

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing in support of the Stibnite Gold Project. Thank you for the opportunity to provide my feedback as part of the National Environmental Policy Act.

I believe Alternative 2 is the best choice for Idaho. Alternative 2 would have less impact on the environment. 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 has prioritized restoration work so many of the efforts occur early in the project. Reclamation efforts have already started at the site. Midas Gold has planted thousands of trees and worked to reduce sediment entering waterways near the site. To me, these actions prove the company is truly committed to restoring the site.

I encourage the USFS to move the Stibnite Gold Project forward and permit Midas Gold Idaho's project as outlined in their Modified Plan of Restoration and Operations, alternative 2 in the DEIS.

Respectfully,

Name: Flora Belzer