

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/19/2024 3:00:35 AM

First name: Henry

Last name: Roller

Organization:

Title:

Comments: In my previous comment I raised concerns about the fact that the Forest Service failed to consider how climate change would exacerbate the negative impacts of the Stibnite Mine. The Forest Service has failed to adequately address these concerns. For example, you none of your analyses of the changes to stream temperatures that this mine will induce accounted for climate change. How is this possible? This is a glaring inadequacy.

Furthermore, in my previous comment, I pointed out that all 27 of the modern operating gold mines in the United States have experienced a pipeline spill or accidental release of hazardous materials. Your documents do not place enough emphasis on ensuring that this will not happen at the Stibnite Mine. Given the track record of environmental damage caused by mines, are you willing to accept that hazardous materials spills will almost certainly occur here?

Also in my previous comment, I noted that many of Idaho's fish populations are Endangered Species Act listed, including in and around the proposed project area. In your own DROD, you state that the No Action Alternative (no new mine) is the environmentally preferable alternative. You will blatantly disregard your own advice by allowing the mine to proceed.

The Biden Administration has established salmon recovery in the Columbia and Snake River basins as a national priority via the September 2023 Presidential Memorandum titled "Memorandum on Restoring Healthy and Abundant Salmon, Steelhead, and Other Native Fish Populations in the Columbia River Basin". By allowing the Stibnite Mine to proceed, I believe you are in violation of these important commitments. You must not disregard the irreparable damage that this mine will cause to salmonids.

Additionally, in my previous comment I mentioned that tribes such as the Nez Perce depend on salmon as a culturally significant food source. Salmon brings irreplaceable benefits to the tribes of this region and these benefits (cultural, health, and spiritual) cannot be ignored. The Nez Perce reserved their rights to fish in all usual and accustomed places in the Treaty of 1855. Given the federal government's long and problematic history of ignoring these treaty rights, you must give more consideration to the concerns about this project raised by tribal members. Please do not continue our country's troubling past of ignoring Indigenous voices.

Finally, the notion that this mine will enhance national security by boosting antimony production is a flawed one. It is worth noting that there are currently no domestic facilities capable of refining the antimony from this project, meaning the raw antimony would have to be exported overseas for refinement. How does exporting raw materials to other countries enhance our national security? Finally, I believe that the antimony argument is being used by proponents of the mine as a smokescreen. The primary objective of the mine is gold extraction. Let's not forget that Perpetua Resources just a few years ago went by a different name: Midas Gold.

I ask you to consider a different path forward, one that includes stream restoration at the abandoned mine site and that does not include building the new mine.

The perceived, often overexaggerated benefits that this mine would cause do not outweigh the environmental and health risks it poses to Idaho. Protecting the interests of hunters, fishers, rafters, and other public land enjoyers would be a better use of the remarkable South Fork Salmon River than allowing a Canadian company to degrade United States lands and waters. Please do not allow the Stibnite Mine to continue.