Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/10/2023 7:27:28 PM
First name: James
Last name: Byrd
Organization:
Title:
Comments: I want to write to request a 45 day extension of the not sufficient 75 day public comment period for a total of 120 days for the stibnite gold project supplemental draft environmental impact statement.

I am an avid kayaker and outdoorsman who recreates and loves the area where stibnite proposes their gold project. I feel very concerned for my health when on the rivers downstream and the river drainages if this were to go through and I am deeply concerned for the endangered species of chinook, steelhead, bull trout, and westslope cutthroat that the Forest Service has even listed as sensitive species. It boggles my mind that 392 million tons of heavy metal laden and possible acid generating material will be disturbed and stored with potential to further contaminate water resources of the site. Also crazy to think of the historic chinook spawning grounds upstream of the miine would be reconnected via na untested mile long fish tunnel, and be covered in hundreds of feet of toxic mine tailings. Crazy to think they say this is restoration when the reconstructed river channel will be flowing on top of the tailings with elevated water temperatures for the next 100 years.

And if not the saddest part is the cultural and ceremonial sites within the 14,221 acre operational boundary will be blocked for at least 20 years and falls within the Nez Perce Tribes traditional hunting, fishing and foraging grounds to which they have TREATY RIGHTS !!

The stibnite gold project impacts resources of integral and high public interest such as ESA listed fish, the Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness, rivers that are eligible for Wild and Scenic River designation, roadless areas, and extensive ecological, cultural and recreational resources.

Even if stibnite says what they want to do with the reclamation efforts the mine site will harm the environment and be a scar on the land for generations. Harmful chemicals will contaminate aquifers and soil for generations. The reparation site they plan on implementing to the site will be disgraceful to the beauty and ecology to the pristine area.

I hope the Forest Service will continue 'Caring for the Land and Serving People' and I want to ensure that the Forest Service has sufficiently detailed information to make a reasonably informed decision and encouraging public participation in the development of that information.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Byrd