

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/8/2023 10:36:00 PM

First name: Meg

Last name: Lojek

Organization:

Title:

Comments: To Linda Jackson, Payette Forest Supervisor:

Due to missing information and ongoing uncertainties in the recent SDEIS regarding Perpetua's proposed mining project, I am writing to ask you to not approve the project. Choose the "no action" alternative for the following reasons:

Fish: Chemical spills, increased water temperatures and fish tunnels will all seriously injure species that are already considered "endangered" -- which is an official legal designation by none other than the US Government. The EIS says all 3 endangered fishes will have decreased population. Idahoans will not stand for that intrusion! The mine would increase arsenic and heavy metals, which will decrease fish habitat for Chinook, Bull Trout, and Steelhead. The SDEIS states a 40% reduction in flows in tributaries--this is not something that endangered species can survive. The USFS would be breaking US law by allowing this to happen. My family is 4 generations of Idahoans who value the South Fork drainage system for fishing, hiking, and dutch oven baking, and the damage caused by this proposed mine is all but guaranteed and irreversible for at least the next 10 generations. "Restoring the site" must include revegetation of these streams, but we all know that in the rough, dry soil of that area, revegetation would take at least 100 years to even begin cooling the waters. Have you studied that yet? The public has a right to know this, and I believe the current SDEIS does not address these facts. It is deficient. Regarding the preposterous fish tunnels (as yet untested for such a length), where are the alternatives we should require of Perpetua? Their tunnels are untested and unproven. They read like something Dr. Seuss would invent in a warning book about "truffula trees"! USFS should ask for alternatives and further studies. Or just tell Perpetua that the gamble is too risky.

Socio-economic: I'd like to ask for the EIS to address traffic, housing, hospitals, schools, fire, police and other essential services in our small rural mountain towns. The USFS needs to include all of these impacts in the EIS, and as of yet, this information is a void. As a local librarian, who comes from a family of teachers and public servants, I see stress on teachers and police, students and families will increase. As it is, we cannot hire enough people to work in our schools, snow plow our roads, and staff our emergency departments. Increasing travel, roads, and the working population will have a large effect that should be studied in depth before local communities suffer irrevocably. Where is that information? Again, the current statement is deficient. Transportation past Highway 55 is left out of the SDEIS and must be included. Idaho Power and electric usage is left out of the SDEIS and must be included. Where is the information about public safety, avalanche mitigation, or effects of such a large increase in transportation needs?

Finally, climate change is completely side-stepped in the current analysis. However, anyone can know that greenhouse gasses will go up. How much? Emissions in Valley County are predicted to DOUBLE. Why has the USFS not analyzed this? We cannot legally or morally ignore the impacts. Furthermore, the modeling in the current SDEIS does not include the effects of climate change over the years. It is a scientific fact that our climate is changing, so the USFS needs to take that into account in the modeling. As it stands, the impact statement is highly uncertain because it ignores the ongoing, exponential effects of such changes. For example, in the paragraph above about fish, the cited 40% reduction in stream flow is based on current or historical flows. As climate change continues, what are the predictions on flows? Please include that in the modeling so we have a complete picture -- one that certainly will be more than a 40% reduction as local temperatures increase and snowpack and rainfall are affected.

Thank you for stopping to address these missing analyses, information and alternatives. The USFS has a duty to consider the irrevocable long-term damage to forest health and productivity. I am concerned the mine will change the natural ecosystem and our human health and resources. Do not approve this mine.