June 1, 2023

Mr. Dayne Doucet
Consolidated Mining Permit Lead
Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries
Mineral Land Regulation & Reclamation
229 Broadalbin St SW
Albany, Oregon 97321

RE: Response to *Wildlife Protection Plan* and *Wildlife Mitigation Plan* Category 3 and 4 Comments in October 20, 2022, Comments for the Consolidated Permit Application, Grassy Mountain Mine Project

Dear Mr. Doucet:

This letter provides responses to category 3 and 4 comments pertaining to the *Wildlife Protection Plan* and *Wildlife Mitigation Plan*, which were uploaded under separate cover to DOGAMI's file sharing system on May 31, 2023.

Responses to the comment numbers listed below are attached to this letter.

178	408	449
325	410	452
326	445B	463B
397	445C	
399	445D	
406		

Please contact me at (775) 625-3600, glen@paramountnevada.com if you have questions or need clarification.

Sincerely,

Glen van Treek
President
Calico Resources USA Corp./Paramount Gold Nevada Corp.
(775) 625-3600
glen@paramountnevada.com

Attachment
Document Submittal Records

Comment Number: 178

Comment Number: 178	**Category:** 3	**Status:** B
Topic: Tailings and Waste Rock	**CPA Reference:** Consolidated Permit Application	
Commentor: ODFW Comment: The third paragraph recommends a tailings management plan, however, ODFW could not locate this information to evaluate risk to wildlife from the TSF. Proposed Resolution: Provide the tailings management plan and incorporate the tailings composition and hazards to wildlife in the required Wildlife Protection Plan.		
Initial Response to Comment: A Tailings Chemical Monitoring plan for tailings facilities has been prepared and provided in Appendix D2 of the CPA. The Wildlife Protection Plan is provided in Appendix D of the CPA.		
Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? Yes	**Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response?** Yes	**TRT Response:** Inadequate. While there is a Tailings Chemical Monitoring Plan submitted, it is not sufficient to address the risk to wildlife, and how to evaluate or address risk. The submitted Plan only references weekly monitoring and after first 6 months, monitoring schedule is to be reevaluated. Weekly monitoring does not meet ODFW's requirement for continual monitoring. ODFW recommends daily monitoring, monitoring must be aligned with discharge activities. Additionally, there is no contingency plan should tailings toxicity levels become elevated.
Preliminary Response to Comment: Monitoring is part of the permitting process. Calico will work with ODFW requests for additional information on monitoring and wildlife risk evaluation. This tracks to new comment #426.		
Agency Comment: Agree to move to Category 3 and address as a permit condition.		
Response to Comment (May 2023): Please refer to response to comment #426 submitted with Appendix D14, *Wildlife Protection Plan,* and Appendix D15, *Wildlife Mitigation Plan*, which were resubmitted to DOGAMI on May 31, 2023.		

Comment Number: 325

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comment Number: 325</td><td>Category: 3</td><td>Status: B</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Topic: Wildlife and Vegetation</td><td colspan="3">CPA Reference: Mitigation Plan, Section 6.1, page 10</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Commentor: USFWS

Comment: This mitigation plan does not consider how the addition of new anthropogenic features (power lines, improved roads, mining buildings/facilities, etc.) will serve as subsides to predators, particularly avian predators of sage-grouse, and may increase the presence of ravens. Avian predators have far-reaching foraging impacts which may extend into nearby habitat utilized for nesting by sage-grouse.

Proposed Resolution: Mitigation principles incorporated into the mitigation plan will need to address impacts resulting from increased avian predator subsidies.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Initial Response to Comment: Included a discussion of potential increased avian predator subsidies and associated impacts to sage-grouse in Wildlife Mitigation Plan. Also included a discussion of measures to minimize and mitigate these impacts.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? No. Power line nesting deterrents are mentioned in the mitigation plan; however, avian predator issues on such anthropogenic features are not mentioned. Predator(s) is mentioned only once the plan specially regarding mammals.</td><td colspan="2">Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response? No.</td><td>TRT Response:

Inadequate. Avian predator subsidies should be listed as an indirect impact to habitat on page 5 of the Revised Wildlife Mitigation Plan (Section 3.3.1 Quantifying Project Impacts). The current mitigation plan includes perching and nesting deterrence structures on the power transmission line, however the GRSG habitat buffer specified (3.3 km) in the Mitigation Plan does not reflect recent literature showing that avian predators using tall structures can impact sage-grouse nest survival up to 12.5 km (Gibson et al. 2018).

