

Linda Jackson, Payette Forest Supervisor,

The following is in response to the Stibnite Gold Project (SGP) EIS #50516

As a fourth generation and current year round resident of Johnson Creek, I am greatly concerned about the proposed Stibnite Gold Mining Project near Yellow Pine and the impact it will have on watersheds, fisheries, recreation, wildlife, air quality and our quality of life.

While I have many concerns regarding this project I am limited in time and will only address the two that keep me up at night. These are: Johnson Creek Road usage and the mining site itself.

The use of Johnson Creek rd. to transport heavy machinery, trucks, hazardous materials and hundreds of workers to and from the project is irresponsible, disrespectful and dangerous. The plan estimates @65 vehicles per day, of one way traffic, five days a week for fourteen hours a day. The noise, dust, gas fumes, road erosion and water contamination from such heavy use will impact many aspects of this area. These impacts include but are not limited to: big game, fish, recreationists, hunters, fisherman, and those of us who have chosen to make this area our home. Johnson Creek rd. is narrow, steep and runs adjacent to the pristine waters of Johnson Creek. Johnson Creek is a tributary of the Salmon River and home to blue ribbon cutthroat, threatened chinook salmon and bull trout, osprey, golden and bald eagles, ducks, geese and many other species that inhabit this area. The narrowness and steepness makes it a safety hazard, not just for workers from the mine but for locals traveling to and from civilization. Johnson Creek rd. is the major route used by Yellow Pine residents during the spring, summer and fall. In the colder months, snow and ice further increase the travel risks. In addition, the East Fork of the South Fork rd., which is further up from Johnson Creek, is prone to avalanches and rock slides. Just recently an avalanche/slide closed this road for several months. These roads are not suitable for the kinds of heavy activities this project would require.

To call this project a "restoration project", as Midas so disingenuously advertises, is greatly misleading. SGP emphasizes how they will restore the damage done by a 100 years of mining. What SGP doesn't emphasize is that they'll be mining 29 times more earth than what has been mined in the past 100 yrs. (436 million tons vs 15 million) as well as leaving 33 times more hazardous tailing (100 million tons vs 3 million tons). The rock that is mined but has no minerals (DRSF's) will be stored in four areas that encompass 480 acres, 480 ft. max deep and total 235 million tons. In addition to this is the hazardous tailings Storage Facility (TSF) which will encompass 818 acres. 405 of these acres will be deposited in the Meadow Creek drainage which is composed of meadows and wetlands. These storage facilities will last forever and have the inevitable potential to leak and contaminate surrounding areas.

SGP's main interest is in the gold. In order to obtain 1 ounce of gold, 80 tons of rock needs to be mined. Depending on the market, this amount of gold would be estimated to be worth \$1,800. 1 ounce of gold from 80 tons of rock is a concentration of about 0.00004%. How can such a low concentration of gold even be a consideration? Gold is not a critical mineral needed for our countries economic or national defense needs. There are other mineral that will be mined along with the gold; silver and antimony. Out of 80 ton of rock an estimated 2 ounces of silver will be obtained, worth around \$42 and

28 lbs. of antimony worth about \$80 would be recovered. While antimony is considered a critical mineral the market price is very low due to abundance worldwide.

The destruction of hundreds of acres of recreational and valuable wildlife/fisheries habitat would be destroyed forever. The short term gain in an increase in jobs and tax base would be offset by generations of lost revenue from recreation. It is easily imagined, with such a grotesque abuse of public lands, that there will be forever costs occurring from damages, i.e. contaminated ground water and streams, associated with this project. This cost would most likely be covered at taxpayers' expense.

How is it that a foreign country can come into the USA, destroy our lands, sell their product to another foreign country (Asian market most likely) and we, the taxpayers and recreationalist are left to adjust to and fiscally support this behavior.

I am adamantly opposed to the Stibnite Gold Project.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts and opinion.

Respectfully,

Teri Norell