

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/16/2020 6:00:00 AM

First name: Jenny

Last name: Fawcett

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Comments and questions for the Stibnite Gold Project

There are five alternative proposals for the Project at Stibnite.

#1. The first proposal from Midas Gold was made in 2016. Since that time, and before, Midas has complied with all requirements for initiating the process of mining.

#2. The second proposal from Midas Gold modified the first proposal. Midas Gold proposed some improvements to the original plan. To partially backfill the Hangar Flat pit lake. Why don't we encourage the Forest Service to backfill it all the way?

In this second proposal the access to Thunder Mountain would remain open from Yellow Pine to Stibnite Road to Thunder Mountain. Access through the mine site. Access equals recreation for all. Common sense to us. Why wouldn't it be this way? Why would the Forest Service object to this proposed access?

Instead of hauling in lime for the Stibnite mine the lime required would be generated on site. Generating lime on site is a huge reduction of truck traffic, dust and noise.

#3. The Forest Service proposes to move the tailings from Meadow Creek into a pristine area. The pristine area is known as the East Fork of the South Fork of the Salmon River. Why would the Forest Service propose moving spent ore tailings into a pristine area? To move the tailings there would increase the footprint of the mining operation beyond what is necessary.

If tailings are moved to this pristine area Midas Gold would not have to fix Blowout Creek at the Meadow Creek drainage or clean up some of the old tailings. And the question is if Midas Gold is willing to clean this area up why would the Forest Service propose to move the tailing storage facility?

#4. The Forest Service believes access to Stibnite is better served by improving Johnson Creek Road.

Johnson Creek Road is along the river and traveled by many. Midas Gold proposes to build a new road, higher up in the watershed (less chance of rock slides and avalanches) and connecting two old roads, Burnt Log Road and Thunder Mountain Road. That means Midas would provide an improved road with grading and rocking. Yes, the road would cross a creek or two but it would not follow along the river.

If the Johnson Creek Road improvement is to be followed why would the Forest Service not take into account that this is along a scenic road used by many and more opportunity for accidents? If spillage of any form occurs it would go into the river. Has the Forest Service considered this?

#5. No mining at all.

We vote for alternative No. 2

Not mentioned in the alternatives is the battle between two Indian tribes, Nez Perce and Shoshone Bannock tribes. One chooses to work with Midas Gold the other tribe does not. Why wouldn't the two tribes work together to accomplish the goal of improved fisheries?

My husband's grandfather John Lynn Driscoll was a banker in Boise for many, many years. He toured Stibnite and thought it was a good idea then (War effort) and we believe it is a good idea now to go forward with the Stibnite Mine project. We have been to the site ourselves and have attended meetings at Midas Gold to become better educated on what they are proposing.

Yes, this is a long-term project and will bring jobs to the area. Once the mining is completed and remediated I believe the people that have worked and lived in our area will stay and/or will bring in other job opportunities for our community. We saw that happen in our little community of Los Banos, CA when the San Luis Reservoir was built during President John Kennedy's tenure. The [acirc][euro]oedam[acirc][euro][bull] people for the most part stayed and created other jobs for our community. We believe that same kind of energy will occur in Valley County.