It is also not clear if the sage-grouse indirect impacts quantified by the Habitat Quantification Tool and reported in Table 10 of the revised Wildlife Mitigation Plan (p. 23) include the increased corvid predation of GRSG nests.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Preliminary Response to Comment: Comment tracks to new comment #455. Please clarify the information requested from Calico. Specifically regarding the request for a larger buffer when estimating impacts of the project on GRSG, Calico is working with ODFW to apply the Habitat Quantification Tool (HQT) to assess the impacts of the proposed project on GRSG habitat functions and identify appropriate mitigation for impacts that cannot be avoided.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Response to Comment (May 2023): Calico added common raven to the description of indirect effects. The HQT scientific rational provides minimization measures intended to reduce the indirect impacts of corvid predation on GRSG. These include installation of perch deterrents and control of trash, as well as controlling access to water resources. We increased the distance for perch deterrent installation out to 10km from GRSG low density habitat (described in the minimization measures) and included measures to control and remove human-generated food resources. See decription of impact minimization measures in Appendix D15, Wildlife Mitigation Plan, which was resubmitted to DOGAMI on May 31, 2023.</td></tr>
</table>

Comment Number: 326

Comment Number: 326	**Category:** 3	**Status:** B
Topic: Wildlife and Vegetation	**CPA Reference:** Mitigation Plan, Section 6.2, page 10	

Commentor: USFWS

Comment: The FWS will need to review avoidance buffers once nesting surveys are completed in accordance with the original Wildlife Study Work Plan. The following are considerations that may be incorporated into future permitted activities. These may be revised pending additional information detailing project activities or observed nesting activity. For active Ferruginous hawk nests: No activity within 0.5 mile buffer from March 5 to June 15. Additional recommendations (optional): further limit impacts by building a nest platform nearby that is not within line of sight of the project, and/or limit the amount of time spent at the site.

1. For active Golden eagle nests: No activity within 1.0 mile buffer for nests that are within line of sight of the project (buffer could be less if topography blocks the nest) from Jan 15 to July 15. If the nest is within 1 mile and within line of sight of the activity, USFWS recommends obtaining an eagle take permit. Additional recommendations (optional): further limit impacts by limiting the amount of time spent at the site.

2. While the Migratory Bird Act does not specifically prohibit nest disturbance, it does prohibit take. So if activities cause abandonment of the nest and eggs or chicks are present, it would be a violation of the Act. The Bald and Golden Eagle Act clearly prohibits nest disturbance.

Proposed Resolution: Nests should be surveyed in accordance with the work plan, during the nesting season, to determine if they are active.

Initial Response to Comment: Additional nest surveys were conducted in 2020 and are reported in BDR Version 4. The TRT Wildlife Subcommittee acknowledged this (02/01/2021), and the TRT approved the BDR Version 4 as complete at their 2/02/2021 meeting. Revised report (Version4) and associated files are on DOGAMI website: https://www.oregongeology.org/mlrr/Calico-GrassyMtn_appResponseDocuments.htm

Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? Yes	**Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response?** Yes	**TRT Response:** Inadequate: Shapefiles were requested to review locations of nests observed during 2020 surveys, however without location data, USFWS is unable to review avoidance buffers at this time. The seasonal avoidance parameters included in the revised Wildlife Mitigation Plan do not comport with the recommendations previously provided for Ferruginous hawks and GOEA. Specifically, the revised plan states provides opportunity for non-compliance with seasonal avoidance by stating that disturbance activities will occur outside of timing restrictions "where feasible". (p.24). Further clarification is required to understand what "feasibility" means in this context. The Mitigation Plan states, "If vegetation clearing must occur during the migratory bird nesting period (April 15 to July 31), a nesting clearance survey of the area to be cleared will be performed no more than 14 days prior to disturbance. If an active nest is found, a 100-foot no-disturbance buffer will be applied until the nest has fledged or failed." The Service is supportive of the applicant's commitment to conducting nest clearance surveys within 14 days of commencing disturbance

