

60 Day Formal Review Comments and Responses



Date of review: 7/24/2024 -9/22/2024

#	Commenter	Page	Comment	Editorial	Material	Note	Change made in plan (Y/N)	Revision
1	Ryan Perish, Minnesota Department of Agriculture	--	The comments and suggestions provided by the MDA as a part of the technical advisory committee have been effectively addressed. As written, we believe this plan sufficiently addresses the priority concerns for groundwater that were indicated in our initial comment letter for this plan. Thank you for including reference to a few of the MDA's programs in this plan including the Groundwater Protection Rule, Minnesota Ag Water Quality Certification Program, and Ag BMP Loan program.			x	N	Thanks for your review!
2	Darren Mayers and Jeff Hrubes, Board of Water and Soil Resources	--	The CWRCWMP is an all-inclusive plan to address groundwater, surface water, habitat and forestry as per the 1W1P Plan Content Requirements adopted by the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) on December 15, 2022 (Version 2.2). Implementation actions in the plan consider a broad range of tools, including Planned Landscape Management, Constructed Environmental Enhancements, Protected Lands Maintenance, Data Collection and Outreach to achieve the goals of the plan. The CWRCWMP meets the Plan Content Requirements.			x	N	Thanks for your review!

#	Commenter	Page	Comment	Editorial	Material	Note	Change made in plan (Y/N)	Revision
3	Chad Anderson, Minnesota Department of Health	--	We feel the plan is written in a manner that incorporates MDH's priority concerns pertaining to groundwater and drinking water, while reflecting the priorities of residents of the watershed and the capacity of the local entities that will implement the plan.			x	N	Thanks for your review!
4	Bonnie Goshey, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	--	The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) appreciates the opportunity to review the draft Crow Wing River Watershed Plan (Plan) dated July 24, 2024, as well as providing input throughout your Plan development process. The Plan incorporates MPCA's issues highlighted in the May 25, 2023 priority concerns letter, and we have no further comments at this time.			x	N	Thanks for your review!
5	Kevin Vistad	30	Lake Belle Taine's water issues are very much a part of the overall watershed. Our water problems should not be ignored. These water problems need to be addressed by One Watershed One Plan.		x		N	We recognize this as a local issue on page 30. Constructing a lake outlet is ineligible for Watershed-Based Implementation Funding, but Lake Belle Taine is a priority resource in the plan, which may assist in finding outside resources to address this local issue.
6	Ben Hadden	30	Page 30 - The water level issues on Belle Taine as mentioned have been ongoing. One of the likely solutions is to develop an outlet. That outlet will likely involve some type of draining into the Crow Wing - indirectly or directly. Therefore, I believe this is a bigger concern than a local issue. Every year the lake waters rise, more nutrients are getting into the water, more shoreline is impacted, and long-term mitigation by landowners has to be deferred due to unknown resolutions. If a solution		x		N	We recognize this as a local issue on page 30. Constructing a lake outlet is ineligible for Watershed-Based Implementation Funding, but Lake Belle Taine is a priority resource in the plan, which may assist in finding outside resources to address this local issue.

#	Commenter	Page	Comment	Editorial	Material	Note	Change made in plan (Y/N)	Revision
			could be found, and owners could develop their shoreline with the maximum water height known, that would do a lot to improve the situation - as well as providing the Crow Wing with healthy water. Please strongly consider this issue for the entire watershed, not just a local issue. Having an outlet for high water is an item the entire watershed will want to be involved with and therefore should be considered now, while the lake is healthy.					
7	Jeffrey Gallagher	30	I am disappointed that the problem with the water level of Lake Belle Taine was dismissed and we were told it was a local issue. We had hoped that your entity would offer us some help in developing a plan to address this problem.		x		N	We recognize this as a local issue on page 30. Constructing a lake outlet is ineligible for Watershed-Based Implementation Funding, but Lake Belle Taine is a priority resource in the plan, which may assist in finding outside resources to address this local issue.
8	Steve Hankey	30	Why, Why, Why, don't you find a solution to stabilize the water level on Belle Taine? I have a sidewalk on my property that was made in 1939 which now has greater than sixty feet of sidewalk under water. That much additional water has to have a negative effect on the water quality and certainly must be introducing toxins and debris into the lake destroying the water quality.		x		N	We recognize this as a local issue on page 30. Constructing a lake outlet is ineligible for Watershed-Based Implementation Funding, but Lake Belle Taine is a priority resource in the plan, which may assist in finding outside resources to address this local issue.

