

From: [David Lieberthal](#)
To: [FS-objections-southwestern-regional-office](#)
Subject: Rosemont FEIS Objection
Date: Sunday, January 19, 2014 1:45:59 PM

To Whom It May Concern:

I am listed as a responder in your Commenter Response Database. I have previously written as required during the earlier process.

The maze of rules and regulations you have imposed for me and others to "properly" object now is overwhelming and will be a basis for future appeals if necessary through the administrative and court process. In hopes that you will consider the merits of this letter rather than to rely on technicalities imposed which prevent meaningful Objections from being considered, I offer the following.

My original comment letter primarily addressed Highway 83 traffic safety issues which I believe were not adequately dealt with in the FEIS. In fact, the FEIS handles the issue as little more than *de minimus*. Yet, the potential increase in personal injury and loss of life, as verified by the statistics which you accepted without contest, assure that accidents will occur on 83 which was in never constructed with mine traffic in anyone's mind's eye. This is a tremendously significant matter, but you have not offered any reasonable alternatives such as increasing the total width of 83 so that mining trucks, which are huge as compared to vehicle traffic contemplated in the construction of 83 can safely travel without risk. Your solutions, referred to below do not solve the issue created by mine vehicles passing each other in opposite directions. They will not leave enough room to reasonably prevent accidents. Given the increase in mining traffic, the statistics assure that sooner or later horrific accidents will occur. Additionally, commuting residents affected will have on a daily basis the risk of colliding with mining vehicles even assuming they they take evasive action to avoid accidents. The mining trucks colliding with passenger vehicles run virtually no such risks because death and injury will fall upon the "little guy" and, of course, ultimately, grieving families.

Turn lanes, striping, added surfacing, and minimizing deliveries at peak hours, which are your acceptable solutions in no way will ameliorate the loss of life and extreme injury which will occur if you permit the Rosemont Mine. The same trucks will still travel the same highway with no alternate lanes. They will still be in the way. They will block each other; they will block passenger vehicles; they will cause frequent evasive action by all who use the highway. They will over time kill and maim humans who occupy Pima and Santa Cruz Counties who earn their living, purchase goods and services, attend medical appointments, worship, use governmental and recreational facilities, visit relatives and friends, all of which require their frequent use of Highway 83 built for those identical reasons. Trading off lives for 400 jobs and tax revenue cannot in any way be justified. Your solutions simply do not meet the danger confronting you. What you have proposed is rhetoric with no substance for the real issue which is the sanctity of human life.

What is a solution for this issue? It is so obvious and yet so obfuscated that one has to seriously question the motives of those who sit in judgment on the issue. Rosemont should not be allowed to use 83 for any mining purpose whatsoever given that 83 is not capable of being adequately widened. They chose this project hoping that they would have virtually unfettered use of 83, which should have been viewed as preposterous. It is beyond belief that The Forest Service would pay so little attention to what is likely to be a severe risk to human life and safety. This is not a complicated issue if you simply face it for what it is -- not an acceptable risk to the users of 83.

I would offer, as I did in my original letter, the contents of which you did not address adequately, that the mine find its own way to construct ingress and egress routes that do not in any way impact on 83. This may mean that Rosemont will have to purchase right of ways from landowners or governmental entities on which their non-offending road may be constructed. Difficult, you say? Rosemont has supposedly offered to pay millions to offset potential water and environmental damage. Why should this issue not require the same type of investment? It is certainly of equal or greater impact on the

citizens and highway 83 users as those who are affected by other issues. And, under no circumstances should Rosemont be permitted to move one vehicle on 83 before actually implementing alternate transportation routes *prior* to commencing mining so that NO lives are lost while Rosemont tries comply, which, of course, might not ever occur.

Respectfully,

David Lieberthal

13635 E. Spring Buck Ct.

Sonoita, AZ 85637

Telephone: 520-455-5173

(Original letter sent from HC 1, Box 1033, Sonoita, AZ 85637 which is the address then assigned by the post office in Sonoita)