

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/29/2020 1:48:15 AM

First name: Daniel

Last name: Bruce

Organization:

Title:

Comments: To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to express my opposition to the Stibnite mining project. My family members have commented on the damage that can be done to fish and wildlife, so I will not comment on that. I'd prefer to discuss 3 topics.

1. History has shown that mining disasters can and do happen. Ultimately when this happens the taxpayers are the ones who are required to clean up the mess after the reserves are met and/or the mining company declares bankruptcy. I feel the upper limit of cost for restoration needs to be addressed when it comes to dealing with a public resource such as land and clean water. The party that creates the environmental damage has often not done their share (100%) of the cleanup. This should never happen when dealing with public resources.

2. Midas Gold is a Canadian company that has promoted the economic benefits of mining in terms of new jobs and community support. The project is not about mining a necessary mineral for the betterment of overall health in the community at large. It is gold, which is a financial instrument for the most part. Idaho Rivers United reports that 2,569 acres of public land will be inaccessible and disturbed for 20 years. Another 13,000 acres will have access restrictions for 20 years. Also, considering the potential environmental impact on public lands and water this seems like a net loss and risk for the local community from a financial risk impact with little return.

3. Finally, it is odd that the public comment period is not 120 days for a project of this importance and scope. There is no reason for this and it puts the comment period squarely in the election cycle and the news can get buried with all the other political news. Plus this could become one of the largest mines in America, so a compacted comment period makes no sense. I think extending the comment period to 75 days makes sense. Also, to my knowledge Midas Gold was allowed to write their own DEIS. I admittedly to not know the normal procedures for this process, but as an outsider looking in it doesn't make any sense to allow the party that has financial incentives to downplay any environmental impacts to write the impact statement. This is akin to asking the prosecutor in a lawsuit to also act as the judge. 3rd party impartial assessment is incredibly important in getting a fair assessment of the environmental impact.

Thank you,