



Q&A: Myth-Busting Claims on the Air Permit to Construct for the Stibnite Gold Project

April 2025

How is the State of Idaho calculating arsenic risk factor as it relates to the Stibnite Gold Project?

When assessing excess cancer risk from exposure to arsenic fugitive dust, a critical factor is the duration (or length) of the exposure. The Idaho cancer risk threshold assumes a 70-year constant exposure. However, when the exposure duration is less than 70 years (like in the case of the Stibnite Gold Project), the exposure duration must be adjusted for an accurate risk calculation.

To ensure that all questions around the Department of Environmental Quality's analysis of potential health impacts from arsenic emissions were fully vetted, the Board of Environmental Quality appointed an independent Hearing Officer to consider the claims that are now being aired in public forums.

The Hearing Officer determined health risk should be calculated based on the actual period of exposure (in this case, the relevant years of the mine plan), otherwise it dramatically overstates the potential risk from the project. As the Department of Environmental Quality and expert toxicologists explained and the Hearing Officer recognized, "failure to account for the true exposure period results in overstating emissions from the project." *January Order at ¶ 30.*

Is this a new way of calculating risk?

No. There is nothing new or novel about the Department of Environmental Quality's approach for assessing cancer risk associated with the Stibnite Gold Project's arsenic emissions – generated mostly by fugitive dust. It is the same methodology used by the EPA, which considers risk to sensitive populations, including children and pregnant women.

The Hearing Officer appointed to review the case held an administrative trial in which expert toxicologists, scientists, and permit engineers testified on the validity of the air permit. The Hearing Officer concluded that the Department acted reasonably and summarily rejected the allegations that are now being presented to the public as scientifically unsupported and inconsistent with the existing regulatory framework.

At the end of the day, these groups' claims have been discredited and appear to be nothing other than an attempt to sow fear and undermine years of regulatory and scientific review.

Alright, so what *is* the risk factor posed by the Project?

4 in 1 million or 1 in about 240,000. This is less than half of the acceptable additional cancer risk under Idaho regulations (which is 1 in 100,000). To put this into context, the chance of getting struck by lightning is 1 in 15,000 in a lifetime.

Why should we trust Perpetua Resources?

Perpetua is committed to designing a project that is protective of human health and the environment. Our actions over the past 14 years demonstrate we take every opportunity to improve environmental conditions and outcomes for the communities around us. Our commitment remains unchanged.