

---

**FINAL**  
**THE STATE OF MONTANA'S RESPONSES**  
**TO PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT 2004**  
**UPPER CLARK FORK RIVER BASIN**  
**RESTORATION WORK PLAN**

---

**PREPARED BY:**

**STATE OF MONTANA**  
**NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE PROGRAM**  
**1301 EAST LOCKEY**  
**P. O. Box 201425**  
**Helena, MT 59620-1425**

**DECEMBER 2004**

**INDEX**  
**STATE OF MONTANA’S RESPONSE TO COMMENTS**

<b><u>Comment Category</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>CATEGORY 1: Support for the Clark Fork Watershed Education Project.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CATEGORY 2: Support for the Butte Waterline Project.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CATEGORY 3: Support for the High Service Project .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CATEGORY 4: Support for the Anaconda Waterline Project.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CATEGORY 5: Support for the Bridger Plant Materials Center Project.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CATEGORY 6: Support for the Browns Gulch Project.....</b>	<b>4</b>

**APPENDIX 1: Comments received during the comment period**

- List of Comment Letters and Public Hearing Comments
- Public Comment Summary Table
- Public Comment Letters
- Public Hearing Record

**APPENDIX 2: Comment letters received before the comment period**

**Acronyms**

Advisory Council	Upper Clark Fork River Basin Remediation and Restoration Education Advisory Council
NRDP	Natural Resource Damage Program
UCFRB	Upper Clark Fork River Basin

# **STATE OF MONTANA'S RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT 2004 UPPER CLARK FORK RIVER BASIN RESTORATION WORK PLAN (December 2004)**

## **Introduction**

On September 10, 2004, the State of Montana released the *Draft 2004 Upper Clark Fork River Basin Restoration Work Plan (Draft Work Plan)* for public comment. The State advertised the release of this plan for public comment in several newspapers in the Upper Clark Fork River Basin (UCFRB) and posted it on the Montana Natural Resource Damage Program's (NRDP) website. In addition, the State sent either copies of the plan or notices that it was available to individuals or entities that, in the past, have demonstrated a special interest in this matter. Those individuals included grant applicants, members of the UCFRB Remediation and Restoration Education Advisory Council (Advisory Council), environmental groups, and local governmental entities in the Basin.

A total of 37 individuals, including representatives of 10 entities, submitted official comments during the public comment period. The State held one public hearing on the *Draft Work Plan*. Eighteen individuals commented at the Butte hearing held on September 16, 2004. The State received 12 comment letters from 19 individuals before the public comment period closed on October 15, 2004. Appendix 1 provides summary tables on the comments and copies of the public comment letters and hearing transcripts.

This document provides the State's responses to these comments. The NRDP prepared these responses on behalf of the Trustee Restoration Council and the Governor.

Each of the comment letters and hearing comments have been numbered and each comment has been assigned an alphabetic designation so that readers of this document can readily refer to the precise text of the various comments to which the NRDP is responding. Similar comments are listed and addressed together. Under the "Category" heading, the NRDP summarizes these comments. Under the "Response" heading, the NRDP indicates what changes, if any, will be made to the *Draft Work Plan* and incorporated into the *Final 2004 Upper Clark Fork River Basin Restoration Work Plan (Final Work Plan)*.

Appendix 2 contains the letters that were received before the *Draft Work Plan* was submitted for public comment. These letters were summarized in that plan.

