MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY

West River Dairy Expansion EAW - List of comments received

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I support this project because they are an outstanding company that cares for people, animals, and the environment.	1-1	431
I am submitting this in favor of West River expansion.	2-1	431
I fully support MPCA to approve the expansion permit for West River Dairy.	3-1	430
I support approval of the West River Dairy expansion.	4-1	431
I support the West River Expansion project as it will add value to additional acres in this region and provide opportunity to future generations.	5-1	431
The environmental implications Riverview's plan to construct a feedlot of this magnitude alone are appalling.	6-1	133
The social implications Riverview's plan to construct a feedlot of this magnitude alone are appalling.	6-2	401
Feedlots like Riverview's externalize costs by putting such significant strain on the environment and the pollution they cause from such a huge concentration of animal manure on a small geographic location.	6-3	326
Even with the best of plans the manure inevitably ends up in the water either through structure failure, natural disaster or both.	6-4	385
Nitrate pollution in the water is a leading contender for increased cancer rates in the population.	6-5	396
Feedlots like Riverview destroy family farms.	6-6	400
Through their sheer size they outbid small family farmers for inputs and resources.	6-7	400
They claim they'll deliver lower prices for consumers and that may be true in the short term but over a long enough time, and after they've put small farmers out of business, they will increase their prices.	6-8	398
At a minimum an Environmental Impact Statement should be completed and made public.	6-9	1
However, this project SHOULD NOT be permitted because of the extreme threat of pollution, the costs the pollution will incur to the communities around it and down stream of it, and the dire threat CAFOs like this pose to small family farmers.	6-10	33
A development of this magnitude with the capability to pollute our already fragile water system in this state	7-1	387
Must at least require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	7-2	1
I support what Land Stewardship Project says about this unprecedented CAFO operation: Minnesota's largest dairy producer has applied to build the first livestock operation in the state to hold over 20,000 animal units. If built, the concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO) will hold 18,855 dairy cattle, bringing the total animal units to 26,397 in one facility.	8-1	434
This proposed operation is the first of its size in Minnesota. It would be nearly double the size of the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers and rural communities.	8-2	434
The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), which is the agency that issues Minnesota's feedlot permits, must recognize the fundamentally new nature of this threat and give this permit greater scrutiny than it ever has to previous proposals. This proposal by Riverview, LLP must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	8-3	1
Please make sure due diligence is done for the people of MN, and conduct a thorough EIS on this huge dairy operation!	8-4	1
I farmed for 15 years near Kenyon, MN. In my experience even a small confinement dairy can pollute the air within 2 miles of the facility, and the water many miles downstream.	9-1	81

MPCA • 520 Lafayette Rd. N., St. Paul, MN 55155 • www.pca.state.mn.us
651-296-6300 • 800-657-3864 or use your preferred relay service • Info.pca@state.mn.us

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is extremely important as we look at the future of our beautiful state to protect the water quality that we have, and improve both.	9-2	387
It is extremely important as we look at the future of our beautiful state to protect the air quality that we have, and improve both.	9-3	81
Confinement dairy's are not good for rivers, streams.	9-4	264
Confinement dairy's are not good for human health	9-5	395
Confinement dairy's are not good for animal health	9-6	74
Confinement dairy's are not good for agricultural economy.	9-7	398
In order to learn more about exactly how our natural resources will be affected we must have an EIS completed as described in MN Rules 4410.2300.	9-8	1
This proposed operation is an unprecedented escalation in scale for Minnesota—nearly double the size of the state's next largest facility in animal units.	10-1	434
This isn't just another farm; it is a fundamentally new and dire threat to the survival of Minnesota's independent farmers.	10-2	400
This isn't just another farm; it is a fundamentally new and dire threat to the survival of Minnesota's rural communities.	10-3	397
The sheer volume of waste—over 200 million gallons of wastewater and 26,000 tons of solid manure annually—makes a comprehensive environmental impact assessment non-negotiable.	10-4	391
We are looking at a massive ecological footprint in the Pomme de Terre watershed, an area already classified as sensitive. With the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby creek already officially listed as impaired by the MPCA, allowing an expansion of this magnitude is a reckless gamble that will inevitably worsen an already critical situation.	10-5	266
This is insanity in action.	11-1	432
A proposal requesting removal of 300 million gallons of water from any aquifer that is already a water source for many families should voluntarily agree to do an EIS.	12-1	31
AS alarming as water use is, even worse is a request to apply over 200 million gallons of manure on coarse textured ground.	12-2	324
Here in SE MN. an area of high livestock numbers we have an alarming number of wells that have developed high nitrate levels.	12-3	193
Now is the time to get it right and ask the right questions.	12-4	435
Please make every effort to protect our greatest resource WATER.. Require an EIS!	12-5	1
I oppose the building of yet another CAFO in Minnesota - namely Riverview, LLPs proposed facility for 18,855 dairy cattle in one facility.	13-1	432
Not only does an operation of this scale decimate the ability for small farmers to continue to be viable	13-2	400
it also threatens the ability to ensure environmental securities for years to come.	13-3	167
it also threatens the ability to ensure labor securities for years to come.	13-4	401
Please prevent this license.	13-5	33

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
When "get big or get out" becomes "grow to gargantuan proportions and take up all the resources" it reminds me of Grandma's saying - "I like a pig, but damn a hog." Stop hogging!	14-1	434
I am concerned about the impact of such a huge concentration of cattle on the people living in the area	15-1	434
And hope you will require an environmental impact statement and study it carefully.	15-2	1
I am writing to ask for a full EIS to be done on Riverview, LLP(for the proposed 11,000-cow dairy feedlot in Section 1 of Synnes Township in Stevens County).	16-1	1
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on water quality and quantity, local roads, and existing independent family dairy farms to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	16-2	2
This proposal is the largest the state has ever seen so a full EIS should be required and conducted.	16-3	1
Riverview, based out of Morris, Minn., is one of the largest dairy producers in the country. With barns and facilities spread across western Minnesota, Riverview, LLP already milks over 125,000 dairy cows in Minnesota alone. They also have a presence in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Arizona. Now, they have begun the permitting process to build the largest CAFO in Minnesota, which could create a model of industrial dairying that our state has never seen.	17-1	434
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on water quality and quantity, local roads, and existing independent family dairy farms to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	17-2	1
To supply water for the operation, pumping from an off-site well will be limited to 226 million gallons per year. For reference, the City of Morris, which is home to over 5,000 people, is permitted to pump up to 300 million gallons of water a year.	17-3	195
Liquid manure storage encompassing 250 million gallons of waste.	17-4	391
13,200 acres of farmland for manure application.	17-5	311
Riverview has a recent history of manure spills in western Minnesota.	17-6	373
In Arizona, the company also recently agreed to pay $11 million to residents affected by the dairy's overpumping.	17-7	194
The proposed Stevens County site sits within five miles of eight different protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas and is part of the Pomme de Terre River watershed,	17-8	173
just 25 miles from its confluence with the Minnesota River.	17-9	277
A facility of this scale located in such a vulnerable area calls for a thorough environmental review	17-10	29
Just as importantly, an EIS of the West River Dairy Expansion proposal would address socio-economic impacts.	17-11	14
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	17-12	400
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	17-13	400
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	17-14	400
PLEASE do an EIS!!! This kind of project will do irreversible harm to our agricultural community for generations to come.	17-15	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This proposed operation is the first of its size in Minnesota. It would be nearly double the size of the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers and rural communities.	18-1	434
It would be nearly double the size of the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units.	18-2	434
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	18-3	400
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	18-4	400
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	18-5	400
No feedlot has ever undergone an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in Minnesota. Each time the MPCA has determined that an operation should undergo one, the operator that requested the permit has withdrawn their application. And all of those operations that were determined to need an EIS were significantly smaller than Riverview's proposed operation will be.	18-6	16
If built, the Riverview operation would be allowed to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year from an off-site well. For reference, the City of Morris, which is home to over 5,000 people, is permitted to pump up to 300 million gallons of water a year.	18-7	195
Once constructed, the facility would produce 202,744,000 gallons of liquid manure and wastewater a year and 26,400 tons of solid manure a year.	18-8	391
The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has not yet completed a mapping of Stevens County's groundwater resources and aquifers for their County Geologic Atlas Series. In fact, they have not even begun the hydrological survey of the county.	18-9	196
The Pomme de Terre watershed, where this expansion is proposed, is already considered a sensitive watershed. The MPCA already lists the two closest waterways to the facility, the Pomme de Terre River and an unnamed creek, as impaired, and this proposal would only exacerbate the impairment.	18-10	266
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	19-1	400
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	19-2	400
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	19-3	400
No feedlot has ever undergone an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in Minnesota. Each time the MPCA has determined that an operation should undergo one, the operator that requested the permit has withdrawn their application. And all of those operations that were determined to need an EIS were significantly smaller than Riverview's proposed operation will be.	19-4	16

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
If built, the Riverview operation would be allowed to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year from an off-site well. For reference, the City of Morris, which is home to over 5,000 people, is permitted to pump up to 300 million gallons of water a year.	19-5	195
Once constructed, the facility would produce 202,744,000 gallons of liquid manure and wastewater a year and 26,400 tons of solid manure a year.	19-6	391
The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has not yet completed a mapping of Stevens County's groundwater resources and aquifers for their County Geologic Atlas Series. In fact, they have not even begun the hydrological survey of the county.	19-7	196
The Pomme de Terre watershed, where this expansion is proposed, is already considered a sensitive watershed. The MPCA already lists the two closest waterways to the facility, the Pomme de Terre River and an unnamed creek, as impaired, and this proposal would only exacerbate the impairment.	19-8	266
This proposed operation is the first of its size in Minnesota. It would be nearly double the size of the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers and rural communities.	20-1	400
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	20-2	400
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	20-3	400
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	20-4	400
No feedlot has ever undergone an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in Minnesota. Each time the MPCA has determined that an operation should undergo one, the operator that requested the permit has withdrawn their application. And all of those operations that were determined to need an EIS were significantly smaller than Riverview's proposed operation will be.	20-5	16
If built, the Riverview operation would be allowed to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year from an off-site well. For reference, the City of Morris, which is home to over 5,000 people, is permitted to pump up to 300 million gallons of water a year.	20-6	195
Once constructed, the facility would produce 202,744,000 gallons of liquid manure and wastewater a year and 26,400 tons of solid manure a year.	20-7	391
The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has not yet completed a mapping of Stevens County's groundwater resources and aquifers for their County Geologic Atlas Series. In fact, they have not even begun the hydrological survey of the county.	20-8	196
The Pomme de Terre watershed, where this expansion is proposed, is already considered a sensitive watershed. The MPCA already lists the two closest waterways to the facility, the Pomme de Terre River and an unnamed creek, as impaired, and this proposal would only exacerbate the impairment.	20-9	266

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Large CAFOs do not have a good environmental record.	21-1	167
Large CAFOs are not more efficient than smaller operations.	21-2	435
Should at the very least require an EIS.	21-3	1
Groundwater pollution is real possibility.	21-4	193
Run off pollution is real possibility.	21-5	272
Being from SE MN , where smaller dairy farms ,less than 200 cows, are usual, we need some common sense in regulations to control Massive CAFOs, flooding the milk market & running other farmers out of Business, Truckers also, & regional Processors all declining	22-1	400
In my opinion there is No Way the Manure can be managed from this size of operation without detrimental effects to Roads.	22-2	306
In my opinion there is No Way the Manure can be managed from this size of operation without detrimental effects to Land.	22-4	176
In my opinion there is No Way the Manure can be managed from this size of operation without detrimental effects to Environment.	22-5	167
We need to exercise Caution On these concerns, WE do not Need this, Just because a Conglomerate wants to Take Over more Markets.	22-6	403
Please require an environmental impact assessment of this massive project.	23-1	1
Just say no!	24-1	435
This is wrong on so many levels.	24-2	435
Small dairy farms need to be part of the MN fabric.	24-3	403
Allowing this turns people into employees.	24-4	403
We need INDEPENTED FARMERS in MN.	24-5	403
Please do not allow such a monstrous operation.	25-1	435
It will be destructive to our rural communities.	25-2	397
As a small-scale farmer (about 30 tillable acres) I am extremely concerned about the environmental risks of CAFOs.	26-1	167
The concentration of wastes exceeds capacity for use as soil amendments resulting, historically, in lagoons, spills and environmental degradation.	26-2	349
Further, the bio hazard of so many animals in confined spaces increases the risk of disease	26-3	72
the negative impact of antibiotic resistance due to the so-called prophylactic use of antibiotics in CAFOs.	26-4	74
This project demands deep questioning and scrutiny.	26-5	435
It has come to my attention that Riverview Dairy is looking to expand their operation to a level that we have not seen before in Minnesota.	27-1	433
As a small scale farmer in central Minnesota who is connected to a lot of other farmers in the region, we are all struggling to get by financially.	27-2	400
Dairy farms continue to close up shop in all of our counties and the answer is not to have one large dairy farm operating in our region.	27-3	403

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This is a recipe for disaster on so many levels from our local farm economies to the environmental impact on such a large operation.	27-4	403
I have a friend who used to run a dairy farm near Riverview and they could not get the milk truck to pick up at their farm because they were too small.	27-5	435
This is not the farm economy we want in rural Minnesota.	27-6	398
Driving farmers out of business due to scale and capital is the exact opposite of what is going to keep our rural communities thriving.	27-7	400
Let's think of creative solutions to protect our water and land while keeping farmers on the land in our communities.	27-8	403
Wow, that's just too many cows in one spot!	28-1	434
Because of my concern for the potential for contamination of the gifts of creation, especially including the waters around the proposed Riverview site	28-2	289
an EIS should be absolutely required for this enormous expansion.	28-3	1
Please do right by the precious remaining wetlands that are within proximity to this site.	28-4	403
Please do right by the civic infrastructure like roads.	28-5	301
This large scale is against wise and environment best practices use of our land and water.	29-1	432
I support approval of the West River Dairy expansion.	30-1	431
Based on my understanding of EISs and of sustainable agriculture and agriculture in general I am strong in support requiring an EIS for the West River Dairy Expansion Project.	31-1	1
If this project goes forward there is no doubt it would have great potential for many kinds of environmental damage.	31-2	167
If this project goes forward there is no doubt it would have great potential for many kinds of damage to communities near by.	31-3	397
If this project goes forward there is no doubt it would have great potential for many kinds of environmental damage and damage to communities near by as well as wider damage to the state's dairy industries. I don't see how this would not be true for an operation that would be very much larger than any current existing operation.	31-4	432
If this project goes forward there is no doubt it would have great potential for many kinds of wider damage to the state's dairy industries.	31-5	400
An EIS is very definitely needed to looked at these potential damages, present this information to the public, and hold hearing where the public can be informed and can make comments.	31-6	1
This operation would use excessive amounts of ground water (a public asset) for any single business. We need to conserve not flagrantly over use this resource.	32-1	227
This amount of animals will also produce a record amount of manure that will be disbursed locally, also endangering the "public" asset of clean water.	32-2	387
This expansion is a foolish proposal and should be denied in the public interests of health and environmental damage.	32-3	432
Please deny Riverview's application for expansion of their dairy farm.	33-1	33
We already have enough nitrates in the ground water	33-2	193

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
runoff into streams and rivers are also a problem.	33-3	289
One of the many reasons dairy farmers are struggling throughout the state is that they have to compete with the benefits given, efficiencies and corner cutting of large scale operations.	34-1	400
Large scale operations may make sense on purely economic level, but the concentration of animals does not make sense by any other measurement of success.	34-2	398
Small farmers across the state are better able to manage herd health.	34-3	72
Small farmers across the state are better able to manage manure handling.	34-4	383
Small farmers across the state are better able to manage pasture.	34-5	162
Large operations with large amounts of animals and their manure NEED to have plans in place APPROVED by environmental scientists that are MANDATED to protect water and land!	34-6	403
And neighbors have a right to now what the impact of these extraction facilities, because they are no longer farms at this level!	34-7	435
The thought that adding 11,000 cows in one place does not trigger an Environmental review is insane to me.	34-8	19
I am concerned to see this has not been addressed in government yet. A project of this size and scope should have a mandatory EIS performed.	35-1	19
EAW's should be for smaller projects.	35-2	19
This project affects so many acres that an EIS is a must to thoroughly look into ALL potential risks to the people and environment.	35-3	1
The volume of products brought into and shipped out of this facility will create many potential issues.	35-4	435
The amount of manure created in this concentrated area should be a major concern for potential water quality issues.	35-5	388
Currently the MPCA rules and the BMP's for synthetic fertilizer do not align.	35-6	37
Neither do the BMP's for fertilizer/manure application.	35-7	37
Water quality for the whole state is currently being reviewed and new guidelines potentially coming forward. It would be wise to wait or at least look at the proposed new guidelines BEFORE granting a permit of this magnitude.	35-8	297
Safety of people and the environment should be a top consideration and the best way to ensure that is to perform an EIS.	35-9	1
As a Minnesotan I value our unique natural resources such as clean abundant water.	36-1	403
Allowing a super mega dairy and cattle farm near Morris, MN would endanger our water resources.	36-2	387
Allowing a super mega dairy and cattle farm near Morris, MN would risk contamination of our wetlands.	36-3	289
Allowing a super mega dairy and cattle farm near Morris, MN would risk contamination rivers.	36-4	289
Allowing a super mega dairy and cattle farm near Morris, MN would force smaller to mid size farms to close due to competition from this behemoth Riverside project.	36-5	400
Therefore I urge a rigorous EIS on the environmental and economic impacts to this community.	36-6	14
I am deeply concerned about a proposal by Riverview LLP (Dairy) to expand it's operation here in my county: Stevens.	37-1	435
This is a huge increase in animal units and will be producing a massive amount of methane, CO2, climate warming gases.	37-2	103

