The plan contains a laudable idea of recharging some of the groundwater to mitigate the water losses of the aquifer. However, the quality of the recharge requires some very careful considerations with respect to the chemical and microbiological parameters. The origins of recharge water are not quite clear, but if they are from Colorado River as one apocryphal comment suggests, then there is a question of agricultural return flows causing this recharge water to be high in salinity, nitrates, and pesticides.


Nitrates can pass through the soil and sand strata untouched. Salinity will depend on the ability of the soil strata to act as a kind of ion-exchange resin to remove its excess levels, and pesticides are their special problems for groundwater.

(e) In the discussion of groundwater, there is a comment about a "flow and solute model" that will delineate DIA for the mine and demonstrate environmental compliance at selected POCs. How? Beyond the meaningless alphabet soup of acronyms, I never trust a computer model without a ground truth component. Computer models can generate artifacts and go unstable if the computer codes do not consider the effects of certain ranges and sensitivities of certain critical parameters in the model. There is no ground truth component, and by the time one realizes that non-compliance has occurred, it may be too late.

(f) Groundwater monitoring is very difficult. The Forest Service recognized that it when requested more detailed information on the groundwater monitoring proposals from the mining company. I have no idea what their response was, but it would be very appropriate to include that response in the public documents for the reading room.

In closing, I feel that the information that I have given you is so important, that I have sent it by certified mail with proof of receipt, and made it an attachment to an email to you, and I have sent copies of it to numerous people on my mailing list, including town officials of Sahuarita, and Congresswoman Gabrielle Gifford's office in Tucson..

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joel L. Fisher". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Joel L. Fisher (PhD)



ERROL L. MONTGOMERY & ASSOCIATES, INC.

CONSULTANTS IN HYDROGEOLOGY



1550 EAST PRINCE ROAD
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85719 (520) 881-4912
FAX: (520) 881-1609
www.elmontgomery.com
E-MAIL: info@elmontgomery.com

ERROL L. MONTGOMERY, P.G.
WILLIAM R. VICTOR, P.G.
RONALD H. DEWITT, P.G.
MARK M. CROSS, P.G.
DENNIS G. HALL, P.G.
TODD KEAY, P.G.
JAMES S. DAVIS, P.G.
MICHAEL J. ROSKO, P.G.
DANIEL S. WEBER, P.G.
LESLIE T. KATZ, P.G.
DENNIS H. SHIRLEY, P.G.
THOMAS W. ANDERSON (1940-2005)
JEFFREY J. MEYER
JANIS K. BLAINER-FLEMING
HALE W. BARTER

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL FORM

DATE/TIME: April 10, 2008 @ 13:55

PROJECT NO: 1232.07

OF PAGES (INCLUDING TRANSMITTAL FORM): 3

TO: Beverly A. Everson
U.S. FOREST SERVICE

FAX #: (520)388-8305

FROM: James S. Davis

FAX #: (520) 881-1609

SENT BY: JSD

PHONE #: (520) 881-4912

REMARKS:

Bev,

Attached is a description and diagram of the well numbering system used by ADWR, BLM, USGS, and other agencies. I think this will explain the system better than I could do it over the telephone. Please look it over and let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Jim Davis

APPENDIX A

WELL NUMBERING SYSTEM

The well numbers used in this report are in accordance with the Bureau of Land Management's system of land subdivision. The land survey in Arizona is based on the Gila and Salt River meridian and base line, which divide the State into four quadrants. These quadrants are designated, counter-clockwise, by capital letters A, B, C, and D. All land northeast of the point of origin is in quadrant A; all land northwest of the origin is in quadrant B; all land southwest is in quadrant C; and all land southeast is in quadrant D. The first digit of a well number indicates the township, the second digit the range, and the third digit the section in which the well is located. The lowercase letters a, b, c, and d after the section number indicate the well location within the section. The first letter denotes a particular 160-acre tract or quarter section; the second letter denotes the 40-acre tract or quarter-quarter section; and the third letter denotes the 10-acre tract or quarter-quarter-quarter section. These letters are also assigned in a counter-clockwise direction, beginning in the northeast quarter. As Figure A-1 shows, well number (A-11-29)28dbc designates the well as being in the SW1/4 of the NW1/4 of the SE1/4, section 28, Township 11 North, Range 29 East. Where more than one well is within a 10-acre tract, consecutive numbers beginning with "1" are added as suffixes. For this investigation, additional well identifiers, enclosed in brackets, are added as suffixes to identify Springerville Generating Station exploration water wells, production water wells, and monitor wells.




FIGURE A-1. WELL NUMBERING DIAGRAM





YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

SEE 2 PAGE ATTACHED COMMENTS REGARDING THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED COPPER PROJECT ON OUR WELLS.

