

Dear Payette National Forest Staff,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Stibnite Gold Project as part of Midas Gold Idaho's Comment Period. I have been closely following Midas Gold Idaho's plans since they first came into our state, in large part because much of the proposed project will take place on public land. The more I have learned about the project, the more excited I am about the possibilities it will bring into our state.

Reviewing the draft environmental impact statement, I believe Alternative 2 is the best choice for Idaho. 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 2 would have less impact on the environment. Alternative 4 is not a good choice because it would put traffic to 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. Alternative 2 would allow Midas Gold to provide critical minerals for the U.S. and clean up the site.

Midas Gold wants to restore the rivers, wildlife and habitat near the Stibnite Gold Project site. We should let them. Please permit the Stibnite Gold Project and continue to move this important project forward.

Regards,

PS My Family is all from Idaho and is the primary place for us to vacation

Name: Brandon Cleverly