

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/10/2020 6:00:00 AM

First name: Joshua

Last name: Pennington

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing in support of the Stibnite Gold Project and the benefits it will bring to Idaho. This project has the potential to put hundreds of Idahoans to work, bring a \$1 billion investment into our state and restore an area of Idaho's backcountry desperately in need of repair.

Reviewing the draft environmental impact statement, I believe Alternative 2 is the best choice for Idaho.

Alternative 3 would have a larger project footprint, impact more wetlands based on functional units, impact more stream reaches and delay the benefits of the project by two years. Alternative 2 would have less impact on the environment. Alternative 4 is not a good choice because it would put traffic to site right next to the East Fork of the South Fork of the Salmon River. This puts waterways and fish at an unnecessary risk. Alternative 4 also would delay the project unnecessarily. Alternative 5 is not even a realistic option because it would leave the site in the same condition it is today. Right now, fish are blocked from their native spawning grounds and arsenic and antimony are leaching into the ground and surface water. It is unconscionable to think we could leave the area in this state of repair. Alternative 2 would allow Midas Gold to provide critical minerals for the U.S. and clean up the site.

Thank you for your time and consideration.