

1 **Required Disclosures**

2 This section addresses additional disclosures that are required by CEQ regulations and/or NEPA.

3 **Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity**

4 NEPA requires consideration of “the relationship between short-term uses of man’s environment and  
5 the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity” (40 CFR 1502.16). As declared by  
6 Congress, this includes using all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical  
7 assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, create and maintain  
8 conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social,  
9 economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans (NEPA  
10 Section 101).

11 This portion of NEPA regulations recognizes that short-term uses and long-term productivity of the  
12 environment are linked and that opportunities that are acted upon have corollary opportunity costs in  
13 terms of forgone options and productivity that could have continuing effects well into the future.  
14 The following discussion examines short-term uses and long-term productivity together, according to  
15 resource categories. Specific impacts of the proposed project on resources are described in the various  
16 resource sections throughout chapter 3.

17 The relationships between short-term uses and long-term productivity would not be appreciably  
18 different from one alternative segment to another but instead come largely from whether the project is  
19 constructed. Resource areas not listed are not expected to have adverse environmental impacts in  
20 which maintenance of long-term productivity is a concern.

21 **Geology, Minerals, and Paleontology**

22 Construction of the Rosemont Copper Project would convert mostly undeveloped lands into an  
23 industrial mining operation. Construction of mine facilities would alter the area’s topography. Impacts  
24 related to the pit and tailings and waste rock facilities would be permanent. Other changes would be  
25 short term.

26 **Soils and Revegetation**

27 Productivity loss for soils would be limited to the disturbed areas affected by land clearing, grading,  
28 and construction; the mine pit; and areas permanently occupied by tailings and waste rock. It is  
29 unlikely that the tailings and waste rock would ever be removed, or that the open pit would be filled,  
30 and effects on soils and some land uses would be permanent. This includes the current livestock  
31 grazing on the area of the mine pit, which would be permanently forgone.

32 Reclamation efforts are anticipated to reestablish vegetation to all area other than the mine pit. Test  
33 plots at the site have demonstrated that it is possible to successfully revegetate under certain  
34 conditions; however, it is not known whether the areas would return to current conditions or the  
35 length of time that would be needed to successfully reclaim the site. However, the goal of reclamation  
36 is to create a self-sustainable ecosystem that would promote site stability and repair hydrologic  
37 function, and it is likely that livestock grazing and wildlife habitat would eventually be reestablished.

1 **Air Quality and Climate Change**

2 Impacts to air quality from mining operations would be short term and are expected to end with mine  
3 closure.

4 **Groundwater Quantity**

5 Groundwater drawdown from mine supply pumping could be mitigated through active recharge near  
6 the Green Valley area; however, there is no guarantee that Rosemont Copper would be able to achieve  
7 its stated desire to recharge more water than it uses for mine purposes. Pumping would last the  
8 duration of the mine life; if pumping is not mitigated, groundwater levels would slowly equilibrate  
9 after about 140 years. Groundwater drawdown from dewatering of the pit would be perpetuated by  
10 the hydraulic sink created by the pit lake and would constitute a permanent change.

11 **Surface Water Quantity**

12 Desert washes in the footprint of the pit, tailings facility, and waste rock facility, including WUS,  
13 would be permanently impacted. A permanent reduction in the quantity of surface water entering  
14 drainages immediately downstream of the mine would occur as a result of capture of runoff by the  
15 mine pit and other areas.

16 **Seeps, Springs, and Riparian Areas**

17 Seeps and springs would be permanently impacted by drawdown in groundwater levels, as would  
18 riparian areas associated with springs. Riparian areas directly lost to surface disturbance would be  
19 permanently impacted. The possible transition of riparian areas along Empire Gulch from  
20 hydriparian to xeriparian would be permanent. The possible reduction in quantity and quality of  
21 xeriparian areas along Barrel Canyon and Davidson Canyon would be permanent, and the most  
22 severe impacts would occur during the active mine life.

23 **Biological Resources**

24 Impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat would primarily be short term and would include destruction  
25 of habitat for mine construction, disturbance from mining and associated activities, and direct  
26 mortality from increased mine related vehicle traffic. Disturbance and direct mortality would cease  
27 when mine closure occurs, and reclamation would eventually allow wildlife habitat to reestablish  
28 itself.

29 **Dark Skies**

30 Increased night sky brightness would occur while mine construction, operation, reclamation, and  
31 closure are occurring. This is a short-term impact, and lighting would be removed during mine  
32 closure.

33 **Visual Resources**

34 Impacts to visual resources would be both short and long term. While impacts associated with  
35 processing plant buildings and structures such as utility lines and fences would cease when they are  
36 removed at closure, the mine pit, tailings facility, and waste rock facility would permanently alter the  
37 scenic landscape and affect the scenic quality of the area in perpetuity.

1 **Recreation and Wilderness**

2 Recreation would be impacted in both the short and long term. Public access would be restricted  
3 within the perimeter fence until mine closure, which is considered to be a short-term impact.  
4 However, much or all of the tailings and waste rock facilities may not be available for uses such as  
5 off-highway vehicle use in the future, depending on the final stability and revegetation of these areas.

6 **Transportation/Access**

7 Impacts from increased mine related traffic; noise related to mining activities; and public health and  
8 safety would be short-term impacts that would cease when the mine is closed.

9 **Cultural Resources**

10 Physical and visual impacts to archaeological sites, cultural landscapes, and plant and mineral  
11 resources caused by construction of the mine would be immediate, permanent, and large in scale.  
12 Mitigation measures cannot replace or replicate the historic properties that would be destroyed by the  
13 mine construction. The landscape, which is imbued with specific cultural attributions by each of the  
14 consulted tribes, would also be permanently affected.

15 **Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice**

16 Socioeconomic impacts are both positive and negative and are primarily short term. The project  
17 would provide increased jobs and tax revenue from construction through closure. However, this  
18 would be offset by potential impacts to local tourism and outdoor recreation economies, possible  
19 impacts to the astronomy industry, and a decrease in nearby property values. The long-term continued  
20 population and economic growth in areas of southern Arizona with existing open-pit copper mines  
21 indicates that these impacts are in the magnitude of being decades long and would not be permanent.

22 Environmental justice impacts are not expected, with one exception. Tribes with cultural, social, and  
23 religious ties to the mine site would be affected permanently from direct, permanent impacts to these  
24 sites and values.

25 **Unavoidable Adverse Effects**

26 As required by CEQ regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1502.16), this EIS describes the  
27 adverse or significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided from implementation of the  
28 proposed project or alternatives. In the resource sections of this chapter, the direct, indirect, and  
29 cumulative environmental effects of the project are discussed in detail. Impacts that are significant  
30 and cannot be avoided are summarized below. Refer to the referenced resource section in this chapter  
31 for a complete description of these impacts. Resource areas that are not listed are not expected to  
32 experience unavoidable adverse effects.

