



"Rosson, Kenneth, LTC,  
152FS, DO"  
<kenneth.rosson@aztu  
cs.ang.af.mil>

To: comments-southwestern-coronado@fs.fed.us  
cc:  
Subject: Rosson Family Comments on Rosemont Mine

07/13/2008 10:24 AM

7578

## Comments to USDA Forest Service on Rosemont Mine Project

Submitted by: Kenneth, Karen, Jacob and Zachary Rosson  
Address: 26951 S Wild Antelope Pl, Sonoita, AZ 85637  
Date: 10 July, 2008

Our residence is approximately 3 miles SSE of the proposed project. We are against this project as proposed or in any alternative form. We are also against the current ongoing activities such as exploratory drilling on public lands without public review, comment or recourse. The following are our comments, concerns and questions, not in priority order, which we would like addressed in the EIS as part of the NEPA process:

**1) Hwy 83 Traffic & Safety** We commute Hwy 83, 12-15 times per week. This road is narrow, winding, bumpy and potentially dangerous. Serious accidents are frequent. Upon review of the proposed mining operations and associated estimates of traffic, we have concerns with the safety of my family and the community. Accidents will increase frequency and severity. Furthermore, the road will degrade rapidly with the frequency of mining traffic and the weight of the trucks. Maintenance will be a problem. We have concerns about the Arizona taxpayer bearing these maintenance costs versus the mining company.

- a) Please provide the statistical estimate of increased accidents for weekdays, weekends and night time driving due to the proposed mining operations. Please delineate between injury accidents and deadly accidents. Provide the groundrules and assumptions for these calculations and the estimates of error on these input data such as experience and level of training of operators, and the effect on the statistical results. Also consider the estimated increase in traffic due to growth in the Tucson and Vail community populations projected in this timeframe.
- b) How will the value of life, injury, and medical costs be considered in this decision? Will this be qualitative or quantitative with respect to the economic analysis and the viability of the mine?
- c) Estimate the increase in road maintenance costs on a yearly basis and for the 20 year period. Please provide the assumptions and error on these calculations as in item a) above. Will the Arizona taxpayers be expected to cover these costs? Will the economic analysis take this into account?
- d) Estimate the increase in local emergency response costs for both accidents and potential hazardous materials incidents. Please provide the assumptions and error on these calculations as

in item a) above. Will the local taxpayers of the Sonoita, Vail and Sahuarita communities be expected to cover these costs?

e) In addition to highway safety, there is an aspect of explosives and hazardous materials security. This includes aspects of transport, storage and personnel access. Please identify the control processes, risks and probabilities of failure of these processes, and associated cost of the consequence of failure(s).

f) How will the above risks and direct costs be considered in the economic viability analysis and the decision?

**Bottom line: If the mine goes in...prior to any mining activity a four lane highway MUST be built and paid for by the mining company. This four lane highway would be from I-10 to the exit to the mine. Again, this MUST happen prior to any mining activity.**

**2) Water Quantity and Quality** Although the water supply for the mine is proposed to be taken from lower elevation aquifers (Sahuarita) with recharge and replacement to be performed with CAP water, we have serious concerns about the effects on the upper (Las Cienegas) aquifer levels. Given the uncertainties in CAP availability, combined with wells already drilled at the proposed mining site and the effect of the open pit, its depth and resultant water drainage into it, we question the true impact on the riparian habitat of the Las Cienegas Conservation Reserve, the Sonoita community and our well. Additionally, we are concerned about water quality in these aquifers. Although chemical processing is proposed to be done in lined leach areas, there is always potential for escape of chemicals and metals from these areas and associated waste ponds. Furthermore, waste rock will always contain some amount of residual chemical and metal oxides subject to runoff from the dry tailings piles. We are concerned about the long term effect of this runoff down Davidson Canyon and subsequent migration into the groundwater. This assessment should be analyzed for long term impacts, not 25, 50 or 100 years, but 200 years or more. Tucson has existed longer than this and will be here for long into the future as will the source contaminants. The future value of the quantity and quality of these aquifers should not be underestimated. Even a mere risk concerning this resource should be grounds for "no action." The MPO proposes to take the "monitoring" approach in which case it will be too late given the likely accumulated investment into the mine and pressure to continue operations.

