

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/3/2023 5:46:42 PM

First name: April

Last name: Whitney

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear US National Forest Service Staff,

I am writing in support of Perpetua Resource's Stibnite Gold Project. The 2021 Modified Mine Plan addresses the problems at the Stibnite site and also demonstrates Perpetua's commitment to listening to the concerns of community members and being a pro-active partner in finding solutions as new issues arise. Perpetua has listened to the community's concerns and modified the scope and footprint of the plan.

In a perfect world, all of the resources we use and need would be readily available. In the real world, the resources that our society relies on for infrastructure, tech, energy and national defense need to be procured through mining. Historically, mining has caused destruction to pristine land or been responsible for questionable human rights practices. This project presents the opportunity to procure crucial minerals, meet the highest modern mining standards, and help secure our military defense and energy security.

Key reasons I support the project:

1. The site as is, is discharging not only sediment, but polluted water into the East Fork South Fork Salmon River. According to the Payette National Forest assessment, treating all water that flows through Perpetua's proposed Stibnite mine would keep or improve water and lower existing arsenic levels in the East Fork, which now exceed federal water quality standards.
2. There is no realistic, timely plan to mitigate this damage outside what Perpetua is proposing.
3. Perpetua has an impeccable safety record so far with only one lost time incident since April 2013 and no reportable environmental incidents since March 2012. That is a result of a culture of safety and high standards set by company management and embraced by employees and contractors.
4. The project is being designed to a standard far above the minimum. The Perpetua team is committed to using the most modern, effective and lowest-risk mining technology even where taking these steps increases costs.
5. As long as the Mining Act of 1872 stands as written, there will continue to be interest in the assets in the ground at the Stibnite site, AND a legal mandate for approving mining there. A lot of people seem to think that if this permit is denied, the issue is closed. That is simply not true.

The bottom line: if this project were proposed on a pristine, untouched backcountry site, I would be against it. If this project were proposed on a formerly mined site that was not sending pollution and toxins into a river without any realistic chance of timely mitigation, I would be against it.

But that is not the reality of the situation we face. The Stibnite site, because of more than a century of past mining and lackluster mitigation (all caused before Midas/Perpetua was involved in any way) has no hope for a clean future without this project.

We can either deny that these problems and challenges exist and be strapped with the legacy problems at the site, or we can use the best practices and modern technologies to try to improve the conditions at Stibnite and in the EFSF Salmon River.

Is this the only solution to the problems at Stibnite? No. Is this the only solution that has a REALISTIC chance of

being executed? Yes.

Scrutinize this project. Hold it to the highest possible standard. Then let it move forward. No one else is going to fix the problems at Stibnite, and they are problems that need to be fixed.