**CATEGORY 1: Support for the Clark Fork Watershed Education Program.** The NRDP received 29 comments from 36 individuals, including representatives of 9 entities, supporting the Clark Fork Watershed Education Project. (See letters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and hearing comments PH-1, PH-2, PH-3, PH-4, PH-5, PH-6, PH-7, PH-8, PH-9, PH-10, PH-11, PH-12, PH-13, PH-14, PH-15, PH-16, PH-18D.) Reasons provided for support include, but are not limited to:

- The project is a worthwhile, long-term investment. For less than \$300 per student, we have the chance to promote science education, citizenship, and the future of our children.
- It is an opportunity to create a lot of special moments and build on a proven education process that is hands-on, inquiry driven, and place-based learning.
- The sixth graders at Kennedy school greatly benefited from the pilot project, which involved an exemplary connection between MT Tech and Butte schools that this proposal will continue.
- The project is a well thought-out, top-notch program, staffed with dedicated science professionals.
- The educational benefits to the children and teachers will extend to the communities in the Basin and create stronger community involvement.
- The project will help foster the development of an informed and caring citizenry that will understand what happened in the past and why it is important to take care of restored resources. By preparing children for the future, we stand a greater chance that the remedies we are spending so much money on will be protected and last in the long-term.
- It is important to offer these services right now since restoration and remediation work is underway.
- Education is a critical component of successful conservation.
- The Advisory Council has a major role via its Executive Order to promote education.
- Several college students commented on how they had benefited from similar environmental education opportunities in the Butte schools that prompted them to pursue science-related degrees in college and careers.
- A few teachers commented on their positive experience from participating in the pilot project.

Prior to the public comment period, the NRDP received 9 letters of support for this project from 8 entities. Those letters are provided in Appendix 2.

**RESPONSE:** These commentators’ support of the Clark Fork Watershed Education Program will be noted in the *Final Work Plan* under the NRDP’s analysis of the “Public Support” criterion of this project in Appendix A of this work plan. The *Draft Work Plan* generally covers the benefits of this project highlighted by these comments under the “Relationship of Expected Costs to Expected Benefits” criterion and other criteria discussions. Therefore, no other changes will be made to the criteria evaluations based on these comments.

**CATEGORY 2: Support for the Butte Waterline project.** The NRDP received 3 comments from 2 individuals and 1 entity supporting the Butte Waterline project. One commentator offered support for public water projects in Butte and Anaconda because such projects are essential to the long-term development and sustainability of the Butte and Anaconda communities. (See hearing comments PH-1, PH-17, and PH-18A.)

Prior to the public comment period, the NRDP received 2 letters of support for the Butte waterline project from 2 entities. Those letters are provided in Appendix 2.

**RESPONSE:** These commentators’ support of the Butte Waterline project will be noted in the *Final Work Plan* under the NRDP’s analysis of the “Public Support” criterion of these projects in Appendix A of this work plan.

**CATEGORY 3: Support for the High Service project.** The NRDP received 3 comments from 2 individuals and 1 entity supporting the Butte Waterline project. One commentator indicated support for public water projects in Butte and Anaconda because such projects are essential to the long-term development and sustainability of the Butte and Anaconda communities. (See hearing comments PH-1, PH-17, and PH-18B.)

Prior to the public comment period, the NRDP received 2 letters of support for the High Service project from 2 entities. Those letters are provided in Appendix 2.

**RESPONSE:** These commentators’ support of the High Service project will be noted in the *Final Work Plan* under the NRDP’s analysis of the “Public Support” criterion of these projects in Appendix A of this work plan.

**CATEGORY 4: Support for the Anaconda Waterline project.** The NRDP received 2 comments from 2 individuals supporting the Anaconda Waterline project. One commentator indicated support for public water projects in Butte and Anaconda because such projects are essential to the long-term development and sustainability of the Butte and Anaconda communities. (See hearing comments PH-1 and PH18-C.)

Prior to the public comment period, the NRDP received 4 letters of support for the Anaconda Waterline project from 4 entities. Those letters are provided in Appendix 2.

**RESPONSE:** These commentators’ support of the Anaconda Waterline project will be noted in the *Final Work Plan* under the NRDP’s analysis of the “Public Support” criterion of these projects in Appendix A of this work plan.