33 **Air Quality and Climate Change**

34 For the proposed action, Phased Tailings Alternative, and Barrel Alternative, emissions from mine  
35 related activities would meet applicable Federal and State standards for air quality but would  
36 constitute impacts that cannot be avoided. The Barrel Trail and Scholefield-McCleary Alternatives  
37 would not meet applicable Federal and State air quality standards during active mining; therefore,

1 these alternatives would produce greater impacts for a longer period of time than the other action  
2 alternatives.

### 3 **Soils and Revegetation**

4 Soil productivity would be impacted in the location of the mine pit. While the area that is covered by  
5 the tailings and waste rock would be permanently impacted, the top layer of soil would be removed  
6 from this area, stockpiled, and used during reclamation. Soil productivity would be expected to be  
7 reestablished on the tailings and waste rock facilities over the long term, but short-term adverse  
8 impacts cannot be avoided.

### 9 **Groundwater Quantity**

10 Groundwater quantity would be reduced by mine supply pumping in the Upper Santa Cruz Sub-  
11 Basin. However, Rosemont Copper's aquifer recharge mitigation could offset this drawdown, should  
12 that mitigation continue to occur. Groundwater quantity reductions resulting from the hydraulic sink  
13 created by the pit lake would constitute a permanent adverse impact that cannot be avoided.

### 14 **Surface Water Quantity**

15 The amount of surface water that would flow into drainages immediately downstream of the mine site  
16 would be permanently decreased, constituting a permanent adverse impact that cannot be avoided or  
17 completely mitigated.

### 18 **Seeps, Springs, and Riparian Areas**

19 The loss of seeps and springs and associated riparian areas constitutes a permanent adverse impact  
20 that cannot be avoided or completely mitigated. The potential transition of riparian areas from  
21 hydroriparian to xeroriparian, or to a lower quality of xeroriparian, also would constitute a permanent  
22 adverse impact that cannot be avoided.

### 23 **Biological Resources**

24 Biological resources would be impacted by direct surface disturbance, noise, vibration, light, dust, air  
25 pollutants, and traffic. Adverse impacts that cannot be avoided or completely mitigated include  
26 changes in cover, changes in foraging efficiency and success, changes in reproductive success,  
27 changes in growth rates of young, changes in predator-prey relationships, increased movement habitat  
28 fragmentation and disruption of dispersal and migration patterns for species using four animal  
29 movement corridors, and increased roadkill on SR 83.

### 30 **Livestock Grazing**

31 Grazing would be impacted by a reduction in the area available for grazing (a permanent reduction  
32 for the area of the pit; a temporary reduction for the area within the security fence and possibly within  
33 perimeter fence until reclamation returns the area to a condition that is compatible with livestock  
34 grazing) and by impacts to seeps, springs, and stock tanks that are used by livestock. Water source  
35 enhancement conservation measures may offset some of the impacts to seeps, springs, and stock  
36 tanks used by livestock on Forest Service grazing allotments. These impacts cannot be avoided or  
37 fully mitigated.

1 **Dark Skies**

2 While night brightness from mine facility lighting would be mitigated to a large degree, residual  
3 impacts would remain that are not avoidable and cannot be completely mitigated.

4 **Visual Resources**

5 The mine pit and residual tailings and waste rock facilities would constitute a permanent adverse  
6 impact that cannot be avoided or completely mitigated.

7 **Recreation and Wilderness**

8 Recreation use of the area would be permanently adversely impacted. Unavoidable adverse impacts  
9 to recreation include long-term displacement from the project area; changes from the existing  
10 semiprimitive, natural setting to a developed, industrial setting; and the loss of public access roads  
11 throughout the project area. These impacts cannot be avoided or fully mitigated.

12 **Hazardous Materials**

13 While the risk of hazardous materials spills would increase during mine construction and operation,  
14 following applicable Federal and State laws and regulations for storage, transport, and handling of  
15 such materials is expected to mitigate for this risk.

16 **Fuels and Fire Management**

17 Increased risks of fire ignition from mine activities are expected to be mitigated through adherence to  
18 a fire plan that requires mine employees to be trained for initial fire suppression and to have fire tools  
19 and water readily available.

20 **Transportation/Access**

21 Increases traffic associated with mine worker commuting and truck traffic to and from the mine are  
22 expected to result in impacts that cannot be avoided or fully mitigated, including increased traffic  
23 congestion and increased risk of traffic accidents.

24 **Noise**

25 Noise from mining activities is expected to have adverse impacts that cannot be avoided or fully  
26 mitigated in close proximity to the mine site or in areas where construction is occurring.

27 **Public Health and Safety**

28 The mine and associated activities are expected to increase risks to public health and safety, primarily  
29 from increased traffic and associated risk of additional traffic accidents. Potential impacts from  
30 emissions and fugitive dust are expected to be mitigated to a large degree by meeting Federal air  
31 quality standards. Potential impacts from transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials is  
32 expected to be mitigated by complying with applicable State and Federal laws and regulations for  
33 such materials.

1 **Cultural Resources**

2 Cultural resources and historic properties and uses would be directly and permanently impacted.  
3 These impacts cannot be avoided within the areas of direct impact, nor can they be fully mitigated.

4 **Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice**

5 Loss of jobs in the local tourism and outdoor recreation industries cannot be avoided or fully  
6 mitigated. Likewise, loss in property values for property close to the mine would constitute an impact  
7 that cannot be avoided or fully mitigated. While much of the impact to dark skies has been mitigated,  
8 the potential risks to the local astronomy industry from the perception that the area's dark skies are  
9 not sustainable cannot be avoided.

10 **Irreversible and Irretrievable**  
11 **Commitments of Resources**

12 As required by NEPA, this section also includes a discussion by resource of any irreversible or  
13 irretrievable commitment of resources that would result from implementing the alternatives.  
14 Irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources is defined as follows in FSH 1909.15  
15 (09/10/2011):

16 Irretrievable. A term that applies to the loss of production, harvest, or use of natural  
17 resources. For example, some or all of the timber production from an area is lost irretrievably  
18 while an area is serving as a winter sports site. The production lost is irretrievable, but the  
19 action is not irreversible. If the use changes, it is possible to resume timber production.

20 Irreversible. A term that describes the loss of future options. Applies primarily to the effects  
21 of use of nonrenewable resources, such as minerals or cultural resources, or to those factors,  
22 such as soil productivity that are renewable only over long periods of time.

23 **Geology, Minerals, and Paleontology**

24 Irreversible commitment of geological and mineral resources would occur with the excavation and  
25 relocation of approximately 1.8 billion tons of ore and waste rock and with the recovery of  
26 approximately 4.6 billion pounds of copper, 100 million pounds of molybdenum, and 70 million  
27 ounces of silver.