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This is a huge increase in animal units and will be producing a massive amounts of waste.	37-3	391
This is a huge increase in animal units and will be producing a massive amounts of water usage.	37-4	195
It also will significantly impact roads.	37-5	308
It also will significantly impact ground water supplies.	37-6	190
I believe, and understand, that this would be the largest dairy facility in the state, and that this size of facility is unprecedented in the state of Minnesota.	37-7	433
This size of dairy will negatively impact small and mid-sized dairy producers.	37-8	400
This size of dairy will negatively impact downtown (Main Street) businesses.	37-9	397
This size of dairy poses a significant risk to the multiple watersheds it is near -- including the Pomme de Terre River nearby which is just 20-25 miles from the Minnesota River.	37-10	277
I strongly urge that MPCA do a detailed and deep EIS on this request to add on to this dairy. The public deserves to know more.	37-11	1
Please Let farming be human scale.	38-1	401
Please Let animals treated humanely.	38-2	74
Stop this.	38-3	432
This project MUST undergo an environmental review, first and foremost.	39-1	1
I can not overstate the impact that CAFO's have on rural residents. Aesthetics and quality of life aside (who really cares about that anyway, right? House values, ability to hang laundry out, ability to take walks outside, all trivial).	39-2	397
The impact that a facility like this has on ground and surface water is terrifying.	39-3	387
In rural areas, we all know that the acres that they report available for manure distribution are a perfect-case scenario, and the larger the operation, with so much volume and the time it takes to get that volume of manure distributed, the more likely that the ground will be : 1. too wet to get onto which leads to concentration in dry (higher, sandier) acres and any concentration affects surface water 2. Frozen, which leads to run off and contamination of surface water. We have all seen this happen. 3. That not all of the acres will actually be available, that some of the acres will be too far, that concentration will happen.	39-4	346
That's just obvious contamination of surface water. Who pays for that? I haven't seen a tax or any real penalties or any responsibility on Riverview's part to pay for cleaning water.	39-5	403
What about ground water and aquifers - apparently this permit asks for 226 million gallons per year. That's over 2/3rds of what Morris MN is permitted - and how many people does that serve? How many people does Riverview serve?	39-6	195
How is this massive CAFO going to affect anyone sharing that aquifer - with concentration of manure, which will undoubtedly happen, especially with larger and larger operations, there will be groundwater contamination.	39-7	193
Is Riverview going to pay for RO systems for every rural household on the aquifer?	39-8	224
What about volume? How many houses/businesses/towns are going to find their wells dry? Do you know? Probably not, the DNR barely knows this. Will Riverview pay for a thorough study?	39-9	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This just isn't fair, there is nothing ok about Riverview, but there's even less ok about forgoing an the requirement for an environmental impact statement.	39-10	1
No feedlot of whom this has been required has ever continued, because there is nothing environmentally sound about massive feedlots. Those operations were all a lot smaller than Riverview's proposal, how can it be permissible to forgo an Environmental Impact Statement?	39-11	433
This sets frightening precedents for corporations (no, Riverview is not a family operation, it is a massive, for profit business that seeks to extract resources with no consideration for the environment or people who live near their operations) to turn our rural areas into "sacrifice zones", sacrificing water, resident flora and fauna, habitat, and live-ability in a huge radius around these areas.	39-12	433
How about economic impact - on dairies, on house values, on rural infrastructure - are you making Riverview fund a 3rd party economic impact assessment?	39-13	400
How many small farms is this going to asphyxiate?	39-14	400
How many independent farmers is this going to be the final straw for?	39-15	400
I feel like my rural community is becoming an industrial zone, and that's not how agriculture will survive, it's what it looks like before it dies, choking on it's own excess. There should be extra barriers, extra costs, extra diligence, extra taxes, extra requirements for any one business that seeks to impact an entire watershed. Not one single regulation less.	39-16	397
As a citizen of Winona County, where we have long fought a large dairy expansion situated on sensitive karst geology, I can really sympathize with the people near Morris where this Riverview expansion will dwarf all other confined animal feeding operations (CAFOs) in the state.	40-1	242
It is imperative that the MPCA and its regulators require a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS for a project of this enormous scope.	40-2	15
The MPCA must hold this organization to the letter of the law, and work to protect the people and the environment in the region.	40-3	435
I am writing to support the approval of the permit allowing Riverview LLP to expand their West River Dairy in Section 1 of Synnes Township in Stevens County.	41-1	431
I strongly support the proposed West River Dairy permit.	41-2	431
Minnesota's largest dairy producer, Riverview, LLP, has applied to build the first livestock facility in Minnesota to hold over 20,000 animal units. If built, the facility will hold 18,855 dairy cattle, bringing the total animal units to 26,397 in one facility.	42-1	434
This proposed expansion would be nearly DOUBLE the size of the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers and rural communities.	42-2	434
It will also be far worse for the cows who have to live there.	42-3	74
This proposal by Riverview must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	42-4	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This proposed expansion would be nearly DOUBLE the size of the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers and rural communities.	43-1	434
You must recognize the fundamentally new nature of this threat and give this permit greater scrutiny than it ever has to previous proposals.	43-2	433
This proposal by Riverview must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	43-3	1
This Industrial-Scale Projects Need Industrial-Scale Review.	44-1	29
This proposed expansion would be nearly DOUBLE the size of the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers and rural communities.	44-2	434
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	44-3	400
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	44-4	400
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	44-5	397
No feedlot has ever undergone an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in Minnesota. Each time the MPCA has determined that an operation should undergo one, the operator that requested the permit has withdrawn their application. And all of those operations that were determined to need an EIS were significantly smaller than Riverview's proposed operation will be.	44-6	16
If built, the Riverview operation would be allowed to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year from an off-site well. For reference, the City of Morris, which is home to over 5,000 people, is permitted to pump up to 300 million gallons of water a year.	44-7	195
Once constructed, the facility would produce 202,744,000 gallons of liquid manure and wastewater a year and 26,400 tons of solid manure a year.	44-8	391
The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has not yet completed a mapping of Stevens County's groundwater resources and aquifers for their County Geologic Atlas Series. In fact, they have not even begun the hydrological survey of the county.	44-9	196
The Pomme de Terre watershed, where this expansion is proposed, is already considered a sensitive watershed. The MPCA already lists the two closest waterways to the facility, the Pomme de Terre River and an unnamed creek, as impaired, and this proposal would only exacerbate the impairment.	44-10	266
I am very concerned about near-term and long-term impacts of this project.	45-1	435
Specifically, I share all the concerns being expressed by the Land Stewardship Project. I now live in Saint Paul but I grew up in a small community in northwestern Minnesota and I understand the negative impacts projects of this size impose on local environments.	45-2	167

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am especially concerned about the precedent that would be set by not requiring an environmental impact statement for this project.	45-3	32
I see the EIS as a necessity for this project and others like it.	45-4	1
An operation this size definitely needs and EIS.	46-1	1
It will use almost as much water as the city of Morris.	46-2	195
Especially concerning are the nearby water sheds.	46-3	290
We are very alarmed by the idea that Minnesota would harbor a massive dairy CAFO.	47-1	435
The ecological impacts are many and serious	47-2	166
the socio-economic impacts are also great	47-3	397
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices	47-4	400
Massive dairy operations will glut the market and allow them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	47-5	400
Minnesota is already losing family farms and allowing this CAFO operation will only accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	47-6	400
Please support the environment, family farms and Main Streets throughout our state and say NO! to CAFO operations	47-7	435
We are very alarmed by the idea that Minnesota would harbor a massive dairy CAFO.	48-1	435
The ecological impacts are many and serious	48-2	166
the socio-economic impacts are also great	48-3	397
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices	48-4	400
Massive dairy operations will glut the market and allow them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	48-5	400
Minnesota is already losing family farms and allowing this CAFO operation will only accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	48-6	400
Please support the environment, family farms and Main Streets throughout our state and say NO! to CAFO operations	48-7	435
Please review this permit with extreme caution, it seems these big dairies only wreck our environment.	49-1	35
There has never been any good that comes from having that many animals in one small location.	49-2	435
If there was a sewage spill it would create havoc on the local people.	49-3	385
I am writing with concern about the Riverview Expansion Act. I request that the proposal by Riverview must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	50-1	1
This proposed expansion would be nearly DOUBLE the size of the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers and rural communities.	50-2	434

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	50-3	400
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	50-4	400
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	50-5	397
No feedlot has ever undergone an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in Minnesota. Each time the MPCA has determined that an operation should undergo one, the operator that requested the permit has withdrawn their application. And all of those operations that were determined to need an EIS were significantly smaller than Riverview's proposed operation will be.	50-6	16
If built, the Riverview operation would be allowed to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year from an off-site well. For reference, the City of Morris, which is home to over 5,000 people, is permitted to pump up to 300 million gallons of water a year.	50-7	195
Once constructed, the facility would produce 202,744,000 gallons of liquid manure and wastewater a year and 26,400 tons of solid manure a year.	50-8	391
The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has not yet completed a mapping of Stevens County's groundwater resources and aquifers for their County Geologic Atlas Series. In fact, they have not even begun the hydrological survey of the county.	50-9	196
The Pomme de Terre watershed, where this expansion is proposed, is already considered a sensitive watershed. The MPCA already lists the two closest waterways to the facility, the Pomme de Terre River and an unnamed creek, as impaired, and this proposal would only exacerbate the impairment.	50-10	266
I am writing to express my concerns with Riverview, LLP's proposal to build the first livestock operation in Minnesota to hold over 20,000 animal units.	51-1	432
The MPCA must recognize the fundamentally new nature of this threat and give this permit greater scrutiny than it ever has to previous proposals.	51-2	29
Minnesota is is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	51-4	400
Agricultural consolidation is pushing small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	51-5	400
We must require an EIS before this proceeds.	51-6	1
This proposal must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on its impacts on water quality to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	51-3a	2
This proposal must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on its impacts on water quantity to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	51-3b	3
This proposal must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on its impacts on local roads to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	51-3c	8

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This proposal must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on its impacts on existing independent family dairy farms to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	51-3d	12
As a concerned citizen of Minnesota, I urge the MPCA to respect our ground water.	52-1	227
As a concerned citizen of Minnesota, I urge the MPCA to respect our air quality.	52-2	81
As a concerned citizen of Minnesota, I urge the MPCA to respect the smaller farmers who are trying to feed us.	52-3	400
Please perform an EIS!	52-4	1
According to Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 1, the MPCA must order an EIS for projects that have the potential for significant environmental effects. In deciding whether a project has the potential for significant environmental effects, the MPCA must compare the impacts that may be reasonably expected to occur from the Project with the criteria set forth in Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7. These criteria are: A. Type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects. B. Cumulative potential effects. The RGU shall consider the following factors: whether the cumulative potential effect is significant; whether the contribution from the Project is significant when viewed in connection with other contributions to the cumulative potential effect; the degree to which the Project complies with approved mitigation measures specifically designed to address the cumulative potential effect; and the efforts of the proposer to minimize the contributions from the project. C. The extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority. The RGU may rely only on mitigation measures that are specific and that can be reasonably expected to effectively mitigate the identified environmental impacts of the project. Due to the unprecedented size of this expansion and the potential for significant environmental effects, an EIS is warranted and required by law.	53-1	1
I believe the West River expansion would be of great value to our area by adding value to farm ground and many more opportunities for area people to stay local.	54-1	431
I am very concerned about the harmful effects of industrial dairying by Riverview, LLP.	55-1	144
A concentrated animal feeding operation of over 20,000 animal units is a major strain on the environment	55-2	167
A concentrated animal feeding operation of over 20,000 animal units is a major strain on water resources.	55-3	387
With Riverview's history of manure spills	55-4	373
With Riverview's history of overpumping	55-5	194
With the location being in a vulnerable area	55-6	189
With the effects on local dairy producers,	55-7	400
I'm asking the MPCA to require a full EIS.	55-8	1
I am in support for this dairy expansion because of the past history of how well they have taken care of the manure application, how they are great to work with as a neighbor.	56-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Riverview's recent history of manure spills in Western Minnesota (including a manure leak from a biogas digester system in March of last year), as well as the recent settlement the company had to pay out to Arizona residents who had been affected by the dairy over pumping water, both raise concerns that Riverview's planned CAFO will adhere to the state and local regulations that protect people and water systems.	57-2	373
And given that the proposed site for this new CAFO sits within five miles of eight different protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas any pollution is likely to have far reaching consequences.	57-3	174
is part of the Pomme de Terre River watershed, just 25 miles from its confluence with the Minnesota River, any pollution is likely to have far reaching consequences.	57-4	277
I spent thirteen years living in Iowa prior to moving to Minnesota. Most of Iowa's animal agriculture operations are CAFOs, and regulation is minimal. As a result, most of Iowa's rivers and streams are aggressively polluted, many as a result of uncontained manure run-off. I do not want to see the same thing happen here.	57-5	267
Furthermore, Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	57-6	400
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	57-7	400
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	57-8	400
Before signing off on Riverview, LLC's proposal, the MPCA must require a full Environmental Impact Statement to be conducted. This way, the potential scope of hazards or problems can be evaluated and documented before any final decisions are made.	57-9	1
The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) must require the proposal by Riverview, LLC to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement in order to analyze the potential negative impacts on water quality.	57-1a	2
The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) must require the proposal by Riverview, LLC to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement in order to analyze the potential negative impacts on water quantity.	57-1b	3
The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) must require the proposal by Riverview, LLC to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement in order to analyze the potential negative impacts on local roads.	57-1c	8
The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) must require the proposal by Riverview, LLC to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement in order to analyze the potential negative impacts on existing independent family dairy farms.	57-1d	12
As a young farmer I fully support the expansion of the West River Dairy.	58-1	431
As a Minnesotan and a social scientist who studies the social impacts of climate change and inequality, the recent history of CAFO expansion doesn't bode well for economic and social development	59-1	398
As a Minnesotan and a social scientist who studies the social impacts of climate change and inequality, the recent history of CAFO expansion doesn't bode well for the environment	59-2	167

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
As a Minnesotan and a social scientist who studies the social impacts of climate change and inequality, the recent history of CAFO expansion doesn't bode well for our waterways.	59-3	289
Systemic review of environmental impacts is an absolute must and should be a minimum threshold undertaking.	59-4	29
We've seen the nitrates build-up and impact on our pristine water supply from farm runoff in our state already	59-5	193
studies from Iowa and Minnesota confirm that an inverse relationship exists between economic vitality and confined animal feeding operations within localized communities.	59-6	398
Riverview Dairy poses a great natural threat to the environment around it.	60-1	167
They could completely uproot the entire ecosystem	60-2	165
cause small, honorable, family-owned farms around them to go bankrupt.	60-3	400
They ethically should be reviewed for their proposed actions.	60-4	59
When I look through the mandatory EIS categories found in Minnesota Administrative Rules 4410-4400, I find it almost laughable that I even need to write this comment to ask the MPCA to require this EIS. How could it possibly be that a facility housing 26,000+ animal units producing over 250,000 gallons of waste PER DAY, drawing over half a MILLION gallons of water from my local aquifer and covering a physical plant footprint of over 1 MILLION square feet not be required to submit a mandatory EIS? When I look through that list of mandatory EIS triggers, I see many things that would worry me far less than an industrial dairy facility: Subp. 11. Industrial, commercial, and institutional facilities. A. For construction of a new or expansion of an existing warehousing or light industrial facility equal to or in excess of the following thresholds, expressed as gross floor space, (1) unincorporated area, 375,000 square feet; (2) third or fourth class city, 750,000 square feet; (3) second class city, 1,000,000 square feet; Subp. 14. Residential development. A. 100 or more unattached or 150 or more attached units in an unsewered unincorporated area or 400 unattached units or 600 attached units in a sewered unincorporated area; Subp. 15. Airport runway projects. For construction of a paved and lighted airport runway of 5,000 feet of length or greater Subp. 22. Sports or entertainment facilities. For construction of a new outdoor sports or entertainment facility designed for or expected to accommodate a peak attendance of 20,000 or more persons or a new indoor sports or entertainment facility designed for or expected to accommodate a peak attendance of 30,000 or more persons, or the expansion of an existing facility by these amounts. How could it possibly be that a sports stadium hosting 20,000 people (only 4,000 AUM FYI) only periodically need more environmental review than an industrial dairy holding 26,000 AUM 24/365? How can that be?	61-1	19

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am pro-farmer. I want Minnesota farmers to have the best chance to succeed in every way. But we need to recognize there is an important and fundamental difference between a local family farm that runs 223 cows (the average Minnesota dairy herd size) and 18,000.	61-2	401
If a business wants to operate at an industrial scale, as Riverview does, then they need to be prepared to undergo industrial review.It is that simple. If you want to play with the big boys, then you need to play by big boy rules. This doesn't even mean anyone is trying to "stop" their business—it is simply Minnesota holding an industrial facility to the same laws and standards that other industrial businesses (and sports stadiums, ahem) must abide by.	61-3	29
I support the proposed expansion of this dairy.	62-1	431
I am writing in strong support of this project.	63-1	431
I fully support their business as a whole including the expansion at West River	64-1	431
I am writing in support of the MPCA approving Riverview's Permit application to expand West River Dairy in Synnes Township.	65-1	431
For these reasons, I strongly support the West River Dairy Expansion.	65-2	431
I wish to strongly oppose this expansion plan for Ridgeview Dairy.	66-1	432
We do not need to encourage more expansion of factory farms in our state - we need more small dairy farms, not larger corporate operations. There are only 2 dairy farms left in my township - there were over a dozen 30 years ago. This loss of small dairy farms is destroying our local economies and is also jeopardizing our state's environmental quality.	66-2	403
I've personally seen the adverse impact of manure spills in our watersheds with thousands of dead fish in our nearby river.	66-3	385
I do not trust the capacity (or interest) of a Ridgeview Dairy when it comes to protecting our state's environment or even caring about supporting our state's economy.	66-4	432
I will also be submitting a seperate comment to MN Attorney General, Keith Ellison, about this situation since Dairyview's expansion is also likely violating federal anti-trust regulations.	66-5	435
Dairyview is the LARGEST dairy farm operation in the U.S. – with multiple factory farms in many states milking 100,000 cows - so it is hard to imagine how this huge milk cartel will not lead to price gouging for Midwest consumers.	66-6	398
Industrial operations of this size should be required to get a permit and education on mitigating pollution via soil health practices, such as utilizing cover crops to prevent runoff and leaching of nitrates into our water supplies.	67-1	47
In addition, these permits should come with a requirement to implement no-till and cover crops across all acres within 3 years.	67-2	47
A requirement to implement no-till and cover crops across all acres within 3 years. These practices achieve green house gas reductions.	67-03	47
A requirement to implement no-till and cover crops across all acres within 3 years. These practices draw down CO2.	67-4	47
A requirement to implement no-till and cover crops across all acres within 3 years. These practices reduce nitrates and phosphorus from entering our water supply.	67-5	47
They maybe a family farm but they are industrial at that size and should be regulated at an industrial level.	67-6	29

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Commenting on the West River Dairy expansion; land use and impacts. Having massively unprecedented amount of bovines in one area will definitely impact the site land and surrounding areas in exponential ways.	68-1	131
Ground water usage must be considered as well as where and how the millions of gallons of water will be going.	68-2	195
This giant proposal is like a small city and is the local water sources as well as waste water processing equip to handle that much??	68-3	346
Rainwater run-off from roofs is another source of displaced water. With numerous huge buildings to house animals on that scale there will be ecosystem impacts from rainwater run-off.	68-4	286
Proper manure handling and disposal is paramount especially when the state has never had a feedlot/facility of this size.	68-5	346
Given the questionable track record of West River Dairy in other states, the environmental & social impacts of the air pollution must be considered.	68-6	95
Given the questionable track record of West River Dairy in other states, the environmental & social impacts of the water contamination must be considered.	68-7	194
Given the questionable track record of West River Dairy in other states, the environmental & social impacts of the increased soil application must be considered.	68-8	403
I am deeply concerned about Riverview LLP's plans to build a large new dairy operation in western Minnesota. This operation could hold up to 20,000 animal units. A dairy this size demands a full EIS by your agency.	69-1	15
Please consider the pollution concerns of such a large operation, and how they will effect Minnesotans.	69-2	146
Of special concern are the use of ground water.	69-3	195
Of special concern are poor air quality stemming from the manure lagoons.	69-4	81
Of special concern the dangers of these lagoons in a watershed of the Minnesota River.	69-5	252
If this expansion was proposed in our area I would be 100% pushing for it so I don't see how it could be a bad thing in your area.	70-1	431
For these reasons, I respectfully support the expansion permit for West River Dairy .	71-1	431
For these reasons, I respectfully ask the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to approve the expansion permit.	71-2	431
I am in favor of the West River expansion,	72-1	431
I believe they are a value to the community and to the economy to the surrounding areas.	73-1	431
I fully support Riverview's permit for its West River Dairy expansion.	74-1	431
This proposed operation is the first of this size in Minnesota. It would be nearly double the size of the next largest operation in our state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers and rural communities and our natural environment.	75-1	433
The existing West River Dairy operation in Stevens County wants to dramatically expand its footprint.	75-2	432
The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has not yet completed a mapping of Stevens County's groundwater resources and aquifers for their County Geologic Atlas Series. In fact, they have not even begun the hydrological survey of the county.	75-3	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The Pomme de Terre River watershed where the expansion is located is a tributary to the Minnesota River, is already considered impaired.	75-4	277
Because of the lack of detailed information about the groundwater situation in Stevens County and the unprecedented size of this operation in Minnesota I believe an EIS will be needed before allowing this expansion. I hope the findings of the EAW will show the way.	75-5	3
I am extremely concerned about the run off from the lot entering local water ways. We will need mitigation strategies detailed should this gain approval.	76-1	268
I am extremely concerned about the run off from the lot entering local water ways. We will need emergency plans in case of natural disasters should this gain approval.	76-2	260
I am extremely concerned about the run off from the lot entering local water ways. We will need continued testing of down stream waterways should this gain approval.	76-3	42
The land is not meant to hold nearly 20,000 cattle in such a small area.	76-4	434
I'm also concerned about how they plan to staff their facilities. As I understand, labor has been difficult to obtain and the rumors indicate Riverview uses undocumented workers to fill their ranks.	76-5	435
A detailed examination of their payroll should also be taken before allowing such an expansion project as well, though I'm sure that falls to a different department.	76-6	435
I am in support of approving the Riverview LLP's proposal to expand their West River Dairy operation.	77-1	431
As a resident of Stevens County I am deeply concerned about the environmental impacts that a project of this scale could have on my community, my state, and the downstream waterways. I think a full, thorough Environmental Impact Statement is necessary for a project of this novel size.	78-1	13
The GHG testing done in this EAW should account for the total number of cows in the facility, not just for the intended additions.	78-2	99
An analysis of simply the increased number of cows DOES NOT equate to the total impact of the facility on water, land, and rural economy.	78-3	432
If this facility needs 13,200 acres of farmland for manure application, this should be further looked into.	78-4	311
The impacts of this facility will not just be within the confines of its property.	78-5	435
I would like to see an EIS that takes into account how the 13,200 acres of farmland and their surrounding areas will be impacted.	78-6	1
The location of this facility is within the Pomme de Terre watershed, just 25 miles north of its confluence with the Minnesota River.	78-7	277
The EAW does not provide enough detail into how this will affect our downstream neighbors from here to the Gulf.	78-8	26
This EAW does not provide enough detail into how it will affect our water resources in Western MN.	78-9	26
As someone with dairy farming family members, I am also interested in this project requiring higher scrutiny for how it will impact small and medium sized dairy farms.	78-10	400

