

Greetings,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my feedback as part of Midas Gold Idaho's public permitting process.

Having compared Alternative 2 with Alternative 3, I believe that Alternative 2 is better from an environmental perspective, having less area, less impact on wetlands based on functional units, less impact on stream reach and avoiding a costly two-year delay to the project. Further, I also believe that Alternative 2 is lower risk and environmentally less impactful and risky than Alternative 4 given the proximity of the Alternative 4 transportation route to major fish-bearing waterways where construction would pose a significant risk, and the delay the project unnecessarily for two additional years at considerable cost. Finally, Alternative 5 is the worst of all alternatives as it means no environmental restoration, no jobs, no capital investment and leaves environmental issues at site unresolved.

The Stibnite Gold Project is the type of project our state needs. I highly encourage the U.S. Forest Service to permit this project, using the alternative two presented by Midas Gold, as expeditiously as possible.

Best Wishes,

Name: Jeff pontius