

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/6/2023 5:54:40 PM

First name: Kevin

Last name: Lewis

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am opposed to alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Stibnite Gold Project. Based on the impacts described in the DEIS, there would be too much environmental damage like loss of riparian habitat, increase in water temperatures, new roads (in an inventoried roadless area, nonetheless), etc.; and too many disturbances to the wilderness character of the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness. I can't speak on the impact to tribal resources personally but knowing that the Nez Perce Tribe is against the project is enough for me.

If I had to choose an alternative, it would be alternative 5; however, the fact that alternative 5 would clear Midas Gold, Inc., as stated on 2-139 of the DEIS, from "removal and/or relocation of legacy materials (tailings and waste rock), backfilling of the Yellow Pine pit, rebuilding of the EFSFSR, or re-establishing fish passage to the headwaters of the EFSFSR" makes the "no action" alternative the least bad of a set of bad alternatives. An ideal alternative would be once where Midas Gold, Inc. is required to follow through with environmental remediation without going forward with the SGP. It would be even better if they were banned from further exploration in the area so that we do not have to deal with any future mining proposals in this environmentally sensitive area.