

Dear Payette National Forest Supervisor,

I am writing to comment on the proposed Midas Gold Idaho Stibnite Gold Project. I am a PhD science writer and biomedical science consultant who resides in McCall. I currently or in the past have donated to the Sierra Club, Nature Conservancy, World Wildlife Fund, and Greenpeace, and consider myself a conservationist who is very concerned about the impacts of human behaviors on the environment. Because of my concerns for the environment, I have been monitoring the Stibnite Project permitting process for the project for about four years, and have read the Forest Service Executive Summary of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and substantial parts of the detailed EIS. Having reviewed the materials, educated myself about the existing state of the legacy mine site, and observed the behavior of Midas Gold as a community member, I fully support their project. Some of the reasons are:

1) Economy. Midas Gold will have tremendous positive impact on the economy. The influx of high paying year-round jobs, anticipated secondary infrastructure improvements (e.g., high speed internet), new housing construction will boost the economy in a region with a high proportion of seasonal workers, many infrastructure needs, and a critical affordable housing shortage. Although mining has a limited lifespan, many of the benefits accrued will not be lost when mining and reclamation operations cease. Also, because the timetable workforce needs are defined, the area will have adequate time to build in responses to the eventual loss of jobs.

2) Community Partners. Midas Gold has already shown itself to be a tremendous community partner. Yes, they have given money to local community projects, but more importantly, they have been actively involved in projects by serving on boards, promoting service/health/education projects, and providing volunteers. In addition, they have instigated their own community projects, e.g., a free ski week and winter coat project. They also established the Stibnite Foundation and already “ before the permitting process is even complete “ donated \$300,000 and 1.5 million shares to the Foundation with significant additional amounts pledged.

3) Restoration. The legacy of mining in the Stibnite area, a brownfield site, is destroyed habitat, loss of fisheries, high levels of toxic chemicals in the soil and water, and unsightly disturbed terrain. After early limited efforts, no government entities have undertaken or publicly announced plans to undertake to additional restoration efforts. Again, even before the permitting process is complete, Midas Gold has planted thousands of trees and worked to reduce sediment entering waterways near the site. Although, the project will have a bigger footprint than the legacy site, the planned reclamation and restoration activities will return the area to a far better condition than its current state.

4) Global vs Local Impact. For the understandable and reasonable desire to reduce pollution and preserve habitat in the US, the actions of citizens and organizations often prevent harvesting of natural resources. Unfortunately, many times, the actions are not based on facts or are based on selected facts. The result is to push these operations overseas where activities like mining and

logging, e.g., are less-well regulated and often have devastating global environmental impacts and negative effects on the local economies and populace. I would prefer that, where practicable, the US harvest our natural resources in the US where we can better control the impacts. Also, as the largest consumer of global resources, we have a duty to use our own resources and not deplete those of the rest of the world.

5) Strategic Need. We need antimony. We mine none in the US. That makes no sense.

In sum, should Midas Gold be allowed to move forward with their project, they will have positive impacts on the local outdoor environment, social/community environment, economy, and infrastructure, and will begin to fill a strategic need while helping the US be a more responsible global partner. The USFS has provided sufficient time to review the document and provide comments. It is time to move forward. I highly encourage the U.S. Forest Service to pick Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative for the Stibnite Gold Project.

Thank you,

Name: Gina Schatterman