

I was employed by Perpetua Resources for 10 years, but I left the company about a year ago. During my tenure with Perpetua, I held the position of Vice President of Development. I left Perpetua because I felt our success was tied to reasonable federal officials making reasonable decisions in a reasonably expedient manner, and having spent more than 5 years trying to positively influence a reasonable outcome to occur, I had to move on as I lost faith that reason would prevail. Regardless, I fully support development of the Stibnite Gold Project.

I believe that America needs a healthy, well-balanced, mineral resources extraction industry. America is blessed with mineral wealth that few countries possess, and we are the largest consumer of mineral resources in the world, yet critical mineral resource sectors are completely absent from our portfolio, not because the minerals can not be extracted responsibly and economically, but because the path to permitting projects is so cost prohibitive and political. How can this situation sit well with any reasonable citizen of this country?

In an effort to move America toward a more responsible mineral resources extraction approach that balances our country's mineral resources production with our mineral resources consumption, I am writing to express my full support for Perpetua Resources and the Stibnite Gold Project.

Historically, many (possibly most) wars have been waged over natural resources wealth - the Middle East provides our most recent and relevant examples. Should America have to go to war because our adversaries decide to cut off the supply chain to mineral resources they control, that American relies on, and that we can economically and responsibly extract and refine here? The thought of that makes me sick.

Perpetua has shown they are committed to Idaho and want to mine responsibly. The Project has been engineered to clean up legacy impacts, reconnect salmon and steelhead to their native spawning streams, and repair one of the watershed's largest source of sedimentation. The Stibnite Gold Project would leave water quality, wetlands and the river better than they are today. The 2021 Modern Mining Plan of the SDEIS clearly documents these outcomes. However, it is worth noting that while the activities of a private company (Bradley Mining Company) can be linked to the current status of the site, those activities were initiated and approved by the US federal government in support of the WWII war effort. Why is that relevant? Perpetua's proposed plan is based on cleaning up the mess that US federal agencies sanctioned more than 80 years ago. What other industry's proposed development is required (at their cost) to clean up environmental impacts undertaken by the US government? From my perspective, this is (and has been) an unreasonably high hurdle, but a hurdle that Perpetua has embraced.

Perpetua Resources wants to help America secure a domestic supply of the critical mineral antimony and clean up a brownfield site. They've made great improvements to the Project from the original documents they submitted, and it's time to permit the Stibnite Gold Project and continue to move this important Project forward.

John Meyer