NAME: LEE M. & JUDITH W. HYDEMAN

EMAIL: hydemanaz@hotmail.com

ADDRESS: 85 HOG CANYON DRIVE SONORA AZ 85637 PO BOX 623

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

**Lee M. & Judith W. Hydeman
P. O. Box 623
Sonoita, AZ 85637**

Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

Re: Impact of Proposed Rosemont Mine on our Wells

We have three wells on our property which provide water for our home, our guest house and for our horses and cattle that graze from time to time under a grazing lease we have with the Crown C Ranch.

areas of concern

We have three ~~questions~~ regarding the impact of the proposed Rosemont Mine on our wells.

First. What will be the impact of the proposed Rosemont Mine operation on the level of water from these wells? Can we expect the water table to be lowered? If so, will my well run dry during any time of the year or is it likely to run dry over the proposed 20 years of operation of the mine? If so, who will pay to get water to my home and water tanks for our animals? What do you estimate the future ground water table to be during the 20 year proposed operation of the mine? Have you calculated the level of the water table given the recent history of the increasing drought conditions in our area in determining the impact of the proposed mine on the water table? If so, what have you calculated as the combined impact of these two factors?

Second. What pollution may occur, if any, on those domestic water resources from the mining and processing operations as proposed by the applicant or any possible changes in those operations over the anticipated 20 years of operation of the mine? What conditions will be imposed on the applicant to cover the potential for pollution of our water resources to assure that we and our animals are protected from personal injury and potential loss and replacement of safe drinking water

The three wells on our property are as follows:

1. Well registration no. 55-87830
2. Well registration no. 55-086801
3. Well registration no. 55-646145

Third. Will you require a bond backed by secure financial resources from the applicant to cover the cost of delivering adequate water to us, if our well or wells do go dry during the proposed 20 years of operation of the mine? How will you determine the amount of the bond to assure it will adequately cover this matter for the areas affected, so that we will have adequate protection for the delivery of water to us?

Sincerely,



Lee M. & Judith W. Hydeman

May 2, 2008

LEE M HYDEMAN
JUDITH W HYDEMAN
PO BOX 623
SONOITA, AZ 85637 0623



Class Stamp
Here

USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 West Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

Attn: Beverly Everson

Fold Here

How to Comment Effectively

To be effective, comments should be specific and factual. Remember, the purpose of this scoping is to identify significant issues related to the proposed operation, and issues to be considered in the Environmental Impact Process (EIS).

The format for commenting is up to you to choose. Comment forms are available, but not required. Send comments by mail, email, or hand-deliver to the Forest Service before the public scoping period ends on April 18, 2008.

Below are several tips for making effective comments.

- Be brief so the reviewer won't miss the point of your comment.
- Be specific so the reviewer clearly understands your concerns.
 - Statements such as "I am concerned about the amount of additional traffic this will cause" are useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
 - Statements such as "Don't do this" or "I like this" are not useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- The better you understand the proposal, the more focused and site-specific your comments will be.
- Your comments must be realistic and feasible.
- Remember, this is the time to identify concerns AND opportunities.

The public comment period is the beginning of the EIS process and represents the foundation of the analysis. Your comments are an important input to the analysis of the social and natural environment.



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT: NEVER MIND THAT: The mining companies have a dreadful record of what they do to the environment and the broken promises of reclamation (see Flux Canyon outside Patagonia for one); The Rosemont Mine will be located in a critical watershed for our whole area - the Santa Ritas; The lakes which supply the Colorado River are below half full and THAT affects the CAP which the mines expect to suck dry in the midst of a long period of serious drought in this area; The habitat will be forever affected for the brief extraction and cash related value of ounces of ore for tons of waste rock; The constant convoy of mine trucks will create clouds of dust, stirring up Valley Fever spores and other dangerous allergens; The 24 hour operation will require lights which will compromise the dark skies needed by the nearby observatories, all built at considerable expense in our area since so few dark skies are still left (are they not an important part of AZ's economy?); The income which will be lost to AZ's tourism industry is equated in the billions whereas the money, if any, paid to the state for the mining privileges is rated in the millions; The plans to contain waste toxins and other debris is no different than other mining operations and we will have the same run-off and death of streams and land we always get with mining; The Tucson Water Co. has shut down many of its wells & converted to the CAP to stop the subsidence of the entire city by pumping out the aquifer - how much will AZ pay to rebuild Tucson - from the pennies paid us by the mining companies? - Good luck; The blasting the mining companies say they will be using will surely disrupt a huge area of livestock operations, let alone people living here; All these negatives argue against this whole idea. But the biggest negative of all: WATER. As a 1992 political slogan said, paraphrased: "It's the Water Dummy". Arizona cannot, should not give away its most precious resource and in the process destroy a huge swath of its environment. Even considering the idea is madness in this day of squandering what little REAL resources we have left.