28 A commitment of resources is considered to be irretrievable when project impacts limit the future use  
29 or productivity of a nonrenewable resource over a limited amount of time, e.g., structures built on  
30 top of paleontologically sensitive geological units. A commitment of resources is considered to  
31 be irreversible when project impacts cause a nonrenewable resource to be permanently lost,  
32 e.g., destruction of significant fossils and loss of associated scientific data. With the implementation  
33 of proper mitigation measures, the project is not likely to result in the irreversible commitment of  
34 paleontological resources. An irretrievable commitment of paleontological resources may occur  
35 should building structures be situated on top of paleontologically sensitive geological units. Such a  
36 commitment would be considered temporary, as the building structures would subsequently be  
37 removed when the project ends.

## 1 **Air Quality and Climate Change**

2 During construction and operation of the project, air pollutant concentrations would be higher  
 3 throughout the analysis area than current levels but within applicable air quality standards. Following  
 4 mine closure and successful reclamation, pollutant concentrations would return to premining levels.  
 5 There would be no long-term irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources.

## 6 **Soils and Revegetation**

7 Soils are a finite resource, and any loss of soils resulting from their removal for tailings and waste  
 8 rock facilities and from erosion and delivery to downstream channels is irreversible. The loss of soil  
 9 productivity is irreversible because a stable new plant community would take an extremely long time  
 10 to redevelop on the surface of the tailings and waste rock facilities. The area of the open pit would  
 11 constitute an irreversible loss of approximately 955 acres of soil that would be lost in perpetuity.

## 12 **Groundwater Quantity**

13 The proposed action and all action alternatives would result in the same commitment of groundwater  
 14 quantity resources. In the Upper Santa Cruz Sub-Basin, the resource commitment is limited to the  
 15 mine water supply withdrawal of approximately 99,600 acre-feet over approximately 20 years. There  
 16 is a commitment from Rosemont Copper to recharge 105 percent of its mine water supply  
 17 withdrawal, or approximately 104,600 acre-feet. While recharge to date has taken place at facilities  
 18 located in the Tucson Active Management Area but far from the influence area of the mine water  
 19 supply wells, there are mechanisms in place that would allow for eventual recharge of all committed  
 20 water in the Upper Santa Cruz Sub-Basin. However, recharge of groundwater is a voluntary  
 21 mitigation measure and is not guaranteed to occur. Loss of this water from the aquifer in the Upper  
 22 Santa Cruz Sub-Basin is an irretrievable impact; the use of this water would be lost during the life of  
 23 the mine. However, once recharge has occurred in the Upper Santa Cruz Sub-Basin, this water would  
 24 once again be available for use.

25 The groundwater resource commitment associated with the flow into the mine pit is the  
 26 approximately 17,800 to 18,500 acre-feet of groundwater withdrawn to maintain minable conditions  
 27 in the pit during the approximately 20-year active mine life. This water would be withdrawn either  
 28 from the pit sump itself or with the use of dewatering wells or drains. After closure of the mine, a  
 29 mine pit lake would form. Estimates of the amount of water lost in perpetuity from the aquifer due to  
 30 evaporation by the mine pit lake ranges from 170 acre-feet per year (Montgomery and Associates Inc.  
 31 2010) to 370 acre-feet per year (Tetra Tech 2010). Loss of this water from the aquifer in the Davidson  
 32 Canyon/Cienega Basin would continue in perpetuity as a result of the formation of the mine pit lake  
 33 and is an irreversible impact.

## 34 **Groundwater Quality and Geochemistry**

35 In general, changes to groundwater quality are for the most part considered to be irreversible,  
 36 depending on the ability for remediation to occur. However, for the Rosemont Copper Project,  
 37 changes in groundwater quality from tailings seepage, waste rock seepage, treated heap leach  
 38 seepage, or the mine pit lake are expected to be minimal, and exceedances of aquifer water quality  
 39 standards are not expected. Therefore irreversible or irretrievable commitments are not anticipated for  
 40 groundwater quality.

1 **Surface Water Quantity**

2 The loss of stock tanks that would be directly impacted by the footprint of mining operations  
3 associated with any action alternative would be irretrievable, with some water sources proposed to be  
4 replaced, depending on wildlife and livestock needs.

5 With respect to surface water flows from the project area, all action alternatives would result in some  
6 variation of both irreversible and irretrievable commitment of surface water resources. Each action  
7 alternative would result in varying amounts of indirect loss to flow in downstream drainages.

8 Irreversible commitment of surface water flows would result from the permanent reduction in  
9 stormwater flows into downstream drainages. Irretrievable commitment of surface water resources  
10 would be associated with additional temporary diversion, storage, and use of stormwater during  
11 mining operations.

12 **Surface Water Quality**

13 With respect to surface water quality, the resources that would constitute an irreversible commitment  
14 of surface water quality include the following: (1) the indirect effect on water quality as a result of the  
15 loss of WUS that would be impacted by the footprint of mining operations associated with any action  
16 alternative; and (2) the reduction of sediment movement in downstream channels.

17 **Seeps, Springs, and Riparian Areas**

18 The proposed action and all action alternatives would result in the same commitment of resources  
19 with respect to seeps, springs, and riparian areas. The resources that would be impacted include the  
20 following: (1) the direct effect on seeps, springs, and riparian areas that would be impacted by the  
21 footprint of mining operations associated with any action alternative constitutes an irreversible  
22 commitment of resources; (2) the indirect effect on seeps, springs, and riparian areas as a result of the  
23 lowering of groundwater levels constitutes an irreversible commitment of resources; and (3) the  
24 associated loss of riparian vegetation constitutes an irreversible commitment of resources.

25 **Biological Resources**

26 The mine pit would be an irreversible commitment of vegetation resources, as the pit would remain in  
27 perpetuity after the project is complete. Thus, 955 acres is considered lost to future use by wildlife,  
28 consisting of 955 acres of lost Madrean evergreen woodland. The direct loss of productivity of  
29 thousands of acres of Madrean evergreen woodland, semidesert grassland, and riparian vegetation  
30 from the waste rock, tailings, and plant facilities would result in both irreversible and irretrievable  
31 commitment of the resources that these areas provide for wildlife (i.e., wildlife breeding, foraging,  
32 wintering, and roosting habitat; animal movement corridors, etc.) and the vegetation communities  
33 themselves.

34 Proper implementation of the reclamation plan and mitigation measures would ensure that most of the  
35 project area would be considered an irretrievable commitment of vegetation and topographic  
36 resources, as these areas would be replanted and reclaimed and eventually redevelop into functioning  
37 Madrean evergreen woodland habitat. However, it is possible that some of these areas would include  
38 an irreversible commitment of an unknown number of acres of native vegetation communities. For  
39 example, some of these areas may be converted from their current native vegetation state (Madrean  
40 evergreen woodland, semidesert grassland, etc.) and may not return to the previous condition, thus  
41 being lost for certain plant and animal species.



