

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/6/2023 12:11:01 AM

First name: Jennifer

Last name: McDaid

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am against this project for the following reasons...

"Perpetua Resources made news for its recent efforts to clean up some areas at the site. While river restoration projects often call for heavy equipment, rerouting streams, transporting vegetation, or adding or removing material (all work that mining companies have significant expertise in), they never call for open pit cyanide leach mining. Restoration projects typically also have measurable results of improved water quality or stream function.

There are far too many examples of real harm caused by this type of mining to water quality and fisheries. While the restoration measures in the original Stibnite Gold mine plan sounded good, they didn't compensate for the projected losses. The 2020 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) found that there would actually be a net loss of habitat for Chinook Salmon and Bull Trout, even with mitigation. There was no win-win. The only question was just how badly the fish would lose.

Half of the new mining area would be in pristine, untouched areas. Perpetua Resources' plan to restore the site involves burying a bull trout stream underneath 100 million tons of combined old and new toxic mine waste. If constructed, the proposed tailings buttress would be the second tallest dam in Idaho and the mine tailings would be deep enough to bury Boise's tallest buildings.

The next issue is what is actually being mined. While antimony may be important, having a small percent of antimony in a gold project should not give the company a pass for a project that could end up doing immeasurable harm.

In its review of the original DEIS, the EPA (under the previous federal administration) wrote that it had ongoing "significant concern regarding potential impacts to water quality and aquatic resources." Additionally, the EPA highlighted the risk for "long term contamination of groundwater of unknown extent" after the mine closes. These are not the type of comments that a well-engineered mining project normally receives, much less a restoration project.

If this mine were actually a clear win for the environment, why did the Forest Service take the highly unusual step of conducting a Supplemental DEIS instead of just issuing a final decision as they have for so many other mines? The answer is that there were so many problems in the previous versions of the mine plan that Perpetua had to modify its mine plan to avoid overt water contamination." (Idaho Conservation League).