

Attention 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.

After reading through the alternatives proposed by the USFS, Alt 5 seems unacceptable. If private industry is willing to take on past legacies, what will happen to the environmental legacies at Stibnite if there is no action? What resources will the U.S. Government dedicate to solving the water quality and fish passage problems if Alt 5 is selected? I worry no resources will be directed to the site and arsenic and antimony will continue leaching into the groundwater and salmon will continue to be blocked from their native spawning grounds. However, if the USFS selects Alternative 2 the site would get the environmental attention that it needs. Under Alternative 2, Midas Gold will pick up and reprocess these legacy tailings, which will reduce long-term metal loading in the ground and surface water.

Each year, hundreds of tons of sediment continue to be dumped into the East Fork of the South Fork of the Salmon River and other waterways from Blowout Creek, impacting water quality and aquatic habitat. Midas Gold has a plan to fix these problems during construction. Unfortunately, if Midas Gold isn't allowed to move forward with its plan, it is highly unlikely these critical improvements will ever happen.

As the U.S. Forest Service and other state and federal agencies review the proposed plan and determine the course of action, I encourage you to consider and appropriately weigh the positive benefits Midas Gold will have on Idaho. Alternative Two truly is a win-win opportunity for Idahoans and the environment.

Respectfully,

Name: Brian Hines