NAME: Sue Hey

EMAIL: N/A

ADDRESS: Box 4 Sonoita, AZ 85637

Sue Hey

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

The public comment period is the beginning of the EIS process and represents the foundation of the analysis. Your comments are an important input to the analysis of the social and natural environment.

- Remember, this is the time to identify concerns AND opportunities.
- Your comments must be realistic and feasible.
- The better you understand the proposal, the more focused and site-specific your comments will be.
 - Statements such as "Don't do this" or "I like this" are not useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
 - Statements such as "I am concerned about the amount of additional traffic this will cause" are useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- Be specific so the reviewer clearly understands your concerns.
- Be brief so the reviewer won't miss the point of your comment.

Below are several tips for making effective comments.

The format for commenting is up to you to choose. Comment forms are available, but not required. Send comments by mail, email, or hand-deliver to the Forest Service before the public scoping period ends on May 19, 2008.


To be effective, comments should be specific and factual. Remember, the purpose of this scoping is to identify significant issues related to the proposed operation, and issues to be considered in the Environmental Impact Process (EIS).

How to Comment Effectively


Fold Here

LET THE BELL RING FOR YOU

USDA FOREST SERVICE



USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 West Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701



Attn: Beverly Everson

YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR THE
PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

This is a beautiful area used by my family since we came to Canyon in 1951, most for hunting & other recreation. It provides a crucial wildlife habitat & migration corridor that links the Santa Rita, Davidson Canyon, Concho Creek and Rincon Mountains. With new mining activity water resources would be depleted adding to our continuing drought problem. Not to mention the eye sore, dust & trucking contamination in the area.

NAME: Thomas Calvin Jr
EMAIL: TCalvin65c@aol.com
ADDRESS: 1861 W. Vada Legs Tucson Az. 85704

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

How to Comment Effectively

To be effective, comments should be specific and factual. Remember, the purpose of this scoping is to identify significant issues related to the proposed operation, and issues to be considered in the Environmental Impact Process (EIS).

The format for commenting is up to you to choose. Comment forms are available, but not required. Send comments by mail, email, or hand-deliver to the Forest Service before the public scoping period ends on April 18, 2008.

Below are several tips for making effective comments.

- Be brief so the reviewer won't miss the point of your comment.
- Be specific so the reviewer clearly understands your concerns.
- Statements such as "I am concerned about the amount of additional traffic this will cause" are useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- Statements such as "Don't do this" or "I like this" are not useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- The better you understand the proposal, the more focused and site-specific your comments will be.
- Your comments must be realistic and feasible.
- Remember, this is the time to identify concerns AND opportunities.

The public comment period is the beginning of the EIS process and represents the foundation of the analysis. Your comments are an important input to the analysis of the social and natural environment.

Fold Here

Attn: Beverly Everson

USDA Forest Service
 Coronado National Forest
 300 West Congress Street
 Tucson, AZ 85701

G. THOMAS CALVIN
 1861 W. Vista Lejos
 Tucson, AZ 85704

USA FIRST-CLASS FOREVER



Place
 Class
 Here



TUCSON AZ 857
 07 MAY 2008 PM 1 L

Tucson, AZ 85701
 Received
 MAY 08 2008
 Coronado National Forest



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

I'd have been on a well in the past, not now. This would significantly drop the water levels for nearby meadows and perhaps cause land to subside. B. we do not have enough H₂O in this area. Taking from A and giving to B is not an answer. C. the damage to the area for the much a short mining project (app 200 yrs) from the community with lower water levels, that's why NO please

NAME: DAVE MAHER

EMAIL: KRISTINA845@AOL.COM

ADDRESS: 1845 VIA DEL RECO70

6 V, A2 85614

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one):

YES

NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

The public comment period is the beginning of the EIS process and represents the foundation of the analysis. Your comments are an important input to the analysis of the social and natural environment.

- Remember, this is the time to identify concerns AND opportunities.
- Your comments must be realistic and feasible.
- The better you understand the proposal, the more focused and site-specific your comments will be.
 - Statements such as "I am concerned about the amount of additional traffic this will cause" are useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
 - Statements such as "Don't do this" or "I like this" are not useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- Be brief so the reviewer won't miss the point of your comment.
- Be specific so the reviewer clearly understands your concerns.

Below are several tips for making effective comments.

The format for commenting is up to you to choose. Comment forms are available, but not required. Send comments by mail, email, or hand-deliver to the Forest Service before the public scoping period ends on April 18, 2008.

To be effective, comments should be specific and factual. Remember, the purpose of this scoping is to identify significant issues related to the proposed operation, and issues to be considered in the Environmental Impact Process (EIS).

