

Grassy Mountain Draft Permits (Public Comment Period 12/8/2025 - 2/6/2026)

| <u>Comment #</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Person</u> | <u>Email</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Attachment</u> |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| 1 | 12/8/2025 | 11:36 | Zeph Friedman-Sowder | agaves.blue@gmail.com | This is a public comment to the proposed gold mine operation at Grassy Mountain by Paramount Gold. The proposed site is in Greater-sage grouse habitat. Greater-sage grouse are adversely affected by cyanide. It limits oxygen to their cells and is deadly. I do not support the Grassy Mountain gold mine and neither do the sage grouse. Please leave Oregon, let nature be wild, and Paramount Gold if you are this selfish, I wish you the absolute worst. | |
| 2 | 12/9/2025 | 7:34 | Bart King | readingmaven@gmail.com | Hello, As an Oregon resident, I wanted to express my opposition to the cyanidation and cyanide pollution of groundwater that would result in allowing the gold mining operation. The full project area spans almost 500 acres of public land managed by BLM, and of course, there are no limits to how groundwater contamination can spread. Sincerely, Bart King 304 Mill Street, Silverton, OR 97381-1433 503.290.4481 | |
| 3 | 12/9/2025 | 9:49 | Alyson Hills-Martin | alysonhillsmartin@gmail.com | Good morning, I am writing to strongly oppose Calico to construct an underground gold mine, surface mill complex, and tailings storage facility to develop the Grassy Mountain gold resource in Malheur County, Oregon. I grew up in a small oil field town in Utah and saw mining of sorts and landscapes ruined even after the company left. How is any level of cyanide safe? Even if the mine is only there for eight years, what about the lined pools of slurry? Despite the company's claims of keeping drinking water safe, the environment from harm, and protecting the decreasing number of sagegrouse, I do not believe them. As we know, most companies would rather pay the fine for harming the environment than following the rules. This seems like an easy decision to disapprove. Our planet doesn't need further destroyed by more mining. Please do not do this. Thank you, | |
| 4 | 12/9/2025 | 11:05 | Tricia / Terry Hedin | laguz3hedi@gmail.com | We oppose the permitting of Paramount Mining's gold mining project in eastern Oregon. We are concerned about the short-term and long-term environmental damage. Also concerned about the permanent storage of contaminated materials in storage facilities. The damages to our public lands, water and air outweigh any limited benefits to Oregon taxpayers. Tricia Hedin Terry Hedin 1180 W. 27th Avenue Eugene, OR 97405 | |
| 5 | 12/9/2025 | 13:33 | Valerie Rogers | val@valrogers.org | Greetings, IF this new mine is permitted, it must be regulated with maximum strictness to protect the environment, especially water, through the full project lifecycle. The company must also be held to the highest standards regarding working conditions and overall community benefit, including tax payments. Obviously the resource is quite valuable but there must be equitable sharing of costs & benefits. You as regulators can and must insure fairness instead of pillage. Thank you, Valerie Rogers Ashland, Oregon | |
| 6 | 12/9/2025 | 14:10 | Nyla Jebousek | nljebousek@gmail.com | Hard NO. Nyla L Jebousek Newport | |

| <u>Comment #</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Person</u> | <u>Email</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Attachment</u> |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|--|--|-------------------|
| 7 | 12/9/2025 | 17:53 | Kate Sullivan | katieirns@gmail.com | <p>I think that the decision to let a NV company mine gold in Oregon is a truly terrible decision (have you been to Vegas/Reno and seen how businesses in the state treat nature/resources?), especially given the byproducts of such mining, namely the contamination of groundwater with cyanide.</p> <p>We need to be pushing back against Trump and Company's desire to open up national parks/preserves to business interests. Once we lose pristine nature/clean water, it's gone.</p> <p>I also want to point out how the promises of jobs have rarely, if ever, been realized (I live in Lane County and have watched the city give huge tax breaks to companies that promised good paying jobs and delivered scant returns) and would urge decision makers to build in requirements, so that any failure to produce X number of agreed upon jobs = the company paying a substantial penalty to the state.</p> <p>Additionally, the company must be required to complete restoration work after mining.</p> <p>I suspect that these kinds of requirements would discourage the company from their endeavor.</p> <p>Please protect our resources and the environment for our children.</p> <p>Kate Sullivan</p> <p>(I also want to remind folks that the race for gold is because billionaires understand the stock market if incredibly unstable at this point in time because they've wildly over-speculated on AI; why should the public pay for irresponsible speculation by millionaires and billionaires?)</p> | |
| 8 | 12/10/2025 | 9:50 | Kevin March | kmarch1961@gmail.com | <p>The Malheur Basin is water starved. The S fork of the Malheur river flows at 2cfs during the summer. The Middle fork is frequently shut entirely when the reservoir runs dry, which is happening with increasing regularity. The Malheur river by the time it reaches Ontario is a toxic soup and considered to have "poor" water quality. It is one of if not the most polluted rivers in the state.</p> <p>A mine pulling 2cfs from 7 wells in the basin will only further exacerbate the water issues, drawing down the aquifer and drawing down the water tables.</p> <p>Furthermore, the DSL is an agency that believes that ephemeral streams are not waters of the state, that they are in essence dirt. However, ODFW OAR 635-415-0005 states that a watershed (31) "is composed of its streams, tributaries and associated uplands" including perennial, intermittent and ephemeral streams and that this "Important Habitat (11) is "Any habitat recognized as a contributor to sustaining fish and wildlife populations on a physiographic province basis over time".</p> <p>A watershed in OAR 635-415-0005 is defined as:</p> <p>(31) "Watershed" means a drainage basin encompassing a stream, its tributaries, and associated uplands at the USGS 4th Field Hydrologic Unit level.</p> <p>Since the Malheur uplands and basin flow into the Malheur river, and with the drawdown of the water resources that a mine of this nature will entail, I encourage you to reject this proposal. It will only exacerbate water quality issues in this area which are already critical for native species and the people downstream.</p> <p>Kevin March 206 Main Ave La Grande, OR 97850 541 962 5726</p> | |