1 Additionally, there would be an overall reduced presence of wildlife in the project area as a result of  
 2 lost habitat and the impacts of dust and artificially night lighting, and there would be a potential  
 3 reduced presence of wildlife in the analysis area as a result of decreased surface water flow in Barrel  
 4 and Davidson Canyons, groundwater drawdown, vibrations, noise, and other human activity during  
 5 the life of the project. Most of this would be considered an irretrievable commitment of resources, as  
 6 it is expected that many species would use the area again after the project is completed and activity  
 7 has ceased. However, it is possible that some species may never return to the area for a variety of  
 8 reasons (change in topography resulting from waste rock facility, tailings facility, and the pit;  
 9 groundwater drawdown of springs and seeps; areas that may not be reestablished to native vegetative  
 10 communities, etc.), and this would then constitute an irreversible commitment of resources for  
 11 wildlife.

## 12 **Livestock Grazing**

13 Vegetation on the site would be constantly changing as reclamation procedures are implemented.  
 14 Eventually, reclamation is expected to return the site to conditions acceptable for postclosure land  
 15 uses such as grazing. Irretrievable commitment of grazing resources would occur until reclamation  
 16 has returned the site to conditions acceptable for grazing.

17 However, the approximately 955-acre open pit represents an irreversible loss of grazing land that  
 18 would not be reclaimed.

## 19 **Dark Skies**

20 There would be an irretrievable, regional, long-term loss of night sky viewing during Rosemont  
 21 Copper Mine construction and operation because night sky brightening, light pollution, and sky glow  
 22 caused by mine lighting would diminish nighttime viewing conditions in the direction of the mine.  
 23 Once the mine completes operations and is closed (including removal of mine lighting), night sky  
 24 visibility would return to conditions similar to those prior to mine construction and operation.

## 25 **Visual Resources**

26 For all action alternatives, there would be an irretrievable loss of scenic quality from increased access  
 27 roads and commuter and truck traffic during the premining and active mining phases of the mine.  
 28 There would be a loss of scenic quality to the existing view of the Santa Rita Mountains caused by  
 29 the upper pit face, pit haul roads, and pit diversion channel cut slope color contrasts until permanent  
 30 timescale rock weathering has reduced these contrasts. The size and extent of the waste rock and  
 31 tailings facilities would create losses of scenic quality until rock weathering and slope revegetation  
 32 have reduced color, form, line, and texture contrasts to a degree that they blend in with the  
 33 surrounding landscape. Due to the geological time frame necessary for these processes to occur, the  
 34 loss of scenic quality associated with the waste rock and tailings facilities would effectively be  
 35 irreversible.

36 There would be an irretrievable loss of scenic quality along SR 83 and along Santa Rita Mountain  
 37 west slope roads until the power lines are removed at the time of mine closure. For each action  
 38 alternative, the visual contrasts that would result from the introduction of facilities associated with the  
 39 project would be an irretrievable loss of the undeveloped, semiprimitive setting until the project is  
 40 closed and full reclamation is complete. Under all of the action alternatives, existing views of the

1 Santa Rita Mountains would be irreversibly lost behind the waste rock and tailings facilities because  
2 of the height and extent of the piles.

### 3 **Recreation and Wilderness**

4 In general, there would be irretrievable and irreversible impacts as a result of displaced recreation  
5 users and adverse effects on recreation experiences and activities.

6 There would be irretrievable impacts to recreation along the Arizona National Scenic Trail with the  
7 proposed action and Phased Tailings Alternative. These two alternatives propose to relocate segments  
8 of the Arizona National Scenic Trail between the perimeter fence and SR 83. That location would not  
9 mitigate the impacts to the trail because the relocated trail segments would not fully meet the scenic  
10 and recreational values for which the current location was chosen. The remaining alternatives would  
11 relocate the Arizona National Scenic Trail to the east side of SR 83, which would mitigate adverse  
12 effects and provide a recreational experience similar to the existing trail, except where highway  
13 crossings are required.

14 Each action alternative would result in the permanent removal of Forest Service off-highway routes,  
15 resulting in a permanent loss of recreation opportunities and activities. Although an east-west route to  
16 access the project area during mining operations would be constructed, public access would only be  
17 permitted outside the mine perimeter fence. North-south routes through the project site would be  
18 closed permanently. Although routes through the project area might be reestablished via the primary  
19 access road and utility maintenance road after mine closure, the possibility of reestablishing a north-  
20 south route and other routes destroyed by mining operations through the reclaimed area would be  
21 difficult due to topography, suitable lands, and resource impacts. Therefore, the impacts to off-  
22 highway vehicle routes are considered both irretrievable for those that would be reestablished  
23 following mine closure and irreversible for those that would be permanently affected.

24 Even after full reclamation is complete, the postmine topography of the project area would limit the  
25 recreation value and potential for future recreation opportunities.

### 26 **Hazardous Materials**

27 With respect to hazardous materials, there are not expected to be any irretrievable or irreversible  
28 changes to resources. Although there is the potential for contamination of surface water, groundwater,  
29 or soils in the event of a spill or accidental release, such an occurrence is not expected to occur, and  
30 environmental remediation is possible (and required by law) if it does occur.

### 31 **Fire and Fuels Management**

32 With respect to fuels and fire management, there are not expected to be any irretrievable or  
33 irreversible changes to resources. Vegetation and fuels in the project area would be constantly  
34 changing as reclamation procedures are implemented. Eventually, reclamation is expected to return  
35 site vegetation to a state that is reminiscent of existing vegetation communities in the area.

### 36 **Transportation/Access**

37 Irretrievable impacts to transportation and access would occur as a result of an increase of traffic on  
38 State, County, and public forest roads from mining operations within the analysis area and from the  
39 reduction of public access to roads within the perimeter fence. Because mine related traffic would

1 cease after mine closure, traffic impacts would not be considered an irreversible commitment of  
2 resources. Existing public forest roads that would be destroyed within the perimeter fence of the mine  
3 would constitute both an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources. Roads that are  
4 permanently covered with tailings and waste rock would be an irreversible commitment, while those  
5 that are cut off to public access by the perimeter fence could potentially be restored or rerouted  
6 following mine closure and therefore are considered to be an irretrievable commitment of resources.

### 7 **Noise**

8 Irretrievable commitment of resources would consist of mine related noise during the premining,  
9 active mining, and final reclamation and closure phases of the mine. Because the mine related noise  
10 would cease after closure of the mine, noise impacts would not be considered an irreversible  
11 commitment of resources.

### 12 **Public Health and Safety**

13 Irreversible changes with respect to public health and safety are not expected. All potential hazards  
14 discussed are limited solely to the construction and operation phases of the mine and are not expected  
15 to remain after closure of the mine. Therefore, they would constitute an irretrievable commitment of  
16 resources.