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Will this project impact the milk market in unsustainable ways?	78-11	398
Will this project support local economies across the state in keeping their family farms afloat?	78-12	400
What is the pattern of small and medium family farmers in Stevens County and the surrounding area?	78-13	400
I am also concerned about a facility of this size being granted permitting access without a full EIS because of Riverview's history of manure spills.	78-14	17
I am also concerned about a facility of this size being granted permitting access without a full EIS because of Riverview's history of water overpumping.	78-15	3
This project will need 250 million gallons of liquid manure storage waste.	78-16	361
I believe there should be scrutiny here to assess the impacts of this facility on communities, especially if these facilities have had already spilled their waste in our rural communities (Kandiyohi County). This EAW does not look at the impacts these spills have had on our communities.	78-17	385
Riverview also just made an agreement with Arizona communities to pay $11 million dollars as a result of their overpumping the aquifer.	78-18	435
This EAW does not look at the impact this facility will have on water resources with enough detail.	78-19	26
A full EIS is required to better understand the impact of this novel and impactful project. As a resident of Stevens County and someone who cares about considering the future of our local economy and natural resources, this project should require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	78-20	1
As a resident of Stevens County MN, where the proposed Riverview Dairy expansion would be located, I am concerned about its environmental impact and would like the MPCA to require a full Environmental Impact Statement before the project can go forward.	79-1	1
This project would more than double the size of Riverview's dairy operation in Stevens County, with the final size being almost twice as large as the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units.	79-2	434
A project of this unprecedented scope demands particular care in reviewing its impacts, which a full Environmental Impact Statement would provide.	79-3	433
In addition, I believe it is important for the EIS to take into account the total projected size of Riverview's Stevens County dairy operations, including existing animal units, not just the size of the expansion.	79-4	11
Total size matters because the larger the total size, the larger the potential impact if something goes wrong. For example, Riverview's Feb. 2025 manure spill in Kandiyohi County likely spilled approximately the same amount of manure in 5 days that an average sized MN dairy farm would produce in 6 months, based on early reports.	79-5	434
We write this letter in support of the West River Dairy expansion.	80-1	431
I am concerned about the impact of this project and believe it needs a full environmental impact statement.	81-1	1
I would also like to request a public meeting regarding this project if possible. As a Morris resident, this project is close to home.	81-2	36

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Looking through the documents and looking at the maps, I see that there are prairie conservation areas and at least one area important to birds (attachment 7c) - having ecologically significant areas nearby merits careful investigation of the potential impacts of such a large project. There are also lakes that support biodiverse populations (7d).Though page 53 of the EAW says that project areas were changed to avoid overlap, "...the DNR noted that the Minnesota Biological Survey (MBS) identified one or more sites of Biodiversity Significance adjacent to some of the proposed manure application areas (Attachment 7d)... in all cases, these ecologically significant areas are outside the tillable fields designated for manure application." Even if manure application guidelines are followed, I believe the impact of areas adjacent to these ecologically significant zones warrants more investigation. Just because an activity does not take place directly on the ecologically significant land does not mean it will not affect said land - adjacent is still nearby enough to be important.	81-3	174
I also see that some of the manure application areas are near the Pomme de Terre River, in some cases right up against it.	81-4	182
I am also concerned about the amount of water used. Hundreds of millions of gallons per year is an incredible amount that's hard to conceptualize. I am glad that there will be pumping restrictions, but these restrictions seem to target shorter lengths of time (years or seasons). More consideration must be given to the long-term impacts of utilizing the area's aquifers. When all the water use around the facility is considered (more ag and nearby communities), the amount is staggering. Is there data that can verify the water used by this facility won't deplete the aquifers faster than they can recharge?	81-5	190
Also, talking climate change - I read the section of the EAW on greenhouse gas emissions. Efficient practices and carbon sinks help, but they can't do it all. More cows means more methane.	81-06	103
My final thought - I would like to see more in-depth data on the hydrology of the area, including the aquifers. A fuller picture and better understanding of the area's groundwater resources must be gained.	81-7	196
I appreciate the work that has been so far, but a closer look is necessary.	81-8	435
The West River dairy expansion, proposed by Riverview LLP, is a project that must be preceeded by an EIS. The size of this project is something MN has not seen before and must be measured and evaluated through the accepted methods of an EIS.	82-1	15
I believe that careful evaluation of projects like this can ensure rural Minnesota's environment is protected, and that agriculture can thrive.	82-10	29
With a project of this size, the mpca should NOT set a new precedent of not evaluating effectively. For the healthy future of Minnesota's farm economy and water quality, require the EIS for the West Dairy Expansion.	82-11	433
The application of Riverview LLP is of such enormous proportions that a full Environmental Impact Statement must be filed with MPCA.	83-1	15
Damage to the environment, local residents, and economy seems inevitable with such a monstrous, industrial entity in a vulnerable rural area--or anywhere else.	83-2	432
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	84-1	400
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	84-2	400

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	84-3	400
In particular, I am concerned about manure spills and protection of our waterways and waterfowl and wildlife production areas.	85-2	385
A farming operation of this magnitude should have a full Environmental Impact Statement completed before being allowed in operation.	85-3	15
As a resident of Stevens County, I am incredibly concerned about the possible environmental impacts a dairy operation of this size would have. Without a full Environmental Impact Statement, we won't know the costs this massive operation would have on the local waterways until after the damage was already done.	85-1a	2
As a resident of Stevens County, I am incredibly concerned about the possible environmental impacts a dairy operation of this size would have. Without a full Environmental Impact Statement, we won't know the costs this massive operation would have on the land until after the damage was already done.	85-1b	15
As a Stevens County resident, I'm concerned about the potential environmental impact of the proposed Riverview Dairy expansion and think the MPCA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement before the project moves forward.	86-1	1
This expansion would more than double Riverview's dairy operation in Stevens County and make it much larger than any other livestock operation in Minnesota in terms of animal units. A project of this size really deserves a thorough environmental review.	86-2	15
Any review should look at the total size of Riverview's Stevens County operations, not just the proposed expansion. The larger the operation, the greater the potential impact if something goes wrong. Recent events, like Riverview's tank failure at Meadow Star Dairy near Pennock, show why careful review matters when operations reach this scale.	86-3	23
There's also precedent for this. In 2014, the MPCA Citizens' Board required a full Environmental Impact Statement for a proposed 8,850 cow Riverview dairy in Stevens County because of concerns about water quality. A full EIS makes sense for projects of this scale.	86-4a	2
There's also precedent for this. In 2014, the MPCA Citizens' Board required a full Environmental Impact Statement for a proposed 8,850 cow Riverview dairy in Stevens County because of concerns about water use. A full EIS makes sense for projects of this scale.	86-4b	3
There's also precedent for this. In 2014, the MPCA Citizens' Board required a full Environmental Impact Statement for a proposed 8,850 cow Riverview dairy in Stevens County because of concerns about cumulative impacts. A full EIS makes sense for projects of this scale.	86-4c	11
This Riverview-proposed expansion of West River Dairy MUST have an EIS before it goes any further.	87-1	1
It would be the largest CAFO in the state, when we should be moving rapidly away from CAFOs toward more sustainable forms of agriculture.	87-2	434
We can't afford the amount of water it would require!	87-3	195
We can't afford the potential for pollution of the water!	87-4	388

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
We can't afford the potential for pollution of the land around it!	87-5	176
Please do a thorough study, not a performative one!	87-6	29
Farming is Everybody's Bread, Butter, and Water. What I do on my hills affects water quality and quantity for Everybody.	88-1	427
I am a retired dairy farmer. Our family milked 100 – 200 cows 1994 until 2024. Due mostly to unstable and low milk prices, we ceased shipping milk and transitioned to a beef farm. The pressure from the existing large Confined Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO) dairies is causing harm to our milk markets for many farmers. They can flood the market, tip the market to a monopoly, and create unfair financial pressure on the existing farms. That pressure makes the milk income price fluctuate and unsustainably low. Farm families quit milking or sell the farm business. Therefore, our towns receive less business, and the community struggles.	88-2	397
A Full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed.	88-3	1
I was a member of the Southeast Minnesota Nitrate Strategies Collaborative Work Group. I learned about water quality and quantity issues during our meetings July of 2024 through June of 2025. One of those issues which comes to mind when I think of this permit application is related to the feed for the 18,855 cows. Certainly, containing and spreading the liquid manure has many concerns for people's safety, the high risk of contaminating water, air, and ground. However, I was surprised to learn that it is raising the feed that often causes more of a nitrogen problem. Corn, a major feed component of dairy cows, is a monoculture crop. When nitrogen is applied, its easily overapplied.	88-4	327
Further, in these unprecedented weather events, a farmer may apply nitrogen pellets in good faith, but a rain of surprise timing and deluge can wash it away, polluting our water and giving the farmer cause to apply more fertilizer, risking more nitrogen going into our drinking water. Cover cropping, precision application, and following recommendations alleviate nitrate runoff and improves soil health. Yet, following regulations does not always protect our environment. Weather events can cause catastrophic overflows, cracks or leaks in structures and hoses happen.	88-5	100
A Full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed to better minimize the huge risks this huge business proposes. The environment and people in that region and watershed deserve a EIS be conducted with integrity.	88-6	1
Water tables, aquifers, streams, creeks, pathways do not abide by township, county or state borders. This proposed expansion is within five miles of eight different waterfowl and wildlife production areas.	88-7	174
Allowing the pumping of 226 million gallons of water every year needs study. Can the aquifer handle that much additional drawdown and not cause issues of quantity or quality for the existing towns, rural wells, farmland, and rivers? Can the watershed survive? I think a full study needs to be completed before a decision can be made on permitting this size of an industrial agriculture business.	88-8	195
A Full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed.	88-9	1
Manure lagoons and miles of hoses also give me concerns for people and water safety. Lagoons of these sizes can be very risky. Man made structures fail eventually. But even if not often, when a hose or lagoon of these sizes leaks, the pollution is not easily or quickly cleaned up. The risks of this size need extra special study before permitting.	88-10	385
A Full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed.	88-11	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
There are not other CAFO's of this huge size in our state. There are studies showing the social and economic effects of CAFO's on our communities. Should we assume that those same effects will be the same except the impact will be huge, as the CAFO is huge? We should not make uneducated and unresearched guesses before allowing a permit for this size CAFO.	88-12	433
A Full Environmental Impact Statement is needed.	88-13	1
I am a concerned citizen from Southeast Minnesota. I appreciate the opportunity for public comment on this EAW for the West River Dairy Expansion. Based on the EAW, I see a clear obligation for MPCA to issue an EIS on this project.	89-1	1
The MPCA has the statutory obligation to issue an EIS in this instance. Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 1 states that the MPCA must order an EIS for projects that have the "potential for significant environmental effects." The criteria for significant environmental effects includes the cumulative potential effects (as stated in Subp. 7 of the same statue). Similar dairies of the proposed size (a combined total of 26,397 AU), have shown clear cumulative impacts to surrounding communities including groundwater nitrate contamination, odor issues, reduced air quality (particulate matter/ammonia), increased greenhouse gases, and increased water consumption. As it stands, the EAW does not provide sufficient information (as referred to in Subp. 2a) to fully quantify these likely impacts. Therefore West River Diary Expansion clearly meets the criteria that mandates MPCA must issue an EIS.	89-2	1
Allowing the proposer to create the largest mega-dairy in Minnesota without the due diligence of an EIS would be an insult to family dairy farmers across the state who are struggling to survive while doing the right thing.	89-3	15
In addition, by not issuing an EIS, the State risks allowing the proposer to pollute our waters at no cost to them, pushing the bill for cleanup onto future taxpayers.	89-4	150
Dairies of the proposed size can pose an economic threat to family farms.	89-5	400
Dairies of the proposed size can pose a hazard to the health and wellbeing of rural communities.	89-6	397
Dairies of the proposed size can become a costly burden to taxpayers in the long run.	89-7	398
Citizens deserve to understand the full risks of the project without the MPCA rubber stamping its approval.	89-8	29
I urge the MPCA to uphold their statutory obligation and issue an EIS on the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	89-9	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	90-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	90-2	434
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	90-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	90-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	90-5	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: The expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters—the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek—are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	90-6	276
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	90-7	388
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	90-8	1
I think an excellent source of information about the risks of CAFOs on water quality can be found in a publication from the journal Environmental Health Perspectives. I respectfully would like to call it to your attention by uploading it here as a .pdf. It is also available on the National Library of Medicine website.	90-9	435
Given Riverview's history of manure spills, I would like there to be testing / research done on how this may affect water resources in the area	91-1	373
Given Riverview's history of water use and water overpumping, I would like there to be testing / research done on how this may affect water resources in the area	91-2	195
Feedlots destroy land	92-1	176
Feedlots destroy water	92-2	264
Feedlots destroy nearby residents' quality of life	92-3	397
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater risks is irresponsible.	92-4	34
Advancing permits without a full understanding of water-quality risks is irresponsible.	92-5	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	92-6	1
As a long-time neighbor to Riverview I encourage the MPCA to approve the expansion permit for West River Dairy.	93-1	431
This project is too large and potentially environmentally destructive to the area.	94-1	434
Please make an informed decision by having a fair environmental study completed.	94-2	29
Better to be safe than sorry.	94-3	435
The Riverview Dairy project must be required to get an Environmental Impact Statement.	95-1	1
The potential for a profound impact on local water resources is too substantial to ignore based on data from other large animal agriculture projects.	95-2	387
Please require a more extensive review of the potential harms before implementing.	95-3	29
The land of 10000 lakes should protect its greatest resource	95-4	137
The Riverview Dairy project must be required to get an Environmental Impact Statement. I am very concerned of the impact the Riverview Dairy will have on the environment. It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	96-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	96-2	434

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	96-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	96-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	96-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: The expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters—the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek—are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	96-6	276
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	96-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	96-8	1
Hello I am a resident of Stevens County and I have concerns about the new expansion of the Riverview dairy lot. I am requesting a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) be made to help guide the planning of this expansion.	97-1	1
I think a full EIS will help ensure that the EAW plan will prevent further sediment deposition in the river.	97-3	2
I think a full EIS will help ensure that the EAW plan will prevent further wildlife impacts.	97-3	7
I think a full EIS will help ensure that the EAW plan will prevent further road floodings.	97-3	8
This feedlot will have environmental impacts and I wish to see all plans to minimize these as much as possible with an EIS.	97-4	1
Thank you for your consideration and work to help make this dairy lot possible. I recognize the importance of having animals to feed the country, and as an avid cheese fan myself I am not against the expansion just want to see a full Environmental Impact Statement to help prevent irreversible damage to the prairie and wetlands around my home. We have few chances to keep our environment safe and look forward to this lot not being part of the problem.	97-5	1
I think a full EIS will help ensure that the EAW plan will prevent any potential leaks of manure into the pomme de terre river.	97-3a	9
I think a full EIS will help ensure that the EAW plan will prevent any potential leaks of other hazardous materials into the pomme de terre river.	97-3b	9
We don't need expansion of a plant that creates more environmental disasters.	98-1	167
This proposed expansion would be nearly DOUBLE the size of the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers and rural communities.	99-1	434
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	99-2	398
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	99-3	403

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	99-4	403
No feedlot has ever undergone an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in Minnesota. Each time the MPCA has determined that an operation should undergo one, the operator that requested the permit has withdrawn their application. And all of those operations that were determined to need an EIS were significantly smaller than Riverview's proposed operation will be.	99-5	16
If built, the Riverview operation would be allowed to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year from an off-site well. For reference, the City of Morris, which is home to over 5,000 people, is permitted to pump up to 300 million gallons of water a year.	99-6	195
Once constructed, the facility would produce 202,744,000 gallons of liquid manure and wastewater a year and 26,400 tons of solid manure a year.	99-7	391
The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has not yet completed a mapping of Stevens County's groundwater resources and aquifers for their County Geologic Atlas Series. In fact, they have not even begun the hydrological survey of the county.	99-8	196
The Pomme de Terre watershed, where this expansion is proposed, is already considered a sensitive watershed. The MPCA already lists the two closest waterways to the facility, the Pomme de Terre River and an unnamed creek, as impaired, and this proposal would only exacerbate the impairment.	99-9	266
I fully support Riverview in the expansion of West River dairy.	100-1	431
This must have an EIS.	101-1	1
This is not farming but an industrial scale operation. Riverview is nothing more than a corporate entity. It has Human Resources departments, accounting departments, logistics departments, lobbying efforts, all the things that a large corporate business entity has; not a family farm.	101-2	435
Please do the right thing and require an EIS.	101-3	1
In conclusion to the matter I am in full support of the west river dairy site as a local Stevens county citizen.	102-1	431
Where is all this water coming from?	103-1	197
Where will all the manure be disposed of?	103-2	346
Not a good move.	103-3	432
I think the Riverview is large enough and already uses way too much resources to let this expansion happen.	104-1	432
You need to think of the pollution that could happen and this expansion will only put more money in the pockets of people who have more than enough already.	104-2	403
This proposed dairy is enormous, and it will create waste and resource demands greater than entire towns.	105-1	133
It would be irresponsible not to require an EIS be completed to ensure that the proper safeguards are in place prior to the approval of this expansion.	105-2	1
This will affect everything and everyone in the area.	106-1	435
It will suck the life out of the surrounding area	106-2	435