| <u>Comment #</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Person</u> | <u>Email</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Attachment</u> |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--|---|-------------------|
| 9 | 12/10/2025 | 11:19 | Kimberly Szabo | invaderkim33@gmail.com | <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am submitting this comment to express serious concern regarding the draft consolidated permit for the proposed Grassy Mountain Gold Mine. My concerns reflect not only scientific and environmental considerations, but also the broader social, economic, and ethical implications for Eastern Oregon and the communities who depend on its fragile ecosystems.</p> <p>Current documents indicate that the project would rely on cyanide-based chemical processing, a method historically associated with catastrophic failures when containment systems degrade, overflow, or suffer structural issues. Even small leaks can release toxic byproducts such as cyanide compounds, arsenic, and heavy metals into groundwater. The region's aquifer is already stressed, and projections suggest substantial drawdown if the mine proceeds. Once an aquifer is compromised, recovery is slow, expensive, and often incomplete.</p> <p>Additionally, the site lies within habitat used by sage-grouse and other sensitive species. Disruption from noise, blasting, machinery, lighting, and construction can have irreversible impacts on wildlife populations that are already declining statewide. No amount of "reclamation" can fully replace a functioning desert ecosystem once it has been deeply disturbed.</p> <p>Supporters often emphasize jobs and short-term economic growth. While this may be true in the early years of construction, mining projects typically rely heavily on specialized out-of-area labor, meaning local residents benefit far less than the promotional materials suggest. Meanwhile, the long-term costs — groundwater monitoring, environmental oversight, potential contamination events, and eventual reclamation — are typically borne by the public, not the companies that leave when the ore runs out.</p> <p>The question is not whether jobs are important; of course they are. But the benefits must outweigh the risks, and in this case, the risk is to irreplaceable natural resources that communities in Eastern Oregon depend on for generations, not just a decade.</p> <p>This is not just about gold. It is about whether rural communities — often overlooked and economically vulnerable — are asked to shoulder disproportionate environmental risk for the sake of corporate profit. It is about protecting water sources in a high-desert region where water is life. It is about ensuring that the people who live closest to the land are not treated as collateral damage for industries that extract wealth and leave behind scars.</p> <p>These landscapes hold cultural meaning, ecological value, and deep roots for the people who call Eastern Oregon home. They deserve to be treated with respect, not as expendable territory.</p> <p>I urge the state to strengthen environmental conditions, extend public review, and require independent hydrological and ecological impact assessments before any final permit is considered. The burden of proof must rest on the applicant — not the public — to demonstrate that this mine will not harm the land, water, wildlife, or people. At present, that burden has not been met.</p> <p>The short-term economic gains do not outweigh the long-term environmental and community risks.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this comment.</p> | |
| 10 | 12/12/2025 | 1:04 | John Oluwaleye | oluwaleyejohn@gmail.com | <p>Submitted in person by public hearing comment</p> <p>Noted Thank and Regards.</p> | |
| 11 | 12/12/2025 | 10:04 | Annmarie Jones | cam_jones@msn.com | <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the use of toxic chemicals, such as cyanide, in gold mining operations. The introduction of these hazardous substances into the environment poses a significant threat to the surrounding ecosystem. Not only can they contaminate soil and water sources, but they can also disrupt the natural balance and lead to numerous environmental issues.</p> <p>It is imperative to consider the long-term consequences of such actions. Using non-sustainable processes to mine for gold can harm people and other living organisms within the area. The health and well-being of communities and ecosystems should be prioritized over short-term economic gains.</p> <p>I urge you to pursue alternative, sustainable methods that do not endanger the environment or the health of those who depend on it. Please take this into consideration and refrain from implementing harmful practices that could have devastating effects on both nature and local communities.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.</p> <p>Sincerely, Annmarie Jones</p> | |
| 12 | 12/12/2025 | 12:13 | Rob Walsh | randwal@comcast.net | <p>They key to making sure the miners are careful is to make them buy environmental insurance.</p> <p>If they are truly being careful, the insurance against environment damage will be relatively inexpensive.</p> <p>If they are not, it will be extremely expensive.</p> <p>I don't know what it would cost to repair poison ground water, but I would think five billion dollars of coverage would be enough.</p> <p>Sincerely, Rob Walsh</p> | |

| <u>Comment #</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Person</u> | <u>Email</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Attachment</u> |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| 13 | 12/12/2025 | 14:39 | Laurel Hines | laulehines@gmail.com | <p>I urge opposing the plan to let a gold mine, operating using cyanide, to put ANY spent products on public lands. If cyanide is to be used for such a mine, there should be strict processes expected to ensure that lands and groundwater is not polluted, and that there is no risk at all to wildlife.</p> <p>It is better to ensure avoiding issues, than trying to clean up pollution afterward, or having to fight the company to get violations resolved.</p> <p>Laurel Hines, Salem, Oregon</p> | |
| 14 | 12/12/2025 | 17:47 | James V. Ciaramitaro | jimciar2011@yahoo.com | <p>In deals like this, the company rarely employs as many local people as they say they will. In many instances, after the ore has been extracted, the company leaves and the taxpayer is stuck with the clean up bill.</p> <p>Mark me down as a vote against this project.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>James V. Ciaramitaro, fencing instructor Willamette University FITS Instructor, (ret.)</p> | |
| 15 | 12/14/2025 | 20:36 | Steve Reed | skylarson@yahoo.com | <p>Absolutely do not allow mining with cyanide in eastern oregon. Stop polluting the planet to make F***!NG (edited) MONEY !!!!!</p> | |
| 16 | 1/7/2026 | 9:18 | Anne March | anneharch@gmail.com | <p>In the Permit to Appropriate the Public Waters the following statements appear: SOURCE OF WATER: SEVEN WELLS, SUPPLEMENTED BY WATERS FROM A MINE IN THE MALHEUR RIVER BASIN PURPOSE OR USE: MINING/INDUSTRIAL USES RATE OF USE: 2.0 CUBIC FEET PER SECOND</p> <p>My input, as a concerned citizen who cares greatly about this dry and beautiful part of Oregon, is that THIS IS INSANITY and will have unforeseen consequences on the watershed. No one, despite claims to the contrary, can predict how this water diversion plan will play out. Underground or above ground, this is indeed a water diversion project.</p> <p>Two Cubic feet per second, drawn from wells or the other mine that is mentioned, is the total amount found in the South Fork of the Malheur River during summer months .</p> <p>This is in violation of ODFW OAR 635-415-005 which states that a watershed (31) "is composed of its streams, tributaries and associated uplands " including perennial, intermittent and ephemeral streams and that this "Important Habitat (11) is "Any habitat recognized as a contributor to sustaining fish and wildlife populations on a physiographic province basis over time".</p> <p>A watershed in OAR 635-415-0005 is defined as: (31) "Watershed" means a drainage basin encompassing a stream, its tributaries, and associated uplands at the USGS 4th Field Hydrologic Unit level.</p> <p>Unless this proposed mine site is at the bottom of the great basin (it is not!), then this could very likely result in the further drawdown of water in the Malheur river watershed. The Malheur River is already being used to capacity downstream in Ontario.</p> <p>This proposal needs to be rejected.</p> <p>Anne March 206 Main Avenue La Grande, OR 97850</p> | |