Comment Number: 326	**Category:** 3	**Status:** B
		activities. However, this statement does not comply with the Service's recommendation for avoiding disturbance to ferruginous hawk and GOEA nests in terms of the size of the no-disturbance buffer and the time period of avoidance. Ferruginous hawks: The buffer for Ferruginous hawks is indicated as 0.25 mi of an occupied nest in the Mitigation Plan which is less than the 0.5 mi buffer previously recommend by the Service. The start time for avoidance proposed is 3/15 which is 10 days later than Service recommendations. GOEA: The buffer for GOEA occupied nests is stated as 0.25 mi in the Mitigation Plan, which is 0.75 mi less than the buffer distance previously recommended by the Service. Any nest in an active territory should be considered occupied. These seasonal and timing restrictions apply to all the nests within the active territory unless the applicant wishes to survey each nest within an active territory immediately prior to commencing disturbing activities to verify current season occupancy. Because three of the five GOEA territories were unclassified in 2020, the applicant should conservatively consider them occupied territories until surveys can be completed to verify occupancy. Because GOEA occupancy may shift during the timeframe since the 2020 survey, depending on when disturbance is scheduled to commence, we recommend resurveying the wildlife study ascertain more recent nest and territory occupancy. The Service recommends monitoring GOEA nest 36-B before, during, and after construction due to its proximity to proposed road construction activities, to document occupancy and nest success.
Preliminary Response to Comment: Calico will revisit the working on the seasonal restrictions, particularly the use of "where feasible" and either remove or provide context and detail. Calico will also review the species-specific timeframes and buffers presented in the WMP. If availalble, please provide any recent best available science supporting the seasonal restriction timeframes and distance buffers for citation.		
Response to Comment (May 2023): Calico removed "feasible" and updated Appendix D15, *Wildlife Mitigation Plan,* to adjust the buffers and seasonal restrictions to match those mentioned in the comment. Calico also added a description of the golden eagle territory surveys to be completed prior to initiation of construction (Appendix D15, *Wildlife Mitigation Plan,* Section 7.1).		

Comment Number: 397

Comment Number: 397	**Category:** 3	**Status:** B
Topic: Sage-grouse	**CPA Reference:** Wildlife Mitigation Plan, Section 6.4, Pg 21, Table 9.	
Commentor: ODFW The potential habitat value and threat level for grade C and D/E are incorrect. Change the potential habitat value for C to read "Fair" and D/E to read "Limited". Change the threat level for C to read "Moderate" and D/E to read "Significant". ODFW requests a better explanation of this table and what it means in relation to project impacts and potential required offsets.		
Initial Response to Comment: Comment requests corrections in Table 9 of WMP as well as a more detailed description of the data presented in table. Calico can work with ODFW to provide requested level of detail.		
Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? NA	**Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response?** NA	**TRT Response:** Agree, to move to Category 3.
Agency Comment: Agree, to move to Category 3.		
Response to Comment (May 2023): Calico made the requested edits to the habitat value and threat levels presented in Appendix D15, *Wildlife Mitigation Plan*. Calico also added a more detailed explanation of the results.		

Comment Number: 399

Comment Number: 399	**Category:** 3	**Status:** B
Topic: Sage-grouse	**CPA Reference:** Wildlife Mitigation Plan, Section 6.5.4, Pg 23, Table 10.	
Commentor: ODFW The final Mitigation Acres column must be represented as functional acres. It is not possible to provide an actual acre value without identifying a physical mitigation site or choosing the Programs In-Lieu Fee option or an accredited mitigation bank.		
Initial Response to Comment: Section 6.5.2 of the WMP explains that "functional acres" provide an expression of mitigation debits and that the functional acre represents multiple real-world acres. Section 8.4 further states that on-the-ground mitigation acreage will likely vary from estimated mitigation acreage amounts (for all habitat impacts) based on the functional value of the selected mitigation area or method (ILF, 3rd Party payment to provide, HMA).		
Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? NA	**Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response?** NA	**TRT Response:** The distinction between the sage-grouse functional acre and other habitat impact acre calculations is a very important to maintain throughout the document. It should not be left up to the reader to remember the nuances between acres and functional acres. ODFW agrees with down grading comment category from 2 to 3.
Agency Comment: The distinction between the sage-grouse functional acre and other habitat impact acre calculations is a very important to maintain throughout the document. It should not be left up to the reader to remember the nuances between acres and functional acres. ODFW agrees with down grading comment category from 2 to 3.		
Response to Comment (May 2023): Calico revised the document to maintain split between functional acres for GRSG and other habitat impacts.		

Comment Number: 406

Comment Number: 406	**Category:** 4	**Status:** B
Topic: Sage-grouse	**CPA Reference:** Wildlife Mitigation Plan, Section 8.1, Pg 26	
Commentor: ODFW For consistency with sections 8.2 and 8.3, provide more detail on the functional acre mitigation requirement for direct and indirect project impacts to sage-grouse habitat.		
Initial Response to Comment: Calico will address by updating Section 8.1 in WMP to provide the requested detail.		
Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? NA	**Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response?** NA	**TRT Response:**
Response to Comment (May 2023): Calico added detail addressing this comment to Appendix D15, *Wildlife Mitigation Plan* (Section 6), which addresses compensatory mitigation for GRSG.		

