In The Matter Of:

Resolution Copper Project And Land Exchange Draft EIS

Public Hearing

Additional Public Comments September 12, 2019



2398 East Camelback Road, Suite 260 Phoenix, Arizona 85016

Original File USFS091219 SWCA-WAT-091219.txt
Min-U-Script® with Word Index

RESOLUTION COPPER PROJECT AND	
LAND EXCHANGE DRAFT EIS	
PUBLIC HEARING	

Central Arizona College San Tan Campus 3736 East Bella Visa Road San Tan Valley, Arizona

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS

September 12, 2019 6:24 p.m.

REPORTED BY: TERESA A. WATSON, RMR Certified Reporter Certificate No. 50876

PREPARED FOR:
U.S. Forest Service

(Certified Copy)

1 PUBLIC COMMENTS

2	SPEAKER:	PAGE:
3	Dr. Lian Bighorse	3
4	Sandra Rambler	4
5	Kevin Brown	6
6	Curt Shannon	7
7	Duke Romero	9
8	Roger Featherstone	11
9	Connie Freeman	13
10	Henry Munoz	13
11	Lisa Levine	16
12	Michael Macias	17
13	Ben Maynard	20
14	Michael Gettens	21
15	Tina Louie	24
16	John Montgomery	25
17	Jeremy Webster	26
18	Don Steuter	27
19	Sandra Rambler	30
20	Roger Featherstone	32
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

MS. GRAHAMS: So with that, we can invite up the first speaker. Should be Number 4.

DR. LIAN BIGHORSE: (Speaking Native language.)
Hello. My name is Dr. Lian Bighorse, L-i-a-n B-i-g-h-o-r-s-e,
and this is my daughter, Soliel.

Well, first I do want to make a comment on the video that we did see. In the video, it's very thorough. Goes over a lot of information. However, it leaves out a whole lot of information as well.

Just a brief history of the land, before our people were imprisoned on reservations, which are in the 19 -- or the 1800s, this was the homeland of the Apache people, and I feel that that definitely needs to be said, because it's left out, and we get a small portion of what's culture and tradition and the tribes that it impacts. Well, it impacts our whole way of life as Native people.

I grew up on the San Carlos Apache Reservation.

I grew up with many different tribes and bands of people that were imprisoned there, and it was a concentration camp for the Native people in the area. My grandmother, when she grew up, she spoke five different languages. It wasn't because she learned it at school. It was because that was that many people that were there, that many different tribes that were there, and that information needs to be addressed. It needs to be said.

For myself, I've grown up going to Oak Flat.

I've been to many ceremonies there, Apache Sunrise Dance ceremonies, holy ground ceremonies. I bring my child up here, my nine-year-old daughter, because she wants to have her Sunrise Dance, her coming of age, her womanhood ceremony at Oak Flat, and she's nine years old. And I don't know, with the impacts, the way it's going to be, if that's going to even be possible.

My children are with me today because we always go to Oak Flat. We camp there all the time. My son right there, he has five different forts, and what's disheartening to me is every time we go to Oak Flat, the first thing he does is he jumps out the car and he says, "Mom, I've got to check my forts. I've got to make sure they're still there."

I've been to Oak flat so many times that -sometimes there's water. They're dewatering the whole area, and
sometimes it's completely dry. The animals are looking for a
new water source. There's so many impacts that aren't in this
video that need to be addressed.

I do appreciate the time limit here, and I hope that those here that haven't heard our message, please look us up. We're Apache stronghold. We've occupied the land, and it's our home. (Speaking Native language.)

MS. GRAHAMS: Number 3.

SANDRA RAMBLER: S-a-n-d-r-a R-a-m-b-l-e-r.

(Speaking Native language.) My name is Sandra Rambler. I come from the Eagle Clan, and come from the Aravaipa people of the

rocks people, and our family has dwelled at Oak Flat

historically. My ancestors. My great-grandparents are buried

at Oak Flat, and that's where my heart is.

And I've already told my children if a bulldozer comes through and builds that mine, I'm going to be there in my camp dress, and if that's the way I go, that's the way I'm going to go. That's just an acceptance that they've already accepted. I'm not afraid to die, and it's to stand up for my people. That's exactly what I'm going to do and keep continuing doing that.

I brought acorn here. (Speaking Native language.) This is what's there. It's been there since time immemorial. It's been there since the beginning of time, just as our ancestors have been, and this is our food. This is what we use in our ceremonies. This is what we use when we gather for wakes, funerals, birthdays, any kind of celebration. This is our food.

