

## Mississippi River Headwaters Comprehensive Plan Formal Review General Public Comments

Commenter	Page Number	Paragraph/Map/Ta ble	Comment	Response
Sharon Natzel	9	Last paragraph	where the plan states only 2 of the 122 lakes failing to meet water quality standards but then I wondered what water quality standards are they failing? Is it the MPCA or DNR or which dept of MN don't the WQS meet.	Edit made
Sharon Natzel	9	Last sentence	assume the 57,708 acres of forests that have been converted are NOT counted in the 42% of land in forests in the 3rd sentence of the last paragraph. Is that correct assumption or is there are clarification opportunity	The acres of forest that have been converted are not considered part of the 42% of current forests.
Sharon Natzel	13	Last sentence	the story we want to be told after the next 10 years - - perhaps an opportunity to add explanation that this plan's time horizon is 10 years	Edit made
Sharon Natzel	17	First paragraph	1st paragraph says that forests cover most of watershed (58%) followed by wetlands 15% and open water 14%; This does not work out correctly if you look at Page 9 which says forests make up 42% of land cover and wetlands and lakes 39%.... Perhaps there is some caveat to insert here to explain the difference perhaps between sources or timing or whatever the difference is??	Edit made
Sharon Natzel	Map 1.5		spelling wrong on color key for Refuge - see Cisco Regufe Lakes (Tier 1 & II)	Edit made
Sharon Natzel	Map 1.6		surprised that the county color of brown covers so much of Itasca State Park... The name leads one to believe it is state owned....	Edit made
Sharon Natzel	26		The combined total of approximately 146.5 miles of crude oil and natural gas pipelines that stretch across the watershed seems very low. There are 5 lines in the Enbridge corridor from Clearbrook to Superior. So each mile is multiplied then by 5 times in order to use the term "combined". Then there also is the Minncan which has 2 pipelines that run from Clearbrook to the Cities - part of it looks to be in the 1W1P area.	The pipeline miles are only the total number of miles within the Watershed from publically available data.

# Mississippi River Headwaters Comprehensive Plan Formal Review General Public Comments

Sharon Natzel	37		Misspelling of word "plan" where missing "p"..... The lan partners also determined	Edit made
Sharon Natzel	44	First sentence	the statement "fail to meet state standards for E.coli or eutrophication" - makes it seem like it is implying that E.coli and eutrophication go hand in hand or are similar to each other....	Since <i>E. coli</i> and eutrophication are separated by "or" it implies they are not realted.
David Lick	NA	NA	This report is well done. I am concerned that not enough of the understanding public will read it. It is time that clean water is viewed as a community issue. Looking at watersheds and water quality on a Statewide basis, it is imperative that the water in the Mississippi Headwaters watershed be given strict attention. The One Watershed One Plan is a great way to initiate the protection the watershed needs. Water should not be managed by county line but on a regional basis so that there is clear consistency on land use, forestry, sewage treatment, industrial use and recreation. It is time that percentages of vegetated watersheds have greater emphasis. After all, the root systems are the filtering mechanism for each watershed. Governments must establish and enforce land use ordinances better as populations of these watersheds increase. Development should not be stymied but enforcement of well thought out processes for conserving the water quality must be adhered to. This plan sets in motion a recipe to achieve more control of the finite water resource that Northern Mn has for its everyday use. I will follow how the plan works its way through the discussion process. Thanks to all of you who have devoted time and energy to quantify the issue.	Thank you Dave. We will continue to make multiple efforts in presenting the plan in various formats to improve outreach and understanding.

## Mississippi River Headwaters Comprehensive Plan Formal Review General Public Comments

Burnell Fischer	NA	NA	Big plans seem to rarely ever get well implemented, just too much to grasp and the planning team is exhausted and turns it over to others to implement. I know that such planning efforts result in well written documents. And that these documents are a clear record of people's thinking. I just worry about the implementation. So, maybe a short 'action' plan of what's next for the first few years is the first outcome and that's what holds people responsible to getting things done.	The Steering team is developing a work plan/action plan to implement this plan after adoption.
Burnell Fischer	NA	NA	regarding forest land, here's my advice, regarding forests and water quality. Keep forests as forests, that's most important, how the forest is managed is secondary. Conservation easements on forest land, particularly shore land on lakes and rivers is critical. The state forest lands stewardship program for private lands (I don't know the proper name) is great, encourage landowner enrollment. Public forest land is usually a done deal, so less worries, but county lands do get sold on occasion, so be watchful - sold with a conservation easement is best.	We recognize the importance of forestry to this watershed and will continue to work with our partners and landowners to maintain as much of the forest as we can.
Gary Roerick	21	Fourth paragraph	when we are discussing Fishermens Brook we use the adjective wholly and I'm wondering if we should use some other verbiage such as completely or something else that refers to being inclusive?	Edit made
Gary Roerick	21	Fifth paragraph	about presettlement conditions, I believe the word should be condition and you should drop the S at the end of the word??	Edit made
Gary Roerick	24	First paragraph	the division of resource management we identify certain areas and we use the word and fish, wildlife, and plant departments, I think we could drop the word "and". Under the next sentence where we say these departments, I'm assuming we want to capitalize the D in departments since we did that in the sentence before it?	Edit made
Gary Roerick	23		the heading State Lands, the second word, state I believe should be capitalized, State of MN?	Edit made

## Mississippi River Headwaters Comprehensive Plan Formal Review General Public Comments

Gary Roerick	23	Third paragraph	under the heading Federal Lands, the third sentence we say, The land within the forest bounds, I believe should read, Some of the land, or, A portion of the land within the forest bounds?	Edit made
Gary Roerick	28	Third paragraph	addressed, existing county water plans or Soil and Water etc., I believe the word county should be capitalized, County?	Edit made
Gary Roerick	37		I believe the fourth sentence it says the lan??	Edit made
Gary Roerick	42	Last paragraph	the water in a watershed is all connected-every, I don't believe this should be hyphenated like it is showing?	Edit made
Gary Roerick	46	first paragraph	"of" practice installation, should we say "for" practice installation or use some other verbiage there?	Edit made
Gary Roerick	54	Table 3.4	we discussed at length, should we address more specifics in regard to SFIA acreage or conservation Easements, etc., how many SFIA , or other acres we would like to see in each of the lake watershed areas, that would include the table 3.4?	We have that information however we are only going to show priority lakes.