a) Please provide the statistical estimate of effects for a minimum of 25 years on our well. The Arizona Department of Water Resources well registration number of our well is 55-210725 located on our property. Provide the groundrules and assumptions for these calculations and the estimates of error on these inputs and the effect on the statistical results. As a minimum, please include the effects of weather (recharge), CAP availability (and potential non-availability), growth projections for the surrounding communities which will create additional water demand, permeability of all relevant geology between the water recharge sources and the extraction or drainage locations, uncertainties in this geology and permeability, effects of seismic disturbances due to blasting on this permeability and all relevant data on the aquifer depth and flow rate data. Please provide an uncertainty assessment in the analysis.

b) Please estimate the effect on quality of water in the aquifers as a function of time. Please estimate for long term (>200 years) effects. Analysis variables should include as a minimum all natural and un-natural contaminants being processed and placed at or near the surface, the probabilities of weather and rain rates, reliability of leach field containment, variability of the tailings soil capping depth and permeability, wind and rain erosion of the soil capping, Davison Canyon geology and substrate permeability between the surface and the local water table, and migration of these local watershed contaminants to the surrounding aquifers. Consideration should also be given the effect of dust contaminants and eventual migration from the operations site (item 5 below). Please provide an uncertainty analysis on these predicted effects.

c) How will the negative value of these effects be considered in the economic viability analysis?

d) Should my well be affected in either quantity or quality, how will we be compensated and what is the certainty of compensation?

**Bottom line: Our well currently provides a potential of 40+ GPM for our household and a wildlife habitat improvement project constructed with the funding and cooperation of the Department of Agriculture and the Natural Resources Conservation Service for the local wildlife, specifically the Pronghorn Antelope. The mine would be responsible for any change to our current well status and quality.**

**3) Property Values** We believe the value of our property has been and will be further affected from this proposed mine operation. This is and will be due to the view-shed degradation on Hwy 83, noise from the 24/7 mining operations, and general quality of life and environmental degradation concerns contained herein.

a) How will we be compensated for this reduction in value?

b) How will the economic analysis take this into account?

c) Will the PIMA County tax assessor's office take this into account for valuations?

d) Is the PIMA County assessor's office being consulted to obtain these economic inputs?

**#4) Natural Environment.** The Cienegas valley is a unique environment to all southern AZ with its high altitude grasslands and wildlife. It is quiet, peaceful and beautiful. Scenic Hwy 83 is the gateway to this environment which will be impacted forever if this project goes forward. Regular blasting with the sonic & seismic effects could likely impact local species and their distribution. We know it will affect our family and the local community.

a) Please provide an analysis and any related studies on the impact of species distribution due to the effects of blasting. Will the local species such as owls, hawks and antelope currently ranging

in the Northeast section of the Cienegas Reserve be displaced? If they are displaced, can it be estimated by how much and how far?

b) Please provide an analysis of the noise levels at our property for both background (steadystate) sound due to vehicle, machine and power generation equipment and transient noise due to blasting and drilling and the frequency thereof. Power generation equipment should include both onsite and offsite locations such as the Greaterville substation.

c) How will this degradation be valued and considered in the analysis and the decision?

**Bottom line: No one can predict the environmental impact of the mine. Answer this...why can't the tailings be blended into the surrounding landscape? We will never understand, with all of the technology and concern for our environment, why mine tailings have to look so "manmade." If the mine goes in, have the mining company be the first to provide a hidden tailing area, blending into the environment in look, vegetation and scope.**

**5) Air Quality.** There is no doubt that local air quality will be affected by mining operations which will generate dust and vehicle emissions. we am concerned about the immediate and long term effects on human health and habitat.

a) Please provide analysis of air constituents as a function of distance and direction from mining operations and year of operation. Analysis should include all stimulus factors such as dust generation from blasting, shoveling, hauling, dumping, and grading, emissions from power generation and vehicles both onsite and in transit, use of chemical volatiles in the course of operations, effectiveness of dust control techniques, variability of the local climate and winds, and changes in the local micro-climate due to effects created by mining operations such as wind pattern changes created from the pit and waste tailing mounds. Please provide an uncertainty analysis on these predicted effects.

b) Please provide the long term human health effects of item a above.

c) Please provide the plant and animal effects of item a above.

d) How will this degradation be valued and considered in the analysis and the decision?

