Dear Linda Jackson.

I would like the Forest Service to reject the proposed mine and choose the No Action Alternative.

I am concerned that the mine is 51% larger than the historical mining footprint (original footprint: 1593 acres; proposed footprint: 3265 acres). Throughout the past years of selling this project, representatives from Perpetua Resources have stressed the importance of sticking to the already disturbed ground. After all, “this is a restoration project.” I heard this *staying within the historical boundaries* mantra repeated on 2 tours of Stibnite, during a Doing Democracy night at the McCall Library, and at an informational opportunity in McCall. If Perpetua Resources feels comfortable misinforming the public about their mining footprint, what other gross inaccuracies are they comfortable with? Does the Forest Service believe that improving Stibnite is only possible by doubling the mine footprint and creating further damage to the area? Does the Forest Service feel destroying previously untouched wetlands and waterways to be on mission?

I am concerned that the mine will knowingly negatively impact water quality. The SDEIS states that water temperature will rise and that it will take 100 years to return to current temps. 100 years! The SDEIS also admits that groundwater contamination will occur. Beyond those 2 crucial aspects of water quality degradation, the reality is that the Stibnite Gold Project with pollute waterways through sedimentation, diesel spills, mineralized mineral disturbances, cyanide, and other contaminates throughout the lifecycle of the Project. Because of this mine, there will be permanent damage to water quality. What does the Forest Service plan to do to mitigate water quality impacts during and post mining activity? What methods of holding Perpetua Resources financially accountable for accidental water quality damage does the Forest Service have?

I am concerned that the mine will exacerbate climate change. The SDEIS states:

“Changes in hydrologic patterns and overall increasing temperatures are expected to result in decreased or degraded soil moisture and quality, air quality, annual streamflow, groundwater recharge, and water quality. Increased surface water temperatures; increased spread of insects and diseases; changes in the timing, duration, and severity of fire seasons; as well as habitat loss and fragmentation 6 also are expected to occur. Closure and reclamation activities under the alternatives could reduce climate change impacts by improving soil quality and implementing best management practices during all phases of the SGP” (ES-10).

No further attempt to model climate variations occurred in the SDEIS. What action can the Forest Service take mid-Project should climate impacts need to be addressed? Can the Forest Service shut the Project down should climate impacts reach a tipping point? What steps will the Forest Service take to identify a tipping point?

I am concerned that the mine will strain local services – e.g., police departments, fire departments, Valley County Search and Rescue, life flight, hospitals, telecommunications, roads, schools, etc. Perpetua Resources is estimated to pay $300,000 annually in property taxes which will not be enough to offset the additional burdens placed on these services. What additional fees will the Forest Service pay to area services to support the strain that Perpetua Resources is not currently being held financially accountable for?

I am concerned about so much more – fisheries, wildlife, area and downstream recreation, tribal rights, soil degradation, air quality, wetlands, avalanche hazards, tailings storage, the fish tunnel, perpetual care, and so much more. The 1667 pages of the SDEIS and the 2 years since the DEIS was issued was still not enough to address the risk this project has to Valley County and the communities downstream and downwind. Because of this, I would like the Forest Service to reject the proposed mine and choose the No Action Alternative.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Sacha Jackson