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
where they get their water from	106-3	197
and drain their manure to	106-4	346
Maybe not right away but when it does, it will be too late!	106-5	432
They're big enough, there's no need to get bigger.	106-6	432
They only want to fill their pockets.	106-7	432
They have no regard for the community. LEAVE OUR COMMUNITY ALONE!! It's perfect the way it is right now and so is Riverview there's no need for it to get bigger!	106-8	397
Who's this going to benefit...Riverview and only Riverview...Ugh.....	106-9	431
I am concerned about the impact of this facility on several factors: (1) the ground water supply	107-1	195
I am concerned about the impact of this facility on several factors: (2) pollution of the surface water shed	107-2	272
I am concerned about the impact of this facility on several factors: (3) increased traffic	107-3	304
I am concerned about the impact of this facility on several factors: (4) the welfare of the animals involved	107-4	74
This project should undergo much scrutiny in terms of the true necessity to further degrade our natural resources.	107-6	435
I am opposed to sacrifice them for the increase in wealth and influence of a corporation that has previously shown to act irresponsibley with public goods.	107-7	403
I am concerned about the impact of this facility on several factors: (5) further degradation of the soil of the county	107-5a	183
I am concerned about the impact of this facility on several factors: (5) further degradation of the biodiversity of the county	107-5b	163
I am concerned about the impact of this facility on several factors: (5) further degradation of the landscape of the county	107-5c	178
Rural Minnesota is constantly fighting to keep local business, agriculture, and resources protected and local.	108-1	403
Allowing Riverview to monopolize the dairy industry is not conducive to the tenants that make rural Minnesota what it is.	108-2	403
The pros — more jobs and expanded industry — do NOT outweigh the possible economic, environmental, and social cons.	108-3	398
Depleting and/or damaging a county's resources to further the monopolization agenda is not sustainable in rural Minnesota.	108-4	432
Resources, such as water, are already at an environmental risk at large in this country due to other risk factors, that putting Steven's county on the map for danger to water only furthers the risks already in place.	108-5	387
Riverview may want to think they deserve to be a monopoly, or titan of industry, or some other self-imposing title, but no amount of money or veiling should make a county turn a blind eye to the risks of our natural resources, land, and local community and economy.	108-6	403
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	109-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now:	109-2	434
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	109-3	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	109-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	109-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	109-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	109-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	109-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	110-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	110-2	432
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	110-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	110-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	110-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	110-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	110-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	110-8	1
I strongly support the expansion	111-1	431
I strongly support the approval of its permitting	111-2	431
As someone who values protected areas and watersheds and all natural resources in general this expansion should not be allowed until a thorough assessment is completed.	112-1	29
Furthermore, Riverview has shown that they overuse resources as evidenced by their Arizona locations.	112-2	435
In addition, there are days that it smells extremely pungent in Morris, so much so that I, who suffer from asthma, have issues going outside due to the overwhelming odor of manure. Expanding would only make that problem worse and hinder people from enjoying the outdoors.	112-3	83
So I urge you to fully study the environmental impact, including air quality before allowing this expansion.	112-4	4
I, for one, am vehemently against this.	112-5	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
As a citizen concerned with environmental stewardship and the long-term sustainability of Minnesota's natural resources, I urge the MPCA to carefully scrutinize this proposal and consider the substantial risks associated with creating what would become the largest concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO) in the state.	113-1	27
Large-scale CAFOs pose significant environmental challenges, particularly in regions where groundwater, surface water, and rural community health are closely interconnected.	113-2	167
The proposed scale of the West River Dairy expansion raises several concerns that warrant heightened regulatory review and public transparency.	113-3	434
First, manure management at this scale presents a serious risk to water quality. With thousands of dairy cattle producing millions of gallons of manure annually, the potential for nutrient runoff, nitrate contamination, and phosphorus loading into nearby waterways increases dramatically.	113-4	388
Minnesota has already experienced widespread nitrate contamination in groundwater due to agricultural runoff. Expanding the state's largest CAFO could exacerbate these existing challenges, if manure storage, land application, and monitoring systems fail or are overwhelmed.	113-5	153
Minnesota has already experienced harmful algal blooms in lakes and rivers due to agricultural runoff. Expanding the state's largest CAFO could exacerbate these existing challenges, if manure storage, land application, and monitoring systems fail or are overwhelmed.	113-5	294
Second, groundwater protection must be a central consideration. Much of rural Minnesota relies on shallow aquifers for drinking water.	113-6	193
Studies across the Midwest have demonstrated that large livestock operations can contribute to nitrate contamination of groundwater through manure seepage, over-application on fields, or extreme weather events.	113-7	193
As climate change increases the frequency of heavy rainfall and flooding, manure lagoons and storage systems face greater risks of overflow or leakage.	113-8	125
Third, the cumulative environmental impact of such a large operation must be evaluated, not merely the direct facility footprint. The transportation of feed, manure spreading over wide land areas, increased truck traffic, and air emissions which include ammonia and methane can affect surrounding ecosystems and nearby residents. Air quality impacts, odors, and particulate matter are well-documented concerns associated with high-density livestock operations.	113-9	23
Fourth, the scale of this proposal raises broader questions about agricultural sustainability in Minnesota. While dairy farming is an important part of the state's rural economy, the consolidation of livestock into extremely large operations can create environmental risks that smaller-scale systems distribute more sustainably across the landscape.	113-10	434
The MPCA has a responsibility to ensure that economic development does not come at the expense of Minnesota's water, soil, and public health.	113-11	48
For these reasons, I respectfully request that the MPCA: 1. Conduct a thorough and transparent environmental review of the proposed expansion.	113-12	29

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
For these reasons, I respectfully request that the MPCA: 2. Require rigorous groundwater monitoring and publicly accessible reporting.	113-13	226
For these reasons, I respectfully request that the MPCA: 3. Ensure that manure management plans account for extreme weather events and long-term soil nutrient loading.	113-14	68
For these reasons, I respectfully request that the MPCA: 4. Evaluate cumulative environmental impacts, including air emissions and watershed-level nutrient pollution.	113-15	23
For these reasons, I respectfully request that the MPCA: 5. Provide meaningful opportunities for public participation and community input before any final approval.	113-16	69
Minnesota's lakes, rivers, and groundwater are among the state's most valuable natural assets.	113-17	435
Decisions regarding large-scale agricultural developments must reflect a precautionary approach that protects these resources for future generations.	113-18	435
Given the fact that the company has been sued for over usage of water, and not caring for the well being of it neighbors, I am saying no to the expansion.	114-1	432
It's a only a matter of time they drain the resources from the area and move on to the next state.	114-2	435
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	115-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	115-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	115-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	115-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	115-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	115-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	115-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	115-8	1
I support a strong environmental impact review for this project.	116-1	1
The scale of the proposed farm is too large and will have a negative effect on the river and the ecosystem of the area.	116-2	133
I do not think this expansion should be allowed to go through.	117-1	432
This area used to be known for small family owned dairyfarms, providing livelihoods for hundreds of families.	117-2	403
These big companies have come into farming communities and taken over.	117-3	403

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Today, if one where to around drive around this area, they would be hard-pressed to find more than a couple of small family dairyfarms.	117-4	403
We need clean rivers, as well as lakes.	117-6	295
Producing that much manure and using that much water from the existing facility is enough, we don't need more added to the environment.	117-7	432
Let's also take into consideration the livelihoods of small family owned dairyfarms.	117-8	400
We also need to protect our lakes and rivers, needs to be taken into consideration.	117-5a	388
We also need to protect the environment as a whole, needs to be taken into consideration.	117-5b	167
No, I do not support this expansion.	118-1	432
I understand it would bring work and economic growth to Morris, but destroying our watershed isn't the way to do it.	118-2	432
Pomme de Terre has a special place close to my heart because I grew up less than a mile from it and often times fished, threw pebbles, and just enjoyed the water.	118-3	265
Please don't ruin this river! It's my childhood and so many others, on a personal level.	118-4	265
This must have an EIS.	119-1	1
This is not farming but an industrial scale operation. Riverview is nothing more than a corporate entity. It has Human Resources departments, accounting departments, logistics departments, lobbying efforts, all the things that a large corporate business entity has; not a family farm.	119-2	403
Please do the right thing and require an EIS.	119-3	1
No.	120-1	432
Provide more opportunities to the young independent generation of farmers to take over and manage their family farms.	120-2	400
The pararie lakes, rivers, beautifully scenic crop fields, and vacation areas are too precious to the Minnesota econony.	120-4	265
Excessive water use can not creep into Minnesota.	120-3a	195
Excessive concentrated gastly waste managment can not creep into Minnesota.	120-3b	338
I vote no. We don't want this.	121-1	432
The land should go to the local farmers and their families that will take over the farming business for years to come.	121-2	400
We live a couple of miles from the West Riverview location and have lived here most of my life. What about our water? We've already seen a noticeable decline in water quality.	122-1	388
When our well needs to be dug deeper - or even relocated - because they have pulled the level so far down, will they be footing that bill?	122-2	224
Will there be any concern for the neighbors?	122-3	397
Already water is a precious resource. We already have corporations trying to take this precious resource for various enterprizes.	123-1	195
There is no need for this expansion.	123-2	432
Especially when you're not done doing all the research about ground water in the area.	123-3	190

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The proposed feedlot is high risk from an environmental standpoint.	124-1	167
The proposed feedlot is high risk from economic standpoint.	124-2	398
Please do not allow them to destroy our water further.	124-3	387
No to the expansion.	125-1	432
Save our small farmers and the land!	125-2	403
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	126-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	126-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	126-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	126-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	126-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	126-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	126-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	126-8	1
Require a Riverview Dairy EIS!	127-1	1
I taught some courses at UM_Morris and worked at the Stevens Community Medical Center in Morris MN. At the latter job, I occasionally treated workers at Riverview Dairy.	127-2	435
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	127-4	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	127-5	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	127-6	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	127-7	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	127-8	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	127-9	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	127-10	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	127-11	1
I also enjoyed the natural areas around Morris, such as the Big Stone National Wildlife Refuge and the Edwards Wetland Management Area, which, along with the city, depend on good water levels.	127-3a	426
I also enjoyed the natural areas around Morris, such as the Big Stone National Wildlife Refuge and the Edwards Wetland Management Area, which, along with the city, depend on good air quality.	127-3b	173
Please for the sake of the local people, animals, and land do NOT allow this to happen!	128-1	432
The long term effects will be un-doable and will negatively impact so many.	128-2	432
Please keep things as they currently are i beg of you	128-3	432
I have lived and worked in Morris and currently raise cattle in a nearby community. For the sake of the community, the waterways, and wildlife, the unprecedented expansion proposed by Riverview must be subject to a full environmental review.	129-1	1
Living not far from this dairy(within 30 min) I have already seen first hand how this large operation has taken over so much farmland as small families cant even compete with what they pay for land and dont feel this would help change that. I think this would be a big mistake!	130-1	400
I think this would be a big mistake!	130-2	432
No, there will be no small farms left if Riverview keeps expanding.	131-1	403
Greed is destroying AG and ruining opportunities for young people to milk cows or join agriculture.	131-2	403
Not to mention Riverview draining wells of water.	131-3	195
There is no reason for anyone to milk 100,000 cows and more.	131-4	435
And have all the workers be visa workers it's really sad what they are doing to Dairy and destroying small communities economy's.	131-5	397
Bring back small farms and stop with corporate farms and greed.	131-6	432
Pretty soon it will just be Riverview being the only dairy farm in MN	131-7	435
I am in favor of the West River Dairy expansion.	132-1	431
Absolutely NO!	133-1	432
CAFO is just a creative way to use language that doesn't say factory farm and industrial scale farming.	133-2	435
Please don't let this happen.	134-1	432
We need smaller farms, not factory farms.	134-2	432
Today's money grab industries should really feel how the communities and environment can and will be affected from decisions that are solely based on profits.	135-1	435

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The Pomme de ter reaches into three other major water sources and if you think there won't be an impact done because of runoff and seapage you are mistaken.	135-3	276
This is a no-brainer and it should be stopped from happening.	135-4	432
Not to mention the little farms that it will crush a long the way.	135-5	400
Absolutely disgusting and when you think of rural Minnesota you definitely don't see this as being a community driven outcome.	135-6	397
Stop this from happening.	135-7	432
The impact that this will have to our water sources are and can be detrimental to a wide range of areas.	135-2a	387
The impact that this will have to our environments are and can be detrimental to a wide range of areas.	135-2b	167
There is way too much at stake here. There must be more information gathered before a decision of this magnitude is made without considering all the ramifications.	136-1	432
We must protect our water!!	136-2	295
We must protect our family farms!!	136-3	403
This huge operation will not only destroy the environment, but will also destroy many small farms.	136-4	400
THIS IS NOT PROGRESS.	136-5	435
I am very concerned about the impact of this facility for several reasons: 1) ground water supply,	137-1	195
I am very concerned about the impact of this facility for several reasons: 3) impact on small family farms in the area.	137-3	400
A full EIS needs to done to understand the impact of this project.	137-4	1
Also, past history with previous Riverview projects need to be taken into account.	137-5	435
An undertaking this large is sure to create unseen problems.	137-6	432
Please be diligent in all aspects of researching this project.	137-7	435
I am very concerned about the impact of this facility for several reasons: 2) pollution of water shed	137-2a	290
I am very concerned about the impact of this facility for several reasons: 2) pollution of soil	137-2b	183
I am very concerned about the impact of this facility for several reasons: 2) biodiversity	137-2c	163
Why award this to a company that has already shown gross misuse of and harm to resources that are beneficial to native species of plants, animals, and residents of the areas they occupy?	138-1	432
The fact that they so closely border 5 different land areas already should be enough to warrant a veto of their expansion.	138-2	435
No	139-1	432
why is it we here in Morris were not IMMEDIATELY made aware of this???	140-1	435
Our watershed is already being contaminated by high levels of nitrogen from farming,	140-2	272
to add more cows to this is deterimental to our well-being and way of life.	140-3	403
Look to Arizona, what Riverview is doing there, they are using up all of the water there!	140-4	435
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement. It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	141-1	15

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	141-2	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	141-3	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	141-4	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	141-5	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible. It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	141-6	1
Riverview should not be allowed to expand on this sight.	143-1	432
IMO they are responsible for the degradation of the Gorder Lake water quality by way of nutrient runoff coming from the excessive manure application of the fields they cut for silage. . This degradation has resulted in water that is green all year around, has no fresh water shrimp in it (Gorder and all of the surrounding waters use to be teaming with aquatic invertebrates) and is no longer of use to migrating waterfowl.	143-2	272
Riverview has artificially driven up the land values making it very difficult for the local farmers to purchase land without repressive debt.	143-3	400
Riverview refuses to enter written contracts for silage with local farmers so that they can back out of their commitment if bad weather damages the corn.	143-4	400
How much milk did Riverview donator offer to sell to local school districts during the milk shortage a few years ago?	143-5	397
Riverview imports all of their labor force from Mexico which leaves locals with no chance at a job.	143-6	397
I am a lifelong resident of Stevens County, and I am writing to express my full support for the West River Dairy expansion.	144-1	431
Riverview, LLP has applied to house an estimated 26,397 dairy cattle at a single site, an alarming proposal that would represent an unprecedented scale for dairy production in Minnesota.	145-1	433
A full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be required. An operation of this size presents complex and far-reaching risks to water quality, air quality and surrounding ecosystems in addition to serious animal welfare concerns that cannot be adequately evaluated through a more limited review.	145-2	1
The proposed expansion also raises concerns for Minnesota's small independent farmers by placing additional economic pressures to those who are already struggling to compete in an increasingly consolidated market.	145-3	400
Minnesota must ensure that decisions of this magnitude are made with public transparency, complete information and careful consideration for the long-term sustainability of our environment.	145-4	32

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
As a resident of Stevens County MN, where the proposed Riverview Dairy expansion would be located, I am concerned about its environmental impact and would like the MPCA to require a full Environmental Impact Statement before the project can go forward.	146-1	1
This project would more than double the size of Riverview's dairy operation in Stevens County in terms of animal units, and almost twice as large as the next largest livestock operation in the state. A project of this unprecedented scope demands particular care in reviewing its impacts, which a full Environmental Impact Statement would provide.	146-2	15
In addition, I believe it is important for the EIS to take into account the total projected size of Riverview's Stevens County dairy operations, including existing animal units, not just the size of the expansion. Total size matters because the larger the total size, the larger the potential impact if something goes wrong.	146-3	2
For example, Riverview's Feb. 2025 manure spill in Kandiyohi County likely spilled approximately the same amount of manure in 5 days that an average sized MN dairy farm would produce in 6 months, based on early reports.	146-4	432
To ignore the potential environmental impacts of this expansion would be completely reckless. A full Environmental Impact Statement should absolutely be obtained before proceeding.	146-5	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	147-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous.	147-2	134
Operations of this scale are bad for animals in a myriad of ways.	147-3	74
Operations of this scale are bad for workers in a myriad of ways.	147-4	398
Operations of this scale are bad for the environment in a myriad of ways.	147-5	133
I think this expansion would be a catastrophic mistake.	148-1	432
There is no need for a dairy operation that large, it would negatively affect the water first in the area surrounding the farm and spread out to the rest of the state and beyond.	148-2	434
This drain on and contamination of natural resources is a colossal mistake in a very critic time for our environment.	148-3	180
I'm staunchly opposed to this expansion.	148-4	432
The Riverview Dairy project MUST be required to get an Environmental Impact Statement	149-1	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	150-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	150-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	150-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	150-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	150-5	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	150-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	150-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	150-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	151-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	151-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	151-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	151-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	151-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	151-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	151-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	151-8	1
I live in Stevens County MN, the same county as the proposed Riverview Dairy expansion, and I am requesting that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement before the project moves forward.	152-1	1
The proposed expansion is significant and it seems only reasonable to expect a full Environmental Impact Statement.	152-2	1
While I am happy that Riverview, an important part of our community in Stevens County, wants to invest in an expansion here, I do think it is necessary to require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	152-3	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	153-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	153-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	153-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	153-4	391

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	153-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	153-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	153-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	153-8	1
I am writing to encourage the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to require a full environmental impact statement for the proposed expansion of Riverview's dairy feedlot (mentioned above.)	154-1	1
I realize the Riverview is a successful agribusiness and brings much to our community, but the magnitude of this expansion is such that it poses potential threats to the environmental quality (land, air, water) in Stevens County.	154-2	167
I believe these threats should be full investigated and necessary actions to prevent and/or mitigate environmental impact should be identified before the project moves forward.	154-3	29
More specifically, I am concerned about the potential impact that a dairy feedlot that is significantly larger than the current operation will have on water quality.	154-4	434
I am an aquatic ecologist who has studied aquatic life in both the Pomme de Terre River and in local prairie pothole ecosystems. I value the opportunities to enjoy the natural resources that support fish and wildlife in our area and recognize that many depend on uncontaminated groundwater for drinking water and other household uses.	154-5	193
Our freshwater ecosystems and connected ground water have the potential to be directly impacted by such a large dairy operation; I am concerned about both water quality and water quantity.	154-6	195
I think that before moving ahead with such a large project that the potential impact on the local environment should be investigated more thoroughly.	154-7	29
This expansion will result in the largest dairy feedlot in the state of Minnesota. Given the magnitude of this dairy operation it believe it is essential that the MPCA and Riverview undertake the full Environmental Impact Statement process before this project moves forward.	154-8	1
Having this many animals in one area cannot be healthy to our waterways.	155-1	289
This is just a big huge company thinking they can push us all around.	155-2	435
I can't imagine trying to drill a well anywhere near there and think you're gonna get good clean water.	155-3	193
You cannot let this happen.	155-4	432
As a former resident of NW Iowa - this sounds like a horrible proposal and sets future precedent that nobody wants. See the rates of cancer in Iowa? It's connected to the ag pollution in the air and water. Don't make the mistakes Iowa has in terms of putting the profits of Mega Agriculture Monopolies ahead of the well being of the citizens in this community.	156-1	432
As a former organizer for Food and Water Watch - I saw the significant amount of environmental damage and quality of life degradation in my own community in Sioux County - which houses more factory farms than any other place in the country.	156-2	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The nitrates in our water due to ag waste runoff was well above advisable levels,	156-3	420
the cancer rates in that area of Iowa are especially high,	156-4	395
not to mention every other illness related to breathing CAFO polluted air	156-5	395
drinking livestock waste littered water.	156-6	193
I'm thankful to live in Madison where we have a Reverse Osmosis treatment plant for our drinking water - but if this project comes to pass - expect that MANY more Minnesotans and everyone downstream from the waterways surrounding this expansion will have their health jeopardized just for Big Ag profits.	156-7	193
I very loudly and clearly disagree with this expansion proposal. Do what is right for Minnesotans, not the ag monopolies that leave our communities struggling economically and environmentally.	156-8	432
I am writing in support of the West River Dairy expansion.	157-1	431
I have two main concerns about the West River Dairy Expansion:	158-1	432
1. Possible depletion through over-pumping of the local ground water aquifer. An in-depth analysis of the impact on the local aquifer(s) needs to be done before hand. The buried drift aquifers of this area tend to have very slow re-charge and therefore can be over drawn and depleted by large quantity withdrawals, leading to permanent destruction of the aquifer.	158-2	190
2. An in-depth long-term analysis of the nutrient loading from manure applications and their impact on the soils and waters (ground water and surface waters) of the surrounding area.	158-3	356
Thousands of feet of private drain tile connect to a nearby public county drain tile (underground pipe) that drains the acres in and around the dairy operation and flows east directly to the Pomme de Terre River. Drain tiles act as a direct conduit for toxic nutrients such as nitrates.	158-4	425
The soils in this area are already naturally high in phosphorus. Manure spreading adds large quantities of phosphorus to the soil, often far in excess of the needs of crops. Phosphorus binds to soil particles. When soils erode due to high winds and flooding (common on cropland in this area) the phosphorus can cause severe toxic algal blooms in nearby water bodies. Attached is an example of a recent blue-green algae bloom on near-by hypereutrophic Long Lake just east of Morris, MN.	158-5	294
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	159-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	159-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	159-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	159-4	391

