Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/27/2020 12:00:00 AM
First name: Kira
Last name: Tenny
Organization:
Title:
Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Proposed Stibnite Gold Project in Valley County, Idaho, and thank you in advance for your sincerest and most honest consideration of the following comments and concerns. As the comments and concerns in this letter pertain directly to the project and the project area, and specifically point out oversights and omissions of information required and necessary for the public and the Forest Service to have access to in order to adequately assess this project, please consider this a substantive comment letter.

First and foremost, I am writing to submit my concerns and state/ request that a supplemental DEIS is needed because the current DEIS has missing information, oversights, and omissions. Further, with its current content I am advocating strongly for Alternative 5, no action. It is notable that Alternatives 1-4 present very similar project plans, all of which center around cyanide-leach mining. This is a practice already banned in Montana, Wisconsin and 5 Colorado counties. Why have other alternatives that are less environmentally destructive, such as dry mining, not been proposed?

I am also writing to request that the comment period be extended to the full 120 days because I did not have enough time to review the extensive DEIS document due to its truly extensive length, and personal circumstances of limited time due to my work, my fleeing wildfires for one week this fall due to hazardous air quality, and my family and community obligations. Sixty days is simply not enough time to review such an extensive document for anyone who holds a full time job, is a parent with children living at home, has experienced life events such as births and deaths, or has other obligations- it is unreasonable to limit the number of comments and the opportunity to comment, especially in the circumstances of COVID with this shorter time period when other similar proposals, such as the Pebble Mine were given comment periods of 120 days. Due to my personal circumstances and multiple requests in previous comments for an extension of the comment period to 120 days, if the extension is not granted by tomorrow (October 28, 2020), please grant me the opportunity to comment further within 120 days. Is this a possibility? Further, it took a considerable amount of time to figure out how to navigate. It is not accessible and the current 60 day period is not inclusive of those of us with limited time to review and submit comments.

I was born and raised in Idaho, and the long-term health of the intertwined environmental, economic, and social-cultural health currently and for future generations is incredibly significant to me. I hold a Masters degree in Resource Conservation and have worked with the U.S.F.S. on a project developing modules for sustainable recreation planning through the University of Montana. I work as an educator and an international consultant for sustainable development and conservation in Chile, Bhutan, and Bolivia.

Upon quick review of the DEIS, it is clear to me that this proposed project negatively affects environmental, economic, and social-cultural health of Idaho and Idahoans both immediately and well beyond the 13 year proposed project timeline. What can the USFS do to ensure that if the project were to be carried out, United States citizens would not inherit the legacy of negative impacts of the project? What measures are mandatory to put in place in order to ensure local communities and the environment are not overall negatively impacted as a result of the project?

The current DEIS presents alternatives that are narrow in scope and rely on incomplete analysis. There are no modeled predictions or results for Alternatives 3 & 4, and the DEIS has not fully disclosed the effects of 3 and 4 for comparisons. Please provide this information (modeled predictions and results) in a supplemental DEIS for public comment.

In brief (due to my time constraints), here are my initial and primary concerns:

1. Non-unique mining alternatives for Alternatives 1-4: Alternatives 1-4 are similar and present the same type of mining, cyanide leach mining, which is banned in Montana and certain areas throughout the United States due to negative environmental and human health effects. Please provide alternatives that consider more unique proposals, such as dry stack mining, which was never considered or modeled. This could / should be considered when dealing with an environment sensitive to water quality and quantity. There is also the potential for underground mining, which would have less rock removal and therefore less rock waste. All 4 of the alternatives contain 3 open pits & a giant tailings storage facility, which are practices proven to yield unstable and negative environmental impacts, particularly regarding water quality. This is particularly concerning in consideration of the lack of clarity in Midas's post operation plan. Please provide clarity in the Supplemental DEIS as to what the post operational plan is in terms of water quality, cross check this with regulations and standards, and provide a long-term accountability plan for Midas, even in terms of declaration of bankruptcy.

2. Water Quality: Chemical reactions between rock and water have the potential to release acid and toxic metal ions into groundwater and surface water. Groundwater quality and quantity will be adversely impacted by the project. These impacts will then affect surface water which in turn affects aquatic organisms. Groundwater and surface water have many interactions and should be thought of as two parts of a single integrated system, the primary distinction between the two being the time scales of their respective processes. Modeling in the DEIS shows that arsenic, antimony, mercury, and other metals will contaminate water for many years after mine closure. Keep in mind this detrimental prediction likely represents a best case scenario. With all due respect, please clarify for me how this is legal? Thank you.

