



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE

PIMA COUNTY GOVERNMENTAL CENTER
130 W. CONGRESS, TUCSON, AZ 85701-1317
(520) 740-8661 FAX (520) 740-8171

C.H. HUCKELBERRY
County Administrator

January 19, 2010

Ms. Jeanine Derby
Forest Supervisor
Coronado National Forest
300 W. Congress Street
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Re: Rosemont Alternatives Analysis

Dear Ms. Derby:

Pima County has been an active cooperater in alternatives analysis regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Rosemont proposal. Our participation began in the scoping process, when we requested a revision of the Forest Service's purpose and need statement. This suggestion was rejected by the Forest Service, as was our request for a land exchange, underground mining techniques, and concurrent evaluation of various copper proposals within the Coronado National Forest.

In our subsequent letters dated July 29, August 28, September 30, and December 18, 2009, we proposed a number of other alternatives, including:

1. Alternative means of mining the oxide portion of the ore body
2. Pit backfilling (complete and partial)
3. Santa Cruz Valley disposal
4. Constructed "canyon" passage for stormwater to Barrel Canyon
5. Tailing pile liner option
6. Different pit configurations, including mining other prospects owned by Rosemont
7. Different heap leach locations
8. Different oxide mining methods, including microbial leaching
9. Alternative which does not require modification of the Forest Plan
10. Direct use of CAP
11. Alternative means of CAP recovery

Ms. Jeanine Derby
Re: Rosemont Alternatives Analysis
January 19, 2010
Page 2

12. Alternative wellfield locations
13. Upper Barrel-Scholefield Obliteration
14. Upper Barrel Obliteration with Wasp Canyon Diversion
15. Southeast Claim Obliteration with Wasp Canyon Diversion
16. Upper McCleary Canyon Alternative

On November 5, 2009, I met with you and requested three-dimensional data representing the pit and various other terrain modifications proposed by Rosemont. We again requested your assistance with this matter on December 17, 2009 and January 13, 2010.

Pima County has been unable to participate fully in developing alternatives due to the lack of information. With these data, Pima County would have been able to develop alternatives with explicit consideration of site topography and volume of disposal piles. Such information would have been useful to the deliberative process.

Sincerely,



C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

CHH/mjk

c: Julia Fonseca, Environmental Planning Manager
Pima County Office of Conservation Science and Environmental Policy