

DEAR MS JACKSON,

I am proud to welcome Midas Gold Idaho into our state and proud to support the Stibnite Gold Project. I hope you will take the time to consider my comments on why you should move to permit the project.

If you examine Midas Gold Idaho's Plan of Restoration and Operations, it is evident the company identified the best possible plan to restore the site under Alternative Two. The company is limiting its footprint to existing disturbance as much as possible to minimize new disturbance, natural fish spawning routes will be restored after being blocked for decades and the company has plans to make improvements that will keep thousands of pounds of sediment out of the river each year. According to 4.12-22 of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, Alternative two would provide an additional 26.5 km of habitat for anadromous salmonoids becomes available before mining begins, a net gain of 11.1 km of intrinsic potential habitat for steelhead trout and 12.4 km for bull trout. The document also indicates this alternative could help to increase productivity and diversity of these fish by opening up access to historically blocked habitat (DEIS 4.12-39). Unfortunately, if Midas Gold Idaho is not allowed to move forward with its plan, it is highly unlikely that these critical improvements will ever happen.

Midas Gold Idaho wants to invest \$1 billion in our state, bring more than 1,000 jobs to rural Idaho and still provide access to Idaho's public lands. This is the type of project our state needs. I highly encourage the U.S. Forest Service to pick alternative 2 as the preferred alternative moving forward.

Sincerely,

Name: Wendell Ivie