

012446



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

Coronado National Forest
Supervisor's Office

300 W. Congress
Tucson, Arizona 85701
Phone (520) 388-8300
FAX (520) 388-8305
Deaf & Hearing Impaired 711

(4) la.

File Code: 1950-3/2810
Route To:

Date: May 10, 2010

Subject: Rosemont Copper Project Alternatives for Detailed Analysis

To: Rosemont Copper Project Interdisciplinary Team Leader

This memo documents my decision regarding the alternatives to be considered in detail in the Rosemont Copper Project environmental analysis. I want to thank the interdisciplinary team for its rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of a range of reasonable alternatives that meets the purpose and need, and addresses one or more significant issues. I expect the high degree of collaboration with interested parties to continue as we further refine these alternatives and move into the analysis phase of the NEPA process.

In reviewing extensive input from the interdisciplinary team, cooperating agencies, public scoping comments, and the proponent, I am deciding the following conceptual alternative footprints will go forward for detailed analysis at this time:

- Proposed Action (Mine Plan of Operations)
- No Action
- Phased Tailings
- Barrel Only
- Scholefield

Each of these alternatives is described in more detail in the attachment.

Landforming as a discrete alternative has yet to be informed by final reports from our sub-contractors. Whether or not landforming is retained as an alternative carried forward, I expect the team to identify and apply additional designs and mitigation to the various alternatives to further reduce visual impacts.

At this time, I am also directing the interdisciplinary team to drop from detailed analysis the Sycamore/Barrel alternative, pit backfill, and modified pit configuration. I appreciate the interdisciplinary team taking the requisite "hard look" at these concepts. Your findings and rationale for dropping these alternatives from detailed analysis will need to be clear and complete in the project record and summarized in the EIS.

It is understood the alternatives will continue to develop as mitigation and monitoring are further explored and defined. Similarly, details such as power line and water line alignments and construction methods and access road alignments will need to be clarified as soon as possible. Maps will also need to be closely reviewed for accuracy and completeness. I do not consider



alternatives to be complete until mitigation is specified for each alternative. I expect to be briefed on alternatives as they are fine tuned.

Ultimately, the final set of alternatives to be considered in detail will meet the requirements of NEPA to be reasonable, to include a no action alternative, to meet the purpose and need for the project, to address significant issues, to include mitigation and monitoring, and to represent a range that responds differently to significant issues and will produce measurable differences in effects.

Please share this information with the interdisciplinary team along with my appreciation of their efforts to further along the thorough and objective analysis of this complex and important project.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jeanine A. Derby".

JEANINE A. DERBY

Forest Supervisor

cc: SWCA Environmental Consultants, Rosemont Copper Company, Robert Cordts, Bob Davis

Alternatives Selected for Detailed Analysis

Rosemont Copper Project

May 7, 2010

This document briefly describes each alternative considered for detailed analysis. All alternatives listed here, except for No Action, meet the purpose and need for the project.

▪ Proposed Action (Mine Plan of Operations)

This alternative was the proposal noticed in the Federal Register. As with all action alternatives, the Proposed Action includes an open pit, waste rock and tailings facilities, a plant site, transportation routes, support facilities, and power and water delivery systems. This alternative is inconsistent with the Forest Plan. No additional mitigation beyond what was included in the accepted MPO will be added to this alternative.

▪ No Action

This alternative is required by NEPA and provides a basis for describing the environmental effects of the Proposed Action and other alternatives. The Proposed Action would not be implemented with this alternative and there would be no change to current management within the project area. The No Action alternative does not meet the purpose and need. No Forest Plan amendment is anticipated with the No Action Alternative.

▪ Phased Tailings

This alternative modifies the original proposal by phasing tailings placement to avoid McCleary Canyon for the first 12 years of the mine life. The alternative also relocates the main access road to avoid riparian habitat, reduce road length, and mitigate visual impacts. Other mitigation measures, such as redesign of the drainage through the waste and tailings facilities, are included to reduce potential impacts. This alternative would likely generate a Forest Plan amendment.

▪ Barrel Only

This alternative restricts impacts to a single drainage (Barrel Canyon) that has fewer riparian values than other drainages. It preserves the wildlife corridor and free-flowing condition in McCleary Canyon. An increased set back of the toe of the waste rock slope away from the bottom of McCleary drainage is being explored. This alternative includes additional mitigation and monitoring requirements. This alternative would likely generate a Forest Plan amendment.

▪ Scholefield

This alternative preserves important heritage resources by removing tailings and waste facilities from Barrel Canyon and placing them in Scholefield Canyon. It may reduce visual impacts because the geomorphology and vegetation are less variable in the Scholefield Canyon area than in the areas around Barrel Canyon and may be easier to reproduce with

reclamation. The alternative also has less potential impact on recreational opportunities in Barrel Canyon than the Proposed Action.

The alternative has been redesigned by the interdisciplinary team so that all of the waste rock and tailings are pulled out of McCleary Canyon. The location of the heap leach facility may require additional adjustment as project analysis proceeds. Additional mitigation and monitoring requirements are included. This alternative would likely generate a Forest Plan amendment.