

Dear Ms. Jackson,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Midas Gold Idaho's Alternative 2. Over the last several years, I've had the opportunity to hear a handful of presentations on the Stibnite Gold Project, sit down with project staff and observe how the company has lived out its mission as it has grown. It is with this knowledge that I encourage you to permit the Stibnite Gold Project.

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).

Thank you for reviewing my comments. Again, I urge you to permit Midas Gold's carefully thought out plan as outlined under alternative 2.

Regards,

Name: Tab H Morse