

From: [Brian Beck](#)
To: [FS-objections-southwestern-regional-office](#)
Subject: Objections to Rosemont copper project
Date: Monday, February 10, 2014 7:12:44 PM

Rosemont Copper Project: A proposed mining operation
Reviewing Officer, Southwest Region
Jim Upchurch, Forest Supervisor, Coronado National Forest, Nogales Ranger District
Dear Mr. Upchurch of the U.S. Forest Service:

I previously commented on the mine plan for proposed Rosemont Mine in southern Arizona. My concerns from previous comments and current objections include:

Mitigation- How has the Forest Service determined if the money set aside is adequate? \$25 million and 1,700 ACRE feet of water is not enough to mitigate the long-term effects this mine will bring and the cleanup required. How will the taxpayers be protected from having to make up the difference? Do they have a choice? Why does the company not have to put more up front? Won't the removal of nearly 300,000 trees affect the ecosystem in this area greatly, as well as the other chemical additions and moonscape treatment of the land? How will the forest service really remedy this? The mitigation plan offered is minimal at best.

Reclamation- The usual Arizona reclamation method of putting up a fence and making the mine a scenic view is not enough to mitigate the potentially toxic area, including a pit lake, left behind. What will the requirement for reclamation be- that will go beyond what the mining plan offers? Beyond closure of the mine? How will taxpayers be protected from having to fund this reclamation?

Tourism and Recreation- Has a study been done that will show that the economic impact to tourism into the future and 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?

Security- Why does the U.S. copper supply have to be given up to a foreign interest with no regard to: royalty payment to the U.S., reserving the copper for our future use if needed and safety to our water supply and land close to the border when the land becomes open to the mining company's jurisdiction and not necessarily under the current regulation anymore?

If the no action alternative is one of the choices, why is the Forest Service stance that it must follow the 1872 mining law so strong? Why is this even a choice if the Forest Service says it cannot use it? The Forest Service has a no action alternative choice that should be considered on water effects alone.

WATER!! Even more long-term effects studies are needed. Will this be addressed? Why does the Forest Service feel other agencies such as the EPA and Army Corp opinions are not valid enough to force a different decision based on how the residents will deal with water long after the mine is closed and gone? Local jurisdictions, residents, property owners and business owners are in opposition to the mine because of effects on water. Why are these opinions also not as important as the outdated law that governs this public land? Laws can be changed.

Conclusion- Nothing from this mine will benefit southern Arizona in the long term. The jobs and economic benefits will be temporary and the mitigation and scars will be permanent. Southern Arizona deserves better from the federal government. How will there be clean water and copper reserves if needed for my children and grandchildren if this mine, which is in the wrong place at the wrong time, is allowed?

Sincerely and with hope,

Kim Beck
1514 N Cloverland Ave
Tucson, AZ 85712
520-326-9587
coyotes@cox.net