**6) Light pollution.** In addition to the attractive natural environment of the area, another key reason we moved here is the dark night sky. This interest is shared by many local astronomers both amateur and professional as witnessed by the many observatories in the area. It has been stated that mining operations will comply with the Mt Hopkins lighting code unless safety is involved. It should be noted here that bright light does not necessarily translate to safety. In certain cases, transition from light to dark or the creation of shadows from bright light, can actually be less safe. For the operations to date, supporting exploratory drilling and limited development, these lighting codes have been ignored. These points were raised at the public scoping hearings and yet bright lighting continues to be aimed upward as of the date of these comments raising questions in my mind as to the level of commitment of the company. The

ultimate effect of large scale operations and lighting code compliance remains highly uncertain.

**a)** Please provide an analysis of light pollution as a function of distance and direction from mining operations and year of operation. It is requested that energy flux density and spectral content be provided. Analysis should include all sources such as fixed, temporary and vehicular lighting, direction of lighting, power output, spectral content of output, reflectance factors such as dust (item 5 above) and emissions from operations, and the changes in ground albedo (reflectance) due to the evolution of the operations landscape. Please provide an uncertainty analysis on these predicted effects.

**7) Other Economic Matters.** In addition to the above specific comments and their associated effect on value of the decision, the following additional economic questions are provided.

**a)** Will the increased power demands of the MPO raise our utility rates, and if so, by how much? What is the uncertainty in the answer? Will there be an effect on the quality of our electrical service?

**b)** How will the long term negative effect on local economies be considered after the mine is closed?

**c)** Will the recent increases in fuel prices and other future inflation factors be re-considered in the mine economic feasibility?

**d)** Given the historical track record of the local mining industry with their associated closures and resultant environmental impact, how will the likely negative, long-term financial impact to the taxpayer be considered in the economic analysis?

**e)** Please summarize, other than reclamation, what potential liabilities the bonding action is intended to cover. What will be the amount of this bonding? Please disclose financial details such as bond value growth with time, risks to these bonds as a function of time, bond holder, intended rating of the bonds and intended governing legal language associated with the bonds. Please provide an uncertainty analysis in the answers.

**#8) Miscellaneous Items.** Some of these remaining comments and questions may be philosophical in nature, however, we believe they are worthy of statement.

**a)** In the USDA Forest Service Memorandum of Understanding and the Notice of Intent documents, the legalities which govern mineral exploration and development are cited. These are the Mining Law of 1872, the 1897 Organic Administration Act, the 1960 Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act, the 1970 Mining and Minerals Act and the Regulations at Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 228A. The extent of the proposed MPO will involve more than public national forest lands and mining interests. Some of these additional legal requirements are considered and governed by the EIS and NEPA process. The extent of the project will also involve private land,

BLM, and state lands, and furthermore involve county level permitting processes. It is unclear as to the total extent of federal and state laws governing the decision and rules for the development of this project. These include questions for applicability of laws concerning clean air, clean water, water rights, and Native American archeological rights, to mention a few. Since the EIS, NEPA and Record of Decision is considering a complete assessment of the impacts of the total extent of this proposed project, it is requested that all governing laws both Federal and State be delineated beyond those cited in the MOU and NOI, which are applicable to all types of land, resource usage, and risks to resources as proposed in the full extent of the MPO.

b) The EIS and NEPA process is intended to identify and analyze the environmental, social and economic impacts of the proposed project. They will comprise a part of the inputs to the Record of Decision. Other inputs will include but not be limited to financial influence, policy, politics and dynamic evolution of all of these. One example of these dynamics is the recent Mining Reform Act passed in the House and currently in the Senate for consideration. If this law is passed before the ROD, will it affect the ROD? Given the ultimate responsibility for the ROD, we ask the USDA Forest Service, what will be the weighting criteria (ranking of importance) of all input considerations by which the decision will be made? And furthermore, what level of consideration will be given to risks and uncertainties in the input data?

**In Summary**, we wish to thank the USDA Forest Service the opportunity to participate in the public hearings and to make written comments into the EIS and NEPA process. As can be seen by the nature of our questions, we wish to highlight the importance of off-nominal error analysis and assessment of the variability of assumptions. If the uncertainty in the answer is large enough, then the answer is suspect to begin with. All good analysis and decision making should take this into account.