| Comment # | Date | Time | Person | Email | Comment | Attachment |
|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|--|--|------------|
| 17 | 1/8/2026 | 18:40 | Susan C. Walsh | scwalsh97@gmail.com | <p>As an Oregonian, I am writing to formally express my opposition to the Paramount Gold Company's proposed Grassy Mountain Gold and Silver Mine in Malheur County, Oregon.</p> <p>This public land belongs to the people of Oregon and lies within the traditional territory of the Northern Paiute people. It is unclear whether tribal concerns have been fully addressed or meaningfully incorporated into the decision-making process.</p> <p>The project proposes the use of large quantities of toxic materials to extract relatively small amounts of gold and silver. Although the Environmental Impact Statement assures that the site will be "remediated and monitored for 20 years," the environmental damage caused during active mining is irreversible and will far outlast the life of the project itself. Conducting this extraction underground and out of sight does not eliminate its broader environmental impacts.</p> <p>Water is a limited and increasingly precious resource in our state. The projected use of approximately 72 gallons per minute for mining operations represents an excessive and unjustified allocation of water for a short-term private venture, particularly when clean water is essential for drinking, agriculture, wildlife, and long-term ecosystem health.</p> <p>The processing and storage of toxic by-products—including the use of cyanide—will remain a concern long after the last ounce of gold is extracted. The Environmental Impact Statement states:</p> <p>"Any water or waste produced by mining will be stored in engineered containment systems built to meet or exceed state and federal environmental standards. These systems are monitored throughout the life of the mine and will be permanently sealed at closure to ensure long-term protection of the surrounding environment."</p> <p>This language is overly optimistic and vague. The term "long-term" is undefined, and the statement does not address what occurs when containment systems inevitably deteriorate over time. The fundamental issue remains: this project relies on the creation and perpetual management of toxic waste, with no truly permanent solution.</p> <p>While the potential economic benefits—estimated at 270 jobs, \$10 million in annual wages, and \$15 million per year in tax revenue—may appear appealing, they are limited in duration. According to the project timeline, construction would last approximately two years, followed by seven to eight years of mining, for a total operational lifespan of roughly a decade.</p> <p>By contrast, the environmental degradation and toxic legacy of this project would burden the land and surrounding communities indefinitely, affecting future generations long after any economic benefit has expired.</p> <p>I urge decision-makers to consider the true long-term costs of this proposal and to continue protecting Oregon's public lands from irreversible harm caused by short-term extraction of a small amount of gold and silver for private profit.</p> <p>Sincerely, Susan C. Walsh</p> | |
| 18 | 1/8/2026 | 18:30 | Susan C. Walsh | s.c.walsh@outlook.com | <p>As an Oregonian, I am writing to express my opposition to the Paramount Gold Company's Grassy Mountain Gold and Silver Mine project in Malheur County Oregon. This public land not only belongs to the people of Oregon but has also been part of the traditional territory of the Northern Paiute people. Have they voiced a concern?</p> <p>It appears that this project will require using large amounts of damaging toxic materials to extract proportionally small amounts of gold and silver.</p> <p>Although the report assures us that the site will be "remediated and monitored for 20 years", the upfront damage to the environment is irreversible and is a long-term consequence of a relatively short-term project. Just because it's performed underground and out of sight does not exempt this extraction process from impacting the environment overall.</p> <p>And, with clean water for drinking and life-sustaining flora and fauna a priority, using 72 gallons per minute to perform this extraction is an extravagant waste of limited resources for our state as a whole.</p> <p>The processing and storage of toxic by-products, and the use of cyanide during the process will remain long after the last ounce of gold is extracted. I find this report in the Environmental Impact Statement with the BLM to be unrealistically optimistic regarding long-term protection:</p> <p>"Any water or waste produced by mining will be stored in engineered containment systems built to meet or exceed state and federal environmental standards. These systems are monitored throughout the life of the mine and will be permanently sealed at closure to ensure long-term protection of the surrounding environment."</p> <p>How long is "long term"? And what happens after the containment system deteriorates? It does not address the fundamental issue of employing and generating poisons through a highly damaging process and needing to deal with the toxic tailings in perpetuity.</p> <p>The potential economic benefits:</p> <p>"Company officials say it would also create 270 jobs, up to \$10 million in annual wages and bring \$15 million a year in taxes to the region."</p> <p>while tempting, makes no promises for how long this would last. This seems to be the timeline:</p> <p>"The company expects construction to take two years, followed by seven to eight years of mining"</p> <p>So maybe 10 years total?</p> <p>Meanwhile the devastation of the land is a long-term result that will plague future generations just as nuclear waste plagues ours. Please consider the long term while considering the permitting of this project and opt to continue to protect our precious lands from the harmful extraction of a small amount of gold and silver for profit.</p> <p>Sincerely, Susan C Walsh</p> | |

| Comment # | Date | Time | Person | Email | Comment | Attachment |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|--|--|---|
| 19 | 1/13/2026 | | Thom Seal | tseal@unr.edu | All, Please find my public and professional comments on the Grassy Mtn project as per the public notice of 8Dec25 attached. Thom Seal, PhD, PE, QP. Mining-Mineral Process-Metallurgical Engineer President - Inventor of Hydro-Jex® Differential Engineering Inc. PO Box 545 Prairie City, OR 97869 510-418-5779 cell-text tseal@unr.edu | 20260113_PublicComment.pdf |
| 20 | 1/16/2026 | | Todd Fuller | | | 20260116_PublicComment.pdf |
| 21 | 1/21/2026 | 13:51 | Taylor Rembowski | taylor.rembowski@malheurco.org | This letter is in support of the DOGAMI permit for Grassy Mountain on behalf of the Malheur County Commission. Taylor Rembowski Economic and Community Development Coordinator/Grant Writer for Malheur County 541-473-5597 316 Goodfellow St. Ontario, OR 97914 | 20260121_1351_PublicComment.pdf |
| 22 | 1/21/2026 | 14:01 | Taylor Rembowski | taylor.rembowski@malheurco.org | Here is the Letter of Support for Grassy Mountain Mine on behalf of Malheur County Economic Development. Taylor Rembowski Economic and Community Development Coordinator/Grant Writer for Malheur County 541-473-5597 316 Goodfellow St. Ontario, OR 97914 | 20260121_1401_PublicComment.pdf |
| 23 | 1/23/2026 | 11:16 | Randy Jones | rjfish100@gmail.com | Dear Becky, please accept my comments, attached here, to the Draft Consolidated Permit(s) for the Grassy Mountain gold and silver mine project. I look forward to participating in this and future public reviews of this important project. I know my comments here reflect the interests of Oregonians in this first effort to permit a modern chemical process mine in the State. My contact information is as follows: Randy Jones 17086 Oxnard Rd. Bend, Oregon 97707 (541) 678-8933 | 20260123_1116_PublicComment.pdf |
| 24 | 1/23/2026 | 19:32 | WW | ww_anne@yahoo.com | No on the gold mine, no on cyanide, protect our over promised water resources. This is not needed and often big business does the damage and pays a fine. WW | |
| 25 | 1/24/2026 | 7:47 | Calico | smiller@slrconsulting.com | The attached letter is provided on behalf of Calico Resources USA regarding the draft Order, draft permits, draft consolidated permit conditions, and the fact sheets issued via public notice by DOGAMI for the proposed Grassy Mountain Mine. R. Scott Miller P.E. Senior Principal - Earth Sciences Land Quality & Remediation D 503-905-3422 O 503-723-4423 M 503-572-1124 E smiller@slrconsulting.com SLR International Corporation 6915 S Macadam, Suite 300, Portland, OR, United States 97219 | 20260124_0747_PublicComment.pdf |

