

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/10/2024 6:35:26 PM

First name: Barbara

Last name: Johnson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Comments for Forest Supervisor Kerwin Dewberry on the HermosaSouth 32 Project, now entitled the Hermosa Critical Minerals Project

So this foreign company has had 11 years to develop its plans and strategy to use our country's water and minerals. They develop a report, and the forest service gives the public 2 weeks to read the 216 page report before they announce a 30 day scoping period. The local communities have decried this as unreasonable, and it is. But the Forest Service hasn't budged. Below please find my scoping comments that I expect the EIS to answer:

Under the Socioeconomic section: Where will this foreign company sell our USA minerals, Indonesian, Asia, their next door neighbors?

How much of this product will be used in US MANUFACTURING?

What percentage of the mined material will stay in the US. What percentage of the mined material will be shipped elsewhere?

Has the State of Arizona adequately assessed the local, regional, and statewide impact of the water use (after the embarrassment of selling our water to Saudia Arabia to grow alfalfa)? The EIS should include a State assessment that is an independent (from politics) assessment concerning the long term implications of the project.

Under Cumulative Impacts:

The United States Government is responsible for assessing cumulative impacts completely and without bias in this EIS. That includes multi state as well as local and regional cumulative effect.....not just quantity, but also quality and location of impact and impact to birds and wildlife as well as water quality and quantity.

Uner Resource Impacts:

The United States Government must protect its resources.

Full mapping of all existing mining permits, including: who owns them, what they are mining, and all proposed mines,. Mines owned by this foreign entity purchased under their Arizona Minerals Purchase, should be highlighted.

Under Purpose and Need:

Give the public a clear connection between mineral extraction, minerals that leave US territory, even for awhile, and then minerals that make there way back to manufacturing and consumer use by US consumers. Percentage and type.

Under Purpose and Need:

Include an explanation of why now? The entity has had the Arizona minerals since 2013, explain the amount of money put into lobbying for FAST 41 legislation by this organization.

Under Cumulative Impacts:

Map out precisely where each mine is located within the region and highlight those mines using water from the same watershed.

Don't give the public documents that the company prepared, give us US Government prepared facts and information for review.

Community Process:

The District Ranger declared that the community input and ideas are valued and that this is part of a multi step process over the next couple of years. From the very beginning the US Government did not value the input and ideas of the community (first and foremost giving time for scoping) and therefore the US Forest Service has set the stage for disrespect, distrust and disinformation...nothing timely, accurate or transparent so far and this is just the first 30 days. The EIS scope should contain a robust and interactive community involvement section that really does reflect timeliness, accuracy, and transparency. And although I do not speak Spanish, I am not ignorant of the need for Spanish interpretation in writing and live. The Scope needs to include communication and coordination with the Tohono O'odham Nation, as they are the users of the Santa Cruz Watershed

Endangered Species:

This EIS scope must contain an analysis of ALL species, including insects, ALL points of intersection with the proposed mine operation for the complete length of the mining period including the after effect of the mining operations beyond the active operational period, And, since these impacts will last generations, this must account for the cumulative effect of climate change on water and habitat, Border activities on water and migration, and species in other protective status categories, such as species of concern, threatened species, etc.

Under Water Quality and Quantity:

The scope needs a complete analysis of water quality and quantity, but not only of the Patagonia Mountains

The Scope needs to include a full and modern watershed analysis of the Sonoita Creek and the Santa Cruz rRver and its ultimate effect on the Colorado River Watershed.

The Scope needs to include all existing planning documents within the region, state and multistate for the quantity and quality of the regional and Colorado River Watershed.

I want to be included in the continued Administrative Review Process. Thank you.