

From: Ingrid Brudenell
To: [FS-comments-intermtn-payette](#)
Subject: Stibnite gold project EIS scoping comment
Date: Thursday, July 13, 2017 12:26:23 PM

Dear Mr. Lannom

I have property in Cascade and recreate by fishing, biking and hiking along the South Fork of the Salmon. I have attended an open house and received information about the project from Midas Gold as well as wildlife and conservation groups.

My three points about the project are: reduce the size of the disturbance and proceed in phases which includes backfilling mine pits instead of building pit lakes; increase the restoration of the S. fork East fork and tributaries so that spawning habitat is protected; prevent ongoing water and soil pollution from heavy metals like lead and mercury, as well as acid mine drainage. We know that heavy metals persist in the environment long after a mine closes.

Midas Gold anticipates working the mine for 14 years and employing local workers. While an economic boom for a period of time the risks must be balanced with the benefits to the natural area and long term uses of the land and water. Consider the fish, birds, wildlife in the ecosystem as well as the economic benefit to Midas Gold and to recreation activities. Recent emails claim that the only way that the area will be restored is by allowing Midas Gold to reopen mining. I question how that can be accurate. I have read that 14 million tax payer dollars was spent on restoring the site previously. If mining is reopened what will be the cost in dollars, man power and the environment?

The questions remain: what if gold values decrease, how will the restoration work be funded? what if Midas Gold bankruptcy occurs, will the forest service have the means to restore the site or who will? What will happen to the workers and the mine area once the Midas Gold project is ended? Will tax payers be left with damaged and degraded land and water ways? What is the track record of Midas Gold for meeting its obligations?

If there is a reasonable estimate that pollution will contaminate the river and its tributaries and there is no feasible cost effective way to prevent the pollution, the project should not proceed.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments. It has been very helpful to read the comments and hear the presentations on this important decision. I hope to get more answers to my questions.

Sincerely, Dr. Ingrid Brudenell



Sent from my iPad