To: Payette Forest Supervisor Keith Lannom

As I understand it, Midas Gold proposes to restore the mine site when mining is finished. To that I make a couple of points.
1. Midas needs to put the restoration money "up front"; in the form of either cash or a bond (NOT "self bonding"). The West is littered with degraded ecosystems that are the product of failed "restoration" or restoration plans rendered moot by the bankruptcy of the firm or abandonment of the site.
2. USFS has a particularly important responsibility to insist of extremely tight standards for any disturbance in the Salmon River watershed. The Salmon River system is unique in the lower 48 due to its near pristine nature and the importance of its fisheries.   "Low risk" is not good enough. USFS must insist on certainty of resource protection. A high standard yes..... but merited by the unique value of the ecosystem.

Given the history of "pit lakes" turning to sterile acid lakes that are a perpetual threat to the surrounding waters; I do not see how USFS can approve a plan that would leave such pits to the future.

Nor do I see it acceptable for Midas to leave as its legacy surrounding valleys with mining spoil.

The burden of proof must be on Midas to show beyond a shadow of a doubt, with the resources to back it up, that the company can meet the Boy Scout standard of leaving their camp site better then they found it. And, yes, I know that in the case of Stibnite we are not talking about land untrammeled by the hand of Man, but we are also talking about a vulnerable and valuable watershed whose importance extends far beyond the boundaries of the proposed mine.

Now living in Baltimore, I am originally from Idaho and return as often as I can because time in the Idaho forests is a balm to wash away the stress of an urban existence.   While I, of course, can find alternate forest venues to restore my soul remember that the fish can not find alternate watersheds.

Mr. Chris Yoder