

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/9/2023 11:59:34 PM

First name: Pamela

Last name: Davis

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I was born in Idaho and have lived here all my life. My childhood vacations were spent around Payette Lake and Stanley, where my father's family had a mining claim. I panned for gold with my cousins. Two of my uncles were mining engineers and one was a geologist. Growing up in this state, loving the mountains, lakes and streams I have tremendous respect for the natural world. I have ridden my bike through a large part of the state, rafted down the rivers and hiked through the mountains. It is why I live here. I can not fathom how anyone would risk the Salmon River and all of the fish and wildlife in that food chain for a Hedge Fund's profit margin. I also have tremendous concern for the effects we are seeing from climate change. Ecosystems are fragile and changing rapidly and are difficult to predict, yet we are using a Mining Law from 1872 to guide our decisions? The mining professionals I knew from my childhood would never have been so cavalier about the risk to our state in today's world. The Supplemental Draft of the Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) tells us there will be irreversible losses from the risk of hazardous spills, from direct loss of fish habitat and from rising stream temperatures. (The proposed remediation was to plant trees to shade and cool the water- in 100 years maybe?). The South Fork area historically had robust populations of steelhead, salmon, bull trout and cut throat. (SDEIS p. 4-386). There were no project specific spill risk calculations for numbers of spills and spill risk probability in the SDEIS. SDEIS Pg. 4-345. One also has to consider Highway 55 and Highway 95, both running next to sensitive fish habitat. If the risk extends from the origin of the reagents, to the mine and the destination of wastes taken away, the area of potential impact is huge and needs to be considered very carefully. The danger from the hazardous materials alone could decimate entire food chains. The Supplemental Draft of the Environmental Impact Statement states:

If approved, the Stibnite Gold Project (SGP) will require large quantities of hazardous materials to be transported to and from and used at the mine site during the 15 years of mining operations (Table ES-1) and, to a more limited extent, for as long as water treatment is necessary. In total, more than 3,000 loads of hazardous materials would be transported to or from the mine every year during operations (Table ES-1). The loads would include more than 8,300,000 gallons of flammable materials (diesel, propane, gasoline) as part of more than 9,400,000 gallons of hazardous bulk liquids to be brought to the mine site annually. In addition, more than 46,000 tons of hazardous bulk solids would be transported to or from the mine site (Table ES-1). This includes the annual use of 4,000 tons of sodium cyanide, which would be delivered in 167 trips carrying 24 tons each, or roughly one trip every other day.

Hazardous materials include Fuels (stat), explosives, acids, cyanide, ammonium nitrate, lime, antimony concentrate and other toxic materials. All highly toxic to fish, and humans I might add, should this happen along Highway 55 and in McCall into the NF Payette River, along mine access roads into the SFSR, Johnson Creek, and EFSF and its tributaries. One spill, at the right time and place, could kill 100% of the eggs, fry, juveniles, and spawning adults of up to four species.

Let's get real here, how many times have we seen or read about toxic spills in this area. It is not a question of if but when. This incredible abundance of life in our rivers and forests needs better stewardship than what is being proposed. It needs to be protected in perpetuity for our grandchildren. The forests that are providing our oxygen and the fish that are such important links in all of the food chains and ecosystems are all essential to our survival. If Perpetua was interested in the perpetuity of healthy habitats, ecosystems, that are essential to our world, they would withdraw their proposal. It is not 1872 and it is time to update the laws to ethically and realistically address the potential risks to our world today. The world is experiencing enough chaos without creating more through poorly planned money grubbing at the expense of our own habitat. There have been such tremendous advances in science and medical care. Let's treat our land and water with the same respect.