

## **Opposed**

**From:** Will Michaels  
**To:** FWP Region 5 Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Cottonwood Island FAS  
**Date:** Saturday, December 19, 2020 1:19:52 PM

\$54K for 45 acres of Yellowstone River Island? Could have gotten way more than that for it at public sale or private sale even being undevelopable. Can't the State use all the money it can get?

I'll give you \$100K for it today.

There's going to be a new FAS a mile away anyhow.

It's a real estate deal, so think like a businessman (or person) instead of a bureaucrat.

Remember taxpayers?

Will Michaels (Absarokee)

---

## **Opposed to change of ownership, supportive of habitat**

**From:** Kendall Smith  
**To:** FWP Region 5 Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Cottonwood Island FAS  
**Date:** Friday, January 8, 2021 11:00:36 AM

Dear FWP,

I am writing in regard to the purchase of Yellowstone River island by Reed Point and I have a few concerns. I live near the Yellowstone and Clark's fork river and was there when the oil spill occurred and throughout the clean up. In my opinion and from what I have seen, Exxon did a great job cleaning up after the oil spill. As you know the spill happened when the water was high, so the oil was then put into places where the river did not usually run. When the water receded there were places with oil that did not wash away. Exxon then came in and cleaned up the oil where it was not washed downstream and where it stuck to the growth along the river. Exxon cleaned very well and where the oil was along the river bank and woods near my house it is very clean. I can't even tell where the oil deposited and would not have even known it happened had I not been there. All of the plants were left unharmed and are grown in just as thick as they were before the spill. FWP also states that Exxon removed cottonwoods and other trees and plants. Of the five miles of riverbank by my house, which is only two or three miles down from the spill, I did not see any loads of lumber or plants come by my house during the cleaning. Exxon cleaned it and their trucks and semis came and went many times throughout the months after the spill and I never once saw a truck full of cottonwood or any plants come by.

FWP also said that the island was being purchased for fishing accesses. Since it is an island with no access to it how is it going to be used as a fishing access? With no bridge the land is useless unless people swim or boat to it. The Moussillian paper and several other sources said that FWP was proposing

to use the islands for recreation- camping, hunting, birdwatching and fishing. I do not see how this is possible with it being an island. If the island is meant to be bought to preserve the land, then there should not be camping on the land. People camping will move more trees and damage the growth more than if land did not change ownership. Camping will also create trash left behind by the campers and other visitors to the island. The trash will need to be cleaned up,

In conclusion I think that the island being owned by the MT DOT is not harming the environment. They have done nothing to disturb the cottonwoods or other plant life. Leaving the island alone like the DOT has done is far better for the environment than people camping, littering and smashing the undergrowth. The land should stay in the same ownership and FWP should spend its time and money elsewhere.

Thank you,

Kendall Smith

---

### **Question already public wondering why the process**

**From:** Jay walker

**To:** FWP Region 5 Public Comments

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Yellowstone island purchase

**Date:** Saturday, December 19, 2020 2:00:00 PM

To whom it may concern,

I recently read an article in the newspaper that stated FWP is purchasing an island in the Yellowstone River for recreational purposes. Sounds fine to me. The article isn't clear (or I missed it) on who FWP is purchasing it from. According to MCA, islands recognized before statehood in Navigable rivers belong to the Federal government. The island(s) in question are obviously recognized by the Lewis and Clark expedition and the Yellowstone is a navigable river, therefore they are already public ground. If not, they are owned privately and the article doesn't mention who currently owns them. The article does state that no improvements would be made to the islands. So if they are currently public, nothing will change other than FWP purchasing them. I'm just seeking clarification. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jay Walker

---

### **Supportive with concerns**

**Ruggles, Mike**

**From:** Tom Kilmer <tom.montana.2011@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 27, 2020 11:03 AM  
**To:** FWP Region 5 Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Cottonwood Island FAS

Greetings. Please accept my comments for the record regarding the proposed purchase of Cottonwood Island in the Yellowstone River.

