

To US Forest Service,

I would like to provide my comments as public feedback on the Stibnite Gold Project as part of Midas Gold Idaho's comment period. I have been following Midas Gold Idaho's plans since they first came into Idaho, in large part because much of the proposed project will take place on public land. The more I have learned about the project, the more excited I am about the possibilities for the future.

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 (DEIS 4.9).

After reading my letter, I hope you can see why you should permit the Stibnite Gold Project. This project is a good thing for Idaho, helps decrease America's dependence on foreign countries for critical minerals and cleans up the environment.

Thanks for you time and consideration,

Name: Bradley Babcock