

Supervisor Linda Jackson
Payette National Forest
500 North Mission Street
McCall, Idaho 83638
linda.l.jackson@usda.gov

Supervisor Linda Jackson:

My name is Sam Rogers. I was born and raised in Hailey Idaho, left for college and travel, and have since returned to work in both river guiding and mountain guiding. I work for multiple companies that depend on natural, untrammled Idaho rivers for their business and subsequently the livelihood of their employees. I am writing to you because I am concerned about the proposal of the Stibnite Gold Project in the wonderful state of Idaho. I am a public landowner and I do not believe that there would be any long-term positive outcomes to this mine being built. I am interested in a healthy and un-tampered ecosystem that new generations can enjoy for years to come. There are many negative effects that a project like this can unleash and I do not believe that the DEIS completely addresses nor solves many of these potential issues.

I am hoping you hear my voice and the voices of thousands of other American citizens needing your help to not allow this project to go through and from becoming another Superfund Site.

Within the DEIS proposal I am most immediately concerned about the following for the protection of the health and economic sustainability of our citizens:

- Polluted drinking water
- Impacts on fish and wildlife
- Contaminated soils and sediments
- Health risks
- Reclamation costs handed to the public after Midas Gold leaves

I am worried about the continued health of the river and forest ecosystems in the headwaters of the South Fork of the Salmon River. I believe there may be some additional components to evaluate, and I would like to ask the following:

1) to ask the Forest Service to create a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the relative agencies and public to review and have the opportunity to comment on in order to address all of the missing and incomplete information of the current DEIS a small sample of which is discussed below. This is the most CRUCIAL piece in transparency.

2) to support Alternative 5, the No Action Alternative, outlined in the existing Stibnite Gold Project's Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

In its current state, the DEIS seems incomplete with a lack of important information. This clearly impedes the public's ability, and the USFS's ability, to properly evaluate the significant adverse impacts of the Stibnite Gold Project. It is simply missing important information. Additional information that MUST be included in the DEIS:

- A mitigation plan for transporting cyanide into and along the SF Salmon River, and Burntlog and Johnson Creeks
- Adequate information on the adequacy of the leak detection layer (for Alt. 2) / the functionality of the MicroDrain liner/leak configuration
- Information on whether or not the public have access to this area and regional recreation / hunting access during mining operations
- The DEIS clearly states that all of the alternatives presented, apart from Alternative 5, would adversely affect federally listed endangered fish species, their habitat, and the watershed's water quality and quantity. This further negatively impacts economic vitality related to tourism and recreation of surrounding communities and those in Idaho who depend upon the integrated watershed of Salmon River systems and the hundreds of thousands of visitors each year to our National Forests. This number and economic benefits are growing immensely annually, with a recorded record number of visitors and related economic benefits in summer 2020. Information regarding future monitoring reports (which are already public documents). Will these be delivered honestly, and reliably and posted on a website for real-time public access?
- Information on accountability for Midas's mining practices
- Information on accountability and future funding for restoration/mitigation projects when the mine becomes inactive

Secondly, after reviewing the DEIS I fully support Alternative No. 5—the No Action Alternative—because I strongly believe that the negative environmental and social impacts (largely omitted in the DEIS) strongly outweigh any positive economic or job-bolstering effects of Midas's proposed Stibnite Mine Project. The following is a brief list highlighting some of the most important reasons that I support the No Action Alternative:

- Cyanide leach mining is a practice banned completely in the state of Montana (1998), Wisconsin (2001), 5 Colorado Counties (2004), and many other countries around the world related to a high affinity for failure and environmental destruction
- Midas's claims that this is a reclamation project but the re-mining is a very small portion of the project; ultimately this is a proposal for a cyanide leach dam double the current size or more
- There is no reclamation or mitigation plan: "no definitive plan in place" and this needs clarification in a supplemental DEIS

- Midas continues to claim safe environmental practices but I cannot find an example / proof. Therefore the DEIS must include requirements for accountability for Midas in the form of binding legal documents
- Even in the DEIS, there is not compelling evidence to refute concern that this mine will have a negative and permanent impact on the health of the downstream ecosystems (fishing, hunting etc.) and recreational landscape of the river corridors
- There is a long history of mining companies going bankrupt and/or leaving sites in environmental distress/destruction requiring the use of federal funds (ie: Superfund Sites). This proposal must include binding legal documents that hold Midas—and any The future entity charged with mining operations—accountable for future environmental cleanup.

In summary, based on the long history of mining practices, specifically regarding open-pit mining and cyanide leach mining, there is ample evidence to support the conclusions that:

- 1) there is a high probability that despite Midas's best intentions and promises there will be enduring and unalterable negative and permanent environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.
- 2) If an accident or incident occurs that causes environmental destruction or degradation, especially if Midas or future mine operators are not directly negligent (i.e. earthquake/storm or flood of unprecedented intensity), no person, corporation or entity will be held financially accountable for remediation or cleanup; explicitly, it is an irrefutable fact that the potential and magnitude of environmental destruction or degradation of the SF Salmon and the downstream resources is much, much greater if the 4 proposed alternatives are endorsed by the USFS versus the No Action Alternative.
- 3) in light of the aforementioned conclusions 1 and 2 above, the potential economic benefits touted by Midas to bolster support for their preferred alternative(s) would not be long term or sustainable economic benefits for Valley County or Idaho, and do not outweigh the risks associated with the proposed project moving forward within the scope of any of the 4 proposed alternatives.

Thank you for reading this letter and considering what we the people have to say. Its time that this sort of thing didn't happen anymore.

Sam Rogers