And, you know, each ethnic group has their own specialized food. Mexicans have Mexican food. Bulgarians have their own types of food. Norwegians have their own types of food. Italians have their own types of food. And this is Apache food. And we're not immigrants. We're from here. We came from here. And you think that we're just going to stand by and just let you bulldoze our land? Let you take the remains of our ancestors?

Oak Flat is (speaking Native language). We had our holy grounds there, and my granddaughter's ceremony was held there, and I have grandchildren that also want to have ceremonies there. And I witnessed the coming of age. I've had dreams of Oak Flat. I've had dreams at my house on Apache land. I've had dreams of our Apache Mountain spirit man coming to us.

And you know what? You tell Congress, you tell Congress to nix this, and this is a cheap way for them to pass it and piggyback it on the National Defense Authorization Act. That is a cheap way to do it. You tell Congress to man up, and you tell them to listen to us, and if we have to have a meeting with Trump, so be it, because we're not going to give up.

MS. GRAHAMS: Number 8.

KEVIN BROWN: Kevin Brown, K-e-v-i-n B-r-o-w-n. I didn't hear anything tonight like some of these people have. I didn't know anything -- well, much of anything about this project before I came here. I don't know much about environmental impact statements, but from what I've seen, I thought I'd see all these positive things about putting in the mine, and all I saw was -- the only positive things are some people were going to get jobs.

Well, I think that's great that people get jobs, but all the other stuff that I've seen has been negative about this project. If you really want an environmental impact statement, the effect on the environmental should be, well,

zero. If they want to build the mine, well, more power to them, as long as the land looks like it looks now. Not with a two-mile-across crater that's collapsing or pumping out 500 million or however many gallons of acre-feet of water it's going to be over the next -- whatever the life of the mine is -- in a place that's already short of water.

I mean, we had to make a deal this year just to have enough water from CAP. We're already pumping too much groundwater. That's just what we need is a project that pumps more groundwater. So if you want to put the "environmental" in environmental impact statement, take care of the environment.

Thank you.

MS. GRAHAMS: Number 5.

CURT SHANNON: Sorry. I was way in the back.

My name is Curt Shannon, C-u-r-t S-h-a-n-n-o-n, and I'm a policy analyst for the Access Fund, and the Access Fund tries to protect rock climbing areas that are threatened by development of exactly this kind. And so I got involved in this project initially because of the tremendous loss of a rock climbing resource.

This impact, if this mine is built, this will be the largest loss of a climbing resource ever in the history of the United States on public land. So I'm pretty upset about that. And so the Access Fund will -- we're going to submit some very detailed written comments, so -- and I only have two and a

half minutes, so I'm just going to give you some general impressions of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement since I've read at least a few sections of it in pretty good detail.

2.

And it just looks to me like this -- this thing is incomplete, and it was kind of rushed out there. It -- you know, like with respect to the preferred tailings site, there hasn't been a cultural survey done there yet. There's no geotechnical analysis. So they're going to do that sometime between now and the writing of the final report. But how do we get to comment on it then? You know, it's too late. Because 60 days after the final report comes out, the land transfers. It goes out of public ownership.

And there are a lot of other things like that, too. There's no environmental analysis for two 230-kilovolt power line corridors that have to be put across Forest Service land. There was no proper hydrological study done at Oak Flat. We know that the one that Rio Tinto did was wrong, because they had to postpone digging Shaft Number 10 for a year when they hit 500 gallons a minute of hot water. So even they know that their study was wrong, and if that was wrong, how do you know everything else in the study wasn't wrong? They should have done another hydrological study.

And, you know, we're currently in a stage zero mandatory restriction on Colorado River water right now. We're in a bad drought. This was -- this was the worst or the

- second-worst monsoon season that we've ever had here locally,
 and what happens when we have to cut another 320,000 acre-feet
 of Colorado River water out of Arizona's supply? We're going to
 be pumping and their -- the mine is going to be pumping
 groundwater like crazy, competing with the people who live right
- here for that same groundwater and everybody who's involved in agriculture in Pinal County, and that was never even considered in the Environmental Impact Statement.
- 9 Anyway, I could go on, but I'll end my rant 10 there. Thank you.
- MS. GRAHAMS: Number 6.

