

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/10/2023 1:38:34 AM

First name: Laura

Last name: Howe

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear USFS-

I am adamantly opposed to the Stibnite Gold project proposed by Perpetua Resources and I fully agree with Idaho Rivers United's comments and opposition to this project. I oppose this project for the following reasons, and am concerned that the US Forest Service is approving a project which will adversely affect me and my use of the area. Please select Alternative #3, No Action.

I am fortunate to live very close to Idaho's Rivers, even though I live in Montana. I often say I can see the Idaho sky from my house in the Bitterroot valley. I have had the pleasure many times to visit the area and have spent time camping, exploring, and rafting in and around Lick Creek, Yellowpine, the EFSF Salmon, and the South Salmon). These are my public lands too, and I want to be able to continue to return to this beautiful land and enjoy it for years to come. That is hard to imagine, boating the EFSF and accessing the river might become problematic with the increase of traffic and the potential to cut us off from boating it. There aren't many good places to access the river with rafts (trucks with trailers and large inflatable boats need access space), and this project has the potential to limit that access even further. The EFSF is an advanced river and access points are critical to rafting to ensure people can safely run only those sections of the river that they are up to, and not have the loss of river access cause them to get run more difficult sections than they otherwise/currently would, possibly getting in over their heads. I don't see that this sort of impact was even considered.

I urge you to approve only Alternative #3 based on significant and permanent (up to 100 years IS permanent to a human) adverse impacts to water quality (pollution and permanently raised temperatures), water quantity (eliminating riparian and wetlands, damaging hundreds of additional acres of those lands, dewatering ground water, and disconnecting groundwater channels), recreation (massive closures and impacts to access due to heavy hauling), tourism, salmon habitat (how can you recommend an option nearly guaranteed to not allow the passage of fish?), the lives of residents (water quality/quantity, air quality, noise, and access). It creates a massive industrial haul corridor in one of the wildest places in the lower 48. Neither of the proposed options is acceptable to become this type of a corridor due to the massive expansion of traffic especially heavy haul equipment. Heavy haul corridors are LOUD, and not suitable for places such as this.

It is one of the headwaters of the Wild and Scenic Salmon River and needs to be protect, not further degraded (this is not a reclamation project by any means!). The EA didn't even analyze these impacts to the Salmon River, which should toss the entire analysis in the trash. That the USFS will halt construction on a bridge on the Middle Fork Salmon for a single salmon Redd in 2022, and then seriously consider allowing this mine to move forward, is unconscionable. This is the wrong place to even consider approving a project that requires air quality mitigation, especially using UNPROVEN technology (no proof that it is effective). That the analysis considers the baseline conditions to which they must return the site, the current heavily contaminated and damaged, is utterly absurd. Why not just call it a shopping mall? That would be as accurate.

It is also unacceptable due to the adverse impact to our nations Tribes, by excluding them from traditional hunting and fishing grounds even furthering our nations illegal disregard for Tribal treaties. Their cultures are the only connection we have in this nation to the history of our nation, and we should embrace them and empower them to thrive. Don't we already have enough, do we have to continue to take more from Tribes?

Please reject this mining proposal and selection Alternative #3, No action.

Laura Howe

On 1/9/23

