

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/9/2024 9:22:42 PM

First name: Jeannie

Last name: Bush

Organization:

Title:

Comments: During the Objections Solutions meeting Oct 12, 2022, I stated:

"An EIS is mandated by NEPA to assess potential impact of actions "significantly affecting the quality of HUMAN environment." This exploratory mining meets that definition. And I meet the definition of HUMAN. " I went on to enumerate the negative impact mining would have: the noise, the excessive water use in an area that is already challenged for water, excessive road maintenance and who will cover that cost, the protected flora and fauna in this project area, the fire response time in this project area, the likelihood of the mining company leaving the project area without reclamation like so many other sites and the scars left for decades, my home tanking in value living next to a mine and more.

I am the human factor in the equation of the significant negative impact of mining. The USFS can make decisions, but I will live with the ramifications of those decisions every single day. The noise 24/7. The fire danger. The disruption on the roads. The fear of my water/well failing. My home value going down. (As one mining supporter said, "just leave" and make it into a VHR! Even if I could try to make it into a vacation home rental, once the reviews tell of the noise, etc, the reviews would tank. It is hard to fathom being told to just leave. THIS IS MY HOME.) I represent the NEPA definition " . . . significant negative effects on the quality of the HUMAN environment."

And finally, this land is sacred to my Native husband, his elders and our descendants. Water is Life. This Pactola 20,000 + acres should be just the START of protecting our watershed from mining.

My husband and I support the withdrawal.