

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/26/2020 11:01:44 PM

First name: Trevor

Last name: Timm

Organization:

Title:

Comments: To whom it may concern,

I don't have much to back my comment on the stibnite gold project. I attempted to read the 100+ page report generated by stibnite and the subsequent 400+ page rebuttal from the forest service. I didn't make it too far past the introduction on each (about 30 pages). I am not a geologist, biologist, forester, or hydrologist so I cannot comment on the analysis provided in these two texts. I am just a kayaker who hopes to someday enjoy the sensitive river areas on and around the salmon river.

It worries me that after this analysis we plan to open up another mine, it appears the first one did not work out and the logic to open up another seems a bit flawed. Stibnite estimates there are still precious metals to be harvested from this site and enough there to make their endeavor profitable. I do not see any contingency plans listed in either the forest service or the stibnite plan as to what happens if the company folds. We have seen this happen at many other mining sites across the US leaving taxpayers left to foot the bill for a half-hearted cleanup and years of remediation.

I would like to see the salmon river preserved rather than used once again as a resource for large companies to profit off the destruction of the land.

Best,

-Trevor J. Timm