Comment Number: 408

Comment Number: 408	**Category:** 4	**Status:** B
Topic: Sage-grouse	**CPA Reference:** Wildlife Mitigation Plan, Section 8.2, Pg 28	
Commentor: ODFW As discussed previously, the mitigation output from the HQT and value represented in this section are in functional acres. It is important to provide this distinction from actual acres.		
Initial Response to Comment: Calico can address this in the WMP.		
Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? NA	**Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response?** NA	**TRT Response:**
Response to Comment (May 2023): Calico clarified the GRSG mitigation is specifically presented as functional acres in the summary of compensatory mitigation presented in Appendix D15, *Wildlife Mitigation Plan*.		

Comment Number: 410

Comment Number: 410	**Category:** 4	**Status:** B
Topic: Sage-grouse	**CPA Reference:** Wildlife Mitigation Plan, Section 8.4, Pg 29, Table 12	
Commentor: ODFW It is incorrect to represent the sage-grouse mitigation responsibility in a table that provides actual impact acres for other species. The sage-grouse mitigation output from the HQT is in functional acres and should be identified as such. Provide the sage-grouse mitigation in a separate table for both the upland and mesic habitats.		
Initial Response to Comment: Calico can update Table 12 to keep the output from the HQT separate from the other acreages. Updates made to the WMP text in response to comment #399 with provide further clarity.		
Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? NA	**Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response?** NA	**TRT Response:**
Response to Comment (May 2023): Calico separated the compensatory mitigation needs into two tables (Tables 12 and 13 presented in Section 6.4) and presented GRSG as functional acres.		

Comment Number: 445B

Comment Number: 445B	**Category:** 3	**Status:** C
Topic: Assessment of direct impacts – roads	**CPA Reference:** Wildlife Mitigation Plan (p, 5); Transportation Baseline Trip Generation 2019-01.pdf (p. 2-3)	
Commentor: USFWS Additionally, p. 6, the Mitigation Plan indicates that employees will be required to use shuttles. This is different than the page 3 of the document "Transportation Baseline Trip Generation 2019-01.pdf" which states that the shuttle is only "proposed" (page 2) and that ridesharing/carpooling will be "actively promoted" (page 3), and that the shuttle may be provided "depending on demand" (page 3).		
Initial Response to Comment: The WPP is correct in stating that employees will be required to use the shuttle service when regularly commuting to the Project Area. The trip analysis is the worst-case scenario, to evaluate trip levels, the proposed plan is consistent.		
Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? NA	**Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response?** NA	**TRT Response:**
Response to Comment (May 2023): Appendix D14, *Wildlife Protection Plan,* and Appendix D15, *Wildlife Mitigation Plan,* both remain correct in stating that employees will be required to use the shuttle service when regularly commuting to the Project Area.		

Comment Number: 445C

Comment Number: 445C	**Category:** 3	**Status:** C
Topic: Assessment of direct impacts – roads	**CPA Reference:** Wildlife Mitigation Plan (p, 5); Transportation Baseline Trip Generation 2019-01.pdf (p. 2-3)	
Commentor: USFWS Decontamination of shuttle vehicles should be considered as a precaution to mitigate the potential for invasive weed spread due to increased traffic on the access roads.		
Initial Response to Comment: Calico can address this comment by adding a requirement to regularly inspect and clean shuttles of noxious weed seeds to the minimization measures detailed in the WMP, Section 7.3.		
Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? NA	**Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response?** NA	**TRT Response:** Decontamination protocols should be a permit condition.
Agency Comment: Decontamination protocols should be a permit condition.		
Response to Comment (May 2023): Calico added a description of the wash station to Appendix D15, *Wildlife Mitigation Plan* (Section 7.1). The wash station will be used to remove noxious weed seeds.		

