**Introduction**

Rosemont Copper Company (Rosemont) submitted a letter to the Coronado National Forest (Coronado) stating that the company is removing the oxide ore processing/heap leach facility from the Barrel Alternative for various reasons. Rosemont then provided updated reports to both the Coronado-the Preliminary Reclamation Plan-and their investors-the Updated Feasibility Study. The provision of all of these documents to the public and cooperators instigated a letter from the Pima County Administrator, Chuck Huckelberry. This letter provided Pima County’s rationale for their request for a new Draft or Supplemental EIS. This paper describes items that were considered by the Forest Supervisor, Jim Upchurch, in his effort to disseminate what has been submitted by Rosemont, Pima County’s argument and make a decision on how to move forward.

**Mine Pit Location/Footprint**

**COUNTY’S STATEMENT:** The Barrel Alternative appears to have a much larger pit than originally proposed. As a result, the total amount of rock removed will be about 80 million tons more than was proposed in 2007 and analyzed in the 2011 DEIS (Pima County Letter dated 10/25/2012).

**BACKGROUND:** There have been numerous reports with numerous different pit outlines, which were largely understood by SWCA as inconsistencies between the Rosemont consultants and their management of GIS layers. The pit outline was never officially or formally altered by Rosemont notice, therefore, the DEIS analysis utilized the pit from the original 2007 MPO. Groundwater analysis

**THE FACTS:** There are only a few documents that have pit outlines/footprints that would require verification or have implications on the EIS analysis because these particular plans have engineering design elements and implications. They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Pit Description and Volumes</th>
<th>Acreage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007 Mine Plan of Operations</strong>&lt;br&gt;Based on $1.50/lb cu pit shell (page 10)</td>
<td>Estimated 600 MT of ore and 1,288 MT of waste rock&lt;br&gt;6,500 ft across N-S, 6,000 ft across E-W&lt;br&gt;1,800-2,900 ft deep (3,150 ft elev.)</td>
<td>Pit area totals about 700 acres (MPO)&lt;br&gt;Per supplied GIS layers- 698.0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Feasibility Study</strong>&lt;br&gt;Based on $1.75/lb cu pit shell (page 6, 67, 71)</td>
<td>About 616 MT of ore and 1,230 MT of waste rock&lt;br&gt;6,500 ft across N-S, 6,000 ft across E-W&lt;br&gt;3,050 ft elev. depth (MPO+100 ft)¹&lt;br&gt;Pit slope angles 28-48 degrees between ramps</td>
<td>Figure 1-18 (p. 136)&lt;br&gt;706.3 (MPO+8.3) acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: These pit specifics are what the Groundwater Modeling and Geochemical testing are based on.*
### 2012 Feasibility Study
Based on $1.88/lb cu pit shell (page 117, 118 & 120)

- About 667 MT of ore and 1,240 MT of waste rock
- 6,500 ft across N-S, 6,000 ft across E-W
- 2,900 ft elev. depth (MPO+250 ft) (p.117 states The ultimate pit is under-optimized due to the capacity limitations of the tailings storage facility.)

Pit slope angles 33-50 degrees between ramps (internal ramps are generally placed in arkose and alluvium pit walls in order to break up the interramp wall heights and limit the overall slope angles to the geotechnical recommendations. This allows the remaining walls to be steeper on an overall basis as fewer ramps were required in these design sectors. An additional benefit is to keep the main internal haulage ramps away from the high, western wall, which has the steepest inter-ramp slope angles. This allows additional sulfide ore to be developed at the base of the west wall.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Pit Description and Volumes</th>
<th>Acreage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 Feasibility Study</td>
<td>About 667 MT of ore and 1,240 MT of waste rock</td>
<td>Figure 15-13 (p. 118) 687.0 (MPO-11) acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pima County letter** (Assumed source: 2012 CDM Preliminary Reclamation Plan) (Figure 11)

- 3,050 ft elev. deep
- 687.0 acres

*Groundwater quantity modeling utilized 3,050 feet elevation as the bottom of the pit.

*Acreage calculation is considered flat surface and does not consider topography.
DECISION MADE BY JIM UPCHURCH:

1. Utilize the Mine Plan of Operations pit outline for analysis purposes, because it reflects greater potential impacts.

2. The final pit depth will be 3,050 feet elevation or higher. The Forest will send a letter to Rosemont to verify this information.