

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/17/2020 6:00:00 AM

First name: Logan

Last name: Weber

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am proud to welcome Midas Gold Idaho into our state and proud to support the Stibnite Gold Project. I hope you will take the time to consider my comments on why you should move to permit the project.

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.

While the economic benefits of this project cannot be ignored, it also will transform an area in need for environmental repair. It is for all of these reasons that I encourage you to move the Stibnite Gold Project forward as outlined in alternative 2 within this 60-day comment period.