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	159-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	159-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	159-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	159-8	1
My godson went to the U at Morris and we and friends still visit regularly to watch sports teams. We cannot stress enough how important an environmental impact statement is to determine just how dangerous this business would be for the surrounding community.	159-9	1
Lastly, some submitted public comments have suggested the need for an Environmental Impact Statement due to the expansion's potential economic impact on local dairy farms. The purpose of an Environmental Impact Statement is to assess potential significant environmental impacts of the proposed project, not create public policy on the appropriate size of dairies in Minnesota.	160-1	19
The legislature is best suited to determine how best to support Minnesota's dairy farmers and the overall dairy industry.	160-2	435
Weaponizing environmental review and permitting to address broader economic policy issues is inappropriate and undermines the state's environmental regulatory process.	160-3	19
I am concerned that Confined Animal Feedlot Operations produce unhealthy products.	161-1	398
I am concerned that Confined Animal Feedlot Operations are cruel to animals.	161-2	74
I am concerned that Confined Animal Feedlot Operations impact air quality negatively.	161-3	81
I am concerned that Confined Animal Feedlot Operations impact water quality negatively.	161-4	388
It seems likely that they would also create biohazards.	161-5	135
It seems likely that they would foster conditions that spread disease.	161-6	72
They also could amount to illegal monopolies.	161-7	398
I encourage all these problems to be further investigated.	161-8	432
We don't need another huge farm in western Minnesota.	162-1	432
Too much extra water usage.	162-2	195
we need to protect our wildlife.	162-3	173
Enough is enough. So NO!!!!	162-4	432
I am not in favor of Riverview Dairy building this expansion.	163-1	432
I live in Morris and I do NOT support the expansion.	164-1	432
Not only is this getting close to a monopoly	164-2	432
but it will also have detrimental impacts to the local environment	164-3	167
but it will also have detrimental impacts to the local economy.	164-4	398

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
For these reasons and many more not mentioned, I support the expansion of West River Dairy.	165-1	431
No to the expansion	166-1	432
limit herd size in a specific area	166-2	434
There should be a full environmental review of the proposed Riverview Expansion.	167-1	1
Expanding the operation to 26,397 animals is a likely disaster for the land.	167-2	434
Expanding the operation to 26,397 animals is a likely disaster for the farmers.	167-3	434
Expanding the operation to 26,397 animals is a likely disaster for the local community.	167-4	434
Huge industries should not be allowed to spoil the land.	167-5	434
Huge industries should not be allowed to spoil the water.	167-6	434
Huge industries should not be allowed to spoil the living of local community members.	167-7	434
Creating this expansion within 5 miles of eight protected wetland and wildlife areas needs to be thoroughly examined.	167-8	174
Quality of life is more important than the profits of huge corporations.	167-9	432
From what I have observed, Riverview, along with other local farmers, is committed to stewardship and sustainability of the land and these resources while providing healthy and affordable food for anyone who eats.	168-1	431
Please do not them expand!	169-1	432
Not good for water pollution!	169-2	388
Not good for air pollution!	169-3	81
I urge the requirement an EIS!	170-1	1
For a project of the size proposed, the UNPRECEDENTED SCALED should make the necessity of an EIS an absolute requirement.	170-2	19
I do not object to Riverview expanding its operation, but I question the wisdom of doing it in ONE LIMITED LOCATION!	170-3	435
Others have detailed other more specific concerns.	170-4	435
I live in Stevens County, where the proposed Riverview Dairy expansion would be located. Given the scale of this expansion, I feel the project should undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement to ensure there is transparency around potential environmental impacts.	171-1	15
We must require a full Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Riverview Dairy expansion before it is allowed to move forward.	172-1	1
I am a resident of Stevens County MN, where the expansion would be located. I am concerned about its scale as the project would more than double the size of Riverview's dairy operation in our county, with the final size being almost twice as large as the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units. A project of this unprecedented scope demands particular care in reviewing its impacts, which a full Environmental Impact Statement would provide.	172-2	1
In addition, it is important for the EIS to consider the total projected size of Riverview's Stevens County dairy operations, including existing animal units, not just the expansion.	172-3	11

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Total size matters because the larger the total size, the larger the potential impact if something goes wrong. For example, Riverview's Feb. 2025 manure spill in Kandiyohi County likely spilled approximately the same amount of manure in 5 days that an average sized MN dairy farm would produce in 6 months, based on early reports.	172-4	434
Please do the report before allowing this proposal to proceed.	172-5	29
I vehemently oppose this project!!	173-1	432
Huge feedlots are terrible for the land.	173-2	432
Huge feedlots are terrible for our family farms as well.	173-3	432
Furthermore, a quick look at their other feedlots shows they have been liable for over-pumping ground water.	173-4	194
Furthermore, a quick look at their other feedlots shows they have been liable for manure lagoon failures.	173-5	385
Furthermore, a quick look at their other feedlots shows they have been liable for various other infractions.	173-6	155
Our clean water in Minnesota is one of our greatest resources and treasures.	173-7	295
Are we going to squander it on a huge operation that gives little, if anything, back to our local economy?	173-8	398
Are we going to squander it on a huge operation that pollute and degrades all the things we as Minnesotans hold most dear?	173-9	432
One would hope not!! Give a resounding NO!! to this permit and project.	173-10	432
I'm local to Morris, and regularly use the Pomme de Terre river bike paths and dog park. I'm concerned about the impact such a large operation would have on the environment that is currently an important part of my day-to-day life.	174-1	167
I'm also very proud of the work the university does with regards to land stewardship, and I'm not sure this is in line with the best interests of the people who live in this area and rely on this land/ecosystem.	174-2	397
If built, the Riverview operation would be allowed to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year from an off-site well. For reference, the City of Morris, which is home to over 5,000 people, is permitted to pump up to 300 million gallons of water a year.	174-3	195
Once constructed, the facility would produce 202,744,000 gallons of liquid manure and wastewater a year and 26,400 tons of solid manure a year.	174-4	391
The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has not yet completed a mapping of Stevens County's groundwater resources and aquifers for their County Geologic Atlas Series. In fact, they have not even begun the hydrological survey of the county.	174-5	196
It is irresponsible to other water users and residents of the area to move forward with this permit without a full understanding of the potential impacts.	174-6	34
The Pomme de Terre watershed, where this expansion is proposed, is already considered a sensitive watershed. The MPCA already lists the two closest waterways to the facility, the Pomme de Terre River and an unnamed creek, as impaired, and this proposal would only exacerbate the impairment.	174-7	182
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	175-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	175-2	134

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	175-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	175-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	175-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	175-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	175-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	175-8	1
20,000 + cattle! There were approximately 8,000 cattle at this dairy to begin with and they want to add up to 18,555 MORE. see FB post "As of early 2026, Riverview LLP has applied for a permit to construct a new dairy facility in Minnesota that would hold approximately 18,855 dairy cattle, which would bring the total to 26,397 animal units This project is notable for being the first in Minnesota to hold over 20,000 animal units in a single facility" Face book	176-1	434
Just the Size of this proposed operation expansion should cause serious pause and REQUIRE that a thorough investigation be completed	176-2	29
including emergency situations	176-3	435
WATER USAGE	176-4	195
WATER ACCESS	176-5	195
AQUIFER AVILABILITY	176-6	190
Affects on other Aquifers	176-7	190
individual wells	176-8	190
surface water quality in the whole area of Stevens county	176-9	289
Just the amount of water that this operation will need supplied to it ALONE SHOULD be enough to automatically require a FULL Environmental Impact Study on this Operation. see below If each cow drinks 30-50 gallons of water per day *26397 cows* 365 days in a year: 289,047,150 to 481,745,250 Gallons of water use just for drinking water for the cattle for a year. if it is really hot or dry outside the number can double to 60-100 Gallons. add washing water, cleaning water and possible irrigation for crops to feed all of these cattle from all over the place and this is a MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT possibly for the whole county.	176-10	3
@120-150 lbs of feces and urine PER COW/ PER DAY *26397 =3167640 to 3,959,550 pounds of waste to remove PER DAY-calculation done at 120 and 150 lbs. (source=dairyland initiative)	176-11	391

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
the proximity to the Wetlands, drainage ditches, creeks in the area as well as the topography on the area should also cause a red flag.	176-12	289
What has happened to water availibility in the area from the previously permitted well that is off site and that is currently being used as a water source for the dairy?	176-13	195
Water Quality?	176-14	193
Do we know precisely what aquifer is being utilized for that well?	176-15	198
Has the aquifer been thoroughly studied?	176-16	190
[Has the aquifer been thoroughly studied?] (recharge rate?	176-17	190
[Has the aquifer been thoroughly studied?] aquifer size?	176-18	190
[Has the aquifer been thoroughly studied?] Depth?	176-19	190
[Has the aquifer been thoroughly studied?] extent?	176-20	190
How long can the aquifer sustain this type of usage?	176-21	195
What will happen if there is a drought?	176-22	210
have wells in the area been monitored for depth data or water quality?	176-23	201
We have been having flooding also lately, what happens in a huge flood to runoff,this spring the county ditch system was overwhelmed and it took until late fall for some areas to drain off.	176-24	141
Where will the manure and urine go if the tanks are full and they cannot get into the fields?	176-25	335
As citizen in Stevens county as well as a citizen in the state of Minnesota, I firmly believe that before the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency gives any permission at all for this facility they Require a FULL Environmental Impact Study.	176-26	1
The effects on wells, sanitation, contamination and the huge number of animal units should require and EIS Study alone.	176-27	1
PLEASE do what is right and require a full environmental impact study.	176-28	1
Letting this be built is a huge mistake.	177-1	432
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state.	177-2	434
It would be using massive amounts of water: Riverview would pump up to 226 million gallons/year from an off-site well—nearly as much as the entire City of Morris.	177-3	195
The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	177-4	391
We don't know the groundwater impacts. The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped—making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	177-5	196
The waters nearby are already listed as sensitive or damaged. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	177-6	266
The Riverview Dairy project must be required to get an Environmental Impact Statement.	177-7	1
This project should have extensive studies done to determine the environmental impact.	178-1	1
Water use	178-2	195
run off	178-3	2

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
air quality	178-4	81
abatement of noise	178-5	249
water	178-6	2
air etc emissions (This project should have extensive studies done to determine the environmental impact.)	178-7	81
The huge amount of water taken from the water table and the treatment necessary to prevent damage to wetlands, lakes and rivers. [Asking for study]	178-9	225
This significant increase in size should require all possible reviews and testing, not least of which would be a thorough, detailed and independently resourced Environmental Impact statement.	178-10	18
Traffic and road maintenance and the impact on transportation adjacent water ways with increased salt/sand.	178-8a	309
Traffic and road maintenance and the impact on transportation adjacent water ways with increased emissions from trucking.	178-8b	302
I am writing to comment on the draft of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the proposed West River Dairy Expansion. This Dairy, if the expansion is allowed, would be nearly double the size of the next largest operation in our state in terms of animal units.	179-1	434
The dairy industry is already, due to the presence of massive operations, pushing small and medium-sized farms out of business and off the land.	179-2	400
Though an Environmental Impact Statement is what is needed for the West River Dairy Expansion, history indicates that operators withdraw their application when asked to undergo one from the MPCA.	179-3	16
The sheer amount of water that would be allowed to be used from an offsite well of 226 million gallons	179-4	195
along with the generation of 202,744,000 gallons of liquid manure and wastewater and the 26,400 tons of solid manure makes this operation's environmental impact staggering and deleterious to the adjacent community.	179-5	391
Barring no mapping of the Stevens County's groundwater resources or hydrological survey of the county this project must not be allowed before preparations are made as to its long term environmental impact.	179-6	196
No	180-1	432
Hello, I spend time in this area, and I am concerned with the proposed size and impact of this operation. This proposed development should get an environmental impact statement to ensure that harm isn't caused to the environment.	181-1	15
I understand that this development would drastically increase water use.	181-2	195
I understand that this development would produce huge amounts of waste.	181-3	391
I understand that this development potentially impact groundwater.	181-4	195
I understand that this development would create an unpleasant odor.	181-5	83
Requiring a full EIS seems very important.	181-6	1
Requiring an Environmental Impact Statement for Riverview Dairy is essential. The proposed facility would be nearly double the size of any existing operation in the state, posing serious environmental risks.	182-1	15
Water demand: Riverview plans to draw up to 226 million gallons annually from an off-site well — comparable to nearly the entire water supply permitted for the City of Morris.	182-2	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Waste volume: Operations would produce roughly 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater per year, along with approximately 26,400 tons of solid waste.	182-3	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	182-4	196
Vulnerable waterways: The site drains into the Pomme de Terre watershed, a designated sensitive area. Both the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby creek are already classified as impaired and could face further degradation.	182-5	266
Issuing permits before these critical data gaps are filled is premature.	182-6	34
The MPCA must require a full Environmental Impact Statement before this project moves forward.	182-7	1
I am writing in strong support of the West River Dairy Expansion.	183-1	431
The very least, an Environmental Impact Statement from a party that is not invested in this project needs to be provided.	184-1	1
It is irresponsible to other water users and residents of the area to move forward with this permit.	184-2	34
There is already increased pressure on water systems.	184-3	195
The threat of water contamination is guaranteed based on previous records.	184-4	155
Concentrated animal feeding operations degrade everyone involved, including the environment.	184-5	167
The profits are not worth the depletion and degradation. Please cease and desist.	184-6	432
I have canoed on the Pomme de Terre River - while it is in a lovely setting, the water quality is already "iffy" (I was glad that we never capsized the canoe).	185-1	432
Please ensure that a thorough environmental impact assessment is completed and interpreted before this project is authorized.	185-2	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	186-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous.	186-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	186-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	186-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	186-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	186-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	186-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	186-8	1
I've never seen an operation as clean and well run as a riverview dairy.	187-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
An environmental review assessing the potential impacts of this expansion are essential.	188-1	29
I am not in favor of the expansion regardless	188-2	432
an accurate and thorough review of how this expansion will impact land, water, and wildlife across our communities is the bare minimum for helping us to understand how significant and extensive the harm will be.	188-3	29
Any possible efforts to delay, discredit, expedite, or avoid a review will show how much Riverview values the communities it inhabits.	188-4	432
A business decision rooted in extracting and consolidating wealth into the hands of a few at the expense of all is not enough justification to move forward. Until the cows are compensated for the abuses they are forced to suffer (obviously incompatible with the business model), an equal amount of money and effort goes into restoring the land that has been polluted, and the millionaires that are profiting off of these abuses equitably re-distribute the excess wealth they've made to the people and communities that make their business possible.	188-5	432
this expansion will only cause more long-term harm to the majority of people in our part of the state.	188-6	397
this expansion will only cause more long-term harm to the majority of land in our part of the state.	188-7	176
this expansion will only cause more long-term harm to the majority of non-human animals in our part of the state.	188-8	74
Please, Do Not let this happen:	189-1	432
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	189-2	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	189-3	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	189-4	196
I am very concerned about negative impacts expansion will impose upon our already fragile environment. Stevens County has the Pomme de Terre River, various lakes, and wetlands that that provide homes to a wide variety of birds and animal life.	190-1	432
Citizens, such as myself, enjoy the wildlife and the natural habitats they occupy.	190-2	173
Environmental impact and conservation must be taken in to consideration before any expansion is approved.	190-3	29
I am writing this letter to express my strong support for the proposed dairy expansion project currently under MPCA review.	191-1	431
A project this size, is so very difficult to judge the impact on the natural resources.	192-1	180
There is no way this project should be allowed because of the massive size and impact this many animals will have in that area.	192-2	432
In MN, I feel we try very hard to keep our natural resources in high regard.	192-3	432
As a property owner in Stevens County, my vote is "No!"	193-1	432
This will impact our water!	193-2	387
This will impact our wildlife areas!	193-3	174

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This will impact our farmers!	193-4	400
This will impact our community!	193-5	397
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	194-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	194-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	194-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	194-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	194-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	194-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	194-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	194-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	195-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	195-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	195-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	195-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	195-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	195-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	195-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	195-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	196-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	196-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	196-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	196-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	196-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	196-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	196-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	196-8	1
Expansion makes no sense considering the environmental consequences and future health of the environment.	197-1	432
Rural area resources such as water and man power are finite and cannot be taken for financial gain.	197-2	432
The future of rural Minnesota does not rest with corporate takeover of the dairy industry. Family farms not religious affiliated structures with lots of tax exemptions and significant amounts of capital. This corporate takeover is the quickest way to undermine our democracy as it takes away the owner/operator independence needed to maintain versatility and diverse thinking in our government. Disenfranchising family farms is the quickest way to destroy rural Minnesota and rural America.	198-1	398
I am from Benson and graduated from the UM of Morris. I am wholeheartedly against building an extension to the already excessively large West River Dairy operation in Steven's County.	199-1	432
Immediately DEMAND a full ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT from Riverview Dairy.	200-1	1
Advancing any permit for Riverview Dairy without full understanding of the frighteningly DEVASTATING GROUNDWATER and WATER-QUALITY risk is unconscionable.	200-2	34
The Riverview Dairy controlled animal feeding operation would be nearly DOUBLE the size of the LARGEST current operation in our state. It's potential environmental DESTRUCTION is MASSIVE.	200-3	434
Riverview would use HUNDREDS of MILLIONS of gallons of water per year.	200-4	195
Riverview would dump HUNDREDS of MILLIONS of gallons of liquid manure and wastewater per year PLUS TENS of THOUSANDS of TONS of solid manure.	200-5	391
The DNR has NO SURVEY or completed County Geologic ATLAS for Stevens County, so aquifer and groundwater resources are UNKNOWN.	200-6	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Nearest waters—the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek—are already COMPROMISED and listed as IMPAIRED.	200-7	266
REQUIRE a full ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT from Riverview Dairy immediately.	200-8	1
No to expansion.	201-1	432
Protect our land against big corporations.	201-2	432
Protect our smaller farmers against big corporations.	201-3	432
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	202-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	202-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	202-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	202-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	202-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	202-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	202-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	202-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	203-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	203-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	203-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	203-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	203-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	203-6	266

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	203-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	203-8	1
Please make Riverside Dairy farm submit to an environmental impact study.	204-1	1
Factory farming is shown to increase use of water.	204-2	195
Factory farming is shown to increase runoff & other harmful chemicals in the water stream.	204-3	388
It is vital we measure this be for building	204-4	29
Hi, the Pomme de Terre River runs through my property, I have 3 acres on one side, 7 on the other. The river is already quite contaminated come early summer	205-1	266
I fear this would make it much worse. I want my kids and I to be able to swim in it all summer! [Pomme de Terre]	205-2	265
PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE do an environmental review, at a minimum, before considering allowing another huge farm.	205-3	29
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	206-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	206-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	206-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	206-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	206-5	196
vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	207-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	207-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	207-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of l quid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	207-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	207-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	207-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	207-7	34