#	Commenter	Page	Comment	Editorial	Material	Note	Change made in plan (Y/N)	Revision
9	Randy and Tami Wenthold	--	<p>Word Document with comments requesting monitoring of pesticides, fungicide, and additional harmful chemicals on ag fields was received.</p> <p>Additionally, the Wentholds commented on timber harvesting in Huntersville Forest, stating that harvesting is taking place on horse trail areas at a faster rate and the scenery of the area is impacted. They requested a map of forest harvests near their property.</p>		x		N	<p>The Minnesota Department of Agriculture has regulatory authority and a monitoring network for edge of field and private wells. Watershed-based Implementation Funding is not allowed to be used for monitoring.</p> <p>The Plan includes forest management as a priority on private lands. Harvesting occurring in state forests is under the jurisdiction of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources and is outside the scope of this plan.</p>
10	Randy and Tami Wenthold		Attached is supporting document regarding Maneb and Paraquat study.		x		N	Study was received. The Minnesota Department of Agriculture has regulatory authority and a monitoring network for edge of field and private wells.
11	Neal Gaalswyk		There should be a statement in this plan that the projects planned or anticipated will only be undertaken as funds become available. This would be consistent with language found in the Leech Lake River 1W1P.	x			Y	Text added to implementation section.
12	Robert Eliason	1	City of Lake Shore has population over 1,000 but not listed. Lake Shore is the most populated city in Cass County. Why is it not listed?	x			Y	Lake Shore was added to the text.
13	Robert Eliason	12	City of Lake Shore has population over 1,000 but not listed. Lake Shore is the most populated city in Cass County. Why is it not listed?	x			Y	Lake Shore was added to the text.

#	Commenter	Page	Comment	Editorial	Material	Note	Change made in plan (Y/N)	Revision
14	Robert Eliason	19	Invasive species: The sentence reads; "AIS in the watershed include Curly-leaf pondweed (Eleventh Crow Wing Lake and Blueberry Lake), Faucet snails (The Gull Chain of Lakes , Crow Wing Chain of Lakes, Duck, Upper and Lower Twin, Stocking, Blueberry, Long, Boulder, Upper Bottle Lake, Shell River, and the Crow Wing River), Eurasian watermilfoil (Mantrap and Bad Axe Lakes) and Zebra mussels (The Gull Chain of Lakes, Long Lake) (DNR 2023). The Gull Chain of Lakes is infested with Curly-leaf pondweed and should be included in the Curly-leaf pondweed list. The Gull Chain of Lakes is also infested with Purple Loosestrife, and that category should be added to the list. Starry Stonewort was recently identified in Middle Cullen Lake by the DNR. This should be listed in the sentence.		x		Y	Removed individual lakes and rephrased to: AIS in the watershed include curly-leaf pondweed, faucet snails, Eurasian watermilfoil, purple loosestrife, starry stonewort, and zebra mussels (DNR 2023). Both the Gull and Crow Wing Chain of Lakes are infested with AIS. Looking at DNR infested waters list found additional lakes and it not feasible to list them all in the text. Plus, this list is always changing. Purple loosestrife was added.
15	Robert Eliason	20	Fig. 2.6 Indicates Cory, Home, and Stoney Brooks as impaired by <i>E. Coli</i> .			x	N	These are streams on the 2022 impaired waters list for <i>E. coli</i> .
16	Robert Eliason	20	The MPCA lists Mayo Creek as impaired by <i>E. Coli</i> , and this should be indicated in the map.	x			Y	The <i>E.coli</i> impaired reach of Mayo Creek is on the map, the whole river is not impaired. Added a label for Mayo Creek.
17	Robert Eliason	41	Surface Water Focus Areas: It is stated that some streams west of Gull Lake that drain into it are impaired. What are the names of these streams? What is the impairment? (I think the answers to these questions should be stated in the narrative.)		x		Y	Added the names of <i>E. coli</i> impaired streams that drain into the Chain

