

# **Stibnite Gold Project EIS Draft Appendix A**

Forest Plan Consistency Review and  
Amendments

This page intentionally left blank.

## Table of Contents

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS.....</b>                                    | <b>A-3</b> |
| Payette National Forest Amendment.....  | A-4        |
| Boise National Forest Amendment .....   | A-4        |
| Substantive Requirements Related to the above Payette and Boise Forest Plan Direction ..... | A-22       |

## Tables

|         |  |      |
|---------|--|------|
| Table 1 | Payette National Forest Standards to be Amended by the Addition of, “This standard does not apply to the Stibnite Gold Project ([ROD citation]).” unless otherwise noted under “Rationale” ..... | A-5  |
| Table 2 | Boise National Forest Standards Which Are Being Analyzed for Inclusion in the Boise Forest Plan Amendment.....   | A-13 |

## LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

The Payette and Boise National Forests are managed under separate Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP or Forest Plan): Payette National Forest (PNF) Land and Resource Management Plan 2003 and the Boise National Forest (BNF) Land and Resource Management Plan 2003 as amended in 2010.

The National Forest Management Act (NFMA) requires that proposed projects, including third-party proposals subject to permits, be consistent with the Forest Plan of the National Forest where the project would occur (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 219.15). When a project is not consistent with the Forest Plan where the project would occur, the Forest Service has the following options: (1) modify the proposed project to make it consistent with the Forest Plan; (2) reject the proposal; (3) amend the Forest Plan so that the project would be consistent with the plan as amended; or (4) amend the Forest Plan contemporaneously with the approval of the project so the project would be consistent with the plan as amended. The fourth option is limited to apply only to the project (36 CFR 219.15(c)).

Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. (Midas Gold) incorporated project design features into their proposal to try to be consistent with the Forest Plans, but even with adjustments to the proposal, mitigations, and following Best Management Practices (BMPs), the plan of operations would be inconsistent with some standards and guidelines in the applicable Forest Plans. Therefore, the Forest Plans would need to be amended before the plan of operations could be approved. With the proposed amendments described below, the Stibnite Gold Project plan of operations would be consistent with the Forest Plans. The scope and scale of the proposed amendments is the Stibnite Gold Project Area and is for the duration of the project for implementation of the Selected Alternative as identified in the final Record of Decision.

The purpose of the amendments is to ensure consistency between the Stibnite Gold Project and the Forest Plans. The planning rule requirement that relates to the purposes of the Stibnite Gold Project is 36 CFR 219.10(a) Integrated resource management for multiple use, including 219.10(a)(2) Renewable and nonrenewable energy and mineral resources. The applicability of other planning rule requirements is described elsewhere in this appendix.

The Forest Plans for both the Boise and Payette National Forests use the term “waive” to indicate an amendment that would mean a standard does not apply to a specific project. The 2012 Planning Rule uses the word “remove” with the same meaning. For purposes of compliance with both the Forest Plans and the Planning Rule, for the Stibnite Gold Project Plan Amendments the two terms are treated as synonymous.

## **PAYETTE NATIONAL FOREST AMENDMENT**

The Payette Forest Plan amendment would waive/remove up to 34 standards and their related guidelines in the 2003 Payette Forest Plan for the Stibnite Gold Project on the Payette National Forest. An evaluation of how the proposed amendment relates to the planning requirements in 36 CFR 219.8-219.11 is below. The effects of the amendment is the effects of the project as described in the EIS. The amendment applies to all action alternatives, though the relationship between standards/guidelines and project components or subcomponents may vary by alternative.

To approve the Stibnite Gold Project, the proposed plan amendment for the Payette Forest Plan would be to add, "This standard does not apply to the Stibnite Gold Project signed Record of Decision." to the standards identified in Table 1.

## **BOISE NATIONAL FOREST AMENDMENT**

The Boise Forest Plan amendment would waive up to 46 standards found in the 2010 Boise Forest Plan for the Stibnite Gold Project on the Boise National Forest. An evaluation of how the proposed amendments relate to the planning requirements in 36 CFR 219.8-219.11 is below. The effects of the amendment are the effects of the project as described in the EIS. The amendment applies to all action alternatives, though the relationship between standards/guidelines and project components or subcomponents may vary by alternative.

To approve the Stibnite Gold Project, the proposed plan amendment for the Boise Forest Plan would be to add, "This standard does not apply to the Stibnite Gold Project signed Record of Decision." to the standards identified in Table 2.

**Table 1 Payette National Forest Standards to be Amended by the Addition of, “This standard does not apply to the Stibnite Gold Project ([ROD citation]).” unless otherwise noted under “Rationale”**

|   | Payette Forest Plan Direction   | Applicable Standard | Rationale  |
|---|---|---------------------|--|
| 1 | Management actions that occur within occupied sensitive plant species habitat must incorporate measures to ensure habitat is maintained where it is within desired conditions, or restored where degraded.  | PNF BTST01          | Sensitive plant species surveys have not been completed for the project area so some impacts to occupied sensitive plant species habitat may be unavoidable even with mitigation.                          |
| 2 | Do not allow collection of sensitive plants except for research or scientific purposes, under the direction of the Forest or Regional Botanist.   | PNF BTST02          | Collection of sensitive plants may be needed for reclamation purposes.   |
| 3 | Design and implement projects to meet the Forest Service approved portions of Conservation Strategies and Agreements for Sensitive species.   | PNF BTST03          | Sensitive plant species surveys have not been completed for the project area and there may be unavoidable impacts to some sensitive species that may be covered in Conservation Strategies and Agreements. |
| 4 | Easement acquisition shall conform to right-of-way planning and shall include existing Forest Transportation System roads and trails as well as project-related new construction. Coordinate with intermingled and adjacent landowners and local governments in developing roads or road systems that serve the needs of all parties. Obtain rights-of-way utilizing eminent domain only if necessary.  | PNF LSST02          | Some project infrastructure may not fully comply with right-of-way planning and may not serve the needs of all parties.  |
| 5 | Where the authority to do so was retained, and in cooperation with affected state, tribal, and local governments, holders of water rights, and other interested parties, require that water diversion structures: a) Be monitored to limit water withdrawals to the amount of the water right and the time period of the water right; and b) Have either fish screens, or other means, to prevent fish entrapment or entrainment. Where the authority was not retained, negotiate changes to meet other Forest resource objectives wherever possible. | PNF LSST12          | A comprehensive water management plan has not yet been provided by Midas Gold for the Stibnite Gold Project so it is undetermined if the project would meet this standard.                                 |

STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|   | Payette Forest Plan Direction  | Applicable Standard | Rationale  |
|---|--|---------------------|--|
| 6 | <p>Prohibit solid and sanitary waste facilities in Riparian Conservation Areas (RCAs). If no alternative to locating mine waste (waste rock, spent ore, tailings) facilities in RCAs exists, then:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyze waste material using the best conventional methods and analytic techniques to determine its chemical and physical stability characteristics.</li> <li>• Locate and design waste facilities using the best conventional geochemical and geotechnical predictive tools to ensure mass stability and prevent the release of acid or toxic materials. If the best conventional technology is not sufficient to prevent such releases and ensure stability over the long term, and such releases or instability would result in exceedance of established water quality standards or would degrade surface resources, prohibit such facilities in RCAs.</li> <li>• Monitor waste and waste facilities to confirm predictions of chemical and physical stability, and make adjustments to operations as needed to avoid degrading effects to beneficial uses and native and desired non-native fish and their habitats.</li> <li>• Reclaim and monitor waste facilities to ensure chemical and physical stability and revegetation to avoid degrading effects to beneficial uses and native and desired non-native fish and their habitats.</li> </ul> <p>Require reclamation bonds adequate to ensure long-term chemical and physical stability and successful revegetation of mine waste facilities.</p> | PNF MIST09          | <p>Mine waste, spent ore, and tailings facilities would be constructed in RCAs. Analysis is showing long term increases in toxic metals due to these facilities and that long term degradation of surface resources would occur.</p> |
| 7 | <p>All projects shall be designed to meet the adopted Visual Quality Objectives (VQOs) as identified in Management Area direction and represented on the Forest VQO map.</p>   | PNF SCST01          | <p>Visual Quality Objectives would likely not be met at the mine site even with mitigation.</p>  |
| 8 | <p>Management activities that may affect soil detrimental disturbance (DD) shall meet the following requirements: a) In an activity area where existing conditions of DD are below 15 percent of the area, management activities shall leave the area in a condition of 15 percent or less detrimental soil disturbance following completion of the activities. b) In an activity area where existing conditions of</p>  | PNF SWST02          | <p>Impacts to soil resources are of such magnitude that detrimental disturbance would occur and would likely not meet the requirements of this standard.</p>   |



STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|    | Payette Forest Plan Direction   | Applicable Standard | Rationale  |
|----|---|---------------------|--|
|    | DD exceed 15 percent of the area, management activities shall include mitigation and restoration so that DD levels are moved back toward 15 percent or less following completion of activities. To estimate soil DD, it is essential that the glossary definitions for “activity area, detrimental soil disturbance and total soil resource commitment” (TSRC) are clearly understood.  |                     |  |
| 9  | Management activities that may affect Total Soil Resource Commitment (TSRC) shall meet the following requirements: a) In an activity area where existing conditions of TSRC are below 5 percent of the area, management activities shall leave the area in a condition of 5 percent or less TSRC following completion of the activities. b) In an activity area where existing conditions of TSRC exceed 5 percent of the area, management activities shall include mitigation and restoration so that TSRC levels are moved back toward 5 percent or less following completion of activities. To estimate TSRC it is essential that the glossary definitions for “activity area, detrimental soil disturbance and total soil resource commitment” are clearly understood.  | PNF SWST03          | Five percent TSRC would be exceeded.   |
| 10 | In cooperation with affected State, Tribal, and local governments, holders of water rights, and other interested parties, determine instream flows needed for protection of water-related resources when assessing permit or license actions such as mining claim development, hydropower development, snowmaking, or water transmission facilities. When determining the sufficient quality, quantity, and timing of flows, use the following four factors: (a) maintenance and restoration of habitat for fish, wildlife, and riparian plant communities; (b) maintenance of channel stability and capacity for passing floods; (c) maintenance of recreational opportunities such as fishing, swimming, boating, and aesthetic enjoyment; and (d) maintenance of water quality and natural temperature regimes. Make sufficient flows a condition of permit or license issuance. | PNF SWST06          | A water resource management plan has not yet been provided by Midas Gold so determination of instream flows needed for protection of water-related resources have not been accomplished. |
| 11 | Within legal authorities, ensure the new proposed management activities within watersheds containing 303(d) listed water bodies improve or maintain overall progress  | PNF SWST07          | Effects due to operations could delay progress toward beneficial uses attainment.  |

STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|    | Payette Forest Plan Direction  | Applicable Standard | Rationale  |
|----|--|---------------------|--|
|    | toward beneficial use attainment for pollutants that led to the listing.   |                     |  |
| 12 | In fish-bearing waters, do not authorize new surface diversions unless they provide upstream and downstream fish passage and, if needed, include either fish screens or other means to prevent fish entrapment/entrainment.  | PNF SWST09          | No upstream fish passage would be provided in Meadow Creek.  |
| 13 | Trees or snags that are felled within RCAs must be left unless determined not to be necessary for achieving soil, water, riparian, and aquatic desired conditions. Felled trees or snags left in RCAs shall be left intact unless resource protection (e.g., the risk of insect infestation is unacceptable) or public safety requires bucking them into smaller pieces.   | PNF SWST10          | Trees and snags necessary for achieving soil, water, riparian, and aquatic desired conditions would be removed from RCAs to allow operations.  |
| 14 | Site-specific analysis or field verification of broad-scale landslide-prone models shall be conducted in representative areas that are identified as landslide prone during site/project-scale analysis involving proposed management actions that may alter soil-hydrologic processes. Based on the analysis findings, design management actions to avoid the potential for triggering landslides. Refer to the Implementation Guide for Management on Landslide and Landslide Prone Areas, located in Appendix B (of the Payette Forest Plan) to help determine compliance with this standard. | PNF SWST12          | Project components would be located in landslide prone areas and mitigation measures may not be sufficient to avoid triggering landslides.   |
| 15 | Design and implement projects to meet the terms of Forest Service approved portions of recovery plans. If a recovery plan does not yet exist, use the best information available (for example, Biological Assessments [BAs], Biological Opinions [BOs], letters of concurrence, Forest Service-approved portions of Conservation Strategies) until a recovery plan is written and approved.  | PNF TEST03          | The project would not be consistent with consultation on the Payette Forest Plan. Project specific consultation regarding Endangered Species Act (ESA) is underway; however, it is anticipated that the project would not meet some portions of recovery plans for anadromous fish and possibly for other species. |
| 16 | Management actions that have adverse effects on Proposed or Candidate species or their habitats, shall not be allowed if the effects of those actions would contribute to listing of the species as Threatened or Endangered under the ESA.  | PNF TEST04          | ESA consultation is underway; however, it is currently unknown if the project would contribute to listing.   |

STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|    | Payette Forest Plan Direction   | Applicable Standard | Rationale   |
|----|---|---------------------|---|
| 17 | In Threatened, Endangered, Proposed or Candidate (TEPC) fish-bearing waters, do not authorize new surface diversions unless they provide upstream and downstream fish passage and, if needed, include either fish screens that meet NMFS (NOAA) Fisheries and/or USFWS criteria or other means to prevent fish entrapment or entrainment.   | PNF TEST07          | Stream diversions during construction, operations, and closure/post-closure phases may not meet this standard.  |
| 18 | Avoid management actions within occupied TEPC plant species habitat that would adversely affect the long-term persistence of those species.   | PNF TEST08          | ESA consultation is underway; however, TEPC plant species habitat surveys have not yet been completed and impacts have not been determined at this time.                              |
| 19 | New facilities for storage of fuels and other toxicants shall be located outside of occupied TEPC plant habitat.  | PNF TEST11          | Site specific details are still being developed for the phases of the project and it has not yet been determined where toxicants may be stored in relation to whitebark pine habitat. |
| 20 | Unless a broad-scale assessment has been completed that substantiates different historical levels of unsuitable habitat, limit disturbance within each Lynx Administrative Unit (LAU) as follows: If more than 30 percent of lynx habitat within a LAU is currently in unsuitable condition, no additional habitat may be changed to unsuitable habitat as a result of vegetative management projects. Fire use, or fire hazard reduction and associated vegetation management activities within the wildland urban interface watersheds, that develop or maintain fuel profiles needed to reduce the risk of wildfire threats to the wildland urban interface areas, are NOT bound by this standard. | PNF TEST15          | Project area LAUs currently exceed 30 percent of lynx habitat in an unsuitable condition. Additional habitat would be converted to unsuitable condition.                              |
| 21 | Avoid adverse effects from locatable mineral operations to TEPC plant species and occupied habitat.   | PNF TEST28          | Clearing for mining operations may cause adverse effects to whitebark pine.   |
| 22 | Adverse effects from new facilities to occupied TEPC plant habitat shall be avoided.  | PNF TEST31          | Facilities associated with the mine project would cause adverse effects to occupied TEPC plant habitat (whitebark pine).  |
| 23 | Allow no net increase in groomed or designated over-the-snow routes or play areas, outside of baseline areas of consistent snow compaction, by LAU or in combination with immediately adjacent LAUs unless the Biological Assessment demonstrates the grooming or designation serves to consolidate use and improve lynx habitat. This does not apply within permitted ski area boundaries, to winter logging, and access to private inholdings. Permits,   | PNF TEST34          | There will be a net increase in groomed or designated over snow routes over baseline in LAUs.   |

STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|    | Payette Forest Plan Direction  | Applicable Standard | Rationale   |
|----|--|---------------------|---|
|    | authorizations, or agreements could expand into baseline routes or areas of existing snow compaction, and grooming could expand to routes of existing snow compaction and routes that have been designated but not groomed in the past and still comply with this standard.  |                     |   |
| 24 | During project planning, affected tribes shall be consulted regarding opportunities for restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of native plant communities that are of interest to tribes when proposed activities may affect those plant communities.  | PNF TRST04          | Tribal consultation is ongoing but restoration, enhancement, and maintenance measures have not yet been agreed upon, though it is likely that some effects to plant communities of tribal interest would be unavoidable.  |
| 25 | Maintain at least 20 percent of the acres within each forested potential vegetation group (PVG) found in a watershed (5th field hydrologic unit [HU]) in large tree size class (medium tree size class for PVG 10, persistent lodgepole pine). Where analysis of available datasets indicates that the large tree size class (medium tree size class in PVG 10) for a potential vegetation group in a watershed (5th field HU), is less than 20 percent of the total PVG acres, management actions shall not decrease the current area occupied by the large tree size class, except when: a) Fine or site/project scale analysis indicates the quality or quantity of large tree size class for a PVG within the 5th field HU would not contribute to habitat distribution or connective corridors for TEPCS and management indicator species (MIS) species in the short or long-term, and b) Management actions that cause a reduction in the area occupied by the large tree size class would not degrade or retard attainment of desired vegetation conditions in the short or long-term as described in Appendix A (of the Forest Plan), including snags and coarse woody debris. | PNF WIST01          | This standard may not be met depending on the exact location of project components in relation to large tree size class distributions by PVG within the project watersheds.   |
| 26 | Design and implement projects within occupied habitats of Sensitive species to help prevent them from becoming listed. Use Forest Service-approved portions of Conservation Strategies and Agreements, as appropriate, in the management of Sensitive species habitat to keep management actions from contributing to a trend toward listing for these species.  | PNF WIST02          | Sensitive plant species surveys have not been completed for the project area so some impacts to occupied sensitive plant species habitat may be unavoidable even with mitigation. There may be project components located in sensitive plant, wildlife, or fish habitats where this project's impacts may contribute to a trend toward listing in the future. |

STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|    | Payette Forest Plan Direction  | Applicable Standard               | Rationale  |
|----|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| 27 | Mitigate management actions within known nesting or denning sites of MIS or Sensitive species if those actions would disrupt the reproductive success of those sites during the nesting or denning period. Sites, periods, and mitigation measures shall be determined during project planning.  | PNF WIST03                        | Proposed mitigation measures may not fully avoid disruption of reproductive success during nesting or denning periods given the year-round nature of the proposed mine.  |
| 28 | In goshawk territories with known active nest stands, identify alternate and replacement nest stands during project-level planning when it is determined that the proposed activity is likely to degrade nest stand habitat.   | PNF WIST05                        | Although surveys in the project area have not identified active nest stands, there would be direct loss of mature forest habitat.  |
| 29 | Mitigate human-caused disturbances within winter/spring ranges if disturbances cause displacement of wildlife while they are occupying those ranges.   | PNF WIST06                        | Proposed mitigation measures may not fully avoid displacement of wildlife in winter/spring ranges given the year-round nature of the proposed mine and the intensity of noise, air quality, and water related impacts anticipated. |
| 30 | Changes to existing recreational settings (mapped recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) classes) are limited to only those that maintain or restore wilderness characteristics.  | PNF WRST01                        | Impacts to wilderness characteristics and related recreational settings are likely unavoidable based on the proximity of project components and subcomponents to designated wilderness and recommended wilderness.                 |
| 31 | When management actions are proposed that may compromise the outstandingly remarkable value, classification, or free-flowing character of an eligible Wild and Scenic River segment, a suitability study must be completed for that eligible river segment prior to initiating the actions.  | PNF WSST01                        | Impacts to outstandingly remarkable values, classifications, or free-flowing character of suitable Wild and Scenic River segments may be unavoidable based on the proximity of project components to such reaches.                 |
| 32 | Management actions, including salvage harvest, may only degrade aquatic, terrestrial, and watershed resource conditions in the temporary time period (up to 3 years), and must be designed to avoid resource degradation in the short term (3-15 years) and long term (greater than 15 years).   | PNF-13 #1301, MPC 3.1 Forest-wide | Approving a plan of operations is a management action that would degrade aquatic, terrestrial, and watershed resource conditions for a duration that would exceed the timeframes prescribed in this standard.                      |
| 33 | Mechanical vegetation treatments, excluding salvage harvest, may only occur where: a) The responsible official determines that wildland fire use or prescribed fire would result in unreasonable risk to public safety and structures, investments, or undesirable resource affects; and b) They maintain or restore water quality needed to fully support beneficial uses and habitat for native and desired non- | PNF-13 #1302                      | Approving a plan of operations is a management action. Activities associated with the project would degrade water quality and habitat for fish, wildlife, and plant species.   |

STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|    | Payette Forest Plan Direction   | Applicable Standard               | Rationale   |
|----|---|-----------------------------------|---|
|    | native fish species; or c) They maintain or restore habitat for native and desired non-native wildlife and plant species.   |                                   |   |
| 34 | Management actions, including salvage harvest, may only degrade aquatic, terrestrial, and watershed resource conditions in the temporary time period (up to 3 years) or short-term (3-15 years) time periods, and must be designed to avoid resource degradation of existing conditions in the long term (greater than 15 years). | PNF-13 #1306, MPC 3.2 Forest-wide | Approving a plan of operations is a management action that would degrade aquatic, terrestrial, and watershed resource conditions for a duration that would exceed the timeframes prescribed in this standard. |

Table Notes:

BTST = Botanical Resources Standard

LSST = Lands and Special Uses Standard

MIST = Mineral and Geology Resources Standard

SCST = Scenic Environment Standard

SWST = Soil, Water, Riparian, and Aquatic Resources Standard

TEST = Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, and Candidate Species Standard

TRST = Timberland Resources Standard

WIST = Wildlife Resources Standard

WRST = Wilderness, Recommended Wilderness, and Inventoried Roadless Areas Standard