- DUKE ROMERO: Good evening. My name is Duke
 Romero. I'm a Picuris Pueblo. My wife is Lian Bighorse, and
 you saw my children.
 - We've been camping out up at Oak Flat for the --since 2014. We've seen all the people that come through, all the snowbirds, all the tourists that come through and visit this park. You know, it's a sustainable economy as it is now. Once they break it down and trash the land, I think Mr. Bosworth here could tell you about the exemptions from the laws for the environmental impacts that the mine has been awarded.
 - So regardless of the EIS impact statements, it doesn't matter, because they're exempt from the laws, and we gave it to them. That's what Sandra Rambler was talking about. Our Congress, the shady deal that was given to them.

And you want to talk about the water, you talk about the water at the mine tailings, but you don't talk about the water up at the mine itself, you know, the underground river that he spoke about, 500 feet per minute that we're losing.

This water belongs to all of us, you know. This is public land.

It's entrusted to us to take care of.

My children, I want them to be able to go back there in 15 years and visit a place that they spent all their summers in. You know, all these folks that come to visit, all the other children. I spoke to a gentleman out here that's going to live across from the site. You know, they're going to take this land, they're going to pollute it, destroy it, and we're going to get stuck with the bill. You know, they've given them those exemptions. They're not talking about those things. That's what you should be talking about. This doesn't matter, because you have given them exemptions from the law. You should put that in the impact statement.

So these are questions you need to talk to these folks here. They represent you. They said you're their constituents. Their video talked about the water. What are they doing to protect the water? Once this water is contaminated and it flows past your fence line that your video talked about, what about when it goes into this gentleman's underground water table? These folks over here? Do you have an answer for that?

Does the mine, once they pick up and leave -- you know, they're being sued in Brazil right now for their mine tailing waste failure, you know. In the history of Brazil, this company is being sued right now. Happened in 2015.

So there's a lot of things that are being left out, and this is politics today. I'm pretty sure you all are here because you're tired of it. You have a vested interest. Your home is near this site. They're not talking about all this. Once this company leaves and takes their profits with them, we get the mess. Our children get the mess. I see a lot of folks here with probably grandkids. Is this how we want to leave our grandkids? A lot of farmers out here. They make a living. All this contaminated water that you're going to then feed all the people. The real jobs are going to come in the medical industry to care or keep the people from dying from all the cancers. That's where the jobs are coming from.

Thank you.

MS. GRAHAMS: Speaker 1.

ROGER FEATHERSTONE: Hi. My name is Roger

Featherstone, R-o-g-e-r F-e-a-t-h-e-r-s-t-o-n-e. I'm a director of the Arizona Mining Reform Coalition. I will be submitting detailed comments at the end of this comment period, but I at least want to get a few things on the record during these meetings.

Our feeling is that this DEIS is incomplete. It

needs to be withdrawn. It needs to be rewritten and then reissued for a variety of reasons. I want to talk a little bit about the original location. The original location for the tailings, Rio Tinto swore on a stack of Bibles that that site was absolutely an excellent, wonderful site for dumping 1.35 billion tons of tailings on, a pile of tailings the size of Picketpost Mountain. Well, when they finally did the site characterization, they found that the water table was much higher than they thought, and the ground was more fractured than they thought. So now all of a sudden we have all these other alternatives.

The preferred alternative, Skunk Camp, they say now will also be the best thing since sliced bread, but they haven't done the level of testing they need to do to find out if that's so. If it doesn't turn out to be the case, then what's Plan B?

The rest I want to talk about is water, like most people here, because we live in Arizona.

Rio Tinto somehow thinks in their proposal that they will use only 10 percent of the amount of water that the average mine, copper mine in Arizona uses, but yet Rio Tinto is not planning on using any new techniques. So why does Rio Tinto think that they can use so much less water than everybody else but still use the same techniques? Is this some kind of voodoo economics or something? You know, I don't understand how they

can come up with that.

2.

The Rio -- the mining plan says that Rio Tinto would pump at least 590,000 acre-feet of water for this mine from the San Tan Valley, where we're sitting, and that would be pumped from along the MARCO Railroad corridor. The DEIS says that this would cause the ground to collapse as much as 10 feet, and it says that the water -- that that water would take at least 124 years to recharge. Is that acceptable to the Pinal County farmers that are using that water to irrigate their crops?

I have some more here, but maybe I'll do round two, but for now, thank you.

MS. GRAHAMS: Number 7.

