

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/11/2024 5:12:28 AM

First name: Lisa

Last name: Meyer

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for taking all of our concerned questions into account as I will be continuing to pursue accountability with any and all affiliated organizations related to the protection of the public and to the environment. I have previously written but need to ask more specifically on the following points for research to be done into these areas:

1. What can be done as to liability if South 32 is claiming to have a "goal" of a net zero loss of biodiversity", and if in fact irreparable harm has been caused to the public and to the environment due to their mining operations can the litigation go beyond fraudulence and into malfeasance correct?

2. In an alluvial aquifer where much of the groundwater is necessary for the health of the ecosystem (including the human beings inhabiting the area) can there be a "robust" study on the effects to the surrounding surface level springs, wells and other water sources within the 2 local watersheds to the extent where we know of exactly where South 32 will be taking the water from and how much will be recharged?

3. If South 32's operations cause international water loss- and it effects Sonora Mexico, what can some of the repercussions be for causing a more global impact for 2 countries suffering from drought? What is the International Law regulating mining operations causing major water rights issues? Can this be addressed so that the public within both countries depending on the Santa Cruz watershed are aware of their rights and the ramifications if their water is taken?

4. According to Section (303) d of the Clean Water Act, Sonoita Creek has already been listed as an impaired water system. Would manganese, copper and silver minerals and other harmful chemical substances released into the waterways be tested and listed as an impaired waterway? What is the effect to the fish at Patagonia Lake in combination of other chemicals also found? Will the fish and other aquatic species be monitored for heavy metals caused by the mining operation?

5. Under the there is an assurance of adequate water supply for the public stating that "ADWR (is responsible for the) implementation of mandatory conservation requirements for all users of groundwater within the AMAs. Municipal water providers, industrial users, and agricultural water users all have been subject to these requirements since the First Management Plan became effective in 1987. Can you research if there are legal exemptions to this that are provided for South 32's Hermosa Project and what are the legal right of the public within both state and federal law to contend significant water loss and impairment? Arizona Law doesn't have to bend to an outdated mining law of 1872 when the scale of impact of the mine is much more detrimental? Is there a comparative analysis of needing the right to water or the right to take- to "take immediate and constructive actions to increase domestic mineral production from the Nation's lands", as Pat Risnor shares. There is a global energy crisis but even larger and more imminent is the Global Climate Change crisis and drought crisis which in regards to rights to life - one takes precedence in order to survive... Please research the facts regarding this in order to competently make a decision regarding the livelihoods of all involved respectfully. If it is found that there is potential for exacerbated crisis- could this be able room for an extension to the statutory "2 year, one month and 27 days... to ensure and protect the right to life? It is an extreme amount of water being proposed to be "dewatered" when we are experiencing extreme weather conditions, has there been studies on the projected extreme drought conditions combined with the dewatering process?

6. Is there a more remote location that could be explored that doesn't affect such an important water source? Can South 32 stop the exploratory mining procedures in Santa Cruz County and seek locations elsewhere and research the impacts of those locations?

7. Can South 32 and Coronado Forest Service have a better percentage of public awareness as to the mining operations? Roughly 1/10 of the households received a letter. There wouldn't be too much cost to make it 100% to ensure adequate necessary awareness and informed consent or commentary could be made within appropriate timeframes. Could it be researched why this hasn't happened and not only from South 32's stance on it?

8. Can there be a thorough hydrologic study done of the supply and demand needs and the effect of all the

groundwater basins effected across county lines by the future endeavors of the Hermosa Project? Also with special consideration to the dependence of groundwater in these basins?

Thank you kindly for your honorable consideration for the common good of all.