

Attention Payette National Forest Supervisor,

I have reviewed the Plan of Restoration and Operations and met with members of Midas Gold Idaho to better understand the company's plans for the Stibnite Gold Project. Below are my comments on the plan to be included in the comment period.

Reviewing the draft environmental impact statement, I believe Alternative 2 is the best choice for Idaho. Alternative 2 would have less impact on the environment. Alternative 2 would allow Midas Gold to provide critical minerals for the U.S. and clean up the site.

Alternative 3 would have a larger project footprint, impact more wetlands based on functional units, impact more stream reaches and delay the benefits of the project by two years.

Alternative 4 is not a good choice because it would put traffic to the site right next to the East Fork of the South Fork of the Salmon River; this puts waterways and fish at an unnecessary risk. Alternative 4 also would delay the project unnecessarily.

Alternative 5 is not even a realistic option because it would leave the site in the same condition it is today. Right now, fish are blocked from their native spawning grounds, and arsenic and antimony are leaching into the ground and surface water. It is unconscionable to think we could leave the area in this state of repair.

I appreciate your time and thoughtfulness. For the reasons I stated in my letter above, please permit the Stibnite Gold Project using Alternative 2, and let Idahoans see the benefits of this important project.

My best,

Lynne E. Volpi

Geologist

Name: Lynne E Volpi