The effects analysis in the DEIS focuses on predictive numerical modeling. In attempting to quantify changes to water quality and quantity at different times during the mining operation and up to one hundred years in the future, the DEIS relies on certain assumptions that contain significant error. This error is primarily based on the methodology employed to analyze uncertainty in the model outputs.

For example, the faults and fracture zones present in the area are acknowledged as having potentially significant influence on groundwater movement and quality. However, they are not taken into account in the modeling. This omission is identified at Chapter 4.8.8.2.1.3. Please provide a model with replicable scientific methods that includes the faults and fracture zones' influence.

Further, the plan to treat surface water in perpetuity to meet state water quality standards relies on an assumption that whatever company mines the site will put money into a trust fund to support the operational costs to treat the water forever. The infrastructure to do so (powerline, roads, treatment facilities) will remain forever. However, the contamination is modeled to still require treatment 100 years in the future. The DEIS assumes, without support that chemical reactions causing contamination will slowly decrease to a point where contaminants will be below state standards. When this time comes is unknowable, and yet, Midas could manage to hold no accountability after mine closure if bankruptcy, or other circumstances of non-accountability are wrangled, which would leave this economic, social, and environmental burden upon the citizens of Idaho and the United States. Moreover, state water quality standards have equal chances of becoming more strict in the future as remaining the same.
S e e C h a p t e r 4 . 8 . 7 , 4 . 8 . 8 , 4 . 9 . 7 , a n d C h 4 . 9 . 8 f o r m o r e d e t a i l . In particular, 4 . 8 . 8 . 2 . 3 expresses an unsupported opinion that it is "unrealistic" to bring water quality up to a standard that is better than what exists currently at the mine site. Further, what is the consumption and water use management Plan?

3. Fish: See: The DEIS indicates that the Forest Service has preliminarily determined that project will adversely affect bull trout (pg. 4.12-87), Chinook salmon (pg. 4.12-69), steelhead (pg. 4.12-75), and their critical habitats; and may indirectly impact Westslope cutthroat trout (pg. 4.12-93). Chinook and bull trout are listed as threatened

species. What are the implications of the Endangered Species Act in these circumstances? What considerations does the best available science recommend in order to maintain and protect these species? Please incorporate these considerations into the DEIS and into your considerations of the project. From my research, the adverse effects of Alternatives 1-4 are too great to even consider them.

The "DEIS p. 3.12.1 describes the 4 special status fish: South Fork Salmon River is not pristine, but it is wild, free-flowing, largely within public lands, undeveloped, and supports native fish. While all fish are of management interest, four special status native salmonids(i.e., fish in the family which includes salmon and trout) are of particular interest because of their status as 4 federally-listed fish or fish of management concern. These all require cold, clear, clean, running water and varying unobstructed migration pathways to complete their life cycles."

4. Recreation: It is noted in the DEIS that the local communities rely heavily on tourism to support their economies" and that "[t]he analysis area is a popular area for a variety of recreation activities on both private and public lands," yet there is no report, information, or analysis on how the Stibnite proposal will affect tourism, recreation, or the related economic benefits to local communities. A supplemental report and information are needed accordingly. Further, the sources are out of date (many are 2003 and 2010) in the context of Idaho experiencing a population boom, and its residents holding high value in recreation opportunities.

Idaho's Recreation and tourism generates $7.8 billion in consumer spending and support 78,000 jobs; 79% of Idaho's residents participate in outdoor recreation; and recreation opportunities is a recruitment tool for businesses used to attract and retain workers (Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2018; Idaho Business for the Outdoors, 2020). Recreation and tourism are a big deal locally, state-wide, and nationally and thus, please provide the missing information on impacts to recreation and recreation and tourism economies as related to the Stibnite Alternatives and a management plan and contingencies for the recreation in the area per each alternative.

Please also include a report on model impacts Alternatives will have on recreation in the South Salmon and Salmon Rivers related to water quality scenarios.

5. Native American Rights: What considerations have been taken into account of Nez Perce rights and positions on this proposal? Social-cultural and economic impacts intertwined with environmental impacts must be provided in the supplemental DEIS.

I am very invested in this area and the well-being of its clean water, endangered species, natural environment, and local communities' health and economies, which is why I have great concerns about this project and am requesting a Supplemental DEIS and a longer review period in order to be able to comment adequately.

Thank you in advance for extending the comment period to the full 120 days and for ultimately, insisting on a supplemental DEIS for public comment in order to account for the missing information, outdated sources, and lack of use of best scientific knowledge.

Apologies for the rushed nature of this letter, as I simply wish and am still requesting that I have more time.