

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/12/2024 4:25:47 AM

First name: Jason

Last name: Schuldt

Organization:

Title:

Comments: After reviewing the EA of the Golden Crest project, I have noticed that almost all of the submitted comments are opposed to the project. Some people sent their feelings, some people sent facts, some people wrote long and detailed testimony that would probably win a jury trial, some people even questioned the ability of the Forest Service to decide this issue. However - in the end, almost everyone who took the time to comment agrees that this is a bad plan. But - our comments have been categorized and trivialized. Some are labeled as opinions. Some are discarded because they are not exactly on topic. Like the ones about "Mining". This EA is not about "Mining", and therefore it is "outside the scope of this EA". I believe that this is entirely about mining. The people who commented don't want anybody to go digging test holes (which causes problems that are just explained away in the EA) to find gold (which is probably there), which will lead to needing to mine it and ruin the Northern Hills (and our drinking water). While it appears that Solidarito has a legal right to explore their claims, the Forest Service has a responsibility to make sure that they do it in a way that minimizes the damage to all other interested parties. I don't think that we ever had a chance of stopping this. But the question that remains is - How does the Forest Service ensure that this "Exploratory Drilling" (which is not "Mining" of course, just digging stuff up) is done in a way that minimizes damage to other interested parties? I propose that the up-front bond be set high enough to fix everything that could go wrong. It would have to cover contamination of drinking water, pollution, noxious weeds, picking up litter, reclamation, etc. that actually occur, but it also has to cover opportunity costs as well. Who can put a value on the time and money that future people might never enjoy or spend?