| Comment # | Date | Time | Person | Email | Comment | Attachment |
|-----------|------------|-------|-------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 26 | 1/26/2026 | 15:08 | Jeff Carpenter | jeff.sreda@gmail.com | <p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>On behalf of the Snake River Economic Development Alliance (SREDA), I am writing to formally express our support for the application submitted by Paramount Gold Nevada Corporation regarding the proposed Grassy Mountain Mine project.</p> <p>SREDA's mission is to promote sustainable economic growth, job creation, and long-term prosperity throughout our service area. The proposed Grassy Mountain Mine project represents a significant opportunity to advance these goals by generating high-quality employment, increasing local and regional investment, and strengthening the economic base of Eastern Oregon and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>We recognize Paramount Gold Nevada Corporation's efforts to pursue responsible mineral development while adhering to applicable regulatory standards and environmental stewardship requirements. Projects of this nature can play an important role in supporting rural communities by diversifying the economy, providing family-wage jobs, and contributing to local tax revenues that fund essential public services.</p> <p>For these reasons, the Snake River Economic Development Alliance offers its formal support for Paramount Gold Nevada Corporation's application related to the Grassy Mountain Mine project. We appreciate the opportunity to provide input and respectfully encourage thoughtful consideration of this application.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jeff Carpenter - Executive Director Snake River Economic Development Alliance 208-371-5320</p> | |
| 27 | 1/27/2026 | 8:28 | Bernhard Weldon, TVCC | | | 20260127_CommunityCollege_PublicComment.pdf |
| 28 | 1/27/2026 | 16:41 | John Breidenbach, Ontario CoC | info@ontariochamber.com | | 20260127_OntarioChamberofCommerce_PublicComment.p |
| 29 | 1/27/2026 | 8:29 | Cathy Zacharias, Vale CoC | vale.chamber.or@gmail.com | | 20260127_ValeChamberofCo mmerce_PublicComment.pdf |
| 30 | 12/10/2025 | 11:49 | Bob McDaniel | bobmcdaniel@gmail.com | <p>[Voicemail transcription] Yeah good morning Dayne my name is Bob McDaniel I'm born and raised Oregonian live in Oregon City now and raised my kids here and take pride in my state and 63 years old been here the whole time. I'm calling you in regards to the gold the paramount gold mining project using products that are extremely terrible for our environment and our beautiful country so you're one of the names on the list to reach out and let you know that as a citizen and Oregonian my wife and I completely am in awe that they're talking about using cyanide to extract gold and silver out of hundreds of acres in Eastern Oregon so I am totally opposed. But just wanted to reach out as an Oregonian who takes pride in our beautiful country hate to see all this poison go into our underground aquifers and affect the bird life and the beautiful state of Oregon, so my e-mail is my name it's Bob McDaniel BOBMC DANIEL the numericnumber7@gmail.com. Bobmcdaniel7@gmail.com and my phone number is 503-706-7052 and I just wanted to make sure as a proud Oregonian I do not want to see this happen and wanted to speak up on behalf of us here in the state of Oregon. Hopefully you feel the same way please go to bat for me and my family. And do what we can to stop this from happening. Thank you appreciate your help.</p> | 20251210_1149_PublicComm ent.m4a |
| 31 | 1/30/2026 | | Gail Coon | coons@bendbroadband.com | <p>What are the chances of cyanide poisoning going into the water in the area of the gold and silver mine in eastern Oregon?</p> <p>Gail Coon</p> | |
| 32 | 1/31/2026 | | Judy Meredith | jmeredit@bendnet.com | <p>I am commenting on the proposed gold mining project near Vale, Oregon. It appears that economic gain is taking priority over wildlife, cultural and historic used, and existing nearby land ownership and ranching, agricultural practices. With the groundwater emergency affecting Harney county, does this adjacent county really have adequate water table to sustain water use for 7 or 8 years?</p> <p>My concerns would be as follows:</p> <p>What monitoring and enforcement should be in place regarding chemical leakage and extra damage to the land?</p> <p>What options exist to stop damaging actions? What mitigation and restrictions will be in place to protect existing wildlife migrations, eagle nesting, pronghorn and deer grazing etc.</p> <p>Is there any bond or monies on deposit with the state should damage exceed agreements and require cleanup?</p> <p>Is quarterly or monthly reporting of leakage, groundwater or land damage by toxic sufficient or monthly reporting but immediate or within 24 hour reporting and notification needed by the community and wildlife?</p> <p>Is there a review of groundwater and water table in the area that demonstrates water use by mining would not impact existing vegetation, wildlife, and agricultural and ranching practices? Climate change and drying of the west is real and dangerous to all of water is wasted in previous minerals just for profit of a few</p> <p>What enforcement will exist after the mine completion and the post monitoring supposedly continues for 20 years?</p> <p>If these things are all addressed and all impact is not adverse and state water board, DEQ and ODFW have no issues then the next step to approve the permit may be appropriate. BLM is notorious for prioritizing monetary interests for natural "resources" . Thank you for considering these points.</p> <p>Judy Meredith, 63460 Bridle Lane, Bend, Oregon, 97703</p> | |