CONNIE FREEMAN: Hi. I'm Connie Freeman, and I disagree with everyone that talked earlier this evening, and I believe that they should just return the land back to the San Carlos Apaches. The Oak Flats, that is a sacred ground, and all this discussion should be tabled back to Congress, because Rio Tinto has a bad -- a history of causing major damages throughout the world, and they don't fix that problem. I'm asking you right now. You have a right to say "no" to Rio Tinto. Please say "no." Have Congress review all these studies.

And I thank you.

MS. GRAHAMS: Number 2.

HENRY MUNOZ: Hello. My name is Henry Munoz,

H-e-n-r-y M-u-n-o-z. Born and raised in the town of Superior,
Arizona. I've got five generations of miners in my family. I
have 23 years of mining experience, with 13 in block and cave,
with what they're proposing to do.

My main concern in getting involved with this project was water. First of all, I'm going to reference the DEIS, Chapter 4, Consulted Party, Section 4.8, Cooperating Agencies. This is referencing the United States Geological Survey. Okay? They declined to participate in this EIS. I'm going to give you a rundown of what the USGS is. It's a science bureau within the Department of the Interior. This is basically what they do. The USGS provides science about the natural hazards that threaten the lives and the livelihoods. The water, energy, minerals and other natural resources we rely on, the health of our ecosystems and the environment and the impacts of climate and land use change.

With the USGS not participating, that's like the police department having a homicide on the street and they send a street cop up, and then you have the homicide department going, "Oh, we don't want to have nothing to do with that murder." Okay? The blockade that they're going to be doing, nowhere in the world has that been done at 7,000 feet. Okay? There's no alternatives to the cut and fill, what we did in Superior, which is environmentally friendly. Okay?

Twelve years ago I had a discussion with a

1 Dr. Robert McNish. Twenty-nine years as a geologist with USGS. He was a professor at the U of A. He gave me a rundown of what 2 was going to take place. This is 12 years ago. He said, 3 "Henry, this is what's going to happen." He said, "We're in a 4 5 drought. We were only six years into the drought." He said, 6 "You know what? The Native American tribes are going to win 7 their lawsuit with the water that was rightfully theirs. Okay? They will have the keys to Arizona's future. We better take 8 9 care of them, and we better not be harmful of them or disrespectful with them, because they control our destiny." 10 11 Okay? Hence, you look July 18th, Arizona Republic, City 12 13 of Gilbert, they signed a 100-year water lease with the San Carlos Apache Tribe for \$31.2 million. That's for 6,000 14 15 acre-feet a year. Gilbert could not build any more homes, 16 because they didn't have any water. So they had to buy water. 17 Okay. On August the 9th, City of Chandler paid 18 Gila River Tribe \$143 million for a 100-year lease of water. 19 Also, that deal could be worth up to \$80 million over the 20 100-year period. Okay? 21 Actually, what we have now, too, you guys should 22 be concerned. You have Superstition Vista coming in line. 23 million people are going to be living there, okay, within the 24 next 20 years. So where does all that water come from? 25 Everybody knows that what's taking place right now with the CAP

system.

Okay. Arizona's going to lose 192,000 acre-feet of water. Okay? 2.8 million of that, half of that, the tribe gets that. Nevada's going to lose 8,000 acre-feet, and Mexico will lose 41,000 acre-feet. So just goes to show you that water is important, and you people should be concerned.

Thank you very much. God bless.

MS. GRAHAMS: Number 9.

LISA LEVINE: Hi. My name is Lisa Levine,

L-i-s-a L-e-v-i-n-e.

I am opposed to this project, but since we're here to discuss the EIS, I will make a comment about two aspects in the presentation and the print materials that seem vague to me. One has to do with the tribal values and cultural resources. The presentation seems to suggest that decisions about how to mitigate the impact to tribes that use this land would be made by Resolution Copper and the Forest Service. Those were the two entities mentioned, and then there was mention of other interested parties.

However, if the major stakeholder is not named and established and that process decided how we're going to mitigate resources or mitigate impact, that seems like more work needs to be done to clarify who would be at the table in that discussion of how these mining operations are going to affect the very tribes that use the land. In short, they should be

part of that conversation and actively named rather than discussed in a third-party way by Resolution and the Forest Service.

The other aspect of this plan that seems really vague has to do -- water has come up a lot already, but I'll just reiterate that specifically, the idea of water credits has -- is mentioned in several of the materials, and just as a human being who lives in Arizona, not an expert, it seems incredibly vague and unexplored what exactly the water credits that Resolution will apply for are and why those should be accepted as a sufficient explanation of their plan to, again, mitigate water damage or damage to the water resources of this state.