### 17 **Cultural Resources**

18 The direct impacts to cultural resources and historic properties from construction of the mine and  
19 associated facilities constitute an irreversible commitment of resources. Archaeological sites cannot  
20 be reconstructed once disturbed, nor can they be fully mitigated. Sacred springs would be eradicated  
21 by mine construction and affected by adjacent water drawdown. Changes that permanently affect the  
22 ability of tribal members to use the area for cultural and religious purposes are also an irreversible  
23 commitment of resources. Temporary exclusion of uses such as gathering of traditional materials  
24 during the period of mine construction through closure would constitute an irretrievable commitment,  
25 as reclamation would not restore sources of clays and minerals and may not restore the original  
26 vegetative communities.

### 27 **Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice**

28 There would be irretrievable socioeconomic impacts under all action alternatives because existing  
29 land uses, including recreation opportunities, would be precluded within the project area during the  
30 life of the copper mine. Adverse impacts from increases in nighttime lighting to dark skies could have  
31 irretrievable impacts on the observatories and related research and tourism. Upon termination and  
32 reclamation of the site, it is possible that these uses would return.

33 Mining is usually an irreversible use of land, particularly where extraction is from open-pit rather  
34 than underground mines (Crowson 2009). The action alternatives would potentially cause irreversible  
35 impacts to the affected area with regard to changes in the local landscape, community values, and  
36 quality of life. Disturbance to cultural resources that would disproportionately adversely impact the  
37 Tohono O’odham Nation, as an environmental justice community, would be irreversible.

1 **Cumulative Effects**

2 Cumulative effects analysis has been conducted, and the results are addressed in each individual  
3 resource section in this chapter.

4 **Other Required Disclosures**

5 The Coronado has consulted with the following agencies, as required by pertinent law and regulation.

6 **Consultation under the Endangered Species Act**

7 The Coronado has completed consultation with the USFWS regarding species protected under  
8 Section 7 of the ESA. The USFWS has issued a biological opinion, which can be found in appendix F  
9 of this FEIS. All conservation measures, reasonable and prudent measures, and terms and conditions  
10 specified in the biological opinion are nondiscretionary and would be included as components of the  
11 decision in the ROD.

12 **Consultation under the National Historic Preservation Act**

13 The Coronado has completed consultation with the Arizona SHPO regarding cultural resources  
14 protected under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The Arizona SHPO has entered  
15 into an MOA with the Forest Service (refer to appendix D of this FEIS). All agreements and  
16 mitigation measures specified in the MOA and the historic properties treatment plan are  
17 nondiscretionary and would be included as components of the decision in the ROD.

18 **Conflicts with Regional, State, and Local Plans,  
19 Policies, and Controls**

20 NEPA at 40 CFR 1502.16 directs, “Statements shall discuss (c) Possible conflicts between the  
21 proposed action and the objectives of Federal, regional, State, and local (and in the case of a  
22 reservation, Indian tribe) land use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned. (See  
23 1506.2(d).)” Title 40 CFR 1506.2(d) states, “To better integrate environmental impact statements into  
24 State or local planning processes, statements shall discuss any inconsistency of a proposed action  
25 with any approved State or local plan and laws (whether or not federally sanctioned). Where an  
26 inconsistency exists, the statement should describe the extent to which the agency would reconcile its  
27 proposed action with the plan or law.”

28 ***Las Cienegas National Conservation Area  
29 Resource Management Plan***

30 The Las Cienegas National Conservation Area was established by an act of Congress on December 6,  
31 2000 (Public Law 106-538). The Las Cienegas National Conservation Area is managed by the BLM.

32 The Las Cienegas Resource Management Plan and ROD were approved in July 2003. The purpose of  
33 this section is to address the extent to which the Rosemont Copper Project would conflict with  
34 accomplishment of the goals of the resource management plan and whether those conflicts could be  
35 rectified. It is important to note that the goals of the resource management plan that are summarized  
36 below directly apply only to the areas within the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area. However,  
37 the achievement of some of those goals could be affected by wide-ranging impacts from the  
38 Rosemont Copper Project, and those are the goals that are the subject of this exercise.

1 According to the resource management plan,

2 The approved Las Cienegas RMP is designed to achieve or maintain desired future conditions  
 3 that were developed through the collaborative planning process with the Sonoita Valley  
 4 Planning Partnership. Under the approved RMP, the public lands are open to livestock  
 5 grazing and dispersed recreation. Both motorized and mechanized vehicles are limited to  
 6 designated routes. Recreation is managed within three zones. Two utility corridors are  
 7 established and the public lands are closed to mineral entry and location. The public lands in  
 8 the planning area are designated as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). This  
 9 approved RMP also includes a series of management actions to meet the desired resource  
 10 conditions for upland and riparian vegetation, wildlife habitats, cultural and visual resources,  
 11 as well as livestock grazing and recreation management actions.

12 Goals for the Sonoita Valley (Upper Cienega Creek Watershed) specified in the resource management  
 13 plan include the following:

- 14 1. Maintain and improve watershed health.
- 15 2. Maintain and improve native wildlife habitats and populations.
- 16 3. Maintain and restore native plant diversity and abundance.
- 17 4. Protect water quality.
- 18 5. Protect water quantity.
- 19 6. Assure sustainability and a complementary relationship of mineral resources to the protection  
 20 of water quality and quantity.
- 21 7. Maintain the region's scenic beauty and open spaces.
- 22 8. Sustain compatible traditional, current, and future use of the land.
- 23 9. Promote stewardship of the resources to accommodate current and future opportunities and  
 24 demands.
- 25 10. Manage the cultural resources in the planning area in a manner that provides for their  
 26 preservation and protection and also avails selected properties for scientific, public, and  
 27 sociocultural uses.

28 As described in the resources analyses in this chapter, the Rosemont Copper Project could have  
 29 indirect impacts to resource values within the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area, as follows:

- 30 • Projected groundwater draw from the mine pit down could reduce surface water flows,  
 31 resulting in changes to riparian vegetation and associated wildlife habitat. While these  
 32 impacts are mostly beyond the ability of modeling to predict with any certainty, it seems  
 33 likely that some reduction in stream and spring flow would occur in Empire Gulch over the  
 34 long term (100+ years). The extent of impacts is not known; however, these impacts would  
 35 not further achievement of goals 1, 2, 3, or 5 above.
- 36 • No practicable ways to significantly mitigate the drawdown of groundwater from the pit were  
 37 identified. Therefore, the conflict between implementation of the Rosemont Copper Project  
 38 and achieving the goals of the resource management plan cannot be rectified. The proposed  
 39 acquisition, severance, and transfer of certificated surface water rights as in-stream flow  
 40 rights on upper Cienega Creek would offer legal protection of water quantity within the  
 41 national conservation area that does not exist at this time and would help further achieve goal  
 42 5 above.