How to Comment Effectively

Fold Here

85701+1034

Attn: Beverly Everson

Coronado National Forest
 MAY 02 2008
 Tucson, AZ 85701
 Received

USDA Forest Service
 Coronado National Forest
 300 West Congress Street
 Tucson, AZ 85701



POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE
 PERMIT NO. 1034 TUCSON, AZ
 ZIP+4® 85701-1034

Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St
Tucson, AZ 85641

Hi,

My water is pumped from well number 55-519879. I would like to know what impact the Rosemont mine will have on my well. Can I expect the water table to be lowered? If so will my well run dry? If my well runs dry, who will pay to get water to my home? What do you estimate the future groundwater table depth to be?

Thank you for answering these questions.

Sincerely

Chuck Woodford
P. O. Box 144
Vail, AZ 85641

Rosemont Copper Project FIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St
Tucson, AZ 85701

Hi,

My water is pumped from well number 55-519879. I would like to know what impact the Rosemont mine will have on my well. Can I expect the water table to be lowered? If so will my well run dry? If my well runs dry, who will pay to get water to my home? What do you estimate the future groundwater table depth to be? What guarantees do we have, if my wells go dry or is polluted as an indirect impact of the mine? What will Augusta do to guarantee I have water, and how long will the guarantee last. If the mine closes are there going to be funds put in a trust to cover the expense of having a well dug deeper, if the well no longer produces water is Augusta going to pipe or truck water to me, and what quality will the water be because right now I have EXCELLENT water. My home is worthless if I don't have water. Where will the water come from if they agree to supply me. How will they determine the amount of money that would be set aside in case this occurs.

Thank you for answering these questions.

Sincerely

Chuck Woodford
P. O. Box 144
Vail, AZ 85641

Jeanine Derby

*Beo
for the record*

Mailroom R3 Coronado
Sent by: Karina Montez

To: Jeanine Derby/R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES

cc

03/21/2008 08:48 AM

bcc

Subject: Re: Email for Jeanine Derby

"Alison Bunting" <abunting@sunnecast.net>



"Alison Bunting"
<abunting@sunnecast.net>

To: <mailroom_r3_coronado@fs.fed.us>

cc:

Subject: Email for Jeanine Derby

03/20/2008 10:55 PM

I write to report my dismay at the actions taken by Coronado National Forest personnel at the "open house" to discuss the development of the environmental impact statement on the proposed Augusta Resource Rosemont Mine on Thursday, March 20, 2008 in Patagonia. When citizens in attendance expressed a concern about the format of the meeting and requested an opportunity to speak and be heard the Forest Service personnel left the meeting, 30 minutes after it started.

According your own press release the open house was "designed to allow attendees to view informational displays and ask specialists about the Rosemont Copper Project and the environmental impact statement (EIS) process, and 2) to submit written or oral comments onsite." With over 100 individuals in attendance, the small number of personnel present was not able to either answer questions or hear from even a fraction of those who wanted to receive or give information. When a change in format for the meeting was requested they did not even deign to discuss it; they just packed up and left.

Prior to the "open house" there was already strong concern that the Forest Service is just paying lip service to their responsibility to obtain public comment since the times and dates of the meeting were announced only a week in advance. I feel strongly that our rights as citizens to speak on this important issue have been seriously abridged and urge you to provide meaningful opportunities for citizen comments with a minimum of 30 days advance notice of any meetings.

Alison Bunting
P. O. Box 310
Sonoita, AZ 85637



Attn: Rosemont Team header
520/388-8305

YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR THE
PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

5/9/2008

COMMENT:

Due Diligence. This company is a startup and has never produced revenue and as they admit in their SEC filing, they may never produce revenue. Because so many mining operations go bankrupt before they start finish the reclamation process, the company should have a thorough investigation before they are allowed to proceed. The due diligence process should focus on the corporate structure of the company and in particular on founder, Richard Walker, and his manipulation of this and his other holdings and how they inter-relate.

NAME: Judith Hydeman

EMAIL: HydemanAz@hotmail.com

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 623
Sorsite, AZ 85637

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

May 2, 2008

Re: Rosemont Copper Project EIS

Please no mining or
exploration in Eastern Santa
Cruz County.

I came here sick
from pollution and noise
in the city. Some
places on this earth
need to be quiet &
free of pollution.

Marianne Shama
P.O. Box 946
Patagonia
AZ 85624

Shannon
Box 946
Pat, AZ 85624

Re: Rosemont
Copper Project
EIS

Forest Service
300. W. Congress
Tucson, AZ 85701

NOV 06 2004
10:43 24 2004

122110455
85701+1371

Copper - Proj
mining or
in Santa

sick
and noise
come
earth
et f
pri

anne Sha
Box 946
Pat, AZ 85624

USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 West Congress Street
Tucson, Arizona 85701

6 May 2008

Dear Sir or Madam,

I was somewhat disillusioned and very disappointed after attending the Open House Forum on 23 April 2008 at the Elgin Elementary School concerning the proposed Rosemont Copper Project Mine Plan of Operation. At the Open House, too often questions were left either unanswered or insufficiently answered. I believe many of these questions could have been more completely addressed had an environmental impact study been completed beforehand. It seems odd to me that the Open House Forums are being held before completing the necessary studies.

