

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/10/2023 3:53:08 AM

First name: Danielle

Last name: Desmond

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Ms. Jackson,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide the following comments on the Stibnite Gold Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). At this point in the proposal we should not move forward with the Stibnite Project.

There are too many inconsistencies with projected data and actual reported data. I am an outdoor enthusiast constantly chasing water weather is be frozen or dancing on the river. The most concerning aspect to me is our water trends over the past decade, aquifers and ground water has become more scarce, the rivers I love run at minimal flows creating warmer temps and inhabitable conditions for fish. I understand the need for US to produce antimony. But what are our option to produce clean uncontaminated water ways and thriving wilderness untouched by mankind. We are all lucky to live in such an amazing part of the country with beautiful vast wilderness. The previous mine has done its damage and the proposal if the new mine is going to be far worse with new roads, housing development.

Our rivers and backcountry bring in visitors all over the world. The income generated from people visiting to float our many permitted rivers, hiking our trails and just explore our state has a far less damaging impact as the mine will have. There is not one operating mine in the United States that does not have a negative impact on our environment or community!

Antimony could be replaced by chromium, tin, zinc, and titanium compounds in the paint industry. Cadmium, sulfur, copper, and calcium can be used to harden lead. A number of organic compounds can be used as fire retardants. Recycling, mining, and smelter production will meet the demand for antimony and antimony compounds for many decades to come.

Show me a company that can create a beautiful pristine wilderness! There is no substitution for that.

The Forest Service needs to conduct additional analysis for the Stibnite Gold Project, which is in the headwaters of Idaho's South Fork Salmon River. As detailed more below, the current SDEIS is not sufficient or lawful because it: (1) fails to adequately consider impacts to eligible, suitable, and congressionally designated Wild & Scenic Rivers or opportunities to mitigate impacts; (2) lacks key information and analysis necessary for an informed public review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); and (3) needs to consider a reasonable range of alternatives. Absent additional analysis, I do not believe that the most basic requirements of the NEPA will have been met.

Impacts to eligible, suitable, and congressionally designated Wild & Scenic Rivers have not been adequately considered. The SDEIS completely fails to address potential adverse impacts to the congressionally designated Main Salmon and Middle Fork Salmon rivers. Impacts to water quality in the South Fork Salmon River and its headwaters may negatively impact the Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs) of the Main Salmon River. The Middle Fork Salmon River will likely be impacted, as the Burntlog access route uses significant portions of the high divide that separates the South Fork Salmon and Middle Fork Salmon River watersheds. Light, visual, water, and dust pollution may impact the scenery ORVs of the Middle Fork Salmon River. Additionally, three rivers within the project analysis area have been deemed to be eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System: Burntlog Creek (eligible), Johnson Creek (eligible), and the South Fork Salmon River (suitable). While the SDEIS acknowledges that mining activities would adversely impact ORVs for water quality and fish, there is no consideration of mitigation measures to reduce impacts - such as

graveling access roads to reduce sedimentation.

The SDEIS lacks key information and analysis necessary for an informed review as required by NEPA, including basic engineering specifications and analysis of the tailing's storage facility, sediment modeling, or detailed reclamation plans.

The SDEIS fails to consider a reasonable range of alternatives. The SDEIS only considers the mine applicant's proposed mine plan and no alternative action. This is not a reasonable range of alternatives. Please evaluate an alternative that utilizes underground mining operations rather than open-pit mining. Underground mining operations would greatly reduce the most adverse environmental impacts and must be considered. At minimum, the Forest Service should consider a third alternative that significantly reduces negative ecological impacts.

Finally, the Stibnite Gold Project will negatively impact the treaty-reserved rights of the Nez Perce Tribe and other indigenous peoples. The SDEIS clearly states that "Adverse impacts to tribal rights and interests under either alternative, including preventing access to traditional lands, harming traditional fishing and hunting rights, impacting endangered salmon and concerns that it would harm the tribe's salmon restoration efforts".

Please incorporate missing information and analysis necessary to make an informed decision among alternatives and allow additional time for public comment prior to issuance of a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Stibnite Gold Project.