// Signed //

**Kenneth R Rosson**

**Karen C Rosson**

**Jacob W Rosson**

**Zachary R Rosson**

26951 S Wild Antelope Pl  
Sonoita, AZ 85637

HC1 Box 1031  
Sonoita, AZ 85637

**(residence)**

**(mailing)**

Attached <<Rosson Comments Rosemont.doc>>

**//SIGNED//**

KENNETH "**RAILER**" ROSSON, LTC, AZANG  
162nd Fighter Wing, OG/OSS  
Work: 520-295-6704/DSN 844  
Cell: 520-444-8553  
Fax: 520-295-6293



E-mail: [kenneth.rosson@aztucs.ang.af.mil](mailto:kenneth.rosson@aztucs.ang.af.mil) Rosson Comments Rosemont.doc

## Comments to USDA Forest Service on Rosemont Mine Project

Submitted by: Kenneth, Karen, Jacob and Zachary Rosson  
Address: 26951 S Wild Antelope Pl, Sonoita, AZ 85637  
Date: 10 July, 2008

Our residence is approximately 3 miles SSE of the proposed project. We are against this project as proposed or in any alternative form. We are also against the current ongoing activities such as exploratory drilling on public lands without public review, comment or recourse. The following are our comments, concerns and questions, not in priority order, which we would like addressed in the EIS as part of the NEPA process:

**1) Hwy 83 Traffic & Safety** We commute Hwy 83, 12-15 times per week. This road is narrow, winding, bumpy and potentially dangerous. Serious accidents are frequent. Upon review of the proposed mining operations and associated estimates of traffic, we have concerns with the safety of my family and the community. Accidents will increase frequency and severity. Furthermore, the road will degrade rapidly with the frequency of mining traffic and the weight of the trucks. Maintenance will be a problem. We have concerns about the Arizona taxpayer bearing these maintenance costs versus the mining company.

a) Please provide the statistical estimate of increased accidents for weekdays, weekends and night time driving due to the proposed mining operations. Please delineate between injury accidents and deadly accidents. Provide the groundrules and assumptions for these calculations and the estimates of error on these input data such as experience and level of training of operators, and the effect on the statistical results. Also consider the estimated increase in traffic due to growth in the Tucson and Vail community populations projected in this timeframe.

b) How will the value of life, injury, and medical costs be considered in this decision? Will this be qualitative or quantitative with respect to the economic analysis and the viability of the mine?

c) Estimate the increase in road maintenance costs on a yearly basis and for the 20 year period. Please provide the assumptions and error on these calculations as in item a) above. Will the Arizona taxpayers be expected to cover these costs? Will the economic analysis take this into account?

d) Estimate the increase in local emergency response costs for both accidents and potential hazardous materials incidents. Please provide the assumptions and error on these calculations as in item a) above. Will the local taxpayers of the Sonoita, Vail and Sahuarita communities be expected to cover these costs?

e) In addition to highway safety, there is an aspect of explosives and hazardous materials security. This includes aspects of transport, storage and personnel access. Please identify the control processes, risks and probabilities of failure of these processes, and associated cost of the consequence of failure(s).

f) How will the above risks and direct costs be considered in the economic viability analysis and the decision?

**Bottom line: If the mine goes in...prior to any mining activity a four lane highway MUST be built and paid for by the mining company. This four lane highway would be from I-10 to the exit to the mine. Again, this MUST happen prior to any mining activity.**

**2) Water Quantity and Quality** Although the water supply for the mine is proposed to be taken from lower elevation aquifers (Sahuarita) with recharge and replacement to be performed with CAP water, we have serious concerns about the effects on the upper (Las Cienegas) aquifer levels. Given the uncertainties in CAP availability, combined with wells already drilled at the proposed mining site and the effect of the open pit, its depth and

resultant water drainage into it, we question the true impact on the riparian habitat of the Las Cienegas Conservation Reserve, the Sonoita community and our well. Additionally, we are concerned about water quality in these aquifers. Although chemical processing is proposed to be done in lined leach areas, there is always potential for escape of chemicals and metals from these areas and associated waste ponds. Furthermore, waste rock will always contain some amount of residual chemical and metal oxides subject to runoff from the dry tailings piles. We are concerned about the long term effect of this runoff down Davidson Canyon and subsequent migration into the groundwater. This assessment should be analyzed for long term impacts, not 25, 50 or 100 years, but 200 years or more. Tucson has existed longer than this and will be here for long into the future as will the source contaminants. The future value of the quantity and quality of these aquifers should not be underestimated. Even a mere risk concerning this resource should be grounds for “no action.” The MPO proposes to take the “monitoring” approach in which case it will be too late given the likely accumulated investment into the mine and pressure to continue operations.

