

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/29/2020 4:40:41 AM

First name: Layne

Last name: Mouritsen

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear US, National Forest Service Staff,

I am a native Idahoan and love the outdoor opportunities this beautiful place has to offer. I have raised my family here because Idaho is a great place to live and raise a family. The state has so much to offer everyone. I am writing to voice my support for the Stibnite Gold Project Alternative two proposed by Midas Gold Idaho.

The Stibnite Gold Project would bring economic benefits to Valley County and all of Idaho. Why would we not allow a private company to spend millions of dollars to restore an area that is in severe need of restoration? This company will provide much needed jobs and pay millions of dollars in taxes for the life of the project. Valley County survives on the tourism industry which is very volatile, we need to add diversity for this area by providing great paying jobs that actually offer medical benefits to their workers and their families, unheard of for most of the jobs in rural America.

In looking at all the alternatives proposed by the Forest Service it is apparent that Alternative two is the best option for Idaho and has the least amount of impacts to the area. Unfortunate that the Forest Service did not show Appendix D with the Executive Summary because the effects can be misleading if you do not see the entire reclamation plans as well. I liked seeing that Alternative one was the original plan, and that Midas is willing to continue to review and make the plan better as they go. I am anxiously awaiting the final EIS to see what other adjustments Midas is proposing to make the plan the best it can be.

Alternative three does not make sense to me since that would pollute another watershed and add acreage to the amount of disturbed area and Alternative four does not make sense because crossing a waterway is much better than traveling alongside a waterway, so the Burnt Log road would be the best option. This just opens the potential for a spill and additional sedimentation going into the rivers. The no action alternative five does not help Idaho nor Valley County and is not sensible given we have private money willing to do the clean-up for us.

I am strongly in support of Midas Gold's plan, and believe this project plan will be huge in setting the stage for improving future mining as a whole, and I encourage the U.S. Forest Service to approve Alternative two outlined in the Draft EIS.

After reading my letter, I hope you can see why you should permit Alternative two of the Stibnite Gold Project. This project is a good thing for Idaho, helps decrease America's dependence on foreign countries for critical minerals and cleans up the environment. These benefits cannot wait. Sixty days is long enough for the comment period. Please get this project permitted, it will be a great win for Idaho!

Sincerely,

Layne Mouritsen