	Issue Response Table of Contents	
	Issues	Response to Comments page number
A-D	[BLANK]	
E	Act now to reduce mercury	3
F	Better for economy in long run (health issues)	3
G	Big Stone plant -- problem	3
H	Cap & trade concern	3
I	Coal plant regs / cleanup	4
J	Contamination of land	4
K	Request copy of TMDL	5
L	Dissatisfied with staff performance	5
M	Env. Justice Issues	6
N	EPA modeling	6
O	Equation discussions	7
P	Fines to industries not meeting standards	7
Q	FOIA Request	5
R	Further investigation of MPCA	5
S	Implementation plan not strong enough	8
T	Limits too high (not stringent enough)	6
U	Mandatory dates / timelines for reduction	8
V	Mercury levels too high	6
W	MN should lead / falling behind; don't wait for federal action	3
X	MOS	8
Y	New / future source concerns	10
Z	Offering services during implementation	10
AA	Process problems	5
AB	Product use	10
AC	Proportionality principle challenged	4
AD	Recycling concern	10
AE	Re-release of Hg from lake sediments	4
AF	Return to original draft	5
AG	Re-write/start over	5
AH	Slow progress	3
AI	Speciation	10
AJ	Stormwater issues	4
AK	Taconite regulations	11
AL	Tax Utilities	12
AM	Thank you / good job!	12
AN	TMDL plan does not go far enough	12
AO	Too cozy with industry	5
AP	Uniform deposition	12
AQ	Voluntary doesn't work	12
AR	Will pay more/ cost of electricity should not be issue	13
AS	WWTF issues	12
AT	We need serious measures	3
AU	Need a ten year plan	13
AV	Remove *de minimis*	13

	Issues	Response to Comments page number
AW	Go beyond 90th percentile	18
AX	Poor reasonable assurance	27
AY	Eliminate FCA	28
AZ	Hot spot issues	28
BA	Reductions should be mandatory	29
BB	WQS flawed	29
BC	10% state share too small	29
BD	Cap WLA for 2006, not 1990	30
BE	Reduce coal-plant emissions	4
BF	Reserve capacity issues	10
BG	Trading issues	30
BH	Critical condition issue	30
BI	Develop cost to society, not just to industry	31
BJ	Need better monitoring plan	31
BK	need national reasonable assurance plan	27
BL	Duty of Candor	31
BM	Must acknowlege cultural protocols	6
BN	Need more details on individual permits	12
BO	Uncomfortable with adaptive management approach	31
BP	No backsliding	12
BQ	Need industry fees	32
BR	Move away from coal	32
BS	TMDL needs modeling	6
BT	Need MOS for northeast	8
BU	Don't rely on federal regulations to lower mercury	32
BV	No WWTP expansions	12
BW	Concern with fetal health	32
BX	No new emissions	33
BY	Decrease emissions from nearby states	33
BZ	Need more data	33
CA	Health is a high priority	34
CB	Supports new source set-asides	34
CC	Reduction goals for only three sources	34
CD	Mercury is a global problem	34
CE	Date certain review triggers	8
CF	Need stakeholder participation of all implementation efforts	35
CG	Give load allocation to both national and international sources	35
CH	Coordinate with research organizations during implementation	35
CI	It isn't proven that excess mercury is dangerous to fetuses and the young	35
CJ	the blood mercury trend is down	35
CK	Increase WQS from 0.20 to 0.30	35
CL	Use 20 g/d rather than 30 g/d	35
CM	CAIR should be tracked before additional requirements begun	36
CN	Use of standard size fish questioned	18
CO	Aggregation of fish tissue data questioned	18
CP	Allocations are skewed	36
CQ	Point source loading underestimated and nonpoint source data overestimated	13
CR	WQS will not be met in a reasonable time	36