

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/25/2019 5:18:36 PM

First name: Mark

Last name: Chestnut

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I understand the desire of the forest service to protect this property from damage, however, because of the listing of the North Fork Salmon river as a wild and scenic river, and because the property can be listed and protected as a heritage and historic site, I question the need for a mineral withdrawal.

Under current USFS mining regulations, no mining activity that creates any significant surface disturbance can occur without at a minimum a notice of intent, and on a historic site I would imagine an approved POO.

I am the owner of the Auric claim, that barely infringes on the west end of the proposed withdrawal.

I am an underwater dredge miner, and the mining activities that I partake in do not rise to the level of significant surface disturbance, nor would my mining activities harm the site you are trying to preserve.

Requiring me to submit my claim to the costs of a mineral examiner to continue my mining is not fair in this situation, nor does it follow the legal intent of allowing insignificant environmentally friendly minimal impact mining activities to occur in our National Forests.

I would propose that I should be allowed to access my claim across this property as I have for years now following the established case law for mining claim access, and I would be willing to agree to limit my mining activities to the portion of my claim that is outside of the withdrawal should you actually create one. I should only have to go through a mineral examination when and "IF" I were going to mine on the area of my claim that infringes on the proposed withdrawal area.

I am very understanding of the need to protect historical sites such as this one, however, I honestly question the need to resort to a complete withdrawal when there are ample other protections in place that would prevent disturbance of the site.