

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/29/2020 1:49:27 AM

First name: Rickey

Last name: Minder-Hyman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As a native Idahoan and a stakeholder who is passionate about the perpetuity of our beautiful state, specifically the Salmon River water system, I urge you to take a closer look at the proposed Stibnite Gold Project. The DEIS is lacking critical analysis and sufficient alternatives for the public to weigh in, and the Forest Service must submit a supplemental EIS to address these issues.

We all know, too well, that human kind can not plan for the great movements of nature. Avalanches, floods, earthquakes, wildfires, landslides, and especially, future climate change. I am mostly concerned about the plan for a water treatment facility, in perpetuity. How will this water treatment plant be financed in perpetuity? Who will pay for it? Is there any company that has ever been around for perpetuity? Will the cost of this treatment plant fall into tax payers laps? This entire project, should not a single thing go wrong, on closing day, will still leave the water shed to rely on this water treatment facility. Everything rests on this plan. Relying on the assumption that a trust fund will support the health of the South Fork Salmon forever, for me, as a public land owner, a hunter, a fisher, a boater, a tax payer, a daughter of the Western Central Mountains, is frightening. The contamination is modeled to still require treatment 100 years in the future. 100 years. 100 years... The only things we can count on, as Idahoans, as tax payers, as recreational users, is the perpetuity of the river we already have, the health of the river we already have. Any project, which requires, in perpetuity, for the water to be treated, before sending it out into one of the greatest watersheds in the world, is an accident waiting to happen.

Lastly, there are no modeled predictions or results for alternatives 3 and 4. The DEIS has not fully disclosed the effects of 3 and 4 for comparisons. This is disparate treatment of the alternatives giving us a fragmented basis on which to make judgements for comparisons. The DEIS does not take a HARD LOOK at 3 & 4. There is the hard look doctrine that should have guided this.

In section 17502.14 of NEPA? Regulations it requires that the agency must "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives" and "devote substantial treatment to each alternative." In addition regulations require "appropriate mitigation measures" be included. The treatment of alternatives 3 & 4 was cursory at best and in many sections of the DEIS there are "adverse impacts" mentioned and NO mitigations at all offered. Therefore, I urge you, to support Alternative 5; the No Action Alternative.

Please, I urge you, give this project a harder look. A look that takes into account, protecting what we already have. A look that does not rest on assumptions. After all, we know what assumptions do to us.

May the South Fork Salmon and all she drains to, remain perpetual.

Esto Perpetua,

Rickey Minder-Hyman

Native Idahoan, Council, Idaho