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	207-8	1
Please do not allow this dairy center to be built in the purposed location.	208-1	432
It is irresponsible and could lead to catastrophic environmental damages for generations.	208-2	432
Please let us clean up our precious waters!	208-3	432
I reside in Winona MN but this issue takes place in my home town area. I remember playing in streams on the farm as a child. Making sure our waters are safe for our children and wildlife should take priority!	208-4	265
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	209-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	209-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	209-3	195
—Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	209-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	209-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	209-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	209-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	209-8	1
Riverview Dairy must submit an environmental impact statement!	210-1	1
Stop trying to ruin our beautiful planet!!!	210-2	432
I have no financial investment in Riverview dairy and perhaps that is to my loss, however I do have a concern that this company is doing irreparable harm to the small farms and future farms of our area. The cost of land has been driven up incredibly high and the pockets of Riverview are very deep, no small farm can compete when it comes to land and rent prices and this is not improving.	211-1	400
If the surrounding farms do not sell crops to the dairy for feed and in turn, BUY back liquid manure they are on the loosing end of farming next to a corporate farm that will simply out bid them on land and rent until they have it for them selves.	211-2	400
I am not accusing the company of malicious intent, I believe that to them "its just good business". My children will never be able to farm in the future due to the inflated costs, particularly of land in our home area, due to the Spring Valley/Riverview competition.	211-3	400
The second concern I have is the smell, I do not live close enough to the West River Dairy for that to be a personal issue but I am about 2 miles from the original Riverview Dairy and the smell is very noticeable.	211-4	83

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
During fall when liquid manure is being applied the county stinks as a whole, the well water smells of rotten eggs and this has not been getting better.	211-5	83
I feel the monopoly of Riverview is hurting small family farms if they do not want to participate in the game with Riverview and sell them commodities to stay on good terms.	211-6	400
Large corporations like Riverview are doing a disservice to the farming community in my opinion.	211-7	400
We have enough dairy products in Stevens county, I don't see how adding 11,000 more mouths will help the small guy out.	211-8	400
I did not post comments on the public sight as I feel a target would be on my back and most small farmers I have spoken with have the same reservations about publicly questioning this expansion.	211-9	400
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	212-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	212-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	212-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	212-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	212-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	212-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.nt.	212-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Stateme	212-8	1
Mn does not want or need more rampant polluters.	213-1	432
If this project comes to our state we request and expect a pollution mitigation plan.	213-2	432
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	214-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous here's what we know now.	214-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	214-3	195
Huge waste output: the facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	214-4	391

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	214-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	214-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water quality risks is irresponsible.	214-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full environmental risk impact statement.	214-8	1
Please require an environmental impact statement with time for public comments from community members who will be directly impacted by this operation.	215-1	1
We can't continue to rubber stamp every request by agribusinesses to maximize their profits.	215-2	432
As a state agency, your priority is the well-being of Minnesotans.	215-3	432
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	216-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now:	216-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	216-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	216-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	216-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	216-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	216-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	216-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	217-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous here's what we know now.	217-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	217-3	195
Huge waste output: the facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	217-4	391

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	217-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	217-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water quality risks is irresponsible.	217-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full environmental risk impact statement.	217-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	218-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now:	218-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	218-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	218-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	218-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	218-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	218-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	218-8	1
Please require an environmental impact statement with time for public comments from community members who will be directly impacted by this operation.	219-1	1
We can't continue to rubber stamp every request by agribusinesses to maximize their profits.	219-2	432
As a state agency, your priority is the well-being of Minnesotans.	219-3	432
Please require an environmental impact statement with time for public comments from community members who will be directly impacted by this operation.	220-1	1
We can't continue to rubber stamp every request by agribusinesses to maximize their profits.	220-2	432
As a state agency, your priority is the well-being of Minnesotans.	220-3	432
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	221-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous here's what we know now.	221-2	134

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	221-3	195
Huge waste output: the facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	221-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	221-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	221-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water quality risks is irresponsible.	221-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full environmental risk impact statement.	221-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	222-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous here's what we know now.	222-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	222-3	195
Huge waste output: the facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	222-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	222-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	222-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water quality risks is irresponsible.	222-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full environmental risk impact statement.	222-8	1
Minnesota doesn't need more environmental destruction.	223-1	432
Require an environmental impact study	223-2	1
or just don't approve of it.	223-3	33
If we don't protect our state, we will lose what makes it great.	223-4	432
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	224-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous here's what we know now.	224-2	134

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	224-3	195
Huge waste output: the facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	224-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	224-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	224-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water quality risks is irresponsible.	224-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full environmental risk impact statement.	224-8	1
As Superintendent of Hancock Public School, I am pleased to express my support for the West River Dairy Expansion.	225-1	431
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	226-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous here's what we know now.	226-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	226-3	195
Huge waste output: the facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	226-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	226-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	226-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water quality risks is irresponsible.	226-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full environmental risk impact statement.	226-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	227-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now:	227-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	227-3	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	227-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	227-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	227-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	227-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	227-8	1
Please please please require a full environmental impact statement!	228-1	1
Please require Riverview Dairy to conduct a full environmental impact statement	229-1	1
The Riverview Dairy project must be required to get an Environmental Impact Statement.	230-1	1
Its environmental harm would be enormous.	230-2	167
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure andwastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	230-3	391
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	230-4	195
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped—making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	230-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: The expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek-are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	230-6	182
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	230-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	230-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	231-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous here's what we know now.	231-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	231-3	195
Huge waste output: the facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	231-4	391

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	231-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	231-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water quality risks is irresponsible.	231-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full environmental risk impact statement.	231-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	232-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	232-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	232-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	232-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	232-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	232-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	232-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	232-8	1
The amount of ground water waste, water usage, and other polluting factors is a poor use for this land.	233-1	195
Please reconsider this.	233-2	432
I'm concerned about this project and how it interacts with surface water in our state.	234-1	289
I'm concerned about this project and how it interacts with ground water in our state.	234-2	190
Where is the water coming from for this expansion?	235-1	197
From the spotty aquifer beneath the existing dairy? From a "retired" water use permit from the ethanol plant in Morris?	235-2	198
The ethanol plant still uses water from the same aquifer, but it gets the water from the city instead of directly from the wells it used.	235-3	213
The Pomme de Terre aquifer in Morris is also the city's drinking water source. It is not clear that this aquifer can support a giant dairy operation in addition to the existing demands.	235-4	195
A roughly 20,000 cow dairy will require approximately 30 square miles of land to feed the dairy animals	235-5	73
A roughly 20,000 cow dairy will require approximately 30 square miles of land to absorb their manure.	235-6	312

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Combined with the other two large dairy sites operated by Riverview in Stevens County, Riverview's operations will occupy more than 10% of the land in the county.	235-7	432
Please review the impacts of this expansion carefully. Water is a precious commodity.	236-1	1
I am writing to express my support for the proposed Riverview Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	237-1	431
Massive water use: Riverview would pump up to 226 million gallons/year from an off-site well-nearly as much as the entire City of Morris (permitted for 300 million gallons/year for 5,000+ residents).	238-1	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	238-2	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped—making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	238-3	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: The expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek-are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	238-4	182
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	238-5	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	238-6	1
There needs to be a thorough review of the long term impacts.	239-1	29
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	240-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	240-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	240-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	240-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	240-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	240-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	240-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	240-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	241-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	241-2	134

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	241-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	241-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	241-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	241-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	241-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	241-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	242-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	242-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	242-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	242-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	242-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	242-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	242-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	242-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	243-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	243-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	243-3	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
—Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	243-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	243-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	243-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	243-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	243-8	1
Animal agriculture wreaks havoc on the environment especially factory farms.	244-1	167
I'm asking that a thorough environmental impact assessment is done before any consideration to allow this facility to be built.	244-2	1
Please require an environmental impact statement for this new factory farm	245-1	1
the largest in the state.	245-2	434
The people deserve to know how this farm will impact our lands.	245-3	435
The people deserve to know how this farm will impact our waters.	245-4	435
The people deserve to know how this farm will impact the ecosystem as a whole.	245-5	435
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	246-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now:	246-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	246-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	246-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	246-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	246-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	246-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	246-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	247-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	247-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	247-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	247-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	247-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	247-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	247-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	247-8	1
West River dairy must be required to provide an environmental impact statement!	248-1	1
The expansion of factory farming in Minnesota will have devastating consequences on our lakes endangering people for generations to come.	248-2	396
The expansion of factory farming in Minnesota will have devastating consequences on our ground water endangering people for generations to come.	248-3	396
You must move to protect the people of Minnesota rather than the interests of big dairy.	248-4	435
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	249-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	249-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	249-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	249-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	249-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	249-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	249-7	34

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	249-8	1
As someone who lives in Stevens County and will be affected by this project, I insist MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement before the project can go forward.	250-1	1
This is a hugely transformative proposal that would double Riverview's operations in our county, which is not something to take lightly.	250-2	433
It is the least that can be done to do a FULL Environmental Impact Statement in order to fully understand the impacts of this change.	250-3	1
A project of this unprecedented scope demands particular care in reviewing its impacts, which a full Environmental Impact Statement would provide.	250-4	1
In addition, I believe it is important for the EIS to take into account the total projected size of Riverview's Stevens County dairy operations, including existing animal units, not just the size of the expansion.	250-5	11
Total size matters because the larger the total size, the larger the potential impact if something goes wrong. For example, Riverview's Feb. 2025 manure spill in Kandiyohi County likely spilled approximately the same amount of manure in 5 days that an average sized MN dairy farm would produce in 6 months, based on early reports.	250-6	385
We don't want more pollution from a giant factory farm in MN. This is not the direction we need to go.	251-1	432
Our environment is at a terribly perilous point in time and we need to prioritize the health of everyone before this giant farm that abuses animals as a business.	251-2	395
Hard no from me as a small business owner.	251-3	432
We the people of Minnesota do not want factories replacing farms.	252-1	403
We don't want our food grown inside buildings, and labs.	252-2	403
Listen to the people, the consumers, the indigenous communities, and most importantly nature.	252-3	435
Please allow the planet to provide we don't need human intervention anymore.	252-4	435
This project should require an environmental impact statement.	253-1	1
The size of this operation will have a negative effect on the surrounding area and beyond.	253-2	133
Bigger is not better when resources will be gobbled up.	253-3	434
This operation should not go forward.	253-4	432
I COMPLETELY OPPOSE this request for expansion!!	254-1	432
The environmental impact will be negatively huge and detrimental to many valuable lakes and connecting rivers in both Stevens and Grant counties.	254-2	289
Approving this expansion would be actionable for a Class Action lawsuit.	254-3	435
Please, please DENY this request and protect our valuable lakes and rivers.	254-4	33
Protect our ground water!	254-5	227
This is exactly the opposite direction for The land of 10,000 Lakes. DENY THIS REQUEST!!	254-6	33
Do the EIS study. Go forward with that. Once you have all of the results from the study, then make a decision.	255-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	256-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	256-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	256-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	256-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	256-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	256-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	256-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	256-8	1
Please don't allow this project to move forward without an environmental impact review.	257-1	1
Our water resources are too valuable not at ensure that they will be used wisely.	258-1	295
A full, comprehensive review needs to be completed.	258-2	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	259-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	259-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	259-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	259-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	259-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	259-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	259-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	259-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	260-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous.	260-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	260-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	260-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	260-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	260-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	260-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	260-8	1
Please do not allow this expansion.	261-1	33
The huge amounts of water required is not sustainable in today's world.	261-2	195
I have family and friends in Morris and this would impact their enjoyment of their homes.	262-1	397
Concerns about water shortages are concerning.	262-2	195
Concerns about increased manure smell are concerning.	262-3	83
Concerns about increased manure pollution are concerning.	262-4	352
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	262-5	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	262-6	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	262-7	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	262-8	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	262-9	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	262-10	266
I could not caution you more to not allow this.	263-1	33
These large scale dairy farms are ruining our rural farming community.	263-2	397

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
They (unfortunately) put one up close to our home and it has essentially ruined our once peaceful farm.	263-3	435
We can rarely have our windows open due to the horrible smell when they're separating manure.	263-4	83
The amount of flies that we have is absolutely disgusting and we can't even enjoy being outdoors.	263-5	140
They are pushing every small dairy farm out of business.	263-6	400
When is enough enough for them?	263-7	432
Riverview Dairy must be required to complete a full environmental impact statement.	264-1	1
This facility would be nearly twice the size of any other dairy operation in Minnesota, and the potential damage to our environment is too serious to ignore. Here is what we already know.	264-2	134
Water use: Riverview plans to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year from an off-site well. To put that in perspective, the entire City of Morris with over 5,000 residents is permitted to use 300 million gallons per year.	264-3	195
Waste production: The facility would produce roughly 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater every year, along with 26,400 tons of solid manure.	264-4	391
Groundwater risks: The DNR has not yet completed a hydrologic survey or the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, meaning we do not have a clear picture of local aquifers and groundwater. Approving large water withdrawals before that work is done is a serious gamble.	264-5	196
Already-struggling waterways: This project sits within the Pomme de Terre watershed, which is already designated as sensitive. Both the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek are currently listed as impaired. Adding this facility would likely make things worse.	264-6	266
Moving forward with permits before we fully understand the risks to groundwater and water quality is reckless.	264-7	34
The MPCA must require a complete Environmental Impact Statement before this project goes any further.	264-8	1
An expansion of this magnitude proximity must justify the completion of an environmental assessment.	265-1	29
Minnesota's land is one of our greatest assets and worth protecting against the potential risks of storage of manure.	265-2	176
Minnesota's water is one of our greatest assets and worth protecting against the potential risks of storage of manure.	265-3	295
Minnesota's wildlife is one of our greatest assets and worth protecting against the potential risks of storage of manure.	265-4	173
Minnesota's land is one of our greatest assets and worth protecting against the potential risks of distribution of manure.	265-5	176
Minnesota's water is one of our greatest assets and worth protecting against the potential risks of distribution of manure.	265-6	295
Minnesota's wildlife is one of our greatest assets and worth protecting against the potential risks of distribution of manure.	265-7	173
Minnesota's land is one of our greatest assets and worth protecting against the potential risks of runoff.	265-8	176
Minnesota's water is one of our greatest assets and worth protecting against the potential risks of runoff.	265-9	295
Minnesota's wildlife is one of our greatest assets and worth protecting against the potential risks of runoff.	265-10	76
Minnesota's land is one of our greatest assets and worth protecting against the potential risks of other contaminants.	265-11	176
Minnesota's water is one of our greatest assets and worth protecting against the potential risks of other contaminants.	265-12	295
Minnesota's wildlife is one of our greatest assets and worth protecting against the potential risks of other contaminants.	265-13	173
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	266-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	266-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	266-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	266-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	266-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	266-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	266-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	266-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	267-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	267-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	267-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	267-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	267-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	267-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	267-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	267-8	1
I am deeply concerned to learn that MPCA is even considering granting a permit to Riverview Dairy for their planned expansion without an EIS.	268-1	1
A dairy of this proposed scale does not yet exist in Minnesota, much less nested amongst so many protected wildlife areas.	268-2	174
A dairy of this proposed scale does not yet exist in Minnesota, much less near such a vital watershed.	268-3	433
Given Riverview's recent history of manure spills in Minnesota.	268-4	373

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Given Riverview's recent history of damage they've caused in other municipalities with over-pumping and water table depletion.	268-5	194
it behooves the MPCA to require a full environmental review of any proposed expansion that INCLUDES the existing dairy in the equation (not just the expansion).	268-6	29
Please consider the health of the land.	268-7	176
Please consider the health of the flora and fauna.	268-8	169
Please consider the health of the PEOPLE who live in this area - myself and my children included.	268-9	395
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	269-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	269-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	269-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	269-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	269-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	269-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	269-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	269-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	270-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	270-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	270-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	270-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	270-5	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	270-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	270-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	270-8	1
I am writing to request that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	271-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous,	271-2	433
including massive water use	271-3	195
huge waste output	271-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	271-5	196
potential harm to the Pomme de Terre watershed, designated as sensitive	271-6	266
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	272-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	272-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	272-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	272-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	272-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	272-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	272-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	272-8	1
Please review this project and protect our natural resources.	273-1	29
Please also review and consider the consequences to our local economy if we allow such a large facility.	273-2	398
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	274-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	274-2	134

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	274-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	274-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	274-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	274-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	274-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	274-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	275-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	275-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	275-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	275-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	275-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	275-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	275-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	275-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	276-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	276-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	276-3	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	276-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	276-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	276-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	276-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	276-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	277-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	277-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	277-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	277-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	277-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	277-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	277-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	277-8	1
An EAW must be done to assess environmental impact.	278-1	29
Please don't sell out MN residents because of mislaid policies, this is unnecessary expansion.	278-2	432
Additionally, factory farming on this scale is immoral.	278-3	403
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	279-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	279-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	279-3	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	279-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	279-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	279-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	279-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement	279-8	1
This is a terrible plan, and absolutely must include an EIS	280-1	1
as well as some study of the impact it would have on the surrounding communities.	280-2	397
Small dairy farms MN are already struggling, and this proposal would put many of them out of business	280-3	400
create an unwanted monopoly on milk production	280-4	398
as well as create a potential environmental danger.	280-5	167
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	281-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	281-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	281-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	281-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	281-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	281-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	281-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	281-8	1
When is it going to end?	282-1	403
If the pollution control agency doesn't think it's a good idea why allow it?	282-2	432
Shouldn't this require a more extensive review than an EAW?	282-3	32
I have invested millions in RE projects and an EAW is not a big deal and this project is huge.	282-4	435
I would think the ground water pollution would be unbelievable	282-5	193

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
and the use of all of that water from an "offsite well"? What the does that mean? Where is the well, what aquifer will it draw from and who will that effect?	282-6	198
I'm tired of this crap. Projects like this will have a negative effect on my grandchildrens future	282-7	403
further destroy the family farm	282-8	400
That takes the competetivness out of business.	282-9	398
Food companies are already screwing us.	282-10	403
I understand that Riverview has applied for an expansion that would result in an operation double the size of the next largest livestock operation in Minnesota (in terms of number of animals).	283-1	434
The proposed site in Stevens County, where I live, will be very close to more than a few protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas.	283-2	174
Riverview has a history of manure spills in our area	283-3	373
and inappropriate use of water resources in Arizona.	283-4	194
This proposed project will have a major impact throughout our county.	283-5	397
This proposed project will have a major impact throughout the Pomme de Terre watershed.	283-6	276
This proposed project will have a major impact throughout our communities.	283-7	397
This proposed project will have a major impact throughout habitats downstream.	283-8	172
Therefore, this proposed project must be required to undergo a full and thorough Environmental Impact Statement.	283-9	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	284-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	284-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	284-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	284-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	284-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	284-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	284-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	284-8	1
I am writing in support of the West River Dairy Expansion.	285-1	431
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	286-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	286-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	286-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	286-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	286-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	286-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	286-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	286-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	287-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	287-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	287-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	287-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	287-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	287-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	287-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	287-8	1
I am writing because I am deeply concerned that another CAFO (factory farm) is going to be created in Minnesota.	288-1	434
This is the last thing we need, because of the devastating environmental impact these facilities have	288-2	167
This is the last thing we need, but also because of the documented mistreatment of animals.	288-3	74
Above all else, an environmental impact report must be submitted and audited by an independent organization of experts.	288-4	18
The industry itself cannot be trusted.	288-5	403

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	288-6	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	288-7	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	288-8	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	288-9	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	288-10	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	288-11	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	288-12	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	288-13	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	289-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	289-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	289-3	195
-Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	289-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	289-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	289-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	289-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement	289-8	1
Please do not approve this EAW!	290-1	33
This will negatively affect the environment in the surrounding areas.	290-2	167
And the amount of water needed would be horrific.	290-3	195
This must not get approved.	290-4	33