- 1 • Visitors to the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area would be able to view the  
2 Rosemont Copper Project pit and tailings and waste rock facilities as background from some  
3 areas within the national conservation area. The view of this industrial mining operation  
4 would not further the achievement of goal 7 above.
- 5 • A number of mitigation measures designed to soften or reduce visual impacts of the mine site  
6 have been identified, and their implementation would be required. However, there have been  
7 no practicable mitigations identified that would significantly lessen the visual impact of this  
8 industrial mining development. Therefore, the conflict between implementation of the  
9 Rosemont Copper Project and achieving the goals of the resource management plan cannot  
10 be rectified.

11 While the Rosemont Copper Project would not further the achievement of many of the goals of the  
12 national conservation area, it would not violate the implementing legislation for the Las Cienegas  
13 National Conservation Area. Section 5 of Public Law 106-538 establishes management of the Las  
14 Cienegas National Conservation Area. Section 5(i) contains the following language:

15 NO BUFFER ZONES – The establishment of the Conservation Area shall not lead to the  
16 creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around the Conservation Area. The fact that  
17 there may be activities or uses on lands outside the Conservation Area that would not be  
18 permitted in the Conservation Area shall not preclude such activities or uses on such lands up  
19 to the boundary of the Conservation Area consistent with other applicable laws.

#### 20 ***Cienega Creek Wild and Scenic River Eligibility***

21 In December 1994, the BLM approved the “Final Arizona Statewide Wild and Scenic Rivers  
22 Legislative Environmental Impact Statement,” which determined that 10.5 miles of Cienega Creek  
23 was suitable for recommending to Congress for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River  
24 System.

25 The EIS found that two segments were suitable for designating as Scenic. Segment 1 includes  
26 3.0 miles along Cienega Creek and 1.0 miles along Empire Gulch, where this tributary enters Cienega  
27 Creek. Segment 2 includes 5.5 miles of Cienega Creek and 1.0 miles of Mattie Canyon, where it  
28 enters Cienega Creek. The 10.5-mile total includes 8.5 miles along Cienega Creek, 1.0 miles along  
29 Mattie Canyon, and 1.0 miles along Empire Gulch. Empire Gulch and Mattie Canyon contribute year-  
30 round flow to Cienega Creek within the conservation area.

31 These two segments of Cienega Creek were determined to be eligible for inclusion in the Wild and  
32 Scenic Rivers System by the BLM because the river is free-flowing and has outstandingly remarkable  
33 essential habitat for the Gila topminnow.

34 While some impacts to the outstandingly remarkable essential habitat for the Gila topminnow could  
35 occur in Empire Gulch, these impacts would not occur in the foreseeable future.

36 Groundwater drawdown could affect stream flow in Empire Gulch 150 years or more in the future.  
37 This would reduce the amount of water that Empire Gulch contributes to Cienega Creek. Indirect  
38 impacts on the Gila topminnow could occur in Empire Gulch, where groundwater drawdown is  
39 modeled to occur. These impacts would not affect the free-flowing nature of the 10.5 miles of  
40 Cienega Creek deemed suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System; however,  
41 these impacts have the potential to affect the outstandingly remarkable essential habitat for the Gila

1 topminnow. However, modeling indicates these impacts will not occur for 150 years following mine  
2 closure, and it is likely that it will be many of hundreds of years before drawdown reaches levels in  
3 upper Empire Gulch that impact stream flow levels and thus impact Gila topminnow habitat.

4 While the Rosemont Copper Project could potentially have long-term impacts that could affect the  
5 outstandingly remarkable essential habitat for the Gila topminnow, impacts would not be expected to  
6 occur for 150 years or more.

### 7 ***Saguaro National Park Management Plan***

8 Given the National Park Service's role as stewards of National Park Service lands, the National Park  
9 Service is deemed to have "special expertise" when assessing potential impacts lands within its  
10 jurisdiction. This is particularly true in the case of parks designated as Class I areas under the CAA,  
11 such as Saguaro National Park. Under the CAA, the Federal land manager for these areas has the  
12 "affirmative responsibility to protect the AQRVs [air quality related values] (including visibility) of  
13 any such lands" (42 U.S.C. 7475(d)(2)(B)). To achieve this complex task, the National Park Service  
14 must use the best available science to: (1) evaluate the impact new and existing sources of air  
15 pollution may have on National Park Service units and work to reduce or eliminate adverse air  
16 pollution impacts in parks; (2) monitor current air pollution impacts in parks; (3) provide important  
17 information about air pollution impacts in parks to decisionmakers. This statutory responsibility  
18 positions the National Park Service to serve as the primary experts in identifying and assessing the  
19 effects of air pollution in national parks.

20 The primary mission of the National Park Service is derived from the 1916 National Park Service  
21 Organic Act, which requires the National Park Service to leave park resources and values  
22 "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations" (16 U.S.C. 1). Congress further clarified this  
23 mandate in subsequent legislation and amendments, which found that all parks are part of an  
24 important "single national heritage" and should all be managed and preserved accordingly. As such,  
25 the National Park Service manages all units in the national park system with a requisite level of  
26 resource protection. Class I designation under the CAA reaffirms and further clarifies National Park  
27 Service responsibility with respect to air quality and air quality related values.

28 The National Park Service clarifies agency policy for meeting these statutory mandates in the 2006  
29 National Park Service management policies. The management policies state that the National Park  
30 Service will seek to "perpetuate the best possible air quality in parks" (Section 4.7.1). This means  
31 establishing benchmark conditions for air quality that are consistent with the CAA and other policy  
32 goals. The policies also direct the National Park Service to engage in extensive "cooperative  
33 conservation" with air regulatory agencies, stakeholders, and other Federal land managers to address  
34 air resource issues. The National Park Service aims to address these mandates and policies when  
35 evaluating predicted air quality impacts in National Park Service units.

36 Finally, these National Park Service policies and mandates can be addressed through the NEPA  
37 framework. The CEQ regulations implementing NEPA in 40 CFR 1502.16 identify the required  
38 components of the "environmental consequences" section of an EIS, stating that discussions should  
39 include any "adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be  
40 implemented." The "environmental consequences analysis" "shall" also include a discussion of  
41 "possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of Federal, regional, State, and  
42 local (and in the case of a reservation, Indian tribe) land use plans, policies and controls for the area  
43 concerned" (40 CFR 1502.16 (c)).

1 National Park Service concerns regarding predicted air quality related value impacts to Saguaro  
2 National Park from emissions associated with the proposed Rosemont Copper Mine are described  
3 below.

4 Under EPA definitions in the best available retrofit technology (BART) guidelines for the Regional  
5 Haze Rule, the Rosemont Copper Mine would be considered to “cause” visibility impairment in this  
6 Class I area, based on exceedance of modeling thresholds.

