

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/9/2023 9:39:07 PM

First name: Lin

Last name: Gray

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Linda Jackson

Payette Forest Supervisor

500 N. Mission Street, Building 2

McCall, Idaho 83638

RE: Stibnite Gold Project

Dear Ms. Jackson,

I have copied the following from Perpetua Resources website (<https://perpetuaresources.com>) to illustrate how they may be falsely representing themselves to the public and the Forest Service.

"We are a team of Idahoans who believe in responsible mining so we may protect our beautiful state while providing for those we love." - Responsible mining does not violate the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and require amendments to the Payette and Boise National Forest Resource Management Plans.

"In addition to restoring Stibnite, we are excited to now directly link the redevelopment of the Stibnite Gold Project to a clean energy future by supplying a portion of our antimony to help power the Ambri high-capacity storage battery." - The amount of energy that Perpetua will use to mine gold and antimony in a remote, difficult to access, and ecologically fragile location will create a huge carbon footprint (each year in operation it will double the carbon footprint of Valley County). How can anyone equate this project with "clean energy?"

"What hasn't changed is our dedication to restoring an abandoned mining site..." - If you look at a satellite image of Stibnite as it exists today, and overlay it with the patented mining claims, you will see that the landscape that currently needs to be restored is on private land - the patented mining claims owned by Perpetua. This means they are restoring the mess they themselves purchased. The proposed project will destroy a large area outside of those private lands, on public lands, covering our public lands with waste rock and toxic metals. How will they be held accountable to rehabilitate our public lands?

These three quotes are from the first three paragraphs on Perpetua's website - it goes on and on.

I request that you choose the No Action Alternative and not agree to an alternative that allows a company, that makes it hard to believe it values truthfulness, to proceed with such a poorly conceived project.

Thank you,