

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment during the Draft EIS period for the Stibnite Gold Project.

Having compared Alternative 2 with Alternative 3, I believe that Alternative 2 is better from an environmental perspective, having less area, less impact on wetlands based on functional units, less impact on stream reach and avoiding a costly two-year delay to the project. Further, I also believe that Alternative 2 is lower risk and environmentally less impactful and risky than Alternative 4 given the proximity of the Alternative 4 transportation route to major fish-bearing waterways where construction would pose a significant risk, and the delay the project unnecessarily for two additional years at considerable cost. Finally, Alternative 5 is the worst of all alternatives as it means no environmental restoration, no jobs, no capital investment and leaves environmental issues at site unresolved.

This project is a huge opportunity for Idaho. I encourage the U.S. Forest Service to permit alternative 2 so this brownfield site can finally be restored. The comment period has been extended once already. Sixty days gives Idahoans enough time to submit their comments and I hope there will be no additional delays.

Sincerely,

Name: David K Hammond