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Riverview LLP's proposed expansion of operations at the West River Dairy should receive the highest level of review possible, by both MPCA and DNR, to assure their activities will not negatively impact the quality or quantity of nearby surface waters.	291-1	289
Riverview LLP's proposed expansion of operations at the West River Dairy should receive the highest level of review possible, by both MPCA and DNR, to assure their activities will not negatively impact the quality or quantity of acquifers.	291-2	225
Riverview LLP's proposed expansion of operations at the West River Dairy should receive the highest level of review possible, by both MPCA and DNR, to assure their activities will not negatively impact the quality or quantity of wildlife.	291-3	173
Riverview LLP's proposed expansion of operations at the West River Dairy should receive the highest level of review possible, by both MPCA and DNR, to assure their activities will not negatively impact the quality or quantity of vegetation.	291-4	29
Riverview LLP's proposed expansion of operations at the West River Dairy should receive the highest level of review possible, by both MPCA and DNR, to assure their activities will not negatively impact the quality of nearby soils.	291-5	29
Riverview LLP's proposed expansion of operations at the West River Dairy should receive the highest level of review possible, by both MPCA and DNR, to assure their activities will not negatively impact nearby people.	291-6	395
Permits for this expansion should not be issued unless negative impacts to these resources can be avoided	291-7	32
Permits for this expansion should not be issued unless Riverview should be required to monetarily insure against spills and other accidents which may occur as a result of their operations.	291-8	150
Please call for an environmental impact study.	292-1	1
As an agency that is called to control pollution, you must take this seriously and do what is required of you.	292-2	435
Lives are at stake.	292-3	435
Water pollution is at risk	292-4	146
so is methane pollution	292-5	94
Factory farming is often cruel besides.	292-6	403
Do your jobs please and consider the pros and cons in terms of who benefits and who suffers from rushing this through.	292-7	29
How will this affect Minnesotans quality of life?	292-8	403
How will it harm us?	292-9	395
How will it affect the environment?	292-10	167
How will it benefit?	292-11	403
How will it harm?	292-12	403
Think 7 generations. Be smart, have a heart	292-13	403
As an animal lover in Minnesota, PLEASE, do not add a massive factory farming operation to be added here or anywhere.	293-1	73
It is bad for the environment	293-2	167
it is bad for animals	293-3	403
it is bad for people	293-4	395

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	293-5	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	293-6	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	293-7	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	293-8	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	293-9	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	293-10	1
No to the West Dairy River expansion.	294-1	33
It will be environmentally harmful.	294-2	167
Farming operations like this are simply TOO BIG!	295-1	434
Too big for the land	295-2	434
too big for the neighbors	295-3	434
too big for the water infrastructure	295-4	434
and WAY TOO BIG to not require a EIS.	295-5	15
PLEASE care for the citizens and the environment before the corporations and pause long enough to address the issues an EIS covers.	295-6	1
Thank you for always protecting our environment FIRST.	295-7	167
This project expansion is an environmental disaster in the making.	296-1	167
What we SHOULD be focused on is how to transition dairy away from operations such as these to one that more appropriately uses agriculture.	296-2	432
Plant-based products could not only protect our environment but would eliminate the extreme animal cruelty inherent in these operations.	296-3	403
Just take a look at their website: https://riverviewllp.com/	296-4	403
Animals placed on a merry-go-round for their entire adult lives? Really?	296-5	403
And the public is left to pick up the pieces from these disastrous CAFOs.	296-6	403
How will they dispose of the manure?	297-1	346
what about Pollution from this facility (chemicals in the manure)?	297-2	352
what about Pollution from this facility (water polution)?	297-3	146
what about Pollution from this facility (The amount of water they will need)?	297-4	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
what about Pollution from this facility (effect on ground water)?	297-5	193
what about Pollution from this facility (Air pollution)?	297-6	81
what about Pollution from this facility (Smell)?	297-7	83
what about Pollution from this facility (how will they dispose of dead cows & calves)?	297-8	77
There are so many factors to consider - we need an enviormental Study before any construction. Please checkdo this first!	297-9	29
I am writing as a concerned citizen and health care provider. CAFOs are resource-heavy.	298-1	180
I am writing as a concerned citizen and health care provider. CAFOs produce less-than-healthy animals.	298-2	74
I am writing as a concerned citizen and health care provider. CAFOs contribute to significant pollution in the United States.	298-3	146
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below-cost-of-production milk prices.	298-4	400
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing it to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	298-5	400
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies.	298-6	400
The Pomme de Terre watershed, where this expansion is proposed, is considered a sensitive watershed. The MPCA already lists the two closest waterways to the facility, the Pomme de Terre River and an unnamed creek, as impaired, and this proposal would only exacerbate the impairment.	298-7	266
No feedlot has ever undergone an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in Minnesota. Each time the MPCA has determined that an operation should undergo one, the operator that requested the permit has withdrawn their application. And all of those operations that were determined to need an EIS were significantly smaller than Riverview's proposed operation will be.	298-8	16
If built, the Riverview operation would be allowed to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year from an off-site well. For reference, the City of Morris, which is home to over 5,000 people, is permitted to pump up to 300 million gallons of water a year.	298-9	195
Once constructed, the facility would produce 202,744,000 gallons of liquid manure and wastewater a year and 26,400 tons of solid manure a year.	298-10	391
It is absolutely reasonable to do a full environmental impact study regarding this proposal. Thank you for your consideration.	298-11	1
There is no way this action benefits small dairy farmers	299-1	400
There is no way this action is a positive environment environment for the animals	299-2	73
There is no way this action is healthy for the environment.	299-3	167
This must not be allowed to continue.	299-4	432
The smell alone would be unbearable.	299-5	83
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	300-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	300-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	300-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	300-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	300-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	300-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	300-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement	300-8	1
I am a fly fisherman and outdoorsman. I was on Rush Creek near Lewiston with my 6-yr-old grandson and my son three weeks before the massive 2021 fish kill, where approximately 2,500 trout were killed over a one-mile section just upstream from where we had our magical outing. On that day, my grandson presented a #18 dry fly to the fish by himself and fooled his very first trout. He netted the fish himself while broadly smiling with pride.	301-1	403
The fish kill resulted from a combination of 1) low stream level in late summer 2) large rainfall 3) poor farming practices. There was (and is) a CAFO of about 1,500 cows near the headwaters of Rush Creek in Winona County. Basically, storm runoff transports these toxins into the water at higher concentrations when stream flows are lower (especially as summer progresses) and therefore provide less dilution of the toxins. And large storms are increasingly becoming the norm.	301-2	282
The Driftless Area in SE MN (in places like Lewiston, where Rush Creek is) has a "Swiss cheese" geology, which is why we have cold water spring creeks in the area. Water from the surface can reach the aquifer in 0-3 days.	301-3	238
We learned this the hard way with the 2021 Rush Creek fish kill.	301-4	282
The Central Sands area (like the Willmar area) is also has a very sensitive geology, where surface water can quickly reach aquifers. We cannot afford to find out the hard way with this massive CAFO proposal permitting 18,855 dairy cattle on a single site. Being over ten times the size of the CAFO near the headwaters of Rush Creek, the environmental risks are clear.	301-5	283
We cannot, in good conscience, approve a CAFO of 18,855 dairy cattle before performing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	301-6	15
If the analysis shows that a CAFO of this size would be safe, so be it. But moving forward without and EIS is risking the environment and human health. We must require an EIS for a proposal of this magnitude.	301-7	1
I am concerned about air quality , and its effects on workers, the gases from storage facilities.	302-1	81
I am concerned about air quality , and its effects on workers, the air quality effects from the spreading of liquid manure.	302-2	81

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am concerned about air quality , and its effects on neighbors, the gases from storage facilities.	302-3	81
I am concerned about air quality , and its effects on neighbors, the air quality effects from the spreading of liquid manure.	302-4	81
Of equal concern is water quality and the effects of liquid manure and excess nitrogen fertilizer application on nitrogen levels in groundwater.	302-5	367
Of equal concern is water quality and the effects of liquid manure and excess fertilizer application on phosphorus impacts on surface waters.	302-6	368
An environmental impact statement needs to be done to assess the impacts of this proposed facility on the economic viability of small and mid-size dairies in the entire state.	302-8	12
Riverview's track record of exploiting its immigrant work force must also be reviewed for cases of wage theft, failure to provide worker's compensation benefits to farm workers, and failure to pay overtime wages.	302-9	398
Operations such as this proposed operation are a blight on Minnesotas farm and rural economy.	302-10	398
We need the state of Minnesota to protect us from these facilities, and not allow them.	302-11	403
An environmental impact statement needs to be done to examine air quality.	302-7a	4
An environmental impact statement needs to be done to examinewater quality.	302-7b	2
I believe that a more in depth study into the environmental impact of a production of this size.	303-1	29
This is new territory for MN and its citizens deserve the time and attention to their communities that an in depth study provides.	303-2	397
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	304-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	304-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	304-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	304-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	304-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	304-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	304-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	304-8	1
Riverview Dairy should be required to submit an environmental impact report!!	305-1	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	306-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	306-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	306-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	306-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	306-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	306-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	306-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	306-8	1
I appreciate and respect the process to get these permits	307-1	70
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	308-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	308-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	308-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	308-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	308-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	308-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	308-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	308-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	309-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	309-2	134

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	309-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	309-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	309-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	309-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	309-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	309-8	1
I care deeply about the environmental impact of this CAFO.	309-9	167
I care deeply about keeping Minnesota and its water sustainable for future generations.	309-10	195
I care deeply about keeping Minnesota and its water clean for future generations.	309-10	388
I feel NO person or company should have this many animals, for many reasons. Impact of land around it.	310-1	132
Animal safety due to equipment failure or help issues.	310-2	74
I own land near the project both north (Alberta) and to the south (south of Oliver lake), not close but very possible having an impact.	310-3	432
There are many USFWS properties nearby as well.	310-4	174
This does nothing to help locals either.	310-5	397
They have a track record of manure spills.	310-6	373
I really believe a project of this size needs EIS study done.	310-7	1
I actually believe they may have too many cows already.	310-8	434
We don't want of need this!	311-1	432
Please consider the soil.	312-1	183
Please consider your neighbors.	312-2	397
This large number of animals in one location is not healthy for the environment.	312-3	434
No project of significant size such as this should be allowed in a community without an environmental impact study.	313-1	19
We can destroy the environment easily but we can't restore it without a great deal of money.	313-2	432
Do the right thing.	313-3	432
It is essential that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	314-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now:	314-2	134

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	314-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	314-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	314-5	196
Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	314-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	314-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	314-8	1
When is enough enough ???	315-1	432
There is already an abundance of dairy cows cattle in this area of MN.	315-2	434
This will be one more nail in the coffin for the small dairy producer.	315-3	400
I can't imagine that such a large operation is good for the environment.	316-1	167
I can't imagine that such a large operation is good for the surrounding rural neighborhood.	316-2	397
You must at least do an environmental review.	316-3	29
While I don't live in that area (I live in the city now), I grew up in west central Minnesota and my brother now operates an industrial hog operation on what used to be our family farm. Not only is it cruel to the animals to be confined as they are	316-4	74
While I don't live in that area (I live in the city now), I grew up in west central Minnesota and my brother now operates an industrial hog operation on what used to be our family farm the manure lagoons reek and make living in the area so unpleasant.	316-5	369
Plus the manure concentration on the fields and the inevitable contamination of waterways are a travesty to the environment.	316-6	289
I urge you to take a closer look at this proposal for the West River Dairy Expansion -- and deny the request.	316-7	33
We need to move to more sustainable and regenerative agriculture in this state -- and stop these huge livestock operations!	316-8	432
I am terrified by the Riverview proposal. Living nearby the Daley Farms in the karst topography of southeast Minnesota, I feel the anxiety of these neighboring communities.	317-1	432
These monstrous CAFOs demonstrate selfish disregard for the health of everyone, even their own families.	317-2	395
These monstrous CAFOs demonstrate selfish disregard for the safety of everyone, even their own families.	317-3	395
These monstrous CAFOs demonstrate selfish disregard for the economic conditions of everyone, even their own families.	317-4	398
These industrial farms will leave a "legacy" of greed.	317-5	403
These industrial farms will leave a "legacy" of toxic well water.	317-6	193
These industrial farms will leave a "legacy" of deserted towns.	317-7	397
These industrial farms will leave a "legacy" of human suffering.	317-8	397

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This is beyond opinion. They are undisputable facts.	317-9	403
I am writing to express my concerns with Riverview, LLP's proposal to build the first livestock operation in Minnesota to hold over 20,000 animal units.	318-1	434
The MPCA must recognize the fundamentally new nature of this threat.	318-2	432
This proposal must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on its impacts on local roads before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	318-4	8
This proposal must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on its impacts on existing independent family dairy farms to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	318-5	12
Minnesota is is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	318-6	400
Agricultural consolidation is pushing small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	318-7	400
We must require an EIS before this proceeds.	318-8	1
This proposal must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on its impacts on water quality to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	318-3a	2
This proposal must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on its impacts on water quantity to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	318-3b	3
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	319-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	319-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	319-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	319-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	319-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	319-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	319-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement	319-8	1
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	320-1	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	320-2	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	320-3	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement	320-4	1
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on water quality and quantity to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	321-1	1
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on local roads to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	321-2	8
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on existing independent family dairy farms to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	321-3	12
This is what the MPCA is for, to assess the potential for harmful impacts to our local environments, both ecological and social. According to the documents filed by Riverview, the proposed operation would require:	321-4	32
To supply water for the operation, the facility will be allowed to pump 226 million gallons from an off-site well per year. For reference, the City of Morris, which is home to over 5,000 people, is permitted to pump up to 300 million gallons of water a year.	321-5	195
Liquid manure storage encompassing 250 million gallons of waste.	321-6	391
13,200 acres of farmland for manure application.	321-7	311
Riverview has a recent history of a manure spill in western Minnesota.	321-8	373
In Arizona, the company also recently agreed to pay $11 million to residents affected by the dairy's overpumping.	321-9	194
The proposed Stevens County site sits within five miles of eight different protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas and is part of the Pomme de Terre River watershed, just 25 miles from its confluence with the Minnesota River. A facility of this scale located in such a vulnerable area calls for a thorough environmental review.	321-10	174
Just as importantly, an EIS of the West River Dairy Expansion proposal would address socio-economic impacts.	321-11	14
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices. I have watched this happen in my own county here in Minnesota and the local push-back necessary to prevent the exploitation of resources.	321-12	398
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land. This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	321-13	398
I completely support the expansion of West River Dairy.	322-1	431
This project is too large for the area.	323-1	434
The pollution impact has not been studied and presented.	323-2	146

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This is about greed	323-3	403
This is not about the health of the animals.	323-4	74
This is not about the health of the community.	323-5	395
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	324-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	324-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	324-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	324-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	324-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	324-6	266
Advancing permi ts without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	324-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	324-8	1
Surely an expansion of this size and scope warrants an Environmental Impact Study!	325-1	1
The people of Stevens county, and indeed of all Minnesota, deserve this.	325-2	432
Our environment, and its ability to sustain itself, needs more than just rubber-stamp approvals.	325-3	32
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	326-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	326-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	326-3	195
solid manure.	326-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	326-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	326-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	326-7	34

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	326-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairv be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	327-1	1
It is nearlv twice as big as anv current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now	327-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	327-3	195
Huqe waste output: The facilitv would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure anc wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	327-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	327-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	327-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	327-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement	327-8	1
I urge you to oppose the expansion of West River Dairy, due to the large environmental impacts on local communities.	328-1	432
I urge you to oppose the expansion of West River Dairy, due to the health impacts on local communities.	328-2	432
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	329-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	329-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	329-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	329-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	329-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	329-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	329-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	329-8	1
This huge expansion of factory dairy farming poses risks for environmental pollution.	330-1	167

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This huge expansion of factory dairy farming poses risks for massive amounts of water.	330-2	195
This huge expansion of factory dairy farming poses risks for financial risks for smaller dairy farmers.	330-3	398
Please do an Environmental Impact Statement and give a very careful, thoughtful assessment of this project.	330-4	1
This huge expansion of factory dairy farming poses risks for environmental pollution.	331-1	167
This huge expansion of factory dairy farming poses risks for massive amounts of water.	331-2	195
This huge expansion of factory dairy farming poses risks for financial risks for smaller dairy farmers.	331-3	398
Please do an Environmental Impact Statement and give a very careful, thoughtful assessment of this project.	331-4	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	332-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	332-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	332-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	332-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	332-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	332-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	332-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	332-8	1
Riverview Dairy must be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	333-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Current concerns:	333-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	333-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	333-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	333-5	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	333-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	333-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	333-8	1
After learning about this proposal, I believe it is essential that Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact report.	334-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Current concerns:	334-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	334-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	334-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	334-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	334-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	334-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Report.	334-8	1
This project, due to its unique size and impact, requires a mandatory EIS.	335-1	1
Anything less would be setting a precedent in our state that threatens all future land use for dairy operations by ignoring massive impacts on already fragile natural resources.	335-2	400
Farming cows is a huge contributor to global warming.	336-1	103
Farming cows is a huge contributor to environmental damage.	336-2	167
Please do not expand, even with the most up to date farming practices, this is not good for our climate as a whole.	336-3	33
Please do not expand, even with the most up to date farming practices, this is not good for our protected and already struggling Pomme de Terre watershed.	336-4	33
Riverview Dairy must be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	337-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Current concerns:	337-2	134

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	337-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	337-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	337-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	337-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	337-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	337-8	1
As a homeowner who can't drink their well water due to the high nitrate concentration in it. It is absolutely abhorrent to see and hear such a violation of nature being proposed.	338-1	193
I've never understood why humans are so hell-bent on creating food in such a terrible way.	338-2	403
This is a horrific idea. It's terrible for humans.	338-3	403
It's terrible for humans.	338-4	403
It's terrible for animals	338-5	403
it's only good for a few Farmers Pocketbooks!	338-6	400
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	339-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	339-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	339-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	339-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	339-5	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	339-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	339-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	339-8	1
Aside from environmental concerns wich are innumerable, factory farming is a disgustingly cruel practice.	340-1	432
It should be illegal it is animal cruelty it is human cruelty.	340-2	74
It is vital that the Riverview Dairv be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	340-3	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now	340-4	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	340-5	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquic manure and wastewater annually, plus 26.400 tons of solid manure.	340-6	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	340-7	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	340-8	266
Advancing permits without a ful understanding of groundwater anc water-quality risks is irresponsible.	340-9	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a ful Environmental Impact Statement.	340-10	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	341-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	341-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	341-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	341-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	341-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	341-6	266

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	341-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	341-8	1
The proposed project requires a full environmental impact statement.	342-1	1
Even without one, it is obvious that this project is incompatible with a state that values its lands and waters.	342-2	432
CAFOs enrich a few at the expense of many, bringing minimal economic benefits.	342-3	398
CAFOs enrich a few at the expense of many, bringing very high environmental costs.	342-4	167
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	343-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	343-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	343-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	343-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	343-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	343-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	343-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	343-8	1
It is vital that we require this riverview dairy expansion project to run an environmental impact study before it's approved.	344-1	1
The West River Dairy Expansion would result in enormous environmental harm to its surroundings	345-1	167
The West River Dairy Expansion would result in massive water use would be highly detrimental to the groundwater reserves..	345-2	195
The West River Dairy Expansion would result in massive water use would be highly detrimental to the Pomme de Terre watershed where the expansion would sit.	345-3	182
The West River Dairy Expansion would result in enormous waste output would be highly detrimental to the groundwater reserves.	345-4	193
The West River Dairy Expansion would result in enormous waste output would be highly detrimental to the Pomme de Terre watershed where the expansion would sit.	345-5	182
The EAW is merely assurance by the proposer that all is well.	346-1	50
The Riverview Expansion project needs a thorough Environmental Impact Study to recognize risks across the board, and how, if possible, to prevent permanent damages.	346-2	1
A healthy rural future is essential; myopic focus on short-term profits is predictably destructive.	346-3	397