I support this proposed acquisition with 2 stipulations.

1. No Camping.
2. All who land their boats on this island must be able to prove that they know how to "Poop in the Woods"

As you must already know from your work outdoors a large portion of the people who recreate outdoors in Montana do not know how to "Poop in the Woods"

They leave their smoldering rancid piles of poop on the ground for all to see. They leave grotesque strands of filthy toilet paper tangled in vegetation.

Since FWP will not be able to install a vault toilet on Cottonwood Island the potential for the island being fouled by human poop is high.

So again I suggest No Camping and require that all who land on the island be able to prove that they know how to properly "Poop in the Woods." That is properly dig a hole and bury their business or haul it out in a poop bag or portable camp toilet.

Tom Kilmer  
621 2nd Street  
Helena, Montana  
59601

---

## **Supportive**

**From:** Bert Otis  
**To:** FWP Region 5 Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Cottonwood Island FAS  
**Date:** Monday, December 14, 2020 7:48:21 AM

Dear Fish Wildlife & Parks Commission,

Please support the purchase of the Cottonwood Island FAS. I know right now these lands are already being used by the public, let's make sure they continue to be able to do that, by purchasing them.

Thank You

Bert Otis  
PO Box 60

Draft EA, "COTTONWOOD FISHING ACCESS SITE ACQUISITION YELLOWSTONE RIVER"  
Public Comment Record

Emigrant, MT 59027

---

**From:** Douglas Lovely  
**To:** FWP Region 5 Public Comments  
**Cc:** Terry Smith; rolandiverson@gmail.com; Bruce Pearson; Paul Dextras; Dennis Anderson; Dale Elsberry; Ron Bachman; Rollwitz, Mike; Randy Amundson; Jerry Pawluk; Larry Buelow; Dennis McDonald; John Blodgett  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Cottonwood Island FAS  
**Date:** Thursday, December 17, 2020 12:57:56 PM

As a Montana resident and an avid outdoorsman, I've enjoyed our precious Montana rivers for many, many years. I heartily support the completion of the Cottonwood Island FAS as proposed by the MT FWP!

Doug Lovely  
4133 Julaura Lane  
Billings, MT 59106

---

**From:** Billie Wheaton  
**To:** FWP Region 5 Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Cottonwood Island FAS  
**Date:** Saturday, December 19, 2020 10:49:25 AM

This note is written in support of purchasing the Cottonwood Island FAS. In fact, it is in support of any and all actions that improve and expand the public's access to outdoor activities. Hiking, photography, picnicking, fishing, hunting or just hanging out watching the clouds and water roll by are proven ways to improve our lives. From an economic perspective and from lifestyle-fulfillment perspectives, the Montana access to the outdoors is a major reason why people live in Montana.

We have used the Two Bridges area frequently. And the Cottonwood Island has been our stopping place for a snack and a few last minute fish before taking out when we come down from Reed Point. We are familiar with the area.

I have reviewed the EA and find no disagreement over the conclusions. We strongly support the creation of the Cottonwood Island FAS. And we would support any additional access endeavors between Reed Point and Park City.

John and Billie Wheaton  
567 Joliet Fromberg Road  
Fromberg, MT 59029  
bkjwheaton@yahoo.com

**From:** Kevin Croff  
**To:** FWP Region 5 Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Cottonwood Island FAS  
**Date:** Saturday, December 19, 2020 8:05:24 AM

Hi Mike,

I just read the article in the Gazette about the proposed purchase of an island on the Yellowstone outside of Reedpoint. It indicated that it would become a primitive fishing access site. I'm never opposed to more public access to the Yellowstone but I'm wondering how folks would access it if it is an island?

Along that lines it also indicates that FWP is proposing an access at Twin Bridges, which I have heard before. That is a tricky spot for launching.

Are you considering a ramp there?

Thanks for your time.