It also seems peculiar to me that the National Forest Service is advocating construction of the mine. The Coronado National Forest is owned by the constituents of the United States of America – the National Forest is simply the agency assigned the duty of administering the use of the land and I do not believe exploitation is (or should be) one of their goals. The thought of the National Forest Service approving construction of a mine against the will of the people most directly and adversely affected by it, is absurd. As the name implies, the Forest Service is charged with the task of servicing forest lands, not foreign investment companies or foreign countries.

The key player in the proposed mine is Augusta Resource Corporation, which is headquartered out of Vancouver, British Columbia, and specializes in mining exploration and development. Since they are an investment company, they have the most to gain from constructing the mine and virtually nothing to lose from it. The local NBC television station in Tucson recently reported that Augusta Resource Corporation has already sold \$150 million in silver futures from the proposed mine. This seems a bit premature since the forums were only recently completed and, according to the Coronado National Forest Service spokesperson present at the Elgin Forum, there is still a rather lengthy process that must be completed before the National Forest Service renders its final decision.

At the Elgin forum, I heard several people ask a ranking Rosemont Mining Company employee where the ore from the mine was going and their response was that it really did not matter as it had nothing to do with the mine or its operation. However, it does matter to some of us. The thought of a foreign investment company exploiting our country's natural resources is appalling, especially if the final destination for the minerals extracted from the mine is another foreign country.

There are several additional issues pertaining to the proposed Rosemont Copper Project Mine Plan that I would like to address: water, traffic and housing, pollution, and scenery.

Water – The proposed site of the mine is very near a large metropolitan area that is already water challenged. Extracting 5000 to 8000 acre-feet of water from an already water depressed water table is ludicrous. It does not take a hydrological engineer to determine the water table will suffer severe consequences, which means the people of Tucson as well as the residents of Sonoita, Elgin, Canelo, and Patagonia will also suffer. Santa Cruz County, which shares a common

watershed with the proposed mine site, is considering a referendum requiring land owners prove a 100-year supply of water before issuing a building permit. It doesn't sound like there is enough water available for both the people in the area and the mine and apparently the National Forest Service thinks the mine is more important than the people.

Traffic and Housing – It is estimated that the mine will employ 500 full time employees. Where will they come from? The residents of the Sonoita/Elgin area are comprised primarily of three types of people: 1) ranchers whose families in many cases have lived in the area for generations, 2) college educated professionals who are either retired or already have good jobs in Tucson, Sierra Vista, or Fort Huachuca, and 3) highly motivated and very successful contractors, who are intelligent, self-educated individuals. I doubt very seriously that any of these people are interested in employment at the mine. Consequently, where will the employees come from, where will they live, and how will they travel to and from the mine? Since there is very little housing available in the Sonoita/Elgin area affordable to people making \$59,000 per year; either low-income high-density housing would have to be built in the area or the employees would have to commute from Tucson. If adequate housing were constructed in Sonoita, what would happen to the residents and the facilities after the mine closes in 20 years? Route 83 was not built for high-density traffic and 500 employees would certainly produce significant traffic. In addition, there would be 40 or more large ore-laden trucks traveling from the mine each day and then returning later the same day. Can you imagine the traffic dilemma this will produce on Route 83?

Pollution – There are several active open-pit copper mines in Arizona and numerous others that are now closed. The dust produced from the massive earth-moving equipment and transport trucks necessary to operate an open pit mine is enormous. The debris, when combined with the prevailing winds prevalent in the area, would surely produce a perpetual dust bowl. How do the mine operators or the National Forest Service plan to control the air quality? In addition, the acid used in the leach fields characteristically found around copper mining activities could eventually result in health concerns for those living nearby and an environmental hazard lasting for centuries.

Scenery – The Rosemont Mine would cover a vast area along the east side of the Rosemont Mountain Range totally destroying the splendid view and certainly adversely affecting the local habitat. The mine extends east to within a half mile of State Route 83, and a large portion of the proposed mine site is at a lower elevation than the road and will be clearly visible from the highway. From the maps presented at the Elgin Forum, it appears that most (if not all) of the actual open pit will be on private land and most (if not all) of the tailings would be dumped on public National Forest land. In addition, State Route 83 is designated a scenic highway; however, I suppose it could be reclassified as not-so-scenic (or even ugly) after construction begins since I doubt that very many people consider

the tailings from an open-pit copper mine particularly scenic? The Rosemont Mine contingency showed an interesting time-lapse projection of what the mine site will look like over the next 20 to 25 years. The final slide showed an unscathed landscape other than the open pit itself. The grass in the area will probably reclaim itself within a few years: however, I fail to see how the slow-growing oak and mesquite trees are going to miraculously reappear and reach full growth within five years of the mine shutting down?

