

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/28/2020 6:00:00 AM

First name: danny

Last name: Anon

Organization:

Title:

Comments: U.S.F.S. Officials,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment during the Draft EIS period for the Stibnite Gold Project.

Given the history of the region, I was a bit skeptical when I first heard about this project, but it is clear that Midas is going out of their way to put environmental safety and restoration front and center. For example, according to the DEIS, "it is not anticipated that soils in most of these areas would recover naturally." However, Midas Gold can change the future of the site. The company is already composting and has further plans to help soils recover throughout the life of the project. After looking at the tools provided by the USFS, I feel strongly that Alternative 2 is the best option moving forward. It addresses the purpose and need of the agencies in a manner that provides environmental advantage and economic feasibility over the other analyzed alternatives. With so much promise for the site's future, I hope Alternative 5 is removed from the table. There is finally an opportunity to restore the site and it is an opportunity that shouldn't be passed up.

Midas Gold wants to restore the rivers, wildlife and habitat near the Stibnite Gold Project site. We should let them. The Forest Service has given meaningful time to review the document and comment. Further extensions are not necessary and will only hurt Idahoans by delaying the benefits of the project. Please permit Alternative 2 of the Stibnite Gold Project as outlined in the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

My best,

Name: danny