7 Visibility impacts of this magnitude are of significant concern to the National Park Service in general,  
8 and are of particular concern in this circumstance considering that Saguaro National Park will not  
9 meet the regional haze goals under the ADEQ proposed regional haze state implementation  
10 plan. Regional modeling completed for the regional haze process demonstrates that visibility on the  
11 20% best visibility days at Saguaro National Park will degrade in the future. The goal of the regional  
12 haze program is to improve visibility on the 20 percent worst days and prevent degradation on the 20  
13 percent best days. Visibility impacts from the Rosemont Copper Mine may impede progress toward  
14 the national visibility goal.

15 The National Park Service is concerned about the predicted nitrogen deposition in Saguaro National  
16 Park, which may exceed the National Park Service deposition analysis threshold almost by a factor of  
17 10. The deposition analysis threshold represents a significance threshold and is used only to  
18 determine whether the predicted deposition impacts from the source alone warrant further evaluation  
19 in light of current ecosystem conditions.

20 In this case, the National Park Service believes that desert and semiarid ecosystems, such as those  
21 found in Saguaro National Park, may be impacted by current levels of nitrogen deposition. Research  
22 published recently for other arid areas in the western United States suggests that natural ecosystems  
23 in Saguaro National Park may be at risk for invasion of exotic grasses like cheatgrass and buffelgrass  
24 as a result of increased nitrogen deposition and that biodiversity may be reduced. Nitrogen deposition  
25 in these areas has also been shown to increase fire frequency from enhanced fuel loading of grasses.  
26 Many National Park Service sites in this area also contain cultural resources that could be at risk if  
27 fire frequency increases.

28 The Four Corners region has experienced long-term deposition from large sources of nitrogen  
29 emissions, including stationary point sources and significant growth in the area source sector from  
30 regional oil and gas development. Accordingly, a recent risk assessment evaluating the sensitivity of  
31 numerous National Park Service areas to nutrient enrichment effects from nitrogen deposition ranked  
32 Saguaro National Park at very high risk to impacts from nitrogen deposition.

33 In addition, a recent review report documenting nitrogen critical loads in ecoregions across the  
34 country indicates that nitrogen critical loads may currently be exceeded for herbaceous plants and  
35 shrubs in the vicinity of Saguaro National Park (see the “Projected Effects on Deposition of Sulfates  
36 and Nitrates on Class I Areas” part of the “Air Quality and Climate Change” resource section in this  
37 chapter).

38 Site-specific research has not been conducted in Saguaro National Park to determine the degree to  
39 which nitrogen deposition may be impacting vegetation, including the extent, species composition, or  
40 fuel loading of grasses. However, the existing body of evidence and the nitrogen risk assessment  
41 results for this park suggest that nitrogen deposition is a significant concern. Therefore, the  
42 magnitude of the modeled deposition analysis threshold exceedance due to emissions from the  
43 Rosemont Copper mine is a significant concern for the National Park Service.



### **1 Patagonia-Sonoita Scenic Road Corridor Management Plan**

2 The “Patagonia-Sonoita Scenic Road Corridor Management Plan” was completed in 2003 to  
 3 encourage collaborative community planning for the road and to provide strategies to preserve the  
 4 visual and cultural-historic resources along the road (Wheat Scharf Associates 2003). The corridor  
 5 management plan describes the existing conditions and opportunities for the road, defines the six  
 6 intrinsic qualities as archaeological, cultural, historic, natural, recreational, and scenic resources,  
 7 and lays out strategies to preserve and enhance the intrinsic qualities that draw residents and visitors  
 8 to the corridor. It defines the measure of scenic quality as “how memorable, distinctive,  
 9 uninterrupted, and unified” the view is perceived to be (Wheat Scharf Associates 2003).

10 The Rosemont Copper Project could conflict to some degree with each of the intrinsic qualities that  
 11 were considered when designating the corridor. While mitigation measures could reduce these  
 12 conflicts, impacts and thus conflicts would remain.

### **13 Pima County Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan**

14 In 1998, the Pima County Board of Supervisors initiated discussions on land use planning that  
 15 ultimately led to development of the “Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan.” The “Sonoran Desert  
 16 Conservation Plan,” which was adopted in 2001 as part of the “Comprehensive Land Use Plan  
 17 Update,” was developed using science-based principles shaped by public review and discussion,  
 18 resulting in a plan that reflects community values. The “Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan” is used to  
 19 guide regional efforts to conserve the best lands and most precious resources for future generations of  
 20 Pima County residents to enjoy.

21 According to the “Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan,” the plan is meant to guide all future land use  
 22 decisions of Pima County, as well as where public money is spent by Pima County to conserve open  
 23 space, how cultural and historic resources are protected, and how our Western lifestyle continues.  
 24 While the “Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan” covers lands under all ownership within Pima County,  
 25 the plan does not regulate land uses on Federal lands administered by the Forest Service.  
 26 The “Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan” identifies critical habitat and biological corridors; riparian  
 27 resources; ranch conservation lands; mountain peaks and natural preserves; and cultural resources.  
 28 The area that could be impacted by the Rosemont Copper Mine contains biological core areas and  
 29 multiple use areas; priority archaeological sites, priority archaeological site complexes,  
 30 archaeological sensitivity zones, and NRHP properties; and existing natural preserves (i.e., the  
 31 Coronado National Forest). The proposed project could potentially affect downstream riparian  
 32 restoration/rehabilitation areas. There are many areas of overlap between the conservation principles  
 33 of the “Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan” and the issues addressed in the FEIS. For instance,  
 34 biological corridors and critical habitat for a wide variety of species are addressed in the “Biological  
 35 Resources” resource section of this chapter. Potential impacts to riparian resources are addressed in  
 36 the “Seeps, Springs, and Riparian Areas,” groundwater, and surface water resource sections of this  
 37 chapter. Other potential impacts that are relevant to the objectives of the “Sonoran Desert  
 38 Conservation Plan” are well described in the FEIS in the various resource sections. As stated in the  
 39 resource sections in chapter 3 of the FEIS, impacts have been mitigated to the degree practicable;  
 40 however, conflicts with aspects of the “Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan” would remain.

### **41 Town of Sahuarita General Plan**

42 The “General Plan” for the town of Sahuarita was approved by the Town Council on December 9,  
 43 2002, and ratified by town residents on May 20, 2003. The plan is a comprehensive effort to guide

1 Town of Sahuarita policy and decisionmakers and staff in planning the future of the town. As stated  
2 in the plan, the plan is not a law—it is a guide.

3 Throughout the NEPA process, the Town of Sahuarita has indicated a number of areas where they feel  
4 the Rosemont Copper Project conflicts with the “General Plan:”

- 5 • Continued pumping of groundwater from region that serves Sahuarita residents does not meet  
6 the Town of Sahuarita objective of encouraging water providers to evaluate water demand  
7 within the Town of Sahuarita to ensure that the rate of use does not exceed a potential future  
8 supply. The Town of Sahuarita has also indicated that the planned pumping conflicts with a  
9 Town objective of encouraging water providers to use alternative water sources and water  
10 conservation methods and strategies by all users requiring large quantities of water.