With 1 minute and 13 seconds remaining, I want to, as a teacher, encourage any of the 50-some people in this room who care to sign up and speak, because with all due respect to the people here, if you have to stay here longer and listen to more voices, I think that this meeting will matter more.

So thank you.

MS. GRAHAMS: Okay. So that's -- we've gotten through everyone who signed up in advance. I would invite anyone else who would like to come up and speak that hasn't spoken yet, if you're interested, please.

MICHAEL MACIAS: Hi. My name is Michael Macias.

24 Actually, I wasn't expecting -- oh, hold on. Sorry.

25 M-i-c-h-a-e-l M-a-c-i-a-s.

So I was wasn't planning on the speaking, but I just felt after seeing everything that -- I saw more negative things that positive things when it comes to this mine, and I just want to remind everybody right from the get-go, this thing is wrong, just the way it came and Flake gave this land up. I mean, sneaking in the night before this bill was supposed to be signed by President Obama and just giving our public lands away, that doesn't associate -- everything after has just been so wrong.

I grew up in Superior, and I remember the old tailings there. I remember how water would collect on top of them, and I could see just blood red. And I'm also thankful that they were taken away and cleaned up, for whatever reason that the mine did it.

But, I mean, Superior is so different than all the other little towns around there. You go the Kearney, you see a giant pit. You see Hayden. Hayden was a town. Now it's a table. Miami became infamous for its pollution. Pinto Valley is a giant pit. Again, you've got to collect copper, but at some point, you know, you've got to stop and think about what you're giving up. You know, people in my town, there's people for and people against it, but sometimes I feel like, you know, those mountains around us should be -- could be -- should be 100 miles away, because nobody goes back there and hikes back there and sees all the wilderness and the wildlife and everything.

They said those things -- you don't know what you have until it's gone. Most people don't even know what they have before it's gone.

And so, you know, I get it. Some people are not -- this is all emotional stuff I'm talking about, because I've gone, you know, and hiked on these mountains and camped out. So if you're not that type of person, okay, what I'm saying doesn't matter to you, but there are some of those concerns that I have regarding just safety. I mean, okay. Take, for example, Silver King. Okay? Its tailings will be 1,000 feet high, and this could be dry. Okay. As it rains enough here in Arizona that all this water's going to collect on top of it, and things are so polluted -- I guess you guys talked about it. But nevertheless, you guys have to understand there's so much more going on that you guys can't compensate inside your mine and everything.

I mean, this is a big risk you guys are taking with this mine, and the costs -- we're going to have to bear the costs of it with our health, with our loss of just experience of the nature. I mean, there's so much that we have to think about. I mean, I can't -- I just can't stress that enough. This is -- this is a hard deal. This is a hard deal that you have to go through, and I can't play too much on emotional because, you know, people's jobs. I get it. You know, we need copper. I get it. But at some point, what do you call it?

I mean, BHP -- BHP built the other half of this project. It's like Rio Tinto. They had a mine over there in -- where is it? Back -- San Manuel. San Manuel. They had mining there. They could have mined it for another 30 years. They have copper left. But no, they stopped, tore everything down. Now we come over to Superior and build this new mine. They destroy everything.

So, I mean, there's so many things just don't make sense about it, but yet it just seems like it keeps going forward in this direction for the mine. And I guess, you know, that's what it comes down to. They have all the money, they have all the power, and we're powerless to do anything about it, especially the way John King and everybody have done this. I mean, at what point -- what does it matter? It's like pick your poison now.

And so I just hope those who make the decisions, I just hope that they really think about it, and I hope you make the right choice. Thank you.

BEN MAYNARD: Hello. My name is Ben Maynard,
B-e-n M-a-y-n-a-r-d. And I just live a couple miles from here.
Some of my neighbors.

What I want to know, a couple questions is this is the first time a couple of days ago that I even heard about any of this. No one in my neighborhood has gotten any notices.

Nothing. And I started going around the neighborhood telling my

friends that I know, and they have -- no one has got any of these notices to be here at this meeting or any of the other ones, zones got changed or anything like that. None of us knew anything about it.

And the other thing is, you know, they're taking our water. A lot of people talking about our water. Well, I just live a couple miles from here, and my well's, like, 540 feet deep. Well, what's that going to do when they drop that 30 feet?

And the other thing is I would like to know what they're going to do for the egress and ingress for all the traffic for the filter plant going in right down the road down here.

And that's basically all I got.