| Comment # | Date | Time | Person | Email | Comment | Attachment |
|-----------|-----------|------|----------------|--|--|------------|
| 33 | 1/29/2026 | | Rabbi Fora | info@foraoregon.com | [Transcribed] Thank you. Hi, everybody. Thank you for welcoming me into your club. I am Rabbi Fora, I am a candidate for governor, and I am deeply concerned about what's going on here. According to the NIH, 54% of workers did not adhere to cyanide safety standards. The plan that I've seen, that while they have mentioned that there's public transparency I found out about this meeting because of a third-party newspaper article that a friend sent me. And I have not been able to find any of the reports that you've mentioned. The plan mentions no specifics from my finding on who is liable for a cyanide spill. I understand there was an accident bond mentioned, but there's not really any specifics on that. Besides that, you can't buy back water once it's poisoned. Once it's poisoned, it will be poisoned, and we won't be able to drink it. But I live in Portland, so I won't be drinking that water. You will. I think that's worth mentioning. I think it's worth mentioning on the public record that the brother of a congressman is here, and he works with the company that is getting this permit process done. I also think not providing a total ore estimate or an ROI for this community is a bit strange. A friend of mine did some back-of-the-napkin math. And it's estimated to be, what? Yearly for the mine, they're gonna get 260 mil a year. So, over the course of their 8 years, they'll get over \$2 billion of your money. And then they're saying that we'll have \$10 million of economic activity. Friends, that is one McDonald's, one McDonald's in a gas station. Nearby at an intersection is the same amount of economic activity as putting cyanide close to your water. And I really don't appreciate, I understand that this agency has procedures it needs to follow, and I appreciate all of the hard work that you continually do every day to do that, but I don't appreciate any of the tone that says, no matter how unpopular this is, we'll just follow the law. We will change the law a bit. It is unacceptable to go through with the project when the vast majority of people who will be affected by it don't like it. And I also think it's unacceptable to be taking somebody's land, and to not even have a firm figure on it when they ask. To say, at least, hey, X number of acres are estimated to be private, X number of ore is estimated to be in there. The fact that I can't even get estimates, I'm not asking for exacts. But I drove 6 hours to hear this presentation that I could have watched on Zoom. But no, I care about whether or not we all drink water. And I think you should, too. So, I'll end there. | |
| 34 | 1/29/2026 | | Travis Penfold | tpenfold2014@gmail.com | [Transcribed] Hey, my name's Travis Penfold. I also drove pretty far, because I'm kind of tired of seeing all of our resources kind of get trucked off elsewhere when all the profit are there insane. Hope, where we are, where communities are. Hope. Yes. So, hoping to keep more profit into Oregon, so I guess my confusion for some of this is, why it seems like so much of the monetary gain going out of state when they could be much more utilized here in all of our communities. So why is the benefit seemingly going outside of our state? We're getting, you know, a couple nickels here and there to help with complacency to let people come through and do what they want while they're getting more money, but the communities still suffer or are not doing as good as they could be, I guess. That wasn't really a question, was it? Yeah, I guess that's my concern. Why is it that a company has so much focus on resources that are in Oregon's grounds? Dealing with Oregon's grounds, and water, and wildlife, and communities? And why? | |
| 35 | 1/29/2026 | | Randy Jones | jfish100@gmail.com | [Transcribed] I'm Randy Jones. My affiliation is as a citizen. The first comment I'd like to offer is the designation, the endpoint of tailings, processing. And must be the point at which the discharge of tailings from the mill occurs. That's the only, that's the only approach to accurate and consistent statutory and rule implementation. So, and it's the only way to control, actually, the lowest practicable concentration of cyanide discharge. The statutory language is clear that those such discharges of tailings to the tailing storage facility Must use the best available practical and necessary technologies. Understanding that analysis has been complete. The method has been stipulated. But further on with these comments, the concentration needs to be adjusted. So, multiple ways in rule and statute, that the lowest Degree practicable, the greatest degree practicable of reducing cyanide must be achieved. And the record is clear. The applicant has demonstrated They have the economic, logistical, and technological means to reduce cyanide, wad cyanide concentrations at discharge At, concentrations in the neighborhood of .04 to 0.1 milligrams per liter, and that should be referenced in draft permits. Lastly, I'm very interested in the financial assurance and bonding requirements for the project. In two ways. And, addressing two credible accidents, and I hope that those will be addressed in Prior to issuing, final permits if this project goes that far. The first is A catastrophic mine collapse. The second is a total or partial failure of the tailing storage facilities embankments. In either case, citizens of Oregon should not have to bear the risk or liability, or cost associated with cleanup, And, the contamination of acres outside of the project area, for instance. So that needs to be borne by the applicant, and those numbers should be included in final permits. Thank you very much. | |
| 36 | 1/29/2026 | | Jean Cameron | jeanccameron440@gmail.com | [Transcribed] This is Jean Cameron, can you hear me? Alright, I guess since I'm not allowed to ask questions, only comment my main comment then has to do with page 25 and 59 of the draft permit. Page 25, condition number 218, requires reporting to DEQ on a quarterly basis regarding wildlife mortality. All other reportings are generally monthly. And on page 59, which is ODF&W's, permit condition, I suppose it's 18, They indicate a need to inspect for wildlife injury or mortality daily. So again, I think it should be changed to monthly reporting instead of quarterly. Thank you. Well, sure, they said no questions, but again, this has to do with, this has to do with page 38 of the draft permit, Condition 347. The permit authorizes the permittee to store processed water and surface water runoff from the mill area and the catchment pond, provided the water meets the limits identified in Table A3. The permit team must store any water exceeding those values in closed containers, or additional wildlife deterrents must be approved by DEQ and implemented. And I was looking for an example of what those additional wildlife deterrents might be. My other question had to do with the fact that the employee busing with regard to noxious weed control, the employee busing apparently is only in Vail, and I was curious if it was any other would be originating in any of the other local towns. Thank you. | |

| <u>Comment #</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Person</u> | <u>Email</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Attachment</u> |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|--|---|-------------------|
| 37 | 1/29/2026 | | Jim Mendiola | jimmendiola@malco.com | [Transcribed] My name's, Jim Mendiola. I'm a lifetime Oregonian, lifetime Malheur County resident. I'm a Malheur County Commissioner at present. I'm very excited about this project and have been for quite some time. I'm very impressed, and I welcome the whole crew from Albany and Portland. I know they've trucked a long ways today, and I'd just like to, to voice my appreciation for all the work you guys do in keeping all your regulations straight, and hold these guys to the fire. And I appreciate Calico, for keeping your feet in the fire, and keep on going. So, I'd like to talk about the economic impact, there's probably gonna be over \$2 million, or yeah, \$200 million over the 10 or 15 years this mine's gonna be going, and reclamation. And it's gonna be really good for Malheur County, but it's gonna be really good for Harney County. It's gonna be really good for all the counties that border Oregon. Because there's gonna be workers from all over the place. And I'd just like to voice my opinion and my appreciation for what you guys are doing. All of it. Thank you. | |
| 38 | 1/29/2026 | | Cindy Howard | cindy.howard@ausenco.com | [Transcribed] Cindy Howard. I'm a principal process engineer working for Ausenco Engineering, and I was responsible, as lead process engineer for the feasibility study for this project and for the sections on metallurgy, so managing metallurgical test work and interpreting the results to derive the design basis for the processing plant. I was also responsible for the design of the processing plant. I've written the world design report and the cyanide management plan. I've worked in this industry, I studied chemical engineering, I've worked in this industry for over 27 years in operations, and also in projects and commissioning simple plants. The majority of my experience has been in gold processing. As far as gold projects go, this is a relatively straightforward flow sheet. It's an easy ore body to treat. It's free milling. We don't need to grind to ultra-fine particle sizes to be able to liberate the gold, to leach it. It leaches quickly, within 24 hours in a tank leach scenario, and the cyanide consumption is low, comparatively. We've also put measures in place to, pre-aerate the solution ahead of the leach so that we minimize the cyanide, and that we're adding to the process. We also see that, there's no real nasties in this deposit, such as copper, that would require us to have to run at elevated, excess cyanide levels in the leach. So, we're running with a low excess of reagents, and then it's also a pretty straightforward cyanide destruction process. We've built several safety features into the design. We've got an excess of residence time, than what is typically required for cyanide destruction. We've got excess capacity in the reagent dosing systems. I guess my one comment around the permit conditions for the WAD cyanide concentration in the solution stream of the tailings. In our permit application, we stated we were designed to 15 milligrams per liter, and that level was determined to be, protective of wildlife and the environment, and that was supported by ecological risk assessment, studies. So, I'm just questioning why now this draft permit is stipulating one milligram per liter. I'm not understanding the justification for that. I don't know that it's going to be possible for the plant to achieve that on a daily basis. We've demonstrated really good results in the ideal conditions in a laboratory. But I don't know that it's going to be possible to achieve that consistently, and that it's necessary, to be quite honest. We're probably using excess reagents than we need to. And I think once the mine gets into operation, they can determine what the lowest practicable limit is that can be reached. So, I'm suggesting that the permit be modified to state 15 as what was in the application. Thank you. | |

