

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/16/2026 2:16:58 PM

First name: Cheryl

Last name: Marceau

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My tax dollars fund the Forest Service, and I expect my government to follow the law. In this case that means NEPA: full and complete analysis of a proposed project before it goes to the public, and certainly before any approval. Private enterprise does not have a right to be enriched at the expense of public lands, and the Forest Service does not have the right to rubber-stamp a developer's desired outcome. What I want is simple: all information required by NEPA must be supplied, and it must pass the sniff test. Is the developer simply going through a sham exercise, or are these real, verifiable responses? That question cannot be answered from what has been published so far.

The agency has indicated that this project will require an Environmental Impact Statement, which is appropriate given what is being proposed. But the project milestones listing shows "Milestone Date NEPA Start Date Finding/Decision Date" with no dates filled in for either the start or the decision. The public cannot know when scoping begins, when draft documents will be available, or when a final decision will come. Affected communities, tribal governments, and other stakeholders cannot plan meaningful participation around a schedule that does not exist. The agency must publish firm milestone dates before this process moves forward, and must explain on this record why those fields are currently blank.

The Project Overview states that "These activities will support the underground uranium mine and water treatment plant proposed on adjacent state and private lands." That sentence raises a question the notice never answers: if the mine and water treatment plant are on state and private lands, who is analyzing their impacts? The EIS is being led by the Cibola National Forest, yet the Forest Service's jurisdiction covers only the NFS surface disturbance. The notice does not identify cooperating agencies. It does not explain whether the EIS scope will cover the full connected action, including the mine itself and the water treatment plant, or only the roads and drilling on NFS ground. A scoping process that analyzes only the surface support activities while ignoring the underground uranium mine those activities exist to serve would not satisfy NEPA. The agency must disclose the complete list of cooperating agencies and confirm, in writing, that the EIS will cover the entire connected action.

The Project Overview also states that the proposal, submitted by Roca Honda Resources LLC, is "to conduct developmental drilling, develop infrastructure and construct access roads on NFS lands" on and near Jesus Mesa. That is the entirety of the project description made available to the public. There is no acreage, no disturbance footprint, no drilling depth or volume, and no description of what the infrastructure consists of. Without that information I cannot identify which resources are at risk, and I cannot frame substantive comments. A scoping process built on a description this thin is not a real process; it is exactly the kind of sham exercise NEPA is designed to prevent. The agency must release a detailed project description, including all of the missing physical parameters, before the scoping comment period closes.

I care how public land is managed and how my tax dollars are spent doing it. Neither the missing schedule, nor the unexplained scope, nor the stripped-down project description gives me confidence that this review will be thorough or honest. I expect the Forest Service to hold Roca Honda Resources LLC to genuine, verifiable compliance with NEPA, not to move this project forward until that standard is met.