

Dear Payette National Forest Staff,

I have been closely following Midas Gold Idaho's plans for several years. I am excited to finally have the opportunity to comment on their Draft EIS. Midas Gold Idaho presents a huge opportunity for the Gem State.

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.

I appreciate your time and thoughtfulness. For the reasons I stated in my letter above, please permit the Stibnite Gold Project using alternative 2 and let Idahoans see the benefits of this important project.

Sincerely,

Name: Ernest Evans