| <u>Comment #</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Person</u> | <u>Email</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Attachment</u> |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|--|---|-------------------|
| 39 | 1/29/2026 | | Chris McMahon | chris.macmahon@wsp.com | <p>[Transcribed] My name's Chris McMahon. I'm a senior tailings design engineer with WSP. I was contracted by Calico to perform the design for the tailings storage facility, as well as the temporary waste rock dump. I just wanted to kind of explain a little bit about how the facility is designed, and the protection measures that have been put in place. So, as the tailings leave the mill. As the tailings leave the mill, they will be transported as a slurry, so it would be a combination of crushed rock and water. They'll be discharged into the tailings facility through what are called spigots, and it's a pipeline that runs around the top of the facility that essentially discharges tailings in strategic locations. The facility itself is a double-lined facility, so it has two layers of impermeable barriers. In between those two is a leak detection layer, so that we can monitor for any potential leakage that may occur in the facility. And keep that above a containment layer. The facility is what's called a Valleyfield Dam, so there's a dam that crosses the main drainage. That dam is constructed in phases. Those phases are downstream construction, so as the facility rises, additional raises are added on. Downstream construction is considered the safest type of dam construction in the world. It's used in high seismic regions. We're lucky here in Oregon, it's moderate to low seismicity. But it is designed with consideration of the largest potential earthquake that could happen in this area, called the maximum credible earthquake. As tailings are deposited, water will separate from the tailings mass. As was mentioned in the presentation, water will separate to the surface. That's called a supernatant pool. That water is pumped back to the mill, and it's recycled. Water will leave the base of the tailings and will be collected in a blanket drain above that lining system. That water will be delivered to a collection pond. That also will be brought back to the mill for reuse. As tailings continue to deposit, and the dam continues to be raised, it will only be raised, to the height that the mine needs for the next phase of operation. So, as planned right now, the TSF will contain 2 million tons of tailings. It is designed to accommodate more than that as part of the permitting process, but the current plan is to store 2 million tons in there. The temporary waste rock storage facility will be hydraulically connected to the TSF, and it'll have the same lining system as the TSF as well. enclosure, we will drain the water off the top of the TSF, as well as the base, and we will recontour the surface of the impoundment to promote drainage off the top. Before we construct the spillway, we will cap the facility with another impermeable barrier. And we'll place a soil cover over the top of that to vegetate it. Surrounding the facility to prevent storm water from coming into the TSF. We will have a diversion channel that'll divert storm water from around the facility. During operation, we also have a system to monitor for performance, both through hydraulics leakage, as well as geotechnical conditions, paying attention to things like groundwater and settlement of the dam, inclination of the facility as well. So all of that is going to be regularly monitored. And then, we've also done an inundation study in the event of a hypothetical catastrophic failure. What would the inundation Of the downstream conditions look like if the dam were to fail.</p> | |
| 40 | 1/29/2026 | | Scott Miller | | <p>[Transcribed] My name's Scott Miller. I work for a company called SLR and have been contracted by Calico working on this project for about 4 years now. I'm gonna talk briefly about permit conditions, so the permits appropriately describe it as a mine with no discharge, which is true. So, stuff coming out of the mill, those containment facilities, water's reclaimed. The water that's pumped from the upper underground, and the water that's collected in the facility, again, goes back into the mine and offsets water that'll come through the well field. Regarding the underground or the groundwater, protecting the groundwater. The mining activities, that are proposed, it is the underground mine is going to be in a really low permeability aquifer. So, not much water that's there, and it does move very quickly. The depth of groundwater in the mining area itself is about 100 to 300 feet below the ground surface, and nowhere in the mining area does that groundwater come to the surface. The closest downgradient spring, down at radiant spring, is about 2 miles away, so pretty far away. And the closest that close to the spring is above the level of the groundwater in the mine area, and so the water would have to travel uphill to get to that spring. The nearest stream is 17 miles away, from the mine. There's not really the potential for aquatic exposure to mining activities. Quickly, regarding the underground workings and the drainage there, working in the mine above the water table. There's gonna be very little water in the sumps, you know, there's just gonna be a little bit of water for the drilling activities associated with developing the mine. When the mining gets down deeper, it will go down below the water table. And water will flow inwards from the mine, from the groundwater, into the mine. And that water will be collected, used in underground mining. And what's excess water will be pumped to the surface and used in the milling process. That flow rate is estimated to be about 5 to 10 gallons per minute, which is about an average garden hose at a house. So, pretty really low flow aquifer, even when we're down below water table. That water will be pumped from the underground and it will be used in the process, it will not be discharged. Water collected in the sumps in the underground should will have a high pH, that's because they're going to be using cement in the underground workings, so it's going to have a high pH, and it's going to be kind of muddy, because it's going to be driven on, and there'll be drilling activities. There's a lot of monitoring that will happen in the groundwater monitoring system, wells around the mine area, which is part of this oversight by DEQ, so just be aware that that'll be monitored and protected. That's what I have.</p> | |

| <u>Comment #</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Person</u> | <u>Email</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Attachment</u> |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| 41 | 1/29/2026 | | Sarah Bauman | baughman.sarah@gmail.com | [Transcribed] Hey everyone, Sarah Bauman, third generation Oregonian, just here as a private citizen. So, first I wanted to ask the question on the record of what the date was on that groundwater study, and if it includes the impact after all of the new data centers and the ever-increasing amount of AI. This is not a secret that those are using tons and tons of water. There are a bunch of articles from KPTV, Stanford, Rolling Stone, this has been talked about to death, so I think it would be disingenuous and irresponsible to not look at the impact now versus whenever this study was originally done for the water required for this. Additionally, I want to know if this will impact electricity costs for Oregonians by any way, if this will be yet another project that we will be expected to subsidize the power costs while some big corporation gets a sweetheart deal where they pay almost nothing. Also, I want to know on the topic of transparency that was supposedly around this project, if it had been disclosed anywhere, how this personally benefits Congressman Cliff Bentz's family, and if anyone talks about that, and if that is a conflict of interest, I think it is. I also think this project in general is terrible for Oregon. I don't think we should be putting a bunch of cyanide into the ground. And I've heard lots of, oh, yes, yes, we're very responsible, and we know this and that. History has told us that every time these companies say that, something goes wrong, or some person doesn't follow proper procedure, and then an area's contaminated, and we're the ones who have to pay the cost. Especially people in this exact area. It's not some big company in Nevada. Yeah, we're gonna get \$200 million while they get, what, several billion dollars? It's a ridiculous trade-off. I also just, again, think this is a terrible idea for Oregon. We should be embracing our natural green spaces, our wildlife, all of these things, and outside corporations coming in here to dump a bunch of poison into the ground and kill the wildlife and make people sick. around that area is terrible, and I don't think we should be doing it. And I think that's all I have. | |
| 42 | 1/29/2026 | | Adele Shaffeld Griffin | dandaadams@yahoo.com | [Transcribed] This is Adele Shaffeld Griffin, Malheur County. I actually checked the box not to provide comment, but as most people know, if they're going to ask me, I'll have some type of comment. My children are 5th generation here to Malheur County, and listening to the testimony, I'd ask how many actually live here, grew up here, have vested interest here. But I was forced to leave here in the late 80s because my dad, as a third-generation farmer, couldn't support his family. He ended up, ironically, being a mill worker. He was a millwright, which built the exact type of facility that you guys are talking about. But our community needs jobs. Come here and see the low income. If we're not the poorest county, we're the second poorest county here in our state. We need good jobs here to support our families, so everybody online, thank you to Commissioner Mendiola for his support of the project, but we need the jobs and the mine here in our community. They have met all of the safety features. Look at the years they've jumped through the hoops. It's time to put the jobs in place and put the resources in use, so please let's move forward with this project. Thank you. | |
| 43 | 1/29/2026 | | Brian Cleaver | | [Transcribed] My name's Brian Cleaver, and I'm a rancher. I inherited that job from my parents. We have range permits from the BLM that's dead center, this mine's right in the middle of it. We've tried to develop water on it, we've tried to do everything we can to keep water in a trough or in a creek that the cattle could use, and you guys are talking water, water, water to do this mine. They came in the 80s when Atlas and the rest of them came in here. They've been working on this to develop water, and they went by this permit. Time and again, because they haven't got enough water to leach mine. They drilled wells all the way around it. They used one of our BLM wells to drill a well so they can find enough water to core drill with, because the well we had, they could pump dry in about 24 hours. And put a submersible pump in it. It's right below you guys' mine. It's in the canyon, there's two tanks there, right below the mine site. The two old men that drilled that hole up there and sold it, I drank beer with them 30 years ago. There's no water out there. Nobody's concerned about the cattle that we've got on BLM ground, and where they're gonna get the water. When they started drilling wells, they drilled two wells there. We've got a right to use that water out of those wells by and signed and notarized from Atlas and the subsequent mine facilities that came in and sold to these guys. The water that you've got, they ran originally went in and put flow meters on after they put the mines in, the wells in, and had to meter the wells for the springs that were all around the Grassy Mountain hill. And in 24 hours of pumping those wells, the water rights drop, and the flows of all the springs around this thing diminished. 24 hours is all it took, and you're wanting to pump this for forever up there, and it takes a lot of water to do this. You may be able to control it, you may be able to reuse it. But the animals, all of the animals, not just the cattle, all the deer and everything else that's out there, is gonna, is gonna run out of water before the mine does, and then it's not there. You're talking you go down 300 or 400 feet to get water, and it's not going to be a problem in the mine. Guess what? It's not going to be a problem anyplace, because you haven't got it. They looked at raising the Owyhee Dam to supply water to the original people that were doing this, because they didn't have enough water to do it. I don't know where you're going to come up with the water, but I, so, that's where you're at, guys. They've been at this for 50 years. | |

