

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/9/2023 7:00:00 AM

First name: sharon

Last name: Hanson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear Mr. Harris,

Like you, I value the wild spaces we have here in Idaho while also understanding that we must be balanced stewards of public land that is not set aside as wilderness. This means some environmental impact will occur with economic needs. However, when the environmental impact is long term (perhaps for "perpetua"), and the economic gain is short term, there can be a false urgency to accept a proposal that seems to mitigate both environmental impact and even possible accidents. Long term Idaho residents know mining, even the most well-intended mining, has unexpected consequences and even accidents.

I will not take the time to outline the list of grievances against approving the current Perpetua proposal since I am sure you have read through them many times. I will say that once industry invades previously "undisturbed" areas, the impact on wildlife and in this case Bull Trout spawning grounds can be forever. I have listened to Perpetua speak on how their mining practices are state-of-the-art and safe. Would it be too much to ask to have them go back to the drawing board and make the proposal even less impactful? If we think with a "Seven Generations" mentality, truly looking toward the future of multiple generations and who will benefit most from the upcoming decision, is it worth it to appease the few short term, or the infinite long term?

Please ask Perpetua to make their mining plan less impactful on the environment. This is not an argument asking for no mining at all, but we can make it a more responsible project.

Sincerely,

Sharon Hanson