

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/15/2020 6:00:00 AM

First name: Heidi

Last name: Haley

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing to express my views on Midas Gold Idaho's Stibnite Gold Project. The opportunity presented by the Stibnite Gold Project is compelling for many reasons and it is a project I am committed to seeing come to fruition.

Having compared Alternative 2 with Alternative 3, I believe that Alternative 2 is better from an environmental perspective, having less area, less impact on wetlands based on functional units, less impact on stream reach and avoiding a costly two-year delay to the project. Further, I also believe that Alternative 2 is lower risk and environmentally less impactful and risky than Alternative 4 given the proximity of the Alternative 4 transportation route to major fish-bearing waterways where construction would pose a significant risk, and the delay the project unnecessarily for two additional years at considerable cost. Finally, Alternative 5 is the worst of all alternatives as it means no environmental restoration, no jobs, no capital investment and leaves environmental issues at site unresolved.

The materials you provided in the virtual meeting room made it easy to compare the alternatives and review the DEIS. With these resources, I felt I had everything I needed to comment within the 60 day timeframe. I do not believe another extension is necessary and, in fact, I feel like it would delay the benefits of the project.

I urge you to accept Midas Gold's plan as outlined under Alternative 2 and continue moving this project forward.