

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/19/2024 3:57:23 PM

First name: Joshua

Last name: Landess

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Hi,

As a homeowner here for 20 years now, I have a number of concerns about this project. Some of them are:

- In reading over the Mining Plan of Operations, I question if South32 has really done everything that it could have done to plan for onsite energy harvesting, storage, use, and (when there is a surplus) transmission to offsite. I suspect that Unisource has been pushy in preventing South32 from exploring its options in this area, but in this county we are all accustomed to Unisource manipulating those conversations, and I'd still like to see South32 revise its plans to include more solar power and batteries close to the mine, and a revised statement from South32 as to meeting its 2050 net zero goal (i.e.: could the mine be net zero by 2040 with increased local solar and storage?

I realize it would significantly drive up project costs if larger scale onsite solar and storage were to be provided, and I'm not sure of the issues with transmission, but it would also help with net zero goals, and provide for possible significant increased project revenues and net profits, if the profit is able to reduce or eliminate payments to the local utility and if it is able to sell excess solar power.

- While it is good to see the planned use of electric vehicles, I still see some mention of diesel vehicles. Are they really needed? And if they are eliminated, would not the 2050 net zero date come sooner?

- I am very much concerned as to what I have been able to learn as to the health impacts of Manganese mining and refining. I don't have answers, and will want to hear what South32 has to say about installing methods (and site location decisions, and transportation pathways) far more safe than what other operations have seen around the world. I am skeptical of any refining facility located in or near people, of any transport of the material through our community, and of any mining or refining operation that is not based on old methods. I look forward to South32 explaining itself, as to what the modern version of "good" looks like.

At the same time, I suggest to South32 and lobbyists and the industry in general, that there should be a stiff tariff or ban on Manganese and imported products that incorporate it, if the metal is not mined according to the absolute safest most modern possible methods. That is, South32 should not have to compete with lower-priced Manganese that is lower-priced because companies took shortcuts and communities had people die or suffer terrible injury attributable to old methods and old location decisions. As I understand it, there is a history of such mines and refining around the world that includes both death and injury from local Manganese operations. If companies from outside the US are going to be able to produce cheap Manganese because they don't have to follow safe operation standards (i.e.: because people are injured and die in providing that Manganese), then their product should not be allowed into the US, or only allowed in under very high tariff. Such a ban or tariff would help South32 to focus on delivering an actual safe operation. If they have to compete with much less expensive product from around the world, I don't see how they can propose to do this and I think they'll eventually end up cutting corners and killing or injuring locals.

- I can't speak to what will happen to the water quality in the surrounding area due to the mine, but I am concerned about this.

- South32 should not be just monitoring itself in key matters such as local emissions. That is, I read a story where I believe it was discussed that South32 would be responsible for measuring its own emissions. I oppose this. If an independent auditor is appointed who can keep South32 honest, I think this would work out *much*

better for the health of the community.