a) Please provide the statistical estimate of effects for a minimum of 25 years on our well. The Arizona Department of Water Resources well registration number of our well is 55-210725 located on our property. Provide the groundrules and assumptions for these calculations and the estimates of error on these inputs and the effect on the statistical results. As a minimum, please include the effects of weather (recharge), CAP availability (and potential non-availability), growth projections for the surrounding communities which will create additional water demand, permeability of all relevant geology between the water recharge sources and the extraction or drainage locations, uncertainties in this geology and permeability, effects of seismic disturbances due to blasting on this permeability and all relevant data on the aquifer depth and flow rate data. Please provide an uncertainty assessment in the analysis.

b) Please estimate the effect on quality of water in the aquifers as a function of time. Please estimate for long term (>200 years) effects. Analysis variables should include as a minimum all natural and un-natural contaminants being processed and placed at or near the surface, the probabilities of weather and rain rates, reliability of leach field containment, variability of the tailings soil capping depth and permeability, wind and rain erosion of the soil capping, Davison Canyon geology and substrate permeability between the surface and the local water table, and migration of these local watershed contaminants to the surrounding aquifers. Consideration should also be given the effect of dust contaminants and eventual migration from the operations site (item 5 below). Please provide an uncertainty analysis on these predicted effects.

c) How will the negative value of these effects be considered in the economic viability analysis?

d) Should my well be affected in either quantity or quality, how will we be compensated and what is the certainty of compensation?

**Bottom line: Our well currently provides a potential of 40+ GPM for our household and a wildlife habitat improvement project constructed with the funding and cooperation of the Department of Agriculture and the Natural Resources Conservation Service for the local wildlife, specifically the Pronghorn Antelope. The mine would be responsible for any change to our current well status and quality.**

**3) Property Values** We believe the value of our property has been and will be further affected from this proposed mine operation. This is and will be due to the view-shed degradation on Hwy 83, noise from the 24/7 mining operations, and general quality of life and environmental degradation concerns contained herein.

a) How will we be compensated for this reduction in value?

b) How will the economic analysis take this into account?

- c) Will the PIMA County tax assessor's office take this into account for valuations?
- d) Is the PIMA County assessor's office being consulted to obtain these economic inputs?

**#4) Natural Environment.** The Cienegas valley is a unique environment to all southern AZ with its high altitude grasslands and wildlife. It is quiet, peaceful and beautiful. Scenic Hwy 83 is the gateway to this environment which will be impacted forever if this project goes forward. Regular blasting with the sonic & seismic effects could likely impact local species and their distribution. We know it will affect our family and the local community.

- a) Please provide an analysis and any related studies on the impact of species distribution due to the effects of blasting. Will the local species such as owls, hawks and antelope currently ranging in the Northeast section of the Cienegas Reserve be displaced? If they are displaced, can it be estimated by how much and how far?
- b) Please provide an analysis of the noise levels at our property for both background (steadystate) sound due to vehicle, machine and power generation equipment and transient noise due to blasting and drilling and the frequency thereof. Power generation equipment should include both onsite and offsite locations such as the Greaterville substation.
- c) How will this degradation be valued and considered in the analysis and the decision?

**Bottom line: No one can predict the environmental impact of the mine. Answer this...why can't the tailings be blended into the surrounding landscape? We will never understand, with all of the technology and concern for our environment, why mine tailings have to look so "manmade." If the mine goes in, have the mining company be the first to provide a hidden tailing area, blending into the environment in look, vegetation and scope.**

**5) Air Quality.** There is no doubt that local air quality will be affected by mining operations which will generate dust and vehicle emissions. we am concerned about the immediate and long term effects on human health and habitat.

- a) Please provide analysis of air constituents as a function of distance and direction from mining operations and year of operation. Analysis should include all stimulus factors such as dust generation from blasting, shoveling, hauling, dumping, and grading, emissions from power generation and vehicles both onsite and in transit, use of chemical volatiles in the course of operations, effectiveness of dust control techniques, variability of the local climate and winds, and changes in the local micro-climate due to effects created by mining operations such as wind pattern changes created from the pit and waste tailing mounds. Please provide an uncertainty analysis on these predicted effects.
- b) Please provide the long term human health effects of item a above.
- c) Please provide the plant and animal effects of item a above.
- d) How will this degradation be valued and considered in the analysis and the decision?

