

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/28/2020 6:00:00 AM

First name: Katherine

Last name: Selin

Organization:

Title:

Comments: To Whom it May Concern,

My name is Katie Selin. I'm an urban planner, kayaker, and a concerned citizen and stakeholder who utilizes these public lands in their current undiminished state, lands for which I am an owner of and for which the Forest Service is directed to manage in the public interest. I have yet to visit this magnificent river as I've been working to improve my skills to be a match for these wilds. My cautiously sendy lady-ball paddle gang is nearly ready for this epic river. Please don't destroy it before we get there!

* I am writing to ask the Forest Service to create a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the relative agencies and public to review and have the opportunity to comment on in order to address all of the missing and incomplete information of the current DEIS highlighted below.

"I noticed there is a lot of missing information, and the best way to capture that is with a supplemental DEIS. So as a responsible agency who is involved with managing public resources, such as water quality and quantity, I ask that you please provide the aforementioned information."

* While I am also writing to support Alternative 5, the No Action Alternative outlined in the existing Stibnite Gold Project's Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the requested Supplemental Draft EIS is crucial for review and consideration.

Incomplete and unavailable information impedes the public's ability, and the Services' ability, to evaluate significant adverse impacts.

Here are some additional, important specific examples:

- The DEIS has met CEQ regulation requirements to provide documentation of where information is incomplete or unavailable. However, based on the information provided in Table 4.1-1 it is clear that there are areas where the unavailable/incomplete information is critical to developing a "reasoned choice among alternatives".

Ex. 1 the DEIS states that "NOAA fisheries require use of the Biotic Ligand Model to determine the project-specific copper criteria for fish". The DEIS concedes that "the Biotic Ligand Model-based criteria are preliminary and do not encompass the range of monitoring nodes and the range of variability required for Biotic Ligand Model implementation" (Section 4.12-50). However, even with the preliminary data available, exceedances of copper criteria are predicted (Section 4.12-48). The public should be informed about which, and how many, nodes would be expected to see an excess in copper because copper toxicity can have significant adverse effects on fish and aquatic species. A Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement that includes the adequate parameters for the Biotic Ligand Model (including more nodes and increased duration of data collection) must be completed and made available to the public to reveal the entirety of the impacts to fish and aquatic species.

Please reconsider this project!

Sincerely,

Katie