| <u>Comment #</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Person</u> | <u>Email</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Attachment</u> |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| 44 | 1/29/2026 | | Dr. Thom Seal, PE | tseal@unr.edu | <p>[Transcribed] Yes, hello. I'm Dr. Thom Seal, and I'm a professional mining metallurgical engineer, retired, and I live outside of Prairie City, Oregon, and I sit on the Grant County Natural Resource Advisory Council, and we'd really like to see a permit in Oregon for mining and process, because there's a lot of minerals in Oregon that can be utilized for our economic benefit. I have not met anybody with Calico Resources or Grassy Mountain, etc. I'm just a professional that would like to comment. Now, I used to work in Nevada, just south of the border for many years. I managed and operated several of the gold mines down there, and this permit is equal to or exceeds the processes down there as far as the design, but I have a couple comments on the operation. First, is a request that, if they develop a seep or some other water source in the process of this mining, that they develop it and make some kind of a guzzler to allow the wildlife can have some surface water if they develop that. And the second comment is the, regarding the operation of only, 2,500 metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions per year. I'd like to note that in 2024, the Hole in the Ground wildfire produced 7.4 metric tons of carbon dioxide, approximately, which is over 3,000 times the limit that you're restricting this mine. So, I think your quantity of 2,500 metric tons is unrealistic, and not based upon good science and engineering. The second comment I'd like to make is on the WAD cyanide. The best practices, scientific practices have been practicing for over 40 years down in Nevada, and it's 50 milligrams per liter of WAD. I operated large tailings dams and were responsible for the cyanide WAD content for many, many years. When we got over 40 parts per million, that's when we greatly increased our cyanide destruction capabilities, but that was kind of the threshold, and we monitor it every shift, every 12 hours, as an internal process. And so the fact that they are going to shut down the process at 30 ppm WAD is completely non-realistic as far as best available science and what's normally utilized. And the third thing is the, the way, the, stockpiles. Unless the material that's placed on the stockpile is potentially acid-generating, or has any hazardous materials in it, there's really no need to put a liner under your temporary stockpile, because you're just utilizing the stockpile to feed the mill, and then it'll be rapidly put in the process, and you have a little bit of surge capacity in case there's an issue with the underground, and so I'd like to, submit these comments. I also submitted written comments, but I think their operating permit for their limits for WAD cyanide and total CO2 is greatly exaggerated. Thank you.</p> | |
| 45 | 2/3/2026 | 10:26 | Alex Javier | alexmjavier@gmail.com | <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed grassy mountain mine. The mine is located on land this is home to numerous threatened species, particularly western sage grouse and lahontan cutthroat trout, a fish species which is almost extirpated from Oregon and this area represents its last remaining populations.</p> <p>The additional water draw pressure of 72 gallons per minute could total nearly 20 million gallons annually, an amount that would severely impact the drought stricken waterways, native fish, local agriculture production.</p> <p>Additionally, the cyanide processing is also likely to lead to leaching into the watershed, further damaging the ecosystem.</p> <p>As an Oregonian working in forestry who also has a degree in riparian ecology, I am not opposed to development and I know we need to get our raw materials from somehow, but gold and silver are not as critical as the habitat for the native species, and subsequent recreational value, that this site provides.</p> <p>Thank you for logging my comment.</p> <p>Sincerely, Alex Javier</p> | |

