

Rosemont Copper Mine

Issues set aside from review.

Objection # (last 4 digits)	Objector Name	Issue
0014	Dorothy Niemi	#3: Between the drought and human expansion, wildlife is stressed and the prospect of barrenness and more devastated habitat does not bode well for increasing tourism and all the associated economic activity. The amount of habitat that would be impacted by going ahead with the Rosemont Mine proposal would be huge.
0016	Kenneth Paul	#3: There is insufficient data on the cumulative physical impacts this mine will have on the immediate area as well as the water resources in the surrounding area including the protected riparian habitat Cienega creek and the Tucson basin aquifer.
0017	Michael Stock	There are so many possible harmful effects of the mine that are dealt with to an uncertain or inadequate degree: #6: harmful effects on the air quality of Saguaro National Park East, as well as for local residents; #7: uncertain harmful effects on Davidson Canyon and Cienega Creek
0018	Jack Connelly	#2: Cienega Creek and Davidson Canyon near the mine site could be contaminated by groundwater pollution rising to the surface impacting a source so Tucson's groundwater. #3: The potential harm that Rosemont Copper mine would do to people, plants and wildlife would be detrimental enough that the mine should not be permitted and the environment should be protected as should the water table.
0019	Albert Lannon	#2: I would also add that an endangered species, the jaguar (<i>Panthera onca</i>), has what seems to be a permanent resident in the immediate area. That alone should support the "No Build" option.
0020	Michael Ingram	#1: FS-DS-01 only attempts to reduce the impacts from artificial night lighting. It does not have any "teeth" to it. FS-DS-02 says something about "review results and make proposals" #3: Rosemont's recharge in areas far removed from the mine and trying to "get credit" is ridiculous. Whatever happens in a water basin in Marana has absolutely ZERO bearing on the groundwater problem for residents in the affected Rosemont area. #4: ...forcing those residents to become part of some Rosemont "United Sahuarita Well Owners" group to have any say so in water takes away their rightful use of their water... #5: The Coronado cannot depend on anything that is produced by a contractor who is working at the direction of Rosemont.

Rosemont Copper Mine

Issues set aside from review.

Objection # (last 4 digits)	Objector Name	Issue
0021	Chuck Martin	#3: The FEIS needs to include the review, study, analysis, discussion and consideration of what impacts and effects that the potential short or long term mitigation measures could have to the public, the surrounding private property owners or the users of the adjacent Forest Service land and BLM land.
0023	William Maki	#2: To have Rosemont pumping residential water and offsetting that loss with water of a lesser quality and uncertain quantity (<i>CAP water</i>) is a poor bargain for the citizens of Arizona. The only way to mitigate this impact is to have Rosemont, should the mine be built, use CAP water and to suspend pumping of groundwater.
0025	Wade Bunting	#19: Two additional points must be made about the validity and value of the Rosemont Copper Project EIS. The EIS's conclusions did not rely on good science. The playing field is not level and the rules are rigged because of the outdated 1872 mining law.
0026	Duncan Creed	#2: Rainfall chemical analysis was done on samples from the pristine desert location at Organ Pipe National Park. The mine will be subject to rainfall from an urban environment as well as pollutants from nearby mines and the smelters at Ray and Miami. #3: Table 75 shows no iron content in the 200 year lake. The Santa Rita Mountains have an abundance of iron pyrite in the mineralized zones-particularly in the oxide zone which is now going into the waste rock. It appears that specific samples of rock were taken (high-graded) to produce the desired result. #5: Freeport loses 100-110 vertical inches/year to evaporation from their tailings ponds. This is relatively cool water compared to a residual pit lake. Do not believe the water balance stated in table 74 for evaporation. If there is flow in, why isn't there flow out?
0028	Thomas Purdon	#3: The potential for damage to area home property values and wells from the Rosemont project are severe and costly.
0034	Doug Pickrell	#2: The FEIS is rife with uncertainty.
0038	Kim Beck	#2: Has a study been done that will show that the economic impact to tourism into the future? #3: Why does the U.S. copper supply have to be given up to a foreign interest..... how does the Forest Service determine that a foreign interest copper mine have a better highest and best use of the land than the recreation and tourism use that exists there now
0047	Douglas Downing	#1: The USFS has inadequately addressed the protection of critical water resources and the risk factors associated with water contamination from an open pit mine.

Rosemont Copper Mine

Issues set aside from review.

