

Dear Ms. Linda Jackson,

I am writing to share my thoughts on Midas Gold Idaho's Stibnite Gold project. There are many reasons why I am excited for Midas Gold's project to come to life and I hope through my comments you will understand why. I'm very active in the outdoors, spending most weekends in the Payette or Boise National Forests. I feel a balanced approach to the community, economy and environment will provide the best outcome.

I believe the project presents a plan to repair the environment and boost Idaho's economy "particularly under Alternative 2. Historic mining operations, development of former town site and natural processes have resulted in significant degradation of many elements of the environment. Loss of fish passage, potential water degradation from previous mining activity and excessive erosion are all of great concern to our community. Right now, salmon are blocked from their native spawning grounds. Midas Gold would reconnect salmon passage through a fish passageway before mining begins and permanently connect fish migration after backfilling the Yellow Pine pit. Analysis in the draft Environmental Impact Statement showed removing existing barriers to fish migration will help Chinook salmon. In fact, DEIS 4.12-33 says long-term access to blocked habitat would result in increased genetic diversity of isolated populations and productivity. Restoration plans will also provide a 23% increase in stream functional units, a net gain of 21,941 (appendix D table 8-1). Alternative 2, which includes reprocessing old tailings waste, would lead to long-term reduction in metal loading in ground and surface water (DEIS 4.9). This is a huge plus for the site because of ongoing concerns of arsenic and antimony in the ground and surface water. The Stibnite Gold Project would finance reclamation efforts to address these problems and in turn boost Idaho's economy. It is a win-win for our community, economy and environment.

Thank you for reviewing my comments. Again, I urge you to permit Midas Gold's carefully thought out plan as outlined under alternative 2. I feel the 60 day commenting period is sufficient and hope this moves forward in a timely manner.

Most Respectfully,

Travis Hall

Name: Travis Hall