181

Subject: UFP Comment
Sender: CSMI3 /INTERNET (CSMI3@corp.newmont.com)
Attached Date: 04/24/00 08:33
Priority: normal
Sensitivity: normal
Importance: normal

Part 1

FROM: CSMI3 / INTERNET
DDT1=RFC-822; DDV1=CSMI3@corp.newmont.com;

TO: cleanwater / wo, caet-slc

Part 2

ARPA MESSAGE HEADER

Part 3

I realize it is at the last minute that I comment on the proposed Unified Federal Policy for Watersheds. From the sketchy information I was able to glean, it is outside the intent of the Clean Water Act and undermines state and tribal authority to implement the CWA.

As a committed natural resource industry leader I am concerned at the lack of notice given for this proposal. Why weren't all land users and property owners notified about this new watershed emphasis? Why were only 4 public meetings scheduled? Why are you pushing this while litigation is pending?

Where does multiple and existing use fit in? How does this build upon the sweeping (and overstepping) directions of the Corp of Engineers 404 permitting activities. Where does multiple use fit in? Will existing plans have to be revised?

Why isn't a cost-benefit analysis required? What is the cumulative impact of the UFP with the other 110 CWAP actions? How will public interest be gauged and used in the decision making process? Why didn't you define "significant public use values"?

And finally, what is the expected cost and time frame for implementation?

Thank-you for addressing my concerns.

CAET RECEIVED
MAY 01 2000