It seems rather obvious to everyone who will be directly affected by the mine that the people involved in the initial planning have their own agenda and are concerned only with their personal selfish interests. Apparently the Rosemont Mine and Coronado National Forest management teams believe they are dealing with a group of complacent and illiterate locals, which is rather insulting in itself. They have certainly neglected to take the needs, concerns, and well-being of the people living in the area into consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

Wayne & Tomasi

Wayne F. and Cheryl F. Tomasi
HC1 Box 35
107 Blue Sky Lane
Elgin, Arizona 85611
520-455-9278
wayne.tomasi@gmail.com



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

**PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR THE
PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

See attached letter

NAME:

Wayne Tomasi

EMAIL:

wayne.tomasj@gmail.com

ADDRESS:

*107 Blue Sky Lane HCl Box 35
Elgin AZ 85611*


PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one):

YES

NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.





Wayne Tomasi
HC I box 35
Elyria, AZ 85611

Attn: Beverly
Everson

TUCSON AZ 857
05 MAY 2008 PM 3 T

USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress Street
Tucson AZ 85701

257014374



The public comment period is the important input to the analysis of

- Be brief so the reviewer wo
- Be specific so the reviewer
 - Statements suc
 - issues that can
 - Statements suc
- The better you understar
- Your comments must be
- Remember, this is the fi

Ms. Everson, Please include the following in the EIS process for the Rosemount Mine.
Sincerely, Mike Rantz mike_rantz@yahoo.com

Rosemont Mine Notes

Water reclamation, who monitors it?

Runoff who monitors that?

Is land reclamation guaranteed by a performance bond?

I feel Augusta's reclamation plan is inadequate at best.

How will air, dust and light pollution be mitigated?


How will the safety and the extra wear and tear on Hwy 83 are addressed?

What about possible Native American archaeological sites?


Mike Rantz
929 S. Los Opalos
Green Valley, AZ 85614

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES



COCONADO NATIONAL FOREST
TUCSON, AZ 85701
85701

Colorado National Forest
Supervisor's Office
Bert Everson
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, AZ 85701

1461810438





DeAngeli
5459 N. Agave Drive
Tucson, Arizona 85704
ejdeangeli@earthlink.net
520-690-1107

Team Leader Rosemont Copper Project
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Re: Augusta Resource Rosemont Mine

Dear Sir,

I am writing to state my opposition to the Rosemont Mine in the Santa Rita Mountains. My opposition is based on the following objections:

- Depletion and destruction of our most precious resource – water. Not only are large volumes of water required for the mining process, but the byproducts of mining will pollute and disturb the watershed. Recently I read the most absurd plan – to use CAP water for the mine. How completely outrageous that water would be pumped from the Colorado River so that a foreign corporation can strip the ore from mountains of southern Arizona.
- Permanent destruction of a very special and important natural area that now provides a home to a large population of native plant and animal species.
- Permanent loss of a huge area of public land to public use. This is an important recreation area highly valued by birders, naturalists, hikers, and all those who value magnificent, undisturbed natural areas.
- There can be no justification - no number of promised jobs which are transitory at best, no amount of empty promises of environmental stewardship, no imagined influx of money to the local economy – for allowing Augusta Resource to use and abuse the lands that belong to all the people of the United States. It would be appalling under any circumstances, but the fact that the antiquated mining laws of this country allow this to take place for virtually no compensation makes the situation all the more deplorable.
- I would object to any corporation mining the proposed area, but to have not one, but now two Canadian companies that will reap the rewards and profits, sending the silver, copper, gold and other valuable minerals out of the country while leaving southern Arizonans with a legacy of environmental damage forever, simply infuriates me. When the price of metals falls, as it inevitably will, Augusta Resource will close the mine, lay off the employees, and leave behind the hideous scars on the land that will long outlive all of us.


- Dust, traffic, noise and water pollution will all be increased in the area surrounding the mine as well as for a huge swath of southern Arizona. Augusta Resource has a poor environmental record and has not adequately addressed these issues for the proposed mine, including the lack of completed hydrologic studies.
- Mining's legacy of hideous scars and tailings already assault the views along Interstate 19. Allowing another mine will only add to this sad spectacle.

In closing, I am requesting that the Forest Service consider this Rosemont proposal as part of the totality of impact by the numerous other mining proposals in southern Arizona. Also, I request that Rosemont not be allowed to continue with any activity at the proposed site until the environmental and public hearing process is complete. Rosemont needs to make all materials available for easy public access so that Arizonans have a fair opportunity to evaluate them.

Seldom do any of us have the real opportunity to positively impact the future of our beautiful land, our all-too-precious resources and our legacy as human beings. This is one of those opportunities, and I beg you to not let it pass us by.

Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,



Carole DeAngeli

Cc: Save the Scenic Santa Ritas
8987 E. Tanque Verde, #309-157
Tucson, AZ 85749


The Honorable Gabrielle Giffords
1661 N. Swan, Suite 112
Tucson, AZ 85712

Supervisor Ann Day, District 1
Pima County Board of Supervisors
130 W. Congress, 11th floor
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Carole DeAngeli
5459 N. Agave Drive
Tucson, AZ 85704

TUCSON AZ 857

05 MAY 2008 PM 3 T



Team Leader Rosemont Copper Project
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St.
Tucson, Arizona 85701

10/08 00 25/01
10/08 00 25/01
10/08 00 25/01



85701+1331

DeAngeli
5459 N. Agave Drive
Tucson, Arizona 85704
ejdeangeli@earthlink.net
520-690-1107

anta Rita Mountains. My opposition

water. Not only are large volumes of
of mining will pollute and disturb the
CAP water for the mine. How
he Colorado River so that a foreign
Arizona.

ural area that now provides a home to

This is an important recreation area
who value magnificent, undisturbed

which are transitory at best, no
no imagined influx of money to the
abuse the lands that belong to all the
ny circumstances, but the fact that the
lace for virtually no compensation

a, but to have not one, but now two
, sending the silver, copper, gold and
outhern Arizonans with a legacy of
en the price of metals falls, as it
off the employees, and leave behind
s.

Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

May 5, 2008


To Whom It May Concern:

When we decided to move to Tucson four years ago, part of the appeal was the scenic drive up to Sonoita. There were other reasons, of course, but that pristine Southwestern landscape appealed to our souls. After moving here, we discovered the consequences of mining after hiking the various areas, visiting Bisbee's pits and viewing the destruction of a once lovely range by Phelps-Dodge in Green Valley.

It is with those eyesores in mind that I write you in protest over the proposed Rosemont Copper Project. The huge impact of big rigs on the traffic on a two-lane highway not to mention the cost of road maintenance is frightening. We currently live in Corona de Tucson and we can attest to the destruction of the Houghton corridor by all the heavy trucks that used to travel in and out of the area when home construction was still going strong, prior to the current real estate lull. Furthermore, the folks in the upper regions will no longer have easy access to Metro Tucson without taking other routes or vice-versa. With the cost of fuel seemingly unabated, those longer routes will be a hardship for anyone required to travel on 83. Who will maintain the surface of those roads once the heavy traffic creates massive potholes on that scenic highway? Who will pay for the extra fuel imposed on the people forced to drive longer routes? Will they be compensated for the time lost waiting for the traffic to clear? Then, there is the major issue of water impact which is still being debated. What about the destruction of habitat for the desert dwellers?

When my sister-in-law recently attended the Patagonia meeting, she was sorry to discover there was not to be an open forum, simply a dispensing of literature. Will the proposed discussion hearings that are scheduled for May 12, June 7 and June 30 be as constrictive? When Yellowstone or the Grand Canyon or other national treasures were preserved for prosperity, the forces then in power had vision beyond their generation. Can we say the same of the decision makers of today? Will the generations that follow be able to enjoy the beauty of the Santa Ritas or will we point to the mountains and describe what **used to be there** to our grandchildren? Your call.


Sincerely,



Marie Dagucon
(520) 762-9350

Marie Dagucon
241 S. Nashville Ave.
Vail, AZ 85641

TUCSON AZ 857
05 MAY 2008 PM 3 T




Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

Tucson, AZ 85701
Received

MAY 07 2008

Coronado National Forest

8570181371



Rosemont Copper project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress St
Tucson, AZ 85701

My water is pumped from well number 55-531221

The legal description for the property is:

Township 19 S-Range 17 E-Sec 32
PIMA COUNTY BOOK 307 MAP 30 PARCEL 0670

I would like to know what impact the Rosemont mine would have on my well.
Can I expect the water table to be lowered, if so will my well run dry?
If my well runs dry who will pay to get water to my home?
What do you estimate the future groundwater table depth to be?
Will a trust be established securing funds for wells that are directly or indirectly affected by Rosemont Mine?
Will a surface and ground water study be completed describing the impacts of the Rosemont mine on the East Side of the Santa Rita's?

Thank you for answering these questions.

Sincerely,

Walter J. Karl
Evelyn A. Karl

6 MAY 2008


Mr. & Mrs. Walter J. Karl
P.O. Box 894
Curly Horse Ranch Rd.
Sonoita, AZ 85637

↑
mailing address
physical address is
in Pima County

Mr. & Mrs. Walter J. Karl
P.O. Box 894
Sonoita, AZ 85637

TUCSON AZ 85701


06 MAY 2009 PM 4 T



Rosemont Copper Project EIS
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

Tucson, AZ 85701
Received
MAY 07 2009
Coronado National Forest

8570181371





YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT:

1) Noncarbon alternatives to copper: how are mine investors discounting the risk that this new technology will supplant copper in many applications? Is the EIS comparing different estimates and the underlying assumptions? Are investors prepared to escrow funds in case their economic model falls apart in 10-15 years?