| Comment # | Date | Time | Person | Email | Comment | Attachment |
|-----------|----------|-------|--------------|--|---|---|
| 46 | 2/3/2026 | 18:12 | Jean Cameron | jeanrcameron440@gmail.com | <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>As a member of the Governor's work group that drafted and helped enact the 1991 bill and the subsequent administrative rules regulating chemical process mining, I have been very interested in reviewing the draft consolidated operating permit for Calico Resources USA Corporation's proposed gold mining operation at Grassy Mountain in SE Oregon.</p> <p>It has been gratifying to see that the general standards called for in the 1991 statute, including the use of "best available, practicable and necessary technology," "zero wildlife mortality," and bonded reclamation and monitoring are being required. I also complement DOGAMI for their inclusion of requirements focused on noxious weed control (1GEN-DIV37-DOGAMI-331, page 55) and required compliance with BLM's "Night Sky and Dark Environment" rules (1GEN-DIV37-DOGAMI-337, page 57), which were issues that probably didn't come up in 1991! In addition, I wish to complement the Interagency Project Coordinating Committee member agencies for their comprehensive work on this process.</p> <p>There are two similar conditions in the draft permit that I believe should be strengthened, considering the zero-wildlife mortality standard in the statute (ORS 517.956 (2)(a)). They are:</p> <p>Page 25, 1GEN-WPCF-N-DEQ-218: The last sentence reads: "Analyze these recordings [of wildlife interactions in and around the Tailings Storage Facility, Reclaim Pond, and the Catchment Pond] documenting the type and number of species using the area and report findings to DEQ quarterly as per Table B1." And on Page 60, 1GE3N-DIV37-ODFW-22: "Permittee must monitor wildlife injury and mortality and submit quarterly reports to the ODFW Malheur Watershed District Office."</p> <p>Quarterly reporting is insufficient for reporting wildlife mortality, which is one of the prime concerns associated with the use of cyanide and other toxic chemicals (Benzene, toluene, Xylenes and mercury) in ore processing. I would prefer weekly reports, but since Table B-1 of the DEQ Water Pollution Control Facilities permit requires monthly monitoring reports for all other categories of "Ongoing Monitoring Reporting," I recommend that monthly reports should also be required for wildlife at risk and wildlife mortalities.</p> <p>Because SE Oregon is in the flyway for migratory birds, I am especially concerned about their exposure to the water in the tailings and catchment ponds. I applaud the 1mg/L standard for WAD cyanide, since my research indicates that 1.6 is considered protective of birds. OAR 632-037-125 (2) states that "all chemical processing solutions and associated wastewater must be covered or contained to preclude access by wildlife or maintained in a condition that is not harmful to wildlife." The 1mg/L standard for WAD cyanide should meet this standard.</p> <p>Terrestrial mammals can be fenced off from these water storage facilities, but unless the Wildlife Protection Plan requires obviously visible netting or capping, birds flying over the desert will be attracted to water. Page 6 of the ODEQ WPCF permit states "the permittee must store any water exceeding these values (Table A3) in closed containers or additional wildlife deterrents must be approved by DEQ and implemented." It was stated at the January 29th public hearing that the wildlife plans are still under development. Will these final wildlife protection plans be included in the final permit, or even provided for public comment?</p> <p>In summary, I recommend that wildlife activity, injury and mortality reports should be submitted to the appropriate agencies at least monthly. I also request information regarding the final Wildlife Protection Plans approved as part of this permit.</p> <p>Thanking you for your consideration of these comments, I remain,</p> <p>Sincerely yours,</p> <p>Jean Jean R. Cameron 455 Alexander Loop #440 Eugene, OR 97401 Jeanrcameron440@gmail.com 503-781-3815</p> | |
| 47 | 2/5/2026 | | USFWS | jacqueline_cupples@fws.gov | <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries' (DOGAMI) draft permit conditions for the Grassy Mountain Gold Mine. Because the proposed mine could have impacts to Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed species, species protected by the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) and Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), species that have been petitioned for ESA-listing and have had a positive 90-day finding, as well as other federally or state sensitive species, including Greater sage-grouse (hereafter, sage-grouse), this project is of key concern to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). The Service has identified several clarifications and recommendations for the draft permit conditions as detailed in the attached table. We also provide additional comments in the attached letter.</p> <p>If you have any questions or require further information please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Thank you, Jackie Cupples La Grande Field Office Deputy Supervisor & Oregon Sagebrush Ecosystem Coordinator U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 3502 Highway 30 La Grande, OR 97850 P: 541-962-8593 C: 971-806-3375</p> | 20260205_USFWS_Comment.pdf |
| 48 | 2/6/2026 | | Bill Bold | billbold@codamail.com | My comments are in the attached PDF. | 20260206_0743_PublicComment.pdf |
| 49 | 2/6/2026 | | Randy Jones | rfish100@gmail.com | Becky, my great apology for another email. I failed to adjust the title block with today's date in the previous version. I have done so in the attached version. Please use this one. | 20260206_1055_PublicComment.pdf |

| Comment # | Date | Time | Person | Email | Comment | Attachment |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 50 | 2/6/2026 | 11:39 | Tara McLain, BLM | timclain@blm.gov | Good Morning. I have attached the BLM's comments to the draft permit. Please reach out with any questions. Thank you. Tara McLain Malheur Field Manager Vale District 541-473-6277 541-573-4462 | 20260206_1139_BLM_PublicComments.pdf |
| 51 | 2/6/2026 | 16:01 | Brian Posewitz, Staff Attorney | brian@waterwatch.org | Greetings, As public comments on the proposed permits for Grassy Mountain Mine, WaterWatch of Oregon submits the attached comments it submitted on the federal Draft Environmental Impact Statement, including several comments related to potential impacts to water resources and dependent ecosystems. WaterWatch also requests DOGAMI consolidated permit documents reflect that the deadline of 10/1/28 to complete beneficial use of water under the current permit to use groundwater, G-18337, cannot be extended. The draft DOGAMI consolidated operating permit includes a condition that "[t]his is to be the last extension of time granted for Permit G-10994." (Draft Operating Permit, p. 64.) However, pursuant to a December 11, 2019, final order of the Oregon Water Resources Department approving amendments to G-10994, permit G-10994 was replaced by permit G-18337, and permit G-10994 is "no longer of any force or effect." (12/11/19 Final Order, p. 7.) While permit G-18337 describes the no-further-extensions condition in reference to G-10994, that condition obviously carried forward into permit G-18337. (See 12/11/19 Final Order, p. 7 (new permit "incorporates * * * the [12-26-12] extension of time," which said no further extensions would be granted).) Thank you for considering our comments. Regards, Brian Posewitz, Staff Attorney WaterWatch of Oregon 213 SW Ash St. Portland, OR 97204 (503) 432-8249 (land line) | 20260206_1601_PublicComments.pdf |
| 52 | 2/6/2026 | 19:18 | Scott Miller | | Per the instructions provided in the Public Notice for the Proposed Grassy Mountain Mine Draft Permits and Permit Conditions, Calico is submitting to DOGAMI the following three items: 1. Calico's second public comment letter with additional comments to the issued draft permits. This Calico comment letter includes an attachment (Attachment 1) with comments from the Engineer of Record. 2. Schwabe letter that evaluates the propriety and legality of certain permit conditions. 3. This additional comment: During Calico's review of the draft permit, we noted a couple of permit conditions that refer to ongoing (post-permitting) responsibilities of the Technical Review Team (TRT). References to the TRT are found in DOGAMI permit conditions: 3CON-WPCF-N-DEQ-249, 2PRE-DIV37-ODFW-21, and 2PRE-DIV37-ODFW-295. It is our understanding that the TRT is responsible for reconciling conflicting permit conditions, but once the final permits have been issued the role of the TRT concludes. Your attention to these comments is appreciated. | 20260206_1918_PublicComments_1 |
| 53 | 2/6/2026 | 19:18 | Garrett H. Stephenson | | Letter referenced above 2.Schwabe letter | 20260206_1918_PublicComments_1 |
| 54 | 2/5/2026 | 20:22 | Albert LePage | al@coasttrails.org | Hello: Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the draft permits for the proposed . . . Grassy Mountain Gold Mine project. I have simply pasted them below but also since it might be more useful for your purposes, have also attached them as a pdf file. Finally, please confirm receipt of these submitted comments via email to al.lepage@coasttrails.org and thank you for your consideration in this regard and of the comments, too. Respectfully, Albert LePage, M.Ed. Science, B.S. Biology Member, Society for Conservation Biology Eugene, Oregon 97405 | 20260205_2022_PublicComment.pdf |