But I'd just like to know -- no one was informed of this, and after this meeting, I want someone to tell me why no one in my neighborhood that I went to visit has heard about this. I got informed because my brother lives out of state, has property here. He got a notice in a different state about this meeting. Otherwise, if we had known about this thing, I would have tried to fill this whole room.

Thank you.

MICHAEL GETTENS: Thanks, everyone, for coming out today. My name is Michael Gettens, M-i-c-h-a-e-l G-e-t-t-e-n-s, and I live in Queen Creek, not too far from here.

And my biggest concern is water. I feel like this is a no-brainer. I feel like everyone in this room is in agreement for the most part that this should not happen at all. And I don't think you should be having this conversation, because this land does belong to the indigenous peoples, and I don't know how many times we have to do this to learn that this is not our right. If this is going to be mined, it should be mined by the indigenous peoples of this land.

I'm a -- I moved to Arizona five years ago, and before that, my parents came from Europe. So I feel like it's not really our place to be doing this to the land. We're literally destroying it. We're turning it into a war zone, and the environment is too valuable.

And we've heard everyone speak here that has raised all these points are very -- they're very meaningful, and what I think that is missing from the EIS in particular is the actual value of what is going to be destroyed. I know that there's, you know, concerns. And there's, oh, property value may be detracted from. We know that that's obviously -- that's going to happen. It's going to be -- the property values are going to go down, because you can't live without water in Arizona. The water's going to go down, the property values go down.

So the problem is that we're not valuing -- we're not coming up with a dollar sign of what's this all worth. I

feel like if we were able to actually equate the value of what is going to be lost that's taken hundreds and thousands and millions of years to be created by earth, it would outweigh, it would be more expensive than the actual profits that this mining company is going to make from it.

And this is a foreign mining company. We all know that. And yeah, there's really no value that we're getting from it. There's a few jobs. They're going to be created for a short time, and then it's over, and then we're stuck with what's left. And yeah, so if we could figure out a way to equate the value of what we're actually going to lose and make sure that that's going to be paid back in these proposals that we can all agree to with the Forest Service and Resolution Copper, if they can agree to pay back the actual value of what we're losing, they're going to cancel the mine, because they're going to actually have to pay more than their profit.

Just one strategy. Contact your Congressman, please. Let's get the movement going. Even though it seems like it's the end, like this is going to happen, even if it -- even if they do break ground, we can still petition. We can still gather. We can still slow it down, because it's going to take many years, like we saw in the presentation. It's going to take a long time to do this. So we have time. We can continue to resist and to protect and to celebrate what we have and regenerate it and make it even better instead of destroying it.

Thank you.

TINA LOUIE: I wasn't really planning on coming up here and speaking, but I just thought I had to say something. I've lived here for 22 years. I live at the end of Skyline Road, so a quarter of a mile from my house is right at the edge of State Trust land, and about probably five miles as the crow flies as to where the water gets pumped in near Florence Junction.

So I lived -- I live on a shared well. I have horse property. So this would definitely, you know, concern me as far as water and, you know, the groundwater being contaminated, and so that -- that does worry me some.

I've been a very big outdoor person ever since before I moved here. Rock climbing. I cut my teeth on Babysitters Taste Better and Riders on the Storm. Those are routes out in Magma that that will be gone now.

That's -- it was a little -- I've heard about the operation coming in, probably close to 10, 15 years ago when they first talked about it, and so it was a little disconcerting to me today to hear hard figures like all that land's going to be subsided a mile and a half into the ground. It's going to be a big crater.

I'm a member of the Arizona Trail Association. I ride my horse out to -- from Superior to -- up to Rogers Trough and down to Kearney all the time, and I just can't imagine

looking out on a 34,000 -- 3,400 acre tailing pond out there. So I don't understand how they think they can compensate for some of the sites.

2.

I've been all over Arizona, and I have to tell you, I mean, you guys know that Oak Flat is one of the most iconic places in all of Arizona. When you see that rock formation -- you know, maybe Texas Canyon is a little bit close to that, but to me, it -- you know, it's right up there with the Four Corners region, and so I think it's just -- it's a little hard to hear when you hear facts and figures and know that the recreation's going to be gone.

I do know that the Magma area is one of the top three rock climbing destinations in all of the country. I mean, it's one of the most strategically located next to a major metropolitan area, and that's going to be gone. I mean, just gone. There's not going to be anything there. So I think you guys need to think about alternatives to that. It just -- it's disheartening to hear this.