Objection # (last 4 digits)	Objector Name	Issue
		<p>#4: I believe the FEIS lacks scientific rigor and a peer review by associated Government agencies with expertise in air quality such as the EPA.</p>
0048	Robert Barthelson	<p>#3: In the FEIS, ground water and surface water are handled largely as separate considerations, but they may well interact to produce impacts different from what the study suggests.</p> <p>#4: ...nor is there any indication that there has been any testing of the models to confirm in some minimal way their potential value. I am used to, in reviewing scientific arguments, at least minimal efforts at statistical analysis, but I see none here...</p> <p>#5: To try to minimize the impact of the mine on water resources by saying essentially it is only part of the damage that is coming, as this report does, is to dismiss specifically this synergy (<i>impacts of the Rosemont project on surface water flow, local springs, ground-water, noise, light pollution, increased traffic and decreased habitat, will likely work synergistically toward the failure of whole populations of animals and plants locally, and ruin the possibility of egress to northern/cooler locations</i>).</p> <p>#7: The FEIS report documents a wide range of impacts to the environment, but then minimizes those impacts with inadequate projects, indicates how those impacts have been reduced to a small extent, and then concludes that the mine should be accepted, despite the documented effects. A more reasonable conclusion would not give primacy to the General Mining Law, but would realize the relevance of environmental law in this case, and choose the no action alternative.</p> <p>#8: A study that is missing from the FEIS is an assessment of the future availability of CAP water for Rosemont Copper, which is a late-comer to the large number of groups that seek access to the water.</p> <p>#9: ...the mine site will still be a potential toxic hazard. Pooled water at the site may threaten birds moving from Las Cienegas NCA, Cienega ...Creek, or Patagonia Lake. The toxic materials, under extreme conditions could be washed into Davidson Canyon and into Cienega Creek. This potential threat will remain long after the mine is closed.</p> <p>#10: ...re-mediation plans are only as reliable as long as Rosemont Copper exists as a reliable financial entity.</p>
0051	Quentin Lewton	<p>#3: ADOT and the USFS either doesn't know or doesn't care about the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's (FMCSA) campaign advising motorists to stay out of a trucks</p>

Rosemont Copper Mine

Issues set aside from review.

Objection # (last 4 digits)	Objector Name	Issue
		blind spots... Furthermore ADOT and the USFS are ignoring the guidelines set forth by AASHTO for safe highway construction.
0056	Sandy Whitehouse	#4: Increased nitrogen emissions in the polluted air will foster the growth of buffelgrass and other nonindigenous plants, adding to the threat of fire activity and damage to wildlife habitat.
0060	Nancy McCoy	#3: Drilling would occur for 2 years with well monitoring happening for up to 15 years as stated in the AMI MPO, not 10 years, as stated on page 1126 of the Rosemont FEIS. #4: Cumulative traffic effects must also take into consideration the activities of the Department of Homeland Security.
0061	Anne Cavanaugh	#1: PM emissions have significant health impacts on people, especially the elderly and children. How are the fugitive dust emissions and the direct emissions from this project going to be completely controlled and mitigated? With respect to off-site emissions, there does not appear to be any requirement to mitigate truck emissions and emissions of all construction and off-road equipment that is used on this project.
0062	Dan Meyer	#1: The Rosemont mine because it fails to meet the Forest Service's criteria for approval, namely suitability and reasonableness of the proposed mine plan. He mentions many of the characteristics and impacts of the proposal as evidence that the project is not suitable or reasonable, and thus cannot be approved. He also questions whether the project is economically viable over time, and whether the figures used in the FEIS (supplied by the proponent) have been independently verified. #3: Forest Service regulations regarding mining which uses the surface of the National Forests shall be conducted so as to minimize adverse impacts to those resources (Organic Act). He questions how the project meets this requirement.
0063	Diane Meyer	#2: The proposed recharging with CAP water won't help the residents of Green Valley as the recharge point is downstream from them. Further, the availability of CAP water is iffy at best given all the demands on the Colorado River and the forecasted long-term drought conditions.
0066	John Hoffman	#2: ... the visual impact of a 700 foot high and mile wide pile of rock and debris ...creates an eyesore that makes a mockery of the Scenic Highway designation. And the constant flow of oversized mine haul trucks would further diminish that designation. #3: Without more specific numbers regarding the amount of

Rosemont Copper Mine

Issues set aside from review.

Objection # (last 4 digits)	Objector Name	Issue
		fuel that Rosemont Copper vehicles will be using and how that translates into fuel taxes, the suggestion that those taxes could pay for all the highway damage that would accrue from the heavy vehicle traffic is speculative at best.
0079	Joan Money	<p>#2: Groundwater monitoring measures are not adequate to ensure an aquifer will not be polluted.</p> <p>#3: The MPO should therefore be considered unreasonable and must be rejected (because few people will benefit but many more will be impacted). The MPO must not be approved until the time comes when it is technically, economically, and environmentally feasible (to restore pre-mining conditions, including backfilling the pit).</p> <p>#4: The analysis discussion on page G-36 (regarding water quality in the pit lake) of the FEIS is inappropriate. It is inappropriate to accept only the favorable results of analyses while disregarding the unfavorable results.</p>
0083	FICO	#6: If the Rosemont Mine is allowed, it would facilitate Rosemont's future development of its Peach-Elgin, Broad Top Butte and Copper World claims.
0089	Tom Money	#2: There are also statements that there will be groundwater monitoring plans in place. Monitoring is necessary but by itself is not adequate. A plan to monitor an aquifer for water quality does not constitute a plan to ensure an aquifer will not be polluted.
0091	Pima County	#24: Forest Service failed to follow its own separate permitting process that requires Rosemont to receive a special use authorization for the installation of wells and pipelines on Forest land. There is no mention of this permitting process in the FEIS or ROD, no disclosure of the environmental and social impacts.
0092	Glenn Furnier	<p>#2: The proposed mine will directly affect the Ciénega Creek watershed, an endangered habitat type in southern Arizona. It makes no sense to acknowledge that there will likely be a negative impact on this endangered habitat and then approve the mine proposal.</p> <p>#6: The USFS has also not required the company to guarantee the baseline flow and water quality in Ciénega Creek, a resource in which the public has a significant investment.</p>
0099	Karl Phaler	<p>#2: Forest Service personnel and hired consultants have reached conclusions which are biased in favor of an "approve project" result.</p> <p>#6: The FEIS also fails to properly evaluate public safety issues raised throughout the review process.</p>

