

Payette National Forest Supervisor,

I have reviewed the Plan of Restoration and Operations and met with members of Midas Gold Idaho to better understand the company's plans for the Stibnite Gold Project. Below are my comments on the plan to be included in the comment period.

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.

The length of time it takes to complete these types of permitting exercises is unacceptable. There is no reason a permitting project like Stibnite could not have been completed in much shorter time than the current 7+ years. I would hope the USFS could begin to rationalize the permitting process in the future.

I urge you to accept Midas Gold's plan as outlined under alternative 2 and continue moving this project forward.

Respectfully,

Name: Pete Blakeley