JOHN MONTGOMERY: My name is John Montgomery, J-o-h-n M-o-n-t-g-o-m-e-r-y. I live about a mile and a half from where they're wanting to put this stinking thing.

I thought of something that I don't think anybody else here has thought about. If they suck all the water out from under us here, where are you going to find your house? I see sinkholes all over the place now here. When the water's

1 gone, there's going to be nothing left to hold your house up.

2 What are they going to do about that? You going to build me a

3 new house somewhere else, or am I going to have to dig me a

4 ladder to get in and out of my house, if there's still anything

5 standing of it?

But I agree with everything I've heard here tonight, and I think it's a stinking mess. I don't have no -- I don't want nothing to do with it.

Thank you.

JEREMY WEBSTER: My name is Jeremy Webster. I wasn't planning on speaking. J-e-r-e-m-y W-e-b-s-t-e-r.

I live about less than a mile and a half away from where they're talking about putting the filtration system. I've spent about four to five hours today sifting through the environmental impact. I've read a lot of environmental impact studies, and one of the things that I was focusing on the most is what a lot of people talked about: Water.

I've worked -- I live off of a well, and the biggest thing that I took out of it is there's going to be 14 miles of pipeline that they're talking about putting in at all but one of the alternative locations that is going to pump slurry all the way down into San Tan Valley, and then all the way back up into Superior. Based off of that, there's a lot of potential for environmental impact that hasn't been studied for pipeline breaks and things like that. That's my biggest

concern.

And one of your guys' alternative locations,
Alternative 4, leaves all the tailings, doesn't push the sludge
down for filtration in San Tan Valley, and I think that you guys
really need to take that into account, because there's already
going to be a big enough environmental impact that you guys
should try and mitigate everything else as a result of it. So
please take that into account as you guys go through to approve
whatever alternate location is going to be alternately approved.
Okay?

Thank you.

MS. GRAHAMS: Would anyone else that hasn't spoken yet like to? Please.

DON STEUTER: I can't sit here all night without saying a few words. I'm Don Steuter. I'm the conservation sheriff for the Sierra Club. And that's S-t-e-u-t-e-r.

And I think what most people are talking about tonight is that the scope of analysis that -- in this Draft Environmental Impact Statement is simply too narrow. Despite the fact that it's 1,300 pages long, we really haven't talked about the negative effects of all of this groundwater pumping in the San Tan area, for example.

And then there's a few pet peeves of mine as well. And this never happens in an environmental impact statement, so I'm not surprised to not see any discussion of it.

But in the opening pages, there's always a discussion about the purpose and need. Why do we need -- what's the reason for this project? Why do we need to have it? And the assumption is is that, well, we need to have the Resolution Copper mine because the Resolution Copper mine wants it, and because they think they can make a lot of money digging up that copper.

We never get into any philosophical discussion about is this in the long term really a good thing? Obviously it's got tremendous environmental impact statements, which the Forest Service has done a fairly good job, a fairly good job -- there's a lot of holes -- but a fairly good job in trying to uncover them, and I need to give you some credit for that.

But the truth of it is is that there's a lot of alternative ways to do things without copper. One of the most -- no homes today are plumbed with copper. It's all gone to plastic. I'm in the air-conditioning business, and the air-conditioning manufacturers are all moving from copper coils to aluminum coils. Aluminum is cheaper, and it transfers heat far better.

The copper industry likes to say that, "Well, we're getting a lot of copper because you've got all these" -- for example, you have all these electric cars coming on the market. They're going to require a lot of copper. Is that really true? People are working on carbon nanofibers. I'm not quite sure exactly what that is, but I've read stories about it,

and they predicted -- people predict this is going to be a replacement conductor for copper.

If you want to find alternatives to a particular source like copper, for example, let the price of copper go up. Don't keep building all these copper mines. We probably really don't need them. Let the price of copper go up, and I can guarantee you that we'll find alternatives to copper that will be less environmentally destructive.

The last thing I wanted to bring up is that totally expected, but there's no discussion in this Draft EIS about the appraisal process. We're going to give up 2,400 acres of prime Forest Service land, beautiful land, and we don't really know anything at this point as far as the dollars and the cents involved in the lands that we're going to acquire versus the lands that we're going to give up. We always hear, "Well, just wait. We're still working on it." Ten years they closed -- yeah, they're still working on the appraisals, appraisal process. We're getting people lined up to do it. But there's no information of any real value in the Draft EIS. All of these things should be talked about in the final EIS. So you've got a lot of work to do yet.