Rosemont Copper Mine

Issues set aside from review.

Objection # (last 4 digits)	Objector Name	Issue
0100	Tohono O'odham	<p>#10: As set out in the FEIS, 4,518 acres, which correlates to 0.5% of total acreage will be lost from direct impacts to jaguar proposed critical habitat caused by the Project. FEIS at 694. This acreage is of such a significant size and location that the loss of this habitat will most likely impede north-south movement of the jaguar, thus isolating the population and perhaps ceasing to make the area effective habitat. This concept should have been fully analyzed in the FEIS. One of the conservation measures proposes that, as a part of the reclamation program, "Rosemont will establish a percentage of woody vegetation cover consistent with the elements of jaguar critical habitat (notes that the relevant PCE is >1 to 50 percent) as averaged over the reclamation area, excluding the pit." The idea that "woody vegetation" might be developed in a mine-reclaimed area in our lifetimes is absurd. Also not analyzed, are the probable effects to land not containing the primary constituent elements for jaguar habitat but in all likelihood are used by jaguars to traverse mountain ranges. Finally, and perhaps most concerning is FWS' admission that they do not know the home range size of jaguars in Arizona. BO at 122.</p>
0104	Pascua Yaqui Tribe	<p>#2: The question for the USFS, how is the USFS requiring Rosemont to avoid, minimize and mitigate all of the impacts from the proposed mine which affect Tribal values (mentioned are springs, plants, animals, vegetation and habitat loss, and artifacts)? It is not clear how the USFS has required reasonable measures to protect surface resources. What are the reasonable measures USFS is requiring from Rosemont to protect surface resources?</p> <p>#3: The Pascua Yaqui Tribe remains concerned about the impact of the proposed Rosemont Copper Mine on the air quality in the area of the Santa Rita Mountains and the larger region surrounding the Santa Rita Mountains.</p> <p>#13: USFS states that a number of modifications were made to the preliminary Mine Plan of Operations ("MPO") to meet the purposes of the applicable regulations such as the Endangered Species Act ("ESA"). The question for the USFS is, how much of the monitoring is done by Rosemont itself? If the majority of monitoring is done by Rosemont and USFS relies on Rosemont for self-reporting, the system is inherently flawed.</p>

Rosemont Copper Mine

Issues set aside from review.

Objection # (last 4 digits)	Objector Name	Issue
0107	Tucson Audubon	#5: To the dangers of the pit lake must be added the dangers of surface pooling of intermediate leaching solutions. How many such pools would exist, when would they exist, and what effects would they have on migratory and resident bird species?
0108	Donald Pierson	#4: The forest plan has no practical plan to deal with fugitive dust from the new, unproven dry stack method of tailings storage.
0109	Steve Wind	#3: The FEIS because does not adequately address my concern that the mine would degrade local water resources as well as plant and animal ecosystems.
0111	Bob Harris	#2: ADEQ gave Rosemont a water quality aquifer protection permit that was unjustified and when it was appealed the appeal board rubberstamped the application without following proper procedure. #3: Many of the numbers that are in the forest service EIS are incorrect and incompatible with other documentation. An example of this is the grind factor used to lower the pollution factor because of larger particle size.
0118	Karen Lowery	#4: Another major concerns deals with the ecosystems of the areas, reclamation and the tailings piles. It is my understanding that part of the reclamations and control of the tailings would include dumping plies of rock on the tailings. This would become unsightly and would not restore the ecosystem or natural habitat. #5: My concern is that there are few if any native plants that would grow or thrive on tailings. I do not believe that Rosemont is capable of restoring the tailings pile to an attractive native ecosystem.
0122	Pima Association of Taxpayers	#4: Another concern is that there appears to be no scale or baseline above which the environmental damage done would preclude the mine. #5: The Forest Service employees who would monitor the mineral and biological impacts of the mine would also be paid by Rosemont. If that be true that would appear to be a clear conflict of interest. #6: Yet another question not broached in the report was the following. What law gives citizens and corporations of foreign countries the authority to acquired patented mining claims to American mineral assets?