-----  
Kevin Croff  
Rocky Mountain College  
Tyler Hall 107  
1511 Poly Drive  
Billings, MT 59102  
(406) 657-1056

---

**From:** Michael Fashoway  
**To:** FWP Region 5 Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Cottonwood Island FAS  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 23, 2020 8:18:46 PM

Mr. Ruggles,

I support FWP acquiring Cottonwood Island for use as a water-only FAS. Having just floated and camped along the Yellowstone this past summer, I know how challenging it can be to find public lands along the river suitable for camping. These islands would make a great addition to our current fishing access sites and public lands.

Thanks,

Michael Fashoway  
1310 Stuart St  
Helena, MT 59601

---

**From:** ROBERT B CROOKS

Draft EA, "COTTONWOOD FISHING ACCESS SITE ACQUISITION YELLOWSTONE RIVER"  
Public Comment Record

**To:** [FWP Region 5 Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Cottonwood Island FAS  
**Date:** Thursday, December 17, 2020 9:01:20 AM

I have looked at the EA for the Cottonwood FAS. I am in full support of FWP gaining title to the land purposed for this FAS.

Robert Crooks

---

**From:** [Stephen P](#)  
**To:** [FWP Region 5 Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Islands acquisition  
**Date:** Saturday, December 19, 2020 10:31:18 AM

Great idea. Keep it natural and for the public to recreate, Thanks Stephen Pedalino

---

**From:** [Terry](#)  
**To:** [FWP Region 5 Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Cottonwood island Fishing Access  
**Date:** Thursday, December 17, 2020 1:03:51 PM

As a Montana resident and an avid outdoorsman, I've enjoyed our precious Montana rivers for many, many years. I heartily support the completion of the Cottonwood Island FAS as proposed by the MT FWP!

Terry Smith  
2832 Providence Pl  
Billings, MT  
59102  
[Terrydebbiesmith@gmail.com](mailto:Terrydebbiesmith@gmail.com)

---

Draft EA, "COTTONWOOD FISHING ACCESS SITE ACQUISITION YELLOWSTONE RIVER"  
Public Comment Record

Maggi Buttrell  
712 8<sup>th</sup> Ave Apt 14  
Laurel, MT 59044

Mike Ruggles,  
Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks  
2300 Lake Elmo Drive  
Billings, MT 59105

Dear Mister Ruggles,

The Two Bridges and Cottonwood Island proposal is one of the best ideas presented in quite awhile. The various entities involved shows how government agencies can work together with a mixed bag of proposals and make a really good plan for more recreation possible.

Count me in as very favorable for the implementation of the plan. It is a great idea.

Sincerely,  
Maggi Buttrell

calidris@surewest.net **From:** Ed Harper  
**To:** FWP Region 5 Public Comments  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Purchase of Two Bridges Island in Yellowstone River  
**Date:** Sunday, January 10, 2021 12:21:49 AM  
Hello,

Draft EA, "COTTONWOOD FISHING ACCESS SITE ACQUISITION YELLOWSTONE RIVER"  
Public Comment Record

My name is Edward Harper, 127 Summer Ridge Road, Bozeman 59715 and I am writing in eager support for the purchase of the 45 acre property called the Two Bridges Island located near Reedpoint on the Yellowstone River. Although my primary objective to see this property purchased by Montana FWP is not necessarily because of fishing opportunities, I do view the property as vital riparian habitat. Such habitat is very important to wildlife and the majority of bird species found in Montana rely upon this scarce resource. I have been doing US Breeding Bird Surveys for the Reedpoint Route since 1977. Consequently I am aware of this particular region and feel the purchase would be a significant boost to riparian obligates. I very much want this land acquisition and I hope it will be done. Control of non-native species of weed, grasses, and trees would also enhance the value of this purchase. Both bird and insect populations have declined markedly in the last 50 years and seeing the purchase of this property gives me hope that we may start to reverse these alarming declines.

Thank you,  
Edward Harper