**CATEGORY 5: Support for the Bridger Plant Materials Center project:** The NRDP received 2 comments from 2 individuals in support of the Bridger Plant project. One comment stressed the need for the native plant seeds that would be produced by this project for successful revegetation. (See hearing comments PH-1 and PH18-E.)

Prior to the comment period, the NRDP received 2 letters of support for this project from 2 entities. Those letters are provided in Appendix 2.

**RESPONSE:** These commentators’ support of the Bridger Plant project will be noted in the *Final Work Plan* under the NRDP’s analysis of the “Public Support” criterion of these projects in Appendix A of this work plan.

**CATEGORY 6: Support for the Browns Gulch Project.** The NRDP received 1 comment from 1 individual supporting the Browns Gulch project. This comment indicated support of all projects (See hearing comments PH-1.)

Prior to the public comment period, the NRDP received 7 letters of support for the Browns Gulch project from 3 entities and 4 landowners. These letters are provided in Appendix 2.

**RESPONSE:** These commentators’ support of the Browns Gulch project will be noted in the *Final Work Plan* under the NRDP’s analysis of the “Public Support” criterion of these projects in Appendix A of this work plan.

# APPENDIX 1

Guide to Comments and Public  
Comments Received During the  
Comment Period

## List of Letters

<b>Letter No.</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Date</b>
1	Powell County High School	Terry Mosier	9/7/04
2	Kennedy School – Butte	Terri Daily	9/13/04
3		Pat Munday	9/14/04
4	Montana Tech	Melissa Hayes	9/16/04
5	Montana Tech	Willis Weight	9/16/04
6	Montana Tech	Susan Patton	9/16/04
7		Bruce Hall	9/16/04
8	Ramsay School	Rosemary Garvey	9/20/04
9	Trout Unlimited	Dave McKernan	9/17/04
10	Drummond Public School	Paula Johnston	9/14/04
11	Rattlesnake Productions	Pamela Roberts	10/12/04
12	Butte High Science Department	8 Individuals	10/14/04

## List of Public Hearing Comments

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Commentator</b>	<b>Date</b>
PH-1		Tracy Vidrich	9/16/04
PH-2		Pat Munday	9/16/04
PH-3	Butte School District	Colleen Lean	9/16/04
PH-4		Allen Bone	9/16/04
PH-5		Edwin Daum	9/16/04
PH-6		Jay Deal	9/16/04
PH-7		Megan Shone	9/16/04
PH-8		Ryan Dunn	9/16/04
PH-9		Adam Munson	9/16/04
PH-10		Nick McLean	9/16/04
PH-11		Emily Munday	9/16/04
PH-12		Zack Axtell	9/16/04
PH-13		Kyle Kankelborg	9/16/04
PH-14		Buimin Chang	9/16/04
PH-15		John Driscoll	9/16/04
PH-16		Steve Anderson	
PH-17	Butte Silver Bow	Jennifer Kerns	9/16/04
PH-18		Tom Malloy	9/16/04



**PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY TABLE**

Category 1: Support for the Clark Fork Watershed Education Project	Letters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12; Public Hearing Comments PH-1, PH-2, PH-3, PH-4, PH-5, PH-6, PH-7, PH-8, PH-9, PH-10, PH-11, PH-12, PH-13, PH-14, PH-15, PH-16, PH-18D
Category 2: Support for the Butte Waterline project	PH-1, PH-17, PH-18A
Category 3: Support for the High Service Tank project	PH-1, PH-17, PH-18B
Category 4: Support for the Anaconda Waterline project	PH-1, PH-18C
Category 5: Support for the Bridger Plant Materials project	PH-1, PH-18E
Category 6: Support for the Browns Gulch project	PH-1

# APPENDIX 2

Comment Letters Received Before  
Public Comment Period

This Appendix may be requested from  
the

Natural Resource Damage Program

P.O. Box 201425

Helena, MT 59620

406-444-0205

[nrdp@mt.gov](mailto:nrdp@mt.gov)