Comment Number: 445D

Comment Number: 445D	**Category:** 3	**Status:** B
Topic: Assessment of direct impacts – roads	**CPA Reference:** Wildlife Mitigation Plan (p, 5); Transportation Baseline Trip Generation 2019-01.pdf (p. 2-3)	
Commentor: USFWS Traffic monitoring should continue on both access routes to determine if estimates were accurate and if proposed mitigation measures (e.g., shuttle, speed limits, etc.) continue to be adequate/effective.		
Initial Response to Comment: Calico will work with ODFW and USFWS to refine traffic minimization measure detailed in the WMP, Section 7.3.		
Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? NA	**Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response?** NA	**TRT Response:** Calico's comment does not address the need to continue monitoring traffic impacts. Traffic monitoring and monitoring of mitigation measures should be a permit condition.
Agency Comment: Calico's comment does not address the need to continue monitoring traffic impacts. Traffic monitoring and monitoring of mitigation measures should be a permit condition.		
Response to Comment (May 2023): Calico added a description of the gate log to Appendix D15, *Wildlife Mitigation Plan* (Section 7.1). The gate log records will be used to track daily traffic volumes associated specifically with the Project.		

Comment Number: 449

Comment Number: 449	**Category:** 4	**Status:** C
Topic: Indirect impacts	**CPA Reference:** Wildlife Mitigation Plan, Table 8	
Commentor: USFWS It is not clear why the proponent estimates 0 acres of indirect impact to the Category 2 acres classified as Wyoming Big Sagebrush/Bluebunch Wheatgrass Shrubland Alliance.		
Initial Response to Comment: The acreages presented in Table 8 include direct impacts (from ground disturbance) to all habitat types and the table also presents indirect impacts to mule deer winter range (which will experience no direct impacts). Calico can clarify this table by splitting out the deer winter range impacts.		
Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? NA	**Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response?** NA	**TRT Response:**
Response to Comment (May 2023): Following direction from ODFW, indirect effect acreages are only caluclated for GRSG and mule deer habitat. Calico split the indirect effects to mule deer habitat out of the original Table 8 and these are reported in Appendix D15, *Wildlife Mitigation Plan* (Tables 8 and 9).		

Comment Number: 452

Comment Number: 452	**Category:** 3	**Status:** B
Topic: Monitoring of wildlife protection measures	**CPA Reference:** Wildlife Protection Plan	
Commentor: USFWS The plan specifies that wildlife protection measures will be inspected (e.g., quarterly, daily). However, given that there is little published data regarding the efficacy of Bird Deterrent Balls, additional monitored for efficacy to ensure they are functional and in fact are serving the purpose to prevent wildlife from accessing hazardous areas should occur.		
Initial Response to Comment: Calico is usure of what USFWS is requesting. Calico intends to monitor the bird balls on the reclaim pond for effectiveness on a daily basis. Does USFWS have additional specific recommendations?		
Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? NA	**Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response?** NA	**TRT Response:**
Response to Comment (May 2023): Calico assumes the proposed daily monitoring of bird balls will be sufficient.		

Comment Number: 463B

Comment Number: 463B	**Category:** 3	**Status:** B
Topic: Groundwater drawdown	**CPA Reference:** CPA p.44, Groundwater Baseline Report (Vol. III, p. 51)	

Commentor: USFWS

The drawdown impacts estimated to nearby springs is high (up to 12 ft) and aquifer recharge and recovery rates are low (on the order of inches). In this arid environment, wildlife depend on springs, and the mine operations have the potential to significantly reduce the amount of surface water available for wildlife.

Initial Response to Comment: Groundwater-level monitoring is described in the Monitoring Well Plan (Section 7.1, pg. 34). Calico will work with ODFW to identify appropriate impact minimization actions that could be implemented if monitoring indicates an effect on surface springs. Appropriate measures can be added to Section 7 of the WMP.

Stantec – Comment Addressed as Indicated? NA	**Stantec – Preliminary Assessment – Sufficient Response?** NA	**TRT Response:** Adpative management to respond to negative impacts to ground water in light of drought/climate change should be incoprorated in to the permit. Potential mitigation and minimization actions for impacts to springs should be included in WMP.

Agency Comment: Adpative management to respond to negative impacts to ground water in light of drought/climate change should be incoprorated in to the permit. Potential mitigation and minimization actions for impacts to springs should be included in WMP.

Response to Comment (May 2023): Groundwater-level monitoring is described in Appendix D12, *Monitoring Proposal for Groundwater and Facilities* (aka Monitoring Well Plan; Section 7.1, pg. 34). Following receipt of this comment, Calico also developed Appendix D18, *Spring and Seep Monitoring and Mitigation Plan*. If monitoring indicates an effect on surface springs, Calico proposes to install a mitigation feature such as a groundwater well and pump or a capture apron and guzzler tank to maintain baseline levels of flow for the spring. These measures were added to Appendix D15, *Wildlife Mitigation Plan* (Section 5.1).