Thank you.

MS. GRAHAMS: Anyone else interested in speaking who hasn't had a turn?

Okay. I would open it up to the floor. We still

have more time for the public hearing. So if you've already had a turn and would like to take another three minutes, we will allow you to do that at this time.

Okay. I guess not.

2.

SANDRA RAMBLER: Can I?

MS. GRAHAMS: Yes.

SANDRA RAMBLER: I was waiting for somebody else to come up and say a few words, too. But you don't talk about -- what's so ironic is that when the slide presentation first began, you had pictures of beautiful, pristine land, and they might as well make it show it, and then just put a big old huge hole in there and say, "This is what it's going to end up looking like." And they don't tell you things like that. They just beef you up, beef you up. Like people that have money, they'll do -- like they'll buy you out. They'll step -- they have sellouts. We have sellouts.

Resolution Copper went to Apache, hire Apache, to make them say that the land wasn't sacred. That's how dirty and devious they are, and I don't care if anybody from Resolution Copper's here tonight to say that. You tell Rio Tinto that they're a foreign land. You tell them to take it back to wherever they came from and that we don't want them here. They're not welcome here. No way. We're not going to allow that. That's not right. That's downright dirty when they come to your people -- that's the divide and conquer system that they

set up, and that's what they -- that's how they think they're going to win, because it's all for the lust of money and greed and power. That's what they have, and that's what they will use. They'd do anything. They'll hurt anybody. They don't care who they're going to kill.

And the mining concept, from what I've known, they've always implemented mining -- like safety first, safety first. Everywhere you go, safety first. That's their main focus. Where's the safety of this mine here? I mean, you know it's going to end up taking lives, especially from the tailings right here. I mean, you can't -- Resolution can't possibly think we Americans are so stupid that we're just going to accept money and allow them to bring cancer to our backyard and kill more people that they've already killed. I mean, come on, you guys, you know.

And I appreciate every one of you that have spoken up, because you all made sense. And this whole deal was just total incomplete and so rushed, and where -- talk about NEPA, the cultural impact study. What about us? There's, like, 21 tribes in Arizona. What about all the tribal members and how we're associated with that land? Have you guys even heard that? I mean, my goodness. How much more will it will take for you to understand and wake up and open your ears and hear us? What do we have to do, you know? What do we have to do to make ourselves known that this is what we stand for? This is what we

believe? Oak Flat is like a church to us, and that we're not going to give up, like I said before.

So tell them safety first. Tell Congress to withdraw it and -- because there's no cultural impact study, and that's a violation of our due process of law, our Constitutional right as an American citizen.

MS. GRAHAMS: We have another taker?

ROGER FEATHERSTONE: Roger Featherstone again. I just wanted to add a couple -- few quick points, I think more than anything for some of the folks that just learned about this proposal.

There's a lot of problems with the document, and a lot of it has to do with process. I commented at the Superior meeting that there's a court case that was decided on the Rosemont mine south of Tucson that the district judge halted that project. And that has a lot of implications for the design of this project, and if that's upheld, the Forest Service could very well need to go back to the drawing board on this.

There is -- there are some procedural problems with the whole situation, too, as a few people have talked about. There haven't been studies done on some of the alternatives, and when those are done, the public has a right to comment on those proposals, and I don't know how the Forest Service plans on making that happen. At any rate, there's that.

But I also want to talk a little bit about

problems Rio Tinto has had with mines like this around the 1 2. That should have a large bearing and should be talked 3 about in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Rio Tinto is building a very similar operation in Mongolia. The tailings 4 5 facility as originally designed, they built the same tailings 6 facility in Mongolia, and that facility started leaking after 7 three years. Rio Tinto is currently building a block cave operation at that mine. It's shallow, or it's 4,500 feet rather 8 9 than 7,000 feet, but they're having a heck of a time doing it. 10 The rock just isn't cooperating building that infrastructure. 11 Right now, that project is a year behind schedule at least, and 12 it's \$1.9 billion U.S. over budget. So I think the bottom line here is this is a 13 14 grand experiment. This is a technology that's never been done 15 at this depth. The massive amounts of matter is incomprehensible in a desert climate, and so this is a grand 16 experiment that Rio Tinto wants to pull off. The bottom line to 17 18 keep in mind is Rio Tinto doesn't mine minerals. Rio Tinto 19 mines investors, and that's what this is all about. 20 Thanks. 21 (Hearing comments concluded at 7:18 p.m.) 22 23 24

25