2) Solar panels on tailings/crater: As a gesture of good will, why don't the planners install solar collectors on the mine crater and tailings to contribute to non-polluting energy production?

NAME: ARNOLD URBAN

EMAIL: arniebu@gmail.com

ADDRESS: 1104 N Ramo Head Rd Green Valley, AZ 85614

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO

Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

Attn: Beverly Everson

USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 West Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

Coronado National Forest
Tucson, AZ 85701
May 01 2008
Beverly Everson

TUCSON AZ 857
30 APR 2008 PM 2 L

Arnold B. Urken
1104 N. Rams Head Rd.
Green Valley, AZ 85614



Fold Here

How to Comment Effectively

To be effective, comments should be specific and factual. Remember, the purpose of this scoping is to identify significant issues related to the proposed operation, and issues to be considered in the Environmental Impact Process (EIS).

The format for commenting is up to you to choose. Comment forms are available, but not required. Send comments by mail, email, or hand-deliver to the Forest Service before the public scoping period ends on July 14, 2008.

Below are several tips for making effective comments.

- Be brief so the reviewer won't miss the point of your comment.
- Be specific so the reviewer clearly understands your concerns.
 - o Statements such as "I am concerned about the amount of additional traffic this will cause" are useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
 - o Statements such as "Don't do this" or "I like this" are not useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- The better you understand the proposal, the more focused and site-specific your comments will be.
- Your comments must be realistic and feasible.
- Remember, this is the time to identify concerns AND opportunities.

The public comment period is the beginning of the EIS process and represents the foundation of the analysis. Your comments are an important input to the analysis of the social and natural environment.



YOUR COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT!

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED ROSEMONT COPPER PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

If you would like to make a comment or be added to our mailing list, please fill out this form and hand it to any of our staff or mail it to the address provided. You are also welcome to write a letter or send e-mail to: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us. Thank you!

COMMENT: How will this affect my well & what contamination will our water have.

I'm concerned about all the additional traffic with heavy trucks.

What about the noise 24 hours a day & the air pollution to our "quite, peaceful area"?

Our beautiful views of the Santa Ritas that we see everyday will be destroyed forever!

Where will they get enough power to run a mine?

Who will take care of our water problems long after the mine closes ???

NAME: Linda Pennington

EMAIL: jays of Tucson @ msn.com

ADDRESS: 20404 S. Marauders Tr Vail, AZ 85641

PLEASE ADD ME TO THE MAILING LIST (circle one): YES NO


Please be advised that comments and personal information associated with them, such as names and addresses, become part of the Administrative Record for this NEPA review. As such, they may be made available to a third-party upon request under the authority of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Personally identifying information is protected by the Privacy Act. If you do not wish for your personal information to be released under the FOIA, you may choose not to include it with your comments. Alternatively, you may request an exemption from FOIA with your comment submittal. Should you choose the latter, you would be informed by the Forest Service as to whether or not your request qualifies for an exemption. If it does not, you would be afforded the opportunity to resubmit your comments without personal information or to withhold them altogether.

85701+1391

USFS Permit No. G-10

Attn: Beverly Everson

USDA Forest Service
Coronado National Forest
300 West Congress Street
Tucson, AZ 85701



USA FIREGLASS FOREVER



LET US DATE THE
THINK, SPEAK AND
Place First Class
Stamp Here

30 APR 2008 PM 2 T

TUCSON AZ 857

Fold Here

How to Comment Effectively

To be effective, comments should be specific and factual. Remember, the purpose of this scoping is to identify significant issues related to the proposed operation, and issues to be considered in the Environmental Impact Process (EIS).

The format for commenting is up to you to choose. Comment forms are available, but not required. Send comments by mail, email, or hand-deliver to the Forest Service before the public scoping period ends on July 14, 2008.

Below are several tips for making effective comments.

- Be brief so the reviewer won't miss the point of your comment.
- Be specific so the reviewer clearly understands your concerns.
 - Statements such as "I am concerned about the amount of additional traffic this will cause" are useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
 - Statements such as "Don't do this" or "I like this" are not useful in generating issues that can be analyzed.
- The better you understand the proposal, the more focused and site-specific your comments will be.
- Your comments must be realistic and feasible.
- Remember, this is the time to identify concerns AND opportunities.

The public comment period is the beginning of the EIS process and represents the foundation of the analysis. Your comments are an important input to the analysis of the social and natural environment.



Attn: Beverly Evers

USPS
Permit No. G-1

Tucson, AZ 85701
Received
MAY 01 2008

Coronado National Forest