WSST = Wild and Scenic Rivers Standard

**Table 2 Boise National Forest Standards Which Are Being Analyzed for Inclusion in the Boise Forest Plan Amendment**

|   | Boise Forest Plan Direction   | Applicable Standard | Rationale  |
|---|---|---------------------|--|
| 1 | Management actions that occur within occupied sensitive plant species habitat must incorporate measures to ensure habitat is maintained where it is within desired conditions, or restored where degraded.  | BNF BTST01          | Sensitive plant species surveys have not been completed for the project area. There may be impacts to occupied sensitive plant species habitat that would be unavoidable even with mitigation.                           |
| 2 | Do not allow collection of sensitive plants except for research or scientific purposes, under the direction of the Forest or Regional Botanist.   | BNF BTST02          | Collection of sensitive plants may be needed for reclamation purposes.   |
| 3 | Design and implement projects to meet the Forest Service approved portions of Conservation Strategies and Agreements for Sensitive species.   | BNF BTST03          | Sensitive plant species surveys have not been completed for the project area and there may be unavoidable impacts to some sensitive species that may be covered in Conservation Strategies and Agreements.               |
| 4 | Easement acquisition shall conform to right-of-way planning and shall include existing Forest Transportation System roads and trails as well as project-related new construction. Coordinate with intermingled and adjacent landowners and local governments in developing roads or road systems that serve the needs of all parties. Obtain rights-of-way utilizing eminent domain only if necessary.  | BNF LSST02          | Some project infrastructure may not fully comply with right-of-way planning and may not serve the needs of all parties.  |
| 5 | Where the authority to do so was retained, and in cooperation with affected state, tribal, and local governments, holders of water rights, and other interested parties, require that water diversion structures: a) Be monitored to limit water withdrawals to the amount of the water right and the time period of the water right; and b) Have either fish screens, or other means, to prevent fish entrapment or entrainment. Where the authority was not retained, negotiate changes to meet other Forest resource objectives wherever possible. | BNF LSST12          | A comprehensive water management plan has not yet been provided by Midas Gold for the Stibnite Gold Project so it is undetermined if the project would meet this standard.   |
| 6 | Prohibit solid and sanitary waste facilities in RCAs. If no alternative to locating mine waste (waste rock, spent ore, tailings) facilities in RCAs exists, then:   | BNF MIST09          | Mine waste, spent ore, and tailings facilities would be constructed in RCAs. Analysis is showing long term increases in toxic metals due to these facilities and long term degradation of surface resources would occur. |

STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|   | Boise Forest Plan Direction   | Applicable Standard | Rationale   |
|---|---|---------------------|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyze waste material using the best conventional methods and analytic techniques to determine its chemical and physical stability characteristics.</li> <li>• Locate and design waste facilities using the best conventional geochemical and geotechnical predictive tools to ensure mass stability and prevent the release of acid or toxic materials. If the best conventional technology is not sufficient to prevent such releases and ensure stability over the long term, and such releases or instability would result in exceedance of established water quality standards or would degrade surface resources, prohibit such facilities in RCAs.</li> <li>• Monitor waste and waste facilities to confirm predictions of chemical and physical stability, and make adjustments to operations as needed to avoid degrading effects to beneficial uses and native and desired non-native fish and their habitats.</li> <li>• Reclaim and monitor waste facilities to ensure chemical and physical stability and revegetation to avoid degrading effects to beneficial uses and native and desired non-native fish and their habitats.</li> </ul> <p>Require reclamation bonds adequate to ensure long-term chemical and physical stability and successful revegetation of mine waste facilities.</p> |                     |   |
| 7 | All projects shall be designed to meet the adopted Visual Quality Objectives (VQOs) as identified in Management Area direction and represented on the Forest VQO map.   | BNF SCST01          | Visual Quality Objectives would likely not be met along the Burntlog Route and the powerline corridor even with mitigation.                                 |
| 8 | Management activities that may affect soil detrimental disturbance (DD) shall meet the following requirements: a) In an activity area where existing conditions of DD are below 15 percent of the area, management activities shall leave the area in a condition of 15 percent or less detrimental soil disturbance following completion of the activities. b) In an activity area where existing conditions of DD exceed 15 percent of the area, management activities  | BNF SWST02          | Impacts to soil resources are of such magnitude that detrimental disturbance will likely occur and would likely not meet the requirements of this standard. |



STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|    | Boise Forest Plan Direction   | Applicable Standard | Rationale  |
|----|---|---------------------|--|
|    | shall include mitigation and restoration so that DD levels are moved back toward 15 percent or less following completion of activities. To estimate soil DD, it is essential that the glossary definitions for “activity area, detrimental soil disturbance and total soil resource commitment” (TSRC) are clearly understood.  |                     |  |
| 9  | Management activities that may affect Total Soil Resource Commitment (TSRC) shall meet the following requirements: a) In an activity area where existing conditions of TSRC are below 5 percent of the area, management activities shall leave the area in a condition of 5 percent or less TSRC following completion of the activities. b) In an activity area where existing conditions of TSRC exceed 5 percent of the area, management activities shall include mitigation and restoration so that TSRC levels are moved back toward 5 percent or less following completion of activities. To estimate TSRC it is essential that the glossary definitions for “activity area, detrimental soil disturbance and total soil resource commitment” are clearly understood.  | BNF SWST03          | Five percent TSRC would be exceeded.   |
| 10 | In cooperation with affected State, Tribal, and local governments, holders of water rights, and other interested parties, determine instream flows needed for protection of water-related resources when assessing permit or license actions such as mining claim development, hydropower development, snowmaking, or water transmission facilities. When determining the sufficient quality, quantity, and timing of flows, use the following four factors: (a) maintenance and restoration of habitat for fish, wildlife, and riparian plant communities; (b) maintenance of channel stability and capacity for passing floods; (c) maintenance of recreational opportunities such as fishing, swimming, boating, and aesthetic enjoyment; and (d) maintenance of water quality and natural temperature regimes. Make sufficient flows a condition of permit or license issuance. | BNF SWST06          | A water resource management plan has not yet been provided by Midas Gold so determination of instream flows needed for protection of water-related resources have not been accomplished. |
| 11 | Within legal authorities, ensure the new proposed management activities within watersheds containing 303(d) listed water bodies improve or maintain overall   | BNF SWST07          | Effects due to operations could delay progress toward beneficial uses attainment.  |

STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|    | Boise Forest Plan Direction  | Applicable Standard | Rationale   |
|----|--|---------------------|---|
|    | progress toward beneficial use attainment for pollutants that led to the listing.  |                     |   |
| 12 | In fish-bearing waters, do not authorize new surface diversions unless they provide upstream and downstream fish passage and, if needed, include either fish screens or other means to prevent fish entrapment/entrainment.  | BNF SWST09          | Design details of some project components is incomplete so it is possible that fish passage may be impaired in some cases.  |
| 13 | Trees or snags that are felled within RCAs must be left unless determined not to be necessary for achieving soil, water, riparian, and aquatic desired conditions. Felled trees or snags left in RCAs shall be left intact unless resource protection (e.g., the risk of insect infestation is unacceptable) or public safety requires bucking them into smaller pieces.   | BNF SWST10          | Trees and snags necessary for achieving soil, water, riparian, and aquatic desired conditions would be removed from RCAs to allow operations.   |
| 14 | Site-specific analysis or field verification of broad-scale landslide-prone models shall be conducted in representative areas that are identified as landslide prone during site/project-scale analysis involving proposed management actions that may alter soil-hydrologic processes. Based on the analysis findings, design management actions to avoid the potential for triggering landslides. Refer to the Implementation Guide for Management on Landslide and Landslide Prone Areas, located in Appendix B (of the Boise Forest Plan) to help determine compliance with this standard. | BNF SWST12          | Project components would be located in landslide prone areas and mitigation measures may not be sufficient to avoid triggering landslides.  |
| 15 | Design and implement projects to meet the terms of Forest Service approved portions of recovery plans. If a recovery plan does not yet exist, use the best information available (for example, BAs, BOs, letters of concurrence, Forest Service-approved portions of Conservation Strategies) until a recovery plan is written and approved.   | BNF TEST03          | The project would not be consistent with consultation on the Boise Forest Plan. Project specific consultation regarding ESA is underway; however, it is anticipated that the project would not meet some portions of recovery plans for anadromous fish and possibly for other species. |
| 16 | Management actions that have adverse effects on Proposed or Candidate species or their habitats, shall not be allowed if the effects of those actions would contribute to listing of the species as Threatened or Endangered under the ESA.  | BNF TEST04          | ESA consultation is underway; however, it is currently unknown if the project would contribute to listing.  |

STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|    | Boise Forest Plan Direction  | Applicable Standard | Rationale   |
|----|--|---------------------|---|
| 17 | In TEPC fish-bearing waters, do not authorize new surface diversions unless they provide upstream and downstream fish passage and, if needed, include either fish screens that meet NMFS (NOAA) Fisheries and/or USFWS criteria or other means to prevent fish entrapment or entrainment.  | BNF TEST07          | Stream diversions during construction, operations, and closure/post-closure phases may not meet this standard.  |
| 18 | Avoid management actions within occupied TEPC plant species habitat that would adversely affect the long-term persistence of those species.  | BNF TEST08          | ESA consultation is underway; however, TEPC plant species habitat surveys have not yet been completed and impacts have not been determined at this time.                              |
| 19 | New facilities for storage of fuels and other toxicants shall be located outside of occupied TEPC plant habitat.   | BNF TEST11          | Site specific details are still being developed for the phases of the project and it has not yet been determined where toxicants may be stored in relation to whitebark pine habitat. |
| 20 | Unless a broad-scale assessment has been completed that substantiates different historical levels of unsuitable habitat, limit disturbance within each LAU as follows: If more than 30 percent of lynx habitat within a LAU is currently in unsuitable condition, no additional habitat may be changed to unsuitable habitat as a result of vegetative management projects. Fire use, or fire hazard reduction and associated vegetation management activities within the wildland urban interface watersheds, that develop or maintain fuel profiles needed to reduce the risk of wildfire threats to the wildland urban interface areas, are NOT bound by this standard. | BNF TEST15          | Project area LAUs currently exceed 30 percent of lynx habitat in an unsuitable condition. Additional habitat would be converted to unsuitable condition.                              |
| 21 | Avoid adverse effects from locatable mineral operations to TEPC plant species and occupied habitat.  | BNF TEST28          | Clearing at mine site would cause adverse effects to whitebark pine.  |
| 22 | Adverse effects from new facilities to occupied TEPC plant habitat shall be avoided.   | BNF TEST31          | Facilities associated with the mine project would cause adverse effects to occupied TEPC plant habitat (whitebark pine).  |
| 23 | Allow no net increase in groomed or designated over-the-snow routes or play areas, outside of baseline areas of consistent snow compaction, by LAU or in combination with immediately adjacent LAUs unless the Biological Assessment demonstrates the grooming or designation serves to consolidate use and improve lynx habitat. This does not apply within permitted ski area boundaries, to winter logging, and access to   | BNF TEST34          | There will be a net increase in groomed or designated over snow routes over baseline in LAUs.   |

STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|    | Boise Forest Plan Direction   | Applicable Standard | Rationale   |
|----|---|---------------------|---|
|    | private inholdings. Permits, authorizations, or agreements could expand into baseline routes or areas of existing snow compaction, and grooming could expand to routes of existing snow compaction and routes that have been designated but not groomed in the past and still comply with this standard.  |                     |   |
| 24 | During project planning, affected tribes shall be consulted regarding opportunities for restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of native plant communities that are of interest to tribes when proposed activities may affect those plant communities.   | BNF TRST04          | Tribal consultation is ongoing but restoration, enhancement, and maintenance measures have not yet been agreed upon, though it is likely that some effects to plant communities of tribal interest would be unavoidable.  |
| 25 | Design and implement projects within occupied habitats of Sensitive species to help prevent them from becoming listed. Use Forest Service-approved portions of Conservation Strategies and Agreements, as appropriate, in the management of Sensitive species habitat to keep management actions from contributing to a trend toward listing for these species. | BNF WIST02          | Sensitive plant species surveys have not been completed for the project area so some impacts to occupied sensitive plant species habitat may be unavoidable even with mitigation. There may be project components located in sensitive plant, wildlife, or fish habitats where this project's impacts may contribute to a trend toward listing in the future. |
| 26 | Mitigate management actions within known nesting or denning sites of MIS or Sensitive species if those actions would disrupt the reproductive success of those sites during the nesting or denning period. Sites, periods, and mitigation measures shall be determined during project planning.   | BNF WIST03          | Proposed mitigation measures may not fully avoid disruption of reproductive success during nesting or denning periods given the year-round nature of the proposed mine.   |
| 27 | In goshawk territories with known active nest stands, identify alternate and replacement nest stands during project-level planning when it is determined that the proposed activity is likely to degrade nest stand habitat.  | BNF WIST05          | Although surveys in the project area have not identified active nest stands, there would be direct loss of mature forest habitat.   |
| 28 | Mitigate human-caused disturbances within winter/spring ranges if disturbances cause displacement of wildlife while they are occupying those ranges.  | BNF WIST06          | Proposed mitigation measures may not fully avoid displacement of wildlife in winter/spring ranges given the year-round nature of the proposed mine and the intensity of noise, air quality, and water related impacts anticipated.  |
| 29 | Retain forest stands that meet the definition of old forest habitat for the applicable PVG (refer to Boise Forest Plan, Appendix E). Management actions are permitted in such stands as long as they will continue to meet the definition of old forest habitat.  | BNF WIST08          | This standard may not be met depending on the exact location of project components in relation to large tree size class distributions by PVG within the project watersheds.   |

STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|    | Boise Forest Plan Direction   | Applicable Standard   | Rationale  |
|----|---|---|--|
| 30 | Management actions within large or medium-size class forested stands (Boise Forest Plan, Appendix A definition) that have the species composition required to achieve old forest habitat for the applicable PVG (Boise Forest Plan, Appendix E definition) shall contribute to or not preclude restoration of old forest habitat. | BNF WIST09  | This standard may not be met depending on the exact location of project components in relation to large tree size class distributions by PVG within the project watersheds.  |
| 31 | Changes to existing recreational settings (mapped ROS classes) are limited to only those that maintain or restore wilderness characteristics.   | BNF WRST01  | Impacts to wilderness characteristics and related recreational settings are likely unavoidable based on the proximity of project components and subcomponents to designated wilderness and recommended wilderness. |
| 32 | When management actions are proposed that may compromise the outstandingly remarkable value, classification, or free-flowing character of an eligible Wild and Scenic River segment, a suitability study must be completed for that eligible river segment prior to initiating the actions.                                       | BNF WSST01  | Impacts to outstandingly remarkable values, classifications, or free-flowing character of suitable Wild and Scenic River segments may be unavoidable based on the proximity of project components to such reaches. |
| 33 | Meet the visual quality objectives as represented on the Forest VQO Map, and were indicated...as viewed from the [identified areas/corridors table p. III-334 Boise Forest Plan]  | BNF-17 #1767; BNF-19 #1983; BNF-21 #2155  | Visual Quality Objectives would likely not be met even with mitigation.  |
| 34 | Management actions, including salvage harvest, may only degrade aquatic, terrestrial, and watershed resource conditions in the temporary time period (up to 3 years), and must be designed to avoid resource degradation in the short term (3-15 years) and long term (greater than 15 years).                                    | BNF-20 #2010, BNF-21 #2108, MPC 3.1 Forest-wide   | Approving a plan of operations is a management action that would degrade aquatic, terrestrial, and watershed resource conditions for a duration that would exceed the timeframes prescribed in this standard.      |
| 35 | Management actions, including salvage harvest, may only degrade aquatic, terrestrial, and watershed resource conditions in the temporary time period (up to 3 years) or short-term (3-15 years) time periods, and must be designed to avoid resource degradation of existing conditions in the long term (greater than 15 years). | BNF-19 #1919; BNF-20 #2010; BNF-21 #2113; BNF-19 #1914; BNF-20 #2005; BNF-21 #2108, MPC 3.2 Forest-wide | Approving a plan of operations is a management action that would degrade aquatic, terrestrial, and watershed resource conditions for a duration that would exceed the timeframes prescribed in this standard.      |
| 36 | Mechanical vegetation treatments, excluding salvage harvest, may only occur where: a) The responsible official determines that wildland fire use or prescribed fire would result in unreasonable risk to public safety and structures, investments, or undesirable resource   | BNF-20 #2006  | Approving a plan of operations is a management action. Activities associated with the project would degrade water quality and habitat for fish, wildlife, and plant species.                                       |

STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|    | Boise Forest Plan Direction   | Applicable Standard                      | Rationale  |
|----|---|--|--|
|    | affects; and b) They maintain or restore water quality needed to fully support beneficial uses and habitat for native and desired non-native fish species; or c) They maintain or restore habitat for native and desired non-native wildlife and plant species.   |  |  |
| 37 | Meet the visual quality objectives as represented on the Forest VQO Map (and in each MA 17, 19, and 21 of the BNF LRMP).  | BNF-17 #1767; BNF-19 #1983; BNF-21 #2155 | Impacts would occur from Right of Way clearance, cell towers, and power lines. Visual Quality Objectives would likely not be met even with mitigation. |
| 38 | Management actions, including prescribed fire, must be designed and implemented in a manner that maintains wilderness values, as defined in the Wilderness Act.   | BNF-18 #1801                             | The Burntlog Route would not serve to maintain wilderness values in adjacent designated wilderness.  |
| 39 | Mechanical vegetation treatments, including salvage harvest, are prohibited.  | BNF-18 #1802                             | Mechanical vegetation removal for some project components in or adjacent to wilderness will likely be unavoidable.                                     |
| 40 | Existing motorized or mechanical uses are allowed only if they do not lead to long-term adverse changes in wilderness values.   | BNF-18 #1804                             | Motorized or mechanical uses may degrade wilderness values in designated wilderness.   |
| 41 | Manage the South Fork Salmon River to its Recreational classification standards, and preserve its free-flowing status and outstanding remarkable values (ORVs) until the river is formally designated by Congress or released from further consideration as a Wild and Scenic River candidate.  | BNF-19 #1907                             | ORV's of the South Fork Salmon River may be impacted by project components.  |
| 42 | Mechanical vegetation treatments, salvage harvest, prescribed fire, and wildland fire use may only be used to maintain values for which the area was established, or to achieve other objectives that are consistent with the Research Natural Area (RNA) establishment record or management plan.  | BNF-19 #1911; BNF-21 #2105               | Mechanical vegetation treatment may be needed in RNAs.   |
| 43 | Manage the Burntlog Creek eligible river corridor to its assigned classification standards, and preserve its outstandingly remarkable values and free-flowing status until the river undergoes a suitability study and the study finds it suitable for designation by Congress, or releases it from further consideration as a Wild and Scenic River. | BNF-20 #2001                             | ORV's of the Burntlog Creek may be impacted by project components.   |

STIBNITE GOLD EIS  
 LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

|    | Boise Forest Plan Direction   | Applicable Standard | Rationale   |
|----|---|---------------------|---|
| 44 | Meet the visual quality objectives as represented on the Boise National Forest VQO Map, and where indicated in the table below as viewed from the following areas/corridors: [see table on page III-379 of Boise Forest Plan].  | BNF-20 #2052        | Impacts to VQOs is expected to occur due to facilities associated with the project. Standard would be waived if effects cannot be avoided or mitigated.   |
| 45 | Manage the Johnson Creek eligible river corridor to its assigned Recreational classification standards, and preserve its ORVs and free flowing status until the river undergoes a suitability study and the study finds it suitable for designation by Congress, or releases it from further consideration as a Wild and Scenic River.  | BNF-21 #2101        | ORV's of Johnson Creek may be impacted by project components.   |
| 46 | New roads shall not be built except to replace existing roads in RCAs or directly repair human-caused damage to TEPC fish habitat in streams unless it can be demonstrated through the project-level NEPA analysis and related Biological Assessment that adverse effects to TEPC species or their habitats are avoided unless outweighed by demonstrable short- or long-term benefits to those TEPC species or their habitats. | BNF-21 #2154        | New roads would be constructed in RCAs and adverse effects to TEPC species or their habitats may be realized by implementation of this project without demonstrable short- or long-term benefits to those TEPC species or their habitats. |

Table Notes:

BTST = Botanical Resources Standard

LSST = Lands and Special Uses Standard

MIST = Mineral and Geology Resources Standard

SCST = Scenic Environment Standard

SWST = Soil, Water, Riparian, and Aquatic Resources Standard

TEST = Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, and Candidate Species Standard

TRST = Timberland Resources Standard

WIST = Wildlife Resources Standard

WRST = Wilderness, Recommended Wilderness, and Inventoried Roadless Areas Standard

WSST = Wild and Scenic Rivers Standard

## **SUBSTANTIVE REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO THE ABOVE PAYETTE AND BOISE FOREST PLAN DIRECTION**

The decision document for the plan amendment will explain how the responsible official for the amendment has determined which planning rule requirement at 36 CFR Part 219 Subpart A Sections 219.8 through 219.11 apply to the Selected Alternative and how they were applied at the scope and scale of the amendment. This determination is based on the purpose of the amendment and the effects (beneficial or adverse). At this time, the following are considerations for this determination.

The Payette and Boise Forests and Region have considered the above amendments in relation to the 2012 Planning Rule; however, more information than is currently available for the DEIS will be needed in order to determine consistency with several substantive requirements of the Rule. The following substantive requirements are most directly related to the plan direction listed above, which may be waived/removed with the amendments to the Payette and Boise Forest Plans:

- 219.8(a) Ecological sustainability, including ecosystem integrity; air, soil, and water; riparian areas; and best management practices for water quality.
- 219.8(b) Social and economic sustainability including social, cultural, and economic conditions relevant to the area influenced by the plan; sustainable recreation; including recreation settings, opportunities, and access; and scenic character; multiple uses that contribute to local, regional, and national economies in a sustainable manner; ecosystem services; and cultural and historic resources and uses.
- 219.9(b) Diversity of plant and animal communities: additional species-specific plan components, specifically for Federally listed species; species of conservation concern; including ecosystem integrity; ecosystem diversity; and species of conservation concern.
- 219.10(a)(5) Integrated resource management for multiple use; habitat conditions for wildlife, fish, and plants commonly enjoyed and used by the public.
- 219.10(a)(7) Integrated resource management for multiple use; reasonably foreseeable risks to ecological, social, and economic sustainability.
- 219.10(a)(9) Integrated resource management for multiple use; public water supplies and associated water quality.
- 219.10(b)(1) Integrated resource management for multiple use; cultural, historic, and tribally important.
- 219.10(b)(1)(iv) Protection of congressionally designated wilderness areas as well as management of areas recommended for wilderness designation to protect and maintain the ecological and social characteristics that provide the basis for their suitability for wilderness designation. 219.11(2)(c) Timber harvest for purposes other than timber production.