#	Commenter	Page	Comment	Editorial	Material	Note	Change made in plan (Y/N)	Revision
18	Robert Eliason	58	Surface Water Focus Fig 5.5: Roy and Nisswa are included in the Protect category while Lake Margaret is in Restore category. But Upper Gull, which is larger than Nisswa, Roy and Margaret lakes, is not listed in either the Protect category or the Restore category. (I think Upper Gull should be included in the Protect category as its phosphorus level is the same as found in both Nisswa and Roy lakes.)		x		Y	Upper Gull is in a priority surface water subwatershed and connected to Gull Lake. We edited Figure 5.5 to include Upper Gull in green (protection priority).
19	Robert Eliason	79	The narrative states; "The Gull Lake/River Planning Region is located in the southeast corner of the watershed. At 16% open water, this planning region has abundant lakes. It contains multiple large lakes in its southeastern half, including the Gull Chain of Lakes, North Long Lake, and Edward Lake. The upstream area of the planning region has Mayo Creek, Cory Brook, and Home Brook." Why has Stoney Brook been excluded from the stream list?		x		Y	Added Stony Brook
20	Robert Eliason	79	Fig. 6.8. Why isn't Upper Gull identified as a Focus Lake?'		x		Y	Added it as a focus lake since it's connected to Gull and is in a priority surface water subwatershed.
21	Gull Chain of Lakes Association	--	PDF letter received requesting actions to target Lake Maragret which will improve Gull Lake.			x	N	Work is planned for Lake Margaret in this plan. It is assigned as a 'Restore' priority lake and is given a goal of reducing Total Phosphorus by 57 lbs/yr through 250 acres of BMPs and nearshore practices. GCOLA efforts of lakeshore improvements are welcome and fit into the plan priorities.

#	Commenter	Page	Comment	Editorial	Material	Note	Change made in plan (Y/N)	Revision
22	Sharon Natzel	Figure 1.2	<p>Please consider placing a list of the 6 categories of lakes and which lakes are some of the notable lakes and rivers in the appendix and then also note in Figure 1.2, that the list is in the appendix under the D section, Lake Prioritization.</p> <p>Reason for consideration: Private citizens located on the lakes and streams considered to be some of the notable lakes and rivers in outstanding condition in Figure 1.2 will be able to then easily see the 7 individual list. Citizens can then focus their own efforts and influence efforts perhaps of the local non-profit clubs, associations, and organizations that they may belong to and that may be organized around education. The education could then perhaps include ways to improve / protect / preserve the resources. Examples could be youth fishing clubs, lake associations, UMN Extension Master Gardeners, etc.</p>		x		Y	Added tables of all the lakes and their qualities in Appendix D. We are happy to provide an Excel document to Hubbard COLA as well if that is easier to follow.
23	Sharon Natzel	12	<p>Please consider adding a definition of Drumlin in the first of the four times that the word is used. It is not necessarily a word that is used regularly by the private citizen, unless knowledgeable on glacial features. It is first used on page 12 , in section 2, see below. It could be incorporated within the sentence structure to explain it's a low oval mound or small hill molded by glacial action, etc.</p>		x		Y	Added drumlin definition.

#	Commenter	Page	Comment	Editorial	Material	Note	Change made in plan (Y/N)	Revision
24	Sharon Natzel		Please consider adding a definition or include on the list of acronyms what the DNRA n.d. on Page 15 and for DNRb n.d. 1st used 1 of 3 times beginning on page 16 and also DNRc n.d. on page 16.		x		N	n.d. is in the acronym table. a,b,c, etc, in a citation is standard for when they are the same source and year. For example (DNRA, 2022) vs (DNRb, 2022) are different sources that were published in the same year by the same entity.
25	Rose and Paul Ragole		<p>We appreciate the importance of this entire Plan and magnitude of its scope. We also underscore the importance of Tier 1 Priority Focus Areas (p. 54), Forest Health (p.66) and water quality goal for restoration in our area (& impacts of dams and drainage ditches).</p> <p>Quality & Quantity of water in Upper & Lower Twin Lake (Twin Lakes) is impacted by the Dam in the city of Park Rapids. We believe that should be included in discussions related to water quality improvements.</p> <p>Rose is a Board member of Twin Lakes Association and Paul is a member.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>		x		N	<p>Thank you for your comment. Lower Twin is a priority lake in this plan, which makes the Twin Lakes a priority for improvement projects. The Fishhook River dam in Park Rapids is not a priority for the DNR to modify because it is currently a carp barrier preventing carp from moving into upstream lakes. A Minnesota Pollution Control Agency study (TMDL: https://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/wq-iw8-45e.pdf) concluded that the main source of phosphorus loading to Twin Lakes is from the watershed and internal loading from the sediments. We look forward to working with Twin Lakes Association in the implementation of this plan.</p>

