

Dear Permitting Officials,

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 have visited the area many times since I was a small child, I am now in my 70's, and the area looks better now with what little Midas Gold has been allowed to accomplish than it has ever looked since my first memories of the place. It would be a benefit to the State of Idaho if they are allowed to proceed. We are not just talking about Gold. The United States have been too dependent on foreign sources for strategic minerals for far too long. We need to produce our own strategic minerals and the antimony that this project will provide is a good start in that direction. Stibnite played a vital role during WWII and since then we have become increasingly dependent on foreign sources for our needs. The time to change that situation is now.

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.

Midas Gold wants to restore the rivers, wildlife and habitat near the Stibnite Gold Project site. We should let them. Please permit Alternative 2 of the Stibnite Gold Project as outlined in the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

My best,

Jim McCoy

Name: Jim McCoy