11 Rosemont Copper has addressed this concern by committing to recharge the aquifer with 105  
12 percent of the groundwater it has been authorized to pump for mine operations. Mechanisms  
13 would be in place that would allow the recharge of this area in the Sahuarita area. However, it  
14 should be noted that implementation of these recharge efforts are not within the jurisdiction  
15 of the Forest Service.

- 16 • According to the Town of Sahuarita, the pump stations associated with the water supply line  
17 would not be consistent with aspects of the “General Plan.”

18 Rosemont Copper has addressed this concern by reducing one pump station and by  
19 contracting with the University of Arizona to design pump stations to fit into the surrounding  
20 landscape from an aesthetic standpoint. However, it should be noted that building the pump  
21 stations to University of Arizona specifications cannot be required by the Forest Service.

- 22 • Solid waste would be recycled as appropriate and feasible. Nonrecyclable inert waste would  
23 be disposed of at a State licensed onsite landfill located on Rosemont Copper’s private  
24 property. According to the Town of Sahuarita, this landfill would not be consistent with  
25 aspects of the “General Plan.”

26 The landfill in question would follow all applicable State laws. It is important to note that the  
27 landfill is located on Rosemont Copper private land on the east side of the Santa Rita  
28 Mountains, while the Town of Sahuarita is located on the west side of the Santa Rita  
29 Mountains. It is unlikely that the landfill in question would have any effect on residents or  
30 businesses located in or near Sahuarita.

### 31 ***Santa Cruz County Comprehensive Plan***

32 On June 29, 2004, the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors adopted the Santa Cruz County 2004  
33 “Comprehensive Plan.” The purpose of the “Comprehensive Plan” is to provide guidance to the  
34 County Board of Supervisors in maintaining the diverse development styles, cultures, and  
35 environments. The plan provides specific goals for the Northeast Santa Cruz County Character Area,  
36 which encompasses an area west and south of the Rosemont Copper Project area.

37 While a number of comments were received that stated that the Santa Cruz County “Comprehensive  
38 Plan” was not considered in the DEIS, no specific conflicts or inconsistencies were identified at that  
39 time. In response to these comments, the 2004 Santa Cruz County “Comprehensive Plan” was  
40 reviewed.

1 No land within Santa Cruz County would be directly impacted by the Rosemont Copper Project;  
 2 however, indirect impacts would occur from the project that may not be consistent with some of the  
 3 goals of the Northeast Santa Cruz County Character Area. These include the following:

- 4 • **GOAL 2: OPEN SPACE AND NATURAL TERRAIN REMAIN DOMINANT FEATURES  
 5 OF THE LANDSCAPE AND VIEWSHEDS ARE PROTECTED.**

6  
 7 As described in the “Visual Resources” section in this chapter, the Rosemont Copper Project  
 8 would be seen from some areas within Santa Cruz County. From these areas, natural terrain  
 9 may not remain the dominant features of the landscape and certain viewsheds may be  
 10 adversely impacted. While mitigation and reclamation would reduce the visual impacts of the  
 11 mine to some degree, particularly from distant viewpoints, impacts would remain that cannot  
 12 be rectified. Please refer to the “Visual Resources” resource section in this chapter for further  
 13 information.

- 14  
 15 • **GOAL 7: WILDLIFE HABITAT AND WILDLIFE MOVEMENT CORRIDORS ARE  
 16 RECOGNIZED AND PRESERVED THROUGH THE USE OF ESTABLISHED AND  
 17 INNOVATIVE LAND USE MANAGEMENT TOOLS.**

18  
 19 Map 7 in the “Comprehensive Plan” shows wildlife corridor possibilities. One broad corridor  
 20 connects to the block of NFS land in which the Rosemont Copper Project is located. This  
 21 area of NFS land is connected via linkages to other surrounding areas, thus allowing for the  
 22 movement of wildlife between areas. The impacts of the Rosemont Copper Project on  
 23 wildlife movement corridors and connectivity have been analyzed, and the results are  
 24 disclosed in the “Biological Resources” resource section of this chapter. The analysis found  
 25 that movement habitat fragmentation would increase with the Barrel Alternative, and  
 26 dispersal and migration patterns of species using five animal movement corridors would be  
 27 disrupted. The project would restore small amounts of two movement corridors due to  
 28 decommissioning of roads. Overall, wildlife movement corridors outside Santa Cruz County  
 29 would be impacted, which could have broader impacts that extend into Santa Cruz County.  
 30 This is a potential conflict with the comprehensive plan goal of preserving wildlife  
 31 movement corridors. These impacts cannot be avoided or fully mitigated; thus, the conflict  
 32 with this goal of the “Comprehensive Plan” cannot be rectified.

- 33  
 34 • **GOAL 19: WATER SUPPLIES ARE PROTECTED AND CONSERVED.**

35  
 36 This goal is focused on protecting and conserving groundwater resources. The “Groundwater  
 37 Quantity” section in this chapter details the extensive groundwater impact modeling and peer  
 38 review that have been conducted for this project. While significant impacts to groundwater  
 39 are predicted, it is unlikely that any of these impacts would extend into Santa Cruz County.  
 40 Modeling indicates that a slight drawdown in the level of groundwater from the mine pit may  
 41 extend slightly into Santa Cruz County in about 1,000 years. However, the amount of this  
 42 drawdown and the time period involved are well beyond the capability of this or any model  
 43 to predict with any confidence. It is unlikely that the Rosemont Copper Mine would result in  
 44 impacts that conflict with this goal of the “Comprehensive Plan” in Santa Cruz County; note  
 45 that there is a substantial amount of uncertainty involved with this conclusion.  
 46

1 • GOAL 20: DARK NIGHT SKIES ARE PROTECTED.

2  
3 Dark skies would be affected by the Rosemont Copper Project. Impacts to dark skies have  
4 been analyzed and are disclosed in the “Dark Skies” resource section of this chapter.  
5 Rosemont Copper has developed a mitigation plan for reducing lighting from facilities and  
6 operations, which has reduced impacts to dark skies substantially from those that were  
7 predicted in the DEIS. However, the area in which the mine would be located would be  
8 noticeably brighter than current conditions, and this brightness would be seen from some  
9 areas within Santa Cruz County. The increase in sky glow may conflict with the  
10 “Comprehensive Plan” goal of protecting dark skies during the premining through final  
11 reclamation and closure phases. The impacts to dark skies are being mitigated to the extent  
12 possible, given the mine’s need to operate 24 hours per day and safety requirements. Thus,  
13 this conflict cannot be rectified.