Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/11/2023 4:14:04 AM
First name: Jordan
Last name: Nielsen
Organization:
Title:
Comments: Dear Ms. Jackson

As an Idahoan I fully support the Stibnite Gold Project. I believe in mining at home for the resources we use daily and depend on for our national security. I'm not a big fan of the "Not in my backyard" ethos. We have the best and most stringent environmental review process of any nation and at some point that review process must provide answers. After 12 years of investigation, data analysis, community engagement and technical refinement, Perpetua Resources has created a project to be proud of. The 6-year plus environmental review process scrutinized every aspect of the project and determined Perpertua's proposed 2021 MMP as the preferred alternative. Since the only difference between the two viable alternatives is the proposed access to Stibnite, I'd like to highlight following passages from the SDEIS on the difference between the Burntlog Route and the Johnson Creek Route. It's obvious to me why the USFS chose the 2021 MMP as the preferred alternative.

*"The Burntlog Route would avoid environmental and human health and safety risks associated with the Johnson Creek Route which passes through identified areas for avalanches, landslides, and floods. This route would provide another route for SGP ingress/egress, would decrease SGP and public traffic interaction with Yellow Pine and Johnson Creek area residents; and would decrease the potential for spill risk adjacent to fish-bearing streams." (Ch2. Pg. 2-18)
*"There are more areas of landslides and rockfalls along the Johnson Creek Route (45) than there are along the Burntlog Route (26). Potential avalanche paths crossed by the Johnson Creek Route (94) are more numerous than the Burntlog Route (38) and are more significant in size than along the Burntlog Route. The increased numbers of mass wasting hazards along the Johnson Creek Route would be expected to result in an increased number of temporary road closures and possible accidents involving vehicles than the Burntlog Route." (ES-8)
*"Both the Burntlog and Johnson Creek routes have segments that are exposed to landslides, rockfalls, and avalanches. These geohazards present along the road corridors could increase the potential for truck accidents resulting in spills of hazardous materials. The Burntlog Route has exposure to 26 landslides or rockfalls and 38 avalanche paths. The Johnson Creek Route has exposure to 45 landslides or rockfalls and 94 avalanche paths. The Johnson Creek Route thus may have higher potential for increased trucking accidents and greater spill risk from these geohazards." (ES-13)
*"Close proximity to surface water resources increases the potential consequences of a significant spill along the access routes. The Burntlog Route crosses 37 streams and includes 9 total miles that are within 0.5 mile of surface water resources. The Johnson Creek Route crosses 43 different streams and includes 27 miles that are within 0.5 mile of surface water resources, including several miles which parallel the fish-bearing East Fork SFSR and Johnson Creek waterways. Though the Burntlog Route includes a greater number of stream crossings, the Johnson Creek Route includes greater proximity to water resources. The potential consequences from significant trucking spills would thus be greater along the Johnson Creek Route." (ES-14), (Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat Specialists Report, p.117)
*It also should be noted that use of the Burntlog Route (in-lieu of the existing roads along the Johnson Creek Route) could lower sedimentation impacts by reducing the number of stream crossings (37 versus 43 crossings) and eliminating travel along and adjacent to Johnson Creek and the East Fork SFSR, as Johnson Creek and McCall-Stibnite roads follow and have multiple crossings of these two waterbodies. (Water Quality Specialists Report, p. 162)