From: <u>Maureen grandmont</u>

To: FS-objections-southwestern-regional-office

Subject: Re: Oak Flat Copper mining

**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 6:17:31 PM

I did send a. Original objection that was responded to. You certainly don't make it easy to generate objections. No wonder the mining company is winning the war on dedicating the land. This is so very sad.

Maureen Grandmont



Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 16, 2021, at 5:26 PM, FS-objections-southwestern-regional-office <a href="mailto:objections-southwestern-regional-office@usda.gov">objections-southwestern-regional-office@usda.gov</a> wrote:

Thank you for your email. At this point, we are unable to process your objection to the Resolution Copper Project and Land Exchange as submitted. The Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at 36 CFR 218 Subparts A and B provides specific requirements for the objection process. The reviewing officer must set aside and not review an objection when those requirements are not met (36 CFR 218.10(a)).

Objections to the Resolution Copper Project will only be accepted from those who have previously submitted timely comments regarding this project proposal during a designated opportunity for public comment, unless based on information not available during an earlier designated opportunity for public comment (i.e., new information).

At a minimum, an objection must include the following: (1) The objector's name and address, along with a telephone number or email address if available; (2) Signature or other verification of authorship upon request (a scanned signature for electronic mail may be filed with the objection); (3) Identification of the lead objector, when multiple names are listed on an objection, and verification of the identity of the lead objector, if requested. Individual members of an entity must have submitted their own individual comments in order to have eligibility to object as an individual. Additional requirements are included below.

In addition to the identifying information outlined above, written objection comments on the proposed project must include (1) the name of the proposed project (Resolution Copper), the name and title of the responsible official (Tom Torres, Acting Forest Supervisor), and the name(s) of the National Forest or District on which the proposed project will be implemented (Tonto National Forest); (2) a description of those aspects of the proposed project addressed by the objection, including specific issues related to the proposed project; if applicable, how the objector believes the environmental analysis or draft decision specifically violates law, regulation, or policy; suggested remedies that would resolve the objection; and supporting reasons the reviewing officer should consider; and (3) a statement that demonstrates the connection between prior specific written

comments on the particular proposed project or activity and the content of the objection, unless the objection concerns an issue that arose after the designated opportunities for comment. Specific written comments are written comments within the scope of the proposed action, with a direct relationship to the proposed action, and include supporting reasons for the responsible official to consider.

You are welcome to resubmit an objection that meets the criteria under 36 CFR 218 Subparts A and B within 45 days of the January 15, 2021 publication of the legal notice in the *Arizona Capital Times*. Further information about the objection filing process, including a copy of the legal notice, can be found at <a href="https://www.fs.usda.gov/project/?project=48956">https://www.fs.usda.gov/project/?project=48956</a>.

From: RICHARD GRANDMONT

Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 3:44 PM

To: FS-objections-southwestern-regional-office <objections-southwestern-regional-

office@usda.gov>

Subject: Oak Flat Copper mining

## To Whom This May Concern:

I strongly object to the proposed land swap that paves the way for copper mining in the Tonto National Forest area of Oak Flat.

Water in Arizona is at a premium and this mining would affect the quality of the already limited water supply. In addition to this, there is land in this area that is sacred to the

Apache tribe. Just like what the Resolution Mining Company did in Australia to the indigenous land, so to that will happen here. When is Arizona going to put the health and welfare of its' people and natural resources over the almighty dollar?

Shame, shame, on you for letting this happen.

Sincerely,
Maureen Grandmont

This electronic message contains information generated by the USDA solely for the intended recipients. Any unauthorized interception of this message or the use or disclosure of the information it contains may violate the law and subject the violator to civil or criminal penalties. If you believe you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the email immediately.