

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/6/2023 10:36:08 PM

First name: LES

Last name: BECHDEL

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am opposed to the Stibnite Gold Project for a variety of reasons, but here are two the areas that I feel were not addressed in the SDEIS: 1. Transportation Risks and 2. Economic impacts if the South Fork of the Salmon River is shut down for recreational uses

1. Transportation risks to the South Fork of the Salmon River watershed are not adequately addressed in the SDEIS. It is estimated that 17,000 to 18,000 heavy vehicles will pass over numerous waterways of this pristine area going to and from the mine. This number is amplified when you consider the SGP lasting twenty years. Any number of toxic materials could find their way into the watershed if a vehicle went into a waterway. It is recognized that the Burnt Log route to the mine would reduce the chance of a spill in Johnson Creek and the East Fork of the South Fork, but Burnt Log road would still cross many small streams and creeks that feed into those larger rivers. When one considers how challenging it is to drive during the winter months, it will only be a matter of time before a truck wrecks and spills into a waterway. The same risks would apply to the North Fork of the Payette River for southbound loads and the Little Salmon/Main Salmon Rivers for north bound loads.

A spill of any number of materials would kill fish and could cause lasting damage to the South Fork of the Salmon watershed. Is it worth the risk for a private enterprise? I do not think so. I attended the public meeting at the McCall Best Western Motel on December 6, 2022 and met with both Forest Service personnel and Perpetua contractors. No one seemed to know if there was an action plan in the SDEIS to address a transportation spill into a waterway. A Perpetua employee said they planned to hire experts to deal with the accident if it occurred. I would imagine that time would be of the essence to mitigate such a disaster and that a team of experts with appropriate equipment and materials would have to be on hand to react quickly. No where in the SDEIS do I see this concept addressed.

2. Economic impacts to the surrounding communities have been discussed but I have found no information in the DEIS that discussed river closures and how that would effect local economies. The South Fork of the Salmon draws river runners and fishermen from all over the world. When they travel to the river they spend money in the local communities for gas and food, as well as eating in local restaurants and staying in local motels. If a spill occurs and is considered dangerous to river users, what is the economic impact of that disaster. Will Perpetua be held responsible for those financial losses. As in item one above, is it worth risk? I don't think so.

I have been a resident of McCall since 1985 and have paddled the wilderness section of the South Fork of the Salmon about 20 times. I have also done day kayaking on Johnson Creek and the East Fork numerous times. The thought of river closure because of toxic spill is unthinkable. Also, the image of dead fish floating down those rivers make me nauseous. Is it worth the risk? I don't think so.

Thanks for allowing me to comment. Les Bechdel, McCall, Idaho