

Rosemont Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Public Comment Period - *Now through January 18th, 2012*

Where can I download the DEIS and submit comments online?

www.RosemontEIS.us

Can I submit comments via phone or mail?

Yes, call toll free **(888) 654-6646**

Mail written comments to **Rosemont Comments, P.O. Box 4207, Logan, UT 84323**

Where can I find more information?

www.ScenicSantaRitas.org

www.RosemontEIS.us

Areas of concern regarding the Rosemont DEIS Proposed Action

A table of contents of sorts to help you find your way through this 900+ page document

The first set of page numbers = Summary of Impacts

The second set of page numbers = Environmental Consequences

Air Quality and Climate Change	pp. 158-205 / 177-205
Biological Resources	pp. 349-415 / 385-415
Cultural Resources	pp. 660-699 / 681-699
Dark Skies	pp. 442-452 / 448-452
Fuels and Fire Management	pp. 580-590 / 587-590
Geology, Minerals, and Paleontology	pp. 109-136 / 133-136
Groundwater Quality	pp. 278-296 / 286-296
Groundwater Quantity	pp. 205-278 / 237-278
Hazardous Materials	pp. 552-579 / 558-579
Landownership and Boundary Management	pp. 416-429 / 424-429
Livestock Grazing	pp. 429-442 / 435-442
Noise	pp. 614-643 / 637-643
Public Health and Safety	pp. 643-660 / 651-660
Recreation and Wilderness	pp. 511-551 / 527-551
Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice	pp. 699-754 / 736-754
Soils	pp. 135-146 / 146-158
Surface Water Quality	pp. 322-349 / 335-349
Surface Water Quantity	pp. 296-322 / 311-322
Transportation/Access	pp. 591-614 / 603-614
Visual Resources	pp. 452-511 / 479-511

Tips on preparing DEIS Comments

NEPA is explicit about the requirement that the Lead Agency -- the US Forest Service in the case of the proposed Rosemont Mine DEIS -- prepare responses to all substantive comments received during the comment period on a DEIS. These Lead Agency responses must be addressed and set forth in the Final EIS. It is therefore important for persons preparing comment letters to make certain that their comments – written, phone-in, or oral comments at public hearings – are substantive. The more specific and focused the comment, the more detailed the required response from the Forest Service.

General comments such as “I am concerned about water quality” will be of little value, as well comments such as “I am opposed to this destructive project”.

More specific comments are the most desirable, such as “I live in Tucson, but frequently drive to the Santa Rita Mountains for a variety of recreational and sight-seeing activities. I am very concerned that the traffic analysis in the DEIS omits the added traffic on I-10 and focuses only on I-83. There are already a number of trucks on I-10, but the addition of the constant stream of large trucks carrying ore on I-10 every day if the mine were to go into operation is an impact on my ability to go to the Santa Rita Mountains and a variety of places near there. The additional traffic on I-10 should be analyzed.”

It is useful to direct comments to specific sections, pages, topics, etc, in the DEIS, recognizing that some comments will address missing or incomplete data or even missing topics.

Your comments should be in the form of statements from you. Do not pose your statements as questions. In other words, do not ask the Forest Service, “Have you done a recent survey of traffic on I-10 between downtown Tucson and the exit to highway 83?” Rather, write something like, “The Forest Service should commission a survey of traffic on I-10 between downtown Tucson and the Exit to highway 83.”

Here are some questions you may want to think of as you consider your comments:

1. If the analysis in the EIS does not provide for an adequate discussion of the impacts of a particular type (i.e., air, water, traffic, etc.,) what is missing from the discussion?
2. Should the discussion of a particular impact cover a broader geographic area or a longer timeframe? If so, please identify how you think the analysis should be changed.
3. If you think conclusions about the level of impact on a particular resource are not well justified, why not and what would be needed to reach a sound conclusion?
4. Is mitigation for each resource adequately identified and described? In other words, will the mitigation proposed adequately address the impacts? If not, why not?
5. If you sent in scoping comments, does the EIS adequately address the issues you raised in those comments? If not, what does it omit?