

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/10/2023 3:42:01 AM

First name: Caitlin

Last name: Baird

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear Forest Supervisor Jackson,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SDEIS for the Stibnite gold project proposed at the headwaters of the South Fork Salmon river watershed. Like so many people I have a deep personal connection to this area and have spent some of my best days paddling on the EFSF and SFS river and camping and hiking along their banks. I have observed wild salmon spawning, watched the largest black bear I have ever seen meandering on the riverside, counted large elk and bighorn sheep herds along the hillsides, and mountain biked past huge wolf tracks near the proposed mine site. This watershed is such a diverse thriving wilderness. Along with all these animals mentioned above I am extremely lucky to call Valley County my home and the location of the proposed mine site my backyard. Although, whether you live here or not I think most people given the opportunity to spend any amount of time in this area would agree that what is at stake is so much more precious than gold.

As I understand throughout the life of the mine, hazardous materials will be transported through our community. Chemicals including explosives, acids, cyanide, ammonium nitrate, and other toxic materials. All toxic to not only fish but humans as well. As an emergency room nurse at our local hospital I could potentially be involved in caring for exposures to these hazardous materials. This makes me especially concerned with the lack of risks analysis/action plan if a hazardous spill were to occur. Why was hwy 55, Mccall, and New Meadows not considered in any transportation analysis? The potential exposure of a hazardous spill is much larger than the SDEIS portrays and must be addressed by the forest service.

I was also disheartened to see that the SDEIS made basically no changes from the original DEIS on the socio-economic impacts on the mine and used the same "benefits only" analysis. Our local business leaders have personally invested in the community and conducted their own analysis using a creditable consulting firm and their findings need to be addressed prior to moving forward with any proposals. Mine operations will create additional burdens on city and county services such as schools, roads, police, fire department, hospitals, and telecommunications facilities that will not be offset by the \$300,000 paid by Perpetua in property taxes. I can tell you firsthand that these services have already been stressed with our growing population and lack of affordable housing over the past few years. Not to mention that the independent study also found that Valley county's housing market will become increasingly less affordable for locals if the mine is built. Where will the funds come from to adequately support and staff these necessary services? Where will all these mine employees live? I am concerned that these issues were not adequately examined in either the draft or supplemental EIS document and like so many topics in the document the benefits have been exaggerated.

After reviewing the proposed options there are far too many unavoidable environmental, social, and economic risks to the ecosystem and local communities to approve of this project. I urge you to not approve this mine and choose the No-action alternative. At the very least this SDEIS is deficient in too many ways to creditably use it and the USFS needs to go back and try again. Thank you for your time and the opportunity to comment on this project.