**6) Light pollution.** In addition to the attractive natural environment of the area, another key reason we moved here is the dark night sky. This interest is shared by many local astronomers both amateur and professional as witnessed by the many observatories in the area. It has been stated that mining operations will comply with the Mt Hopkins lighting code unless safety is involved. It should be noted here that bright light does not necessarily translate to safety. In certain cases, transition from light to dark or the creation of shadows from bright light, can actually be

less safe. For the operations to date, supporting exploratory drilling and limited development, these lighting codes have been ignored. These points were raised at the public scoping hearings and yet bright lighting continues to be aimed upward as of the date of these comments raising questions in my mind as to the level of commitment of the company. The ultimate effect of large scale operations and lighting code compliance remains highly uncertain.

a) Please provide an analysis of light pollution as a function of distance and direction from mining operations and year of operation. It is requested that energy flux density and spectral content be provided. Analysis should include all sources such as fixed, temporary and vehicular lighting, direction of lighting, power output, spectral content of output, reflectance factors such as dust (item 5 above) and emissions from operations, and the changes in ground albedo (reflectance) due to the evolution of the operations landscape. Please provide an uncertainty analysis on these predicted effects.

**7) Other Economic Matters.** In addition to the above specific comments and their associated effect on value of the decision, the following additional economic questions are provided.

a) Will the increased power demands of the MPO raise our utility rates, and if so, by how much? What is the uncertainty in the answer? Will there be an effect on the quality of our electrical service?

b) How will the long term negative effect on local economies be considered after the mine is closed?

c) Will the recent increases in fuel prices and other future inflation factors be re-considered in the mine economic feasibility?

d) Given the historical track record of the local mining industry with their associated closures and resultant environmental impact, how will the likely negative, long-term financial impact to the taxpayer be considered in the economic analysis?

e) Please summarize, other than reclamation, what potential liabilities the bonding action is intended to cover. What will be the amount of this bonding? Please disclose financial details such as bond value growth with time, risks to these bonds as a function of time, bond holder, intended rating of the bonds and intended governing legal language associated with the bonds. Please provide an uncertainty analysis in the answers.

**#8) Miscellaneous Items.** Some of these remaining comments and questions may be philosophical in nature, however, we believe they are worthy of statement.

a) In the USDA Forest Service Memorandum of Understanding and the Notice of Intent documents, the legalities which govern mineral exploration and development are cited. These are the Mining Law of 1872, the 1897 Organic Administration Act, the 1960 Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act, the 1970 Mining and Minerals Act and the Regulations at Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 228A. The extent of the proposed MPO will involve more than public national forest lands and mining interests. Some of these additional legal requirements are considered and governed by the EIS and NEPA process. The extent of the project will also involve private land, BLM, and state lands, and furthermore involve county level permitting processes. It is unclear as to the total extent of federal and state laws governing the decision and rules for the development of this project. These include questions for applicability of laws concerning clean air, clean water, water rights, and Native American archeological rights, to mention a few. Since the EIS, NEPA and Record of Decision is considering a complete assessment of the impacts of the total extent of this proposed project, it is requested that all governing laws both Federal and State be delineated beyond those cited in the MOU and NOI, which are applicable to all types of land, resource usage, and risks to resources as proposed in the full extent of the MPO.

b) The EIS and NEPA process is intended to identify and analyze the environmental, social and economic impacts of the proposed project. They will comprise a part of the inputs to the Record of Decision. Other inputs will include but not be limited to financial influence, policy, politics and dynamic evolution of all of these. One example of these dynamics is the recent Mining Reform Act passed in the House and currently in the Senate for consideration. If this law is passed before the ROD, will it affect the ROD? Given the ultimate responsibility for the ROD, we ask the USDA Forest Service, what will be the weighting criteria (ranking of importance) of all input considerations by which the decision will be made? And furthermore, what level of consideration will given to risks and uncertainties in the input data?

**In Summary**, we wish to thank the USDA Forest Service the opportunity to participate in the public hearings and to make written comments into the EIS and NEPA process. As can be seen by the nature of our questions, we wish to highlight the importance of off-nominal error analysis and assessment of the variability of assumptions. If the uncertainty in the answer is large enough, then the answer is suspect to begin with. All good analysis and decision making should take this into account.

// Signed //

**Kenneth R Rosson**

**Karen C Rosson**

**Jacob W Rosson**

**Zachary R Rosson**

26951 S Wild Antelope Pl

Sonoita, AZ 85637

**(residence)**

HC1 Box 1031

Sonoita, AZ 85637

**(mailing)**