

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/7/2020 6:00:00 AM

First name: Mark

Last name: Neely

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Most everyone I have spoken to would like to see the Stibnite Gold Project proposed by Midas Gold move forward, but they want to make sure it is done in the safest way possible, both for the environment and for local communities. That is why I believe the only way to proceed is by approving Alternative 2 of Midas Gold's plan for this project.

Compared to Alternative 3, Alternative 2 offers a much safer location for a proposed storage facility for tailings and waste materials. The draft environmental impact statement released by the USFS states as much in chapter 4 when it notes that the location of this facility in Alternative 2 would be in an area that has been found to have "more than sufficiently competent" bedrock to support the proposed structure.

Meanwhile, the location of this facility proposed in Alternative 3 would be along a stretch of the Salmon River that is currently outside of the project footprint. Even worse, it would be partially located on the site of an old ancient landslide. That doesn't exactly scream safety to me.

Moreover, Midas Gold has a good track record when it comes to safely handling the kinds of hazardous materials that are common in a mining project. As the draft environmental impact statement found, a large volume release to the environment would not be likely to occur "based on the planned infrastructure specifically designed for the storage and management of hazardous materials."

If we're going to do something, we should do it right. In this case, it means not only cleaning up the environment around Stibnite, but ensuring ongoing safety in the future. If that's not reason enough to approve Alternative 2, then I don't know what is.