MEETING MINUTES
Crow Wing River Watershed
Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan
Public Hearing

Date: 10/17/2024

Time: 5:00 pm - 7:00 pm

Location: Sourcewell | Meeting Room
202 12th St NE, Staples, MN 56479

1. Call to order/Attendance Call to order at 5:00 pm (Quorum established)
 - **Voting Members:** Tony Beck, Ken Berg, Erica Jepson, Bob Kangas, Tom Kruger, Ken Laporte, John Lubke, Don Sells, JoAnn Weaver, Mike Weyer
 - **Alternates Members:** Heidi Anderson-Thomas, Tom Kuschel
 - **Staff:** Melissa Berrick, Dana Gutzman (Virtual), Jeff Hrubes, Jake Shaughnessy, Nicole Lundeen (Virtual), Bryan Malone, Darren Newville, Moriya Rufer
 - **Visiting:** Bill Haugan, John Maczko,
2. Plan Overview Presentation
 - Moriya Rufer presented an overview of the Crow Wing 1w1p.
3. Motion to Open Public Hearing
 - Motion By Bob Kangas and seconded by Ken Berg
 - Public Comments
 - Bill Haugan
 1. Provided a letter to the planning partnership. Summarized two paragraphs about Forest Fires and a Proposed Forest Fire Fuel Reduction Recommendations.
 - Sharon Natzel
 1. Thanks the planning partnership for providing a variety of lake resources and information tables. Requested to be sent the lake tables and information as a separate document so it can be use by the Hubbard County COLA.
 - Jeff Hrubes
 1. Thanked the Policy Committee and Staff members for bringing the plan together
 - John Mazcko
 1. For Several Decades the Lake association was told the 1w1p would be the solution to their high-water issue. The Belle Taine association has been added as a local issue. The Bell Taine Association believes additional solutions to the high-water issue needs to be considered that are not mentioned in the plan. Such As an outlet.
 2. The plan itself is confined to watershed issues that can be addressed by the CWMP/1w1p funding and not what needs to be done to address the watershed concerns as a whole. Expected the plan to focus on all issues

in the watershed and not just what could be addressed by watershed-based implementation funding.

4. Motion to Close Public Hearing:

- Motion By John Lubke and Seconded by Bob Kangas

5. Plan Comment Discussion

- **JoAnn and Jeff Hrubes:** Discussed existing policy as to why the 1w1p is unable to directly implement out-letting of Lake Belle Taine.
- **Don Sells:** discussed items Hubbard SWCD is doing to a underwriting a study to do feasibility along
- **Moriya Rufer:** mentioned that Lake Belle Taine is a priority and that could assist them in acquiring funds from other sources in the future.
- **Melisa B:** Reiterate that this plan can be referenced in future grant writing.
- **John Lubke:** In comment to Bill Haugen Comment that they had a presentation regarding fire concerns as they have many downed trees from storms which can cause fire concerns.
- **Darren Newville:** Mentioned that the concerns referenced in Bill Haugan's concerns maybe more easily addressed in the other forestry plan.
- **Bill Haugen:** Concerned 1w1p easement plans may take funding away from their concern.
- **Jeff Hrubes:** Discussed how easements and forest management are compatible.
- **Bill Haugen:** Concerned that no commercial timber harvesting is allowed.
- **Darren Newville:** Mentioned that they have existing easements that have commercial harvests as long as they follow the management plan for the easement.
- **Bill Haugen:** Would appreciate that the hand out provided will be read by the policy committee.
- **Jeff Hrubes:** Mentioned that Bill Haugan's concern would be best addressed at the county comp plan level.

6. Draft Plan Approval

- Motion to approve the adoption of the plan to be recommended to each individual County/SWCD Board.
 - Motion By Mike Weyer and Seconded by Ken Berg

7. Next Steps

- Jeff and Moriya explained the next steps in the final plan adoption. Moriya invites the policy committee to attend the BWSR Northern Regional Committee on January 06, 2025. Discuss with White Earth Tribal is interested in implementation.

8. Motion to Adjourn

- Motion made by Ken Laporte and seconded by Tony Beck