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is inconceivable that a dairy operation of this size will not heavily impact soil in the surrounding area.	347-1	434
It is inconceivable that a dairy operation of this size will not heavily impact water in the surrounding area.	347-2	434
It is inconceivable that a dairy operation of this size will not heavily impact air quality in the surrounding area.	347-3	434
Riverview Dairy should be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	347-4	1
It will drain local water resources	347-5	195
create hundreds of millions of gallons of wastewater annually.	347-6	391
Groundwater impacts are unknown.	347-7	190
This should not go forward without knowing environmental impacts.	347-8	29
Water resources in the area are unknown, so permitting a heavy water user does not sound appropriate.	347-9	190
A full environmental Impact Statement should be required.	347-10	1
I am writing here today for my support for West River Dairy Expansion.	348-1	431
If this doubling of the size of Minnesota's current CAFO capacity can be approved without a full environmental review process, we are truly in trouble.	349-1	29
I find it creepy that agricultural interests in our state would try to slide this under the door rather than achieve a legitimate approval. Operating in this fashion betrays the trust of the public and weakens our state.	349-2	51
Industrial scale agriculture has been an environmental disaster	350-1	167
Industrial scale agriculture has been a disaster, to say nothing about animal welfare (cruelty).	350-2	74
Listen to the folks most affected. Deny the Riverview permit.	350-3	33
This is just simply horrible... as a small family farmer who is hoping to keep our little farm going, we need to stop more expansion from the corporate farms!	351-1	400
We are being swallowed up by these giant corporate farms	351-2	400
wells are a problem	351-3	195
river pollution is a problem	351-4	289
If this passes it's because the pockets are too deep!	351-5	432
Do you ever say no?	352-1	432
How many is too many cows?	352-2	434
How much does this operation actually pay for their water - all that water for the cows and to grow the feed?	352-3	233
This is North America's largest dairy operation - the largest - The Minnesota River Basin is overrun with manure from CAFO's - and you are continuing to permit more facilities.	352-4	52
This proposed project expansion is on sensitive ground - there are wetlands just to the south of the proposed site.	352-5	291
What we know about wetlands is that they are a complex network of capillaries and underground water pathways that goes significantly beyond what we can see above ground	352-6	296
This proposal needs a comprehensive EAW and the impacts to local well water.	352-7	29
This proposal needs a comprehensive EAW and the impacts to the Pomme de Terre River.	352-8	29

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
What is the threshold for saying no - just because someone wants to built it - doesn't meet that we have the land and water to support it.	352-9	19
The impacts on the surrounding area is significant.	352-10	432
This operation has become a monopoly in the dairy industry and has put many small family farms out of business.	352-11	400
At some point the well being of the greater community should outweigh the economic interests of this company.	352-12	397
At some point the well being of the future of our water should outweigh the economic interests of this company.	352-13	295
At some point the well being of the air should outweigh the economic interests of this company.	352-14	81
At some point the well being of the soil health should outweigh the economic interests of this company.	352-15	183
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	353-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	353-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	353-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	353-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	353-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	353-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	353-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	353-8	1
Due to past problems with water access for neighbors, I believe very thorough studies should be done before this project would even be considered.	354-1	225
Due to past problems with possible degradation of our water quality, I believe very thorough studies should be done before this project would even be considered.	354-2	29
Due to past problems with just the sheer size of the proposed dairy, I believe very thorough studies should be done before this project would even be considered.	354-3	434
This is too large an operation for our area.	354-4	434
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	355-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	355-2	134

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	355-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	355-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	355-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	355-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	355-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	355-8	1
This comes strongly urging an environmental impact study for the proposed West River Dairy Expansion in Stevens County, Minnesota.	356-1	1
These mega-dairies are one of the worst things to happen to Chippewa and Swift County. They are nothing more than massive land grabs by a small group of people who claim these operations "help the community," when in reality it's simply greed feeding greed.	357-1	432
What they don't tell the public is the real cost--paid by local taxpayers: Damaged roads: Rural roads are deteriorating under the weight of constant heavy truck traffic, leaving counties to foot the repair bill.	357-2	308
What they don't tell the public is the real cost--paid by local taxpayers: Subsidized labor: These operations bring in H-2A workers and then receive subsides for their food, housing, and wages--another hidden benefit that doesn't help the community at all.	357-3	398
What they don't tell the public is the real cost--paid by local taxpayers: Strained schools: Our school districts are overwhelmed, especially as they work to support students whose families come to the dairies and who are still learning English.	357-4	397
Take a step back and ask: Who actually benefits?	357-5	397
From where I live, it's clear that the dairies and the large farming operations tied to them are trying to grab and control every acre possible. They are not your friends or your neighbors; they are businesses determined to expand at any cost.	357-6	398
On top of that, they work to place their people on township boards, planning and zoning boards, and other local government committees--giving them influence at every level while the broader community pays the price.	357-7	397
Mega-dairies don't strengthen our counties--they hollow them out.	357-8	397
Growing up on a 28 cow 228 acre farm, I saw our livestock use Stumptown Creek as a toilet. 20 years later, we had no livestock near the creek	358-1	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Our septic tank flowed water into the pasture near a tree I stayed away from. 20 years later, a new up to date field for our waste	358-2	432
It would seem to me 26,000 cattle might do more damage than our 28 cows.	358-3	432
Dad applied anhydrous ammonia on our neighbor's corn fields. He needed the money to buy the land. That polluted our well water.	358-4	206
Do an EIS.	358-5	1
Please give West River a permit for the expansion.	359-1	431
This is a horrid idea.	360-1	432
Please I want to see a complete environmental study and economic assessment.	360-2	1
[Please I want to see a complete environmental study and economic assessment.] This needs to be done before any further advancement of the project.	360-3	38
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	361-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	361-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	361-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	361-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	361-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	361-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	361-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	361-8	1
I think that the proposed project should be rejected.	362-1	33
As a PhD aquatic ecologist and freshwater biologist, I see the proposed project as a threat to public health in the nearby communities.	362-2	395
Confined animal operations have long been known to degrade surface water supplies by increasing the incidence of fecal coliform.	362-3	264
Confined animal operations have long been known to degrade surface water supplies by increasing nitrogen and phosphorous loading.	362-4	264

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Confined animal operations have long been known to degrade surface water supplies by increasing the concentration and prevalence of antibiotic resistant bacterial communities.	362-5	264
Confined animal operations have long been known to degrade groundwater supplies by increasing the incidence of fecal coliform.	362-6	193
Confined animal operations have long been known to degrade groundwater supplies by increasing nitrogen and phosphorous loading.	362-7	193
Confined animal operations have long been known to degrade groundwater supplies by increasing the concentration and prevalence of antibiotic resistant bacterial communities.	362-8	193
I have further concerns about how the proposed project will influence water availability to nearby communities as climate change continues to alter water availability in space and time.	362-9	195
Finally, I see the proposed project as a potential threat to community health because a confined animal operation of this size increases the risk of rapid pathogen spread should one of the emerging viruses establish within the herd (e.g., avian influenza). Not only would this hurt the cattle in such an operation, but concentrating animals in these quantities increases the risk of spread to human populations as well.	362-10	395
The Riverview expansion should require a full EIS.	363-1	1
GHG testing and estimating that was done as part of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet was based only on the number of cows they intend to add, not including the base amount of cows they already have. This leaves an incomplete picture of the true costs to the environment, the community, the water, and the land.	363-2	99
Riverview has a recent history of manure spills in western Minnesota.	363-3	373
The Environmental Assessment Worksheet prepared for this project claims that the project will overall reduce GHG emissions because they will not be using anhydrous ammonia on the fields that have manure being spread on them. This grossly undercounts the true emissions of an operation of this scale and must be reviewed further in a full Environmental Impact Statement.	363-4	5
It seems that Minnesota's ground water is under attack from all sides. Mining, ai farms and big ag businesses.	364-1	227
The quantity of water they will use is unacceptable.	364-2	195
The quantity of water they will pollute is unacceptable.	364-3	218
Can they treat and reuse the treated water instead of using fresh water?	364-4	237
This seems like the perfect way to introduce nitrates into large areas of our groundwater.	364-5	193
Will that mean users of groundwater in areas where waste is spread will need to upgrade their home wells or home treatment systems?	364-6	193
I am also concerned by the smell.	364-7	83
Driving through areas with huge feedlots really stink even in cities near huge feedlots by like Colorado going out of Denver and North Platte, Nebraska.	364-8	83
If you're going to spread liquid manure over huge areas then huge areas will stink.	364-9	83

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Basically I am saying that this does not benefit the community,	364-10	397
Basically I am saying that this does not benefit small farmers	364-11	400
Basically I am saying that this does not benefit other water users	364-12	247
I don't think this would be acceptable unless they come up with an environmentally sound method to manage manure that doesn't contribute to nitrate contamination in local wells.	364-13	193
A dairy of this size has the potential to have severe, adverse environmental impacts.	365-1	167
An EIS is needed to determine to what extent this facility will have on the environment and area.	365-2	1
As a Morris, Minnesota resident for almost 20 years, I would like to voice my opposition to the expansion project proposed.	366-1	432
The leadership of the LLC exploits workers.	366-2	432
The leadership of the LLC breaks contracts.	366-3	432
The leadership of the LLC are not good stewards of the land they currently possess.	366-4	432
They will cut corners to make more of a profit.	366-5	432
The amount of resources required for such an expansion will put the entire community at risk, people I worked with and care about.	366-6	432
I encourage you not to approve it!	366-7	432
I oppose any opperation of this size with the volume of water used and the affects it would have on the local aquafers.	367-1	195
I oppose any opperation of this size to the amount of waste produced.	367-2	432
I oppose any opperation of this size to the amount of methane gas released.	367-3	432
This opperation is not a farm it is an industrial plant not unlike an oil refinery and should have a rigorous environmental impact study before any permit is even considered.	367-4	15
As a resident of Stevens county for almost 17 years, I am EXTREMELY concerned about this proposed expansion, and how it will impact both the quality of life for the people who live here.	368-1	395
As a resident of Stevens county for almost 17 years, I am EXTREMELY concerned about this proposed expansion, and how it will impact the environmental impacts for waterin the area.	368-2	387
As a resident of Stevens county for almost 17 years, I am EXTREMELY concerned about this proposed expansion, and how it will impact the environmental impacts for flora, and fauna in the area.	368-3	169
I wholeheartedly agree with the Land Stewardship Project that a full Environmental Impact Statement must be completed, because of these reasons:	368-4	1
GHG testing and estimating as part of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet was based only on the number of cows Riverview LLP intends to add, not including the base amount of cows they already have. This leaves an incomplete picture of the true costs to the environment, the community, the water, and the land.	368-5	434
This proposed operation is the first of its size in Minnesota. It would be nearly DOUBLE the size of the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers and rural communities. The MPCA should give it scrutiny as such.	368-6	434

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Riverview has a recent history of manure spills in western Minnesota. (YIKES!)	368-7	373
In Arizona, the company also recently agreed to pay $11 million to residents affected by the dairy's overpumping.	368-8	194
The proposed Stevens County site sits within five miles of eight different protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas and is part of the Pomme de Terre River watershed, just 25 miles from its confluence with the Minnesota River.	368-9	174
A facility of this scale located in such a vulnerable area calls for a thorough environmental review.	368-10	29
Minnesota has lost 528 dairy farms in the last 4 years, and what's even more concerning, has lost 1,987 dairy farms since 2017. Our state is losing dozens of dairy farms a year due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	368-11	400
This disaster in price is largely caused by massive dairy operations, being able to glut the milk market with cheaper-to-produce milk, making it hard for smaller family farms to compete.	368-12	398
As a descendant of Minnesota dairy farmers, this expansion seems contrary to the spirit of supporting our hard-working citizens and farmers.	368-13	398
The Environmental Assessment Worksheet prepared for this project claims that the project will overall reduce GHG emissions because they will not be using anhydrous ammonia on the fields that have manure being spread on them. This grossly undercounts the true emissions of an operation of this scale and must be reviewed further in a full Environmental Impact Statement.	368-14	5
As a resident of Morris, MN, I am very concerned about the environmental effects of the proposed Riverview Dairy expansion.	369-1	167
The project of such scale has a potential to negatively effect the environment in a variety of ways.	369-2	133
The proposed location is within five miles of eight different protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas and is part of the Pomme de Terre River watershed, just 25 miles from its confluence with the Minnesota River.	369-3	174
A possible manure spill would be devastating to the livelihood of nearby population.	369-4	385
A possible manure spill would be devastating to the livelihood of nearby farms.	369-5	385
A possible manure spill would be devastating to the livelihood of nearby wildlife.	369-6	160
The changed landscape would also affect plants and insects habitats and may create a potential for animal and plant diseases spreading to nearby family farms and other small agricultural businesses.	369-7	178
The consequences of building such an unprecedented project need to be thoroughly evaluated.	369-8	433
The project of this size must undergo a full and thorough Environmental Impact Statement.	369-9	1
This is a matter of highest importance for Morris and its surrounding areas.	369-10	432
As a resident of Stevens County MN, where the proposed Riverview Dairy expansion would be located, I am concerned about its environmental impact and would like the MPCA to require a full Environmental Impact Statement before the project can go forward.	370-1	1
This project would more than double the size of Riverview's dairy operation in Stevens County, with the final size being almost twice as large as the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units.	370-2	434
A project of this unprecedented scope demands particular care in reviewing its impacts, which a full Environmental Impact Statement would provide.	370-3	15

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
In addition, I believe it is important for the EIS to take into account the total projected size of Riverview's Stevens County dairy operations, including existing animal units, not just the size of the expansion. Total size matters because the larger the total size, the larger the potential impact if something goes wrong.	370-4	11
For example, Riverview's Feb. 2025 manure spill in Kandiyohi County likely spilled approximately the same amount of manure in 5 days that an average sized MN dairy farm would produce in 6 months, based on early reports.	370-5	434
For the health and safety of our environment, please say no !	371-1	167
For the health and safety of our water, please say no !	371-2	388
For the health and safety of our clean air, please say no !	371-3	81
For the health and safety of our soil health, please say no !	371-4	183
The Riverview Dairy must be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	372-1	1
This proposed farm is almost twice as big as any current Minnesota dairy operation.	372-2	434
It will cause enormous environmental damage.	372-3	167
I am an environmental educator, and here are the main concerns I have about this farm.	372-4	432
Poo-lution The 11,000 proposed new cattle will create almost as much biological waste as all the people in Saint Paul. And this waste doesn't get treated in a sewage treatment facility. Instead, it gets sprayed on nearby fields.	372-5	434
The Pomme de Terre watershed is designated "sensitive," and the Pomme de Terre River is already listed as "impaired". Adding this much waste to the watershed will almost certainly worsen the situation.	372-6	182
Water Use The farm will pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year from the aquifer. Is this a little or a lot relative to what the area can handle? I don't know, and neither does anyone else. The DNR hasn't analyzed what this means in the context of what the environment can handle. It is irresponsible to permit such large withdrawals without knowing if the system can handle it. What we do know is that throughout the US, groundwater resources have been declining. This is an issue that needs to be evaluated before the project moves forward.	372-7	195
Advancing permits without a full understanding of water-quality and groundwater risks is irresponsible.	372-8	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	372-9	1
Dairy consumption in the US is flat. The only way adding a dairy of this size makes sense is if they are expecting to push other, family-scale dairies out of business, or if they are planning to export their products to other countries. Neither reason is justification for harming our beautiful, clean Minnesota environment.	372-10	400
Thank you for reading my comment. I am extremely worried and frustrated by the Riverview Dairy proposal to install the largest CAFO MN has ever seen in the area where I live, work and recreate on the local waterways.	373-1	265
MN has a climate action plan with tangible goals set for 2030 and beyond. This proposal would move us against those goals as the emissions from the cows, the usage of water and the transportation of cattle would cause significant impacts to the state.	373-2	120
The water usage outline by Riverview is as much as the town of Morris is allowed- so where is that water coming from?	373-3	195
Are we willing to empty our already limited aquifers in the name of a mega corporation over our own residents?	373-4	235

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
At the very least we need an environmental impact statement so we can make sure we are aware of the risks, and who the risks will affect were something to go wrong or over pumping to occur.	373-5	1
Riverview has a history of over pumping and is currently facing a multi million dollar pay out to residents they affected by over pumping in AZ- a state so obviously in need of proper water usage as they are currently experiencing water shortages, how would we trust them to follow rules set in MN? (Inside Climate News; Arizona Comes to Agreement With Major Dairy Farm to Cut Groundwater Pumping That Is Draining Wells)	373-6	194
Riverview also had a recent MN spill in this area with limited transparency on results and impacts to the surrounding residents.	373-7	373
I work with farmers everyday. The amount of small farms in MN, especially small dairies has seen a devastating downfall.	373-8	400
MN is supposed to be a state the leads the way in climate action.	373-9	120
MN is supposed to be a state the leads the way in care of residents.	373-11	397
It is really hard to see how this huge feedlot is good for anyone other than Riverview.	373-12	397
When is enough enough?	373-13	432
We are going to continue losing small farm families and residents in our small towns, which are in need of revitalization efforts- not support for huge mega operations whose use of resources greatly overshadows the need of local residents and businesses.	373-14	397
Due to the unprecedented size of the facility, an Environmental Impact Statement should be done.	373-15	1
It's what's right for our communities.	373-16	432
MPCA needs to find a way to start putting the needs of our communities over the needs of a small percentage of large corporations.	373-17	432
MPCA needs to find a way to start saying no to projects that go against our state climate action plan.	373-18	120
MPCA needs to find a way to start saying no to projects that go against our natural resources.	373-19	180
MPCA needs to find a way to start saying no to projects that go against the wellbeing of our communities.	373-20	397
Please consider the need for a EIS.	373-21	1
In my opinion, this is far too many animals proposed in this project and must have a thorough environmental review!	374-1	27
These massive dairy operations have glutted the market and tightened their hold on the industry.	374-2	398
This project would push more family farmers out.	374-3	400
This project would decimate our main street businesses.	374-4	398
Inconsistent and below cost of production prices are affecting smaller family farms.	374-5	398
The area where this operation is proposed is already considered a "sensitive watershed." This massive dairy project would only do more damage.	374-6	190
There NEEDS to be an EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) done before they are allowed to go forward.	374-7	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	375-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	375-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	375-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	375-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	375-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	375-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	375-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	375-8	1
I am strongly opposed to moving forward with this proposed expansion without a much more comprehensive environmental and socioeconomic review.	376-1	28
Riverview's plan would blanket a huge area with manure, and I do not see sufficient evidence that it will neither create severe air pollution.	376-2	81
Riverview's plan would blanket a huge area with manure, and I do not see sufficient evidence that it will neither create severe water pollution, the latter especially during extreme weather events.	376-3	339
I am alarmed at the apparent assumption that there is no need to look seriously at the risk to the Pomme de Terre and Minnesota River watersheds.	376-4	182
This company does not have a good record, so assurances about solid and liquid waste management practices ring hollow to me!	376-5	373
The water demand is also excessive.	376-6	195
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	377-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	377-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	377-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	377-4	391

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	377-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	377-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	377-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	377-8	1
I support the West River Dairy Expansion in Stevens County.	378-1	431
I am writing to plead that an environmental assessment be required for a project of this size.	379-1	1
It is well known that feedlots have detrimental effects on the environment, such as potential manure spills.	379-2	385
It is well known that feedlots have detrimental effects on the environment, such as potential manure mismanagement.	379-3	371
It is well known that feedlots have detrimental effects on the environment, such as intensive water usage.	379-4	195
We have a duty to protect our wildlife and natural resources from unintended consequences of large operations such as these.	379-5	173
Not to mention, the impact on our small farmers - this will be driving more and more small farmers out of business and taking away their acres of land, when we as a state have a responsibility to support them and not hand over their businesses to corporations.	379-6	400
Please consider doing a full environmental review of this proposed expansion and I thank you for your time.	379-7	1
I am strongly opposed to the expansion of Riverview Dairy.	380-1	432
The operation is already large and has caused problems with both groundwater extraction beyond what the current wells can handle sustainably.	380-2	214
The operation is already large and with the waste generated also has caused issues.	380-3	373
The other wells in the area are at risk due to overuse.	380-4	195
The air pollution caused by an expansion is also problematic.	380-5	81
Such a large operation is not conducive to animal welfare.	380-6	74
Such a large operation is not conducive to human health.	380-7	395
I strongly encourage the MPCA to deny the application for expansion.	380-8	33
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	381-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	381-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	381-3	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	381-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	381-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	381-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	381-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	381-8	1
Do the right thing for your future self and your prodigy. We shouldn't need to convince you this is simply bad form and isn't needed.	382-1	432
The pressure on you and us by corporate entities has to stop.	382-2	432
It's destructive and inhumane.	382-3	432
Do the right thing instead. It will build your character and you'll thank yourself later.	382-4	432
Please get an environmental impact evaluation on this CAFO expansion before permission to build is given	383-1	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	384-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	384-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	384-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	384-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	384-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	384-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	384-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	384-8	1
Please require an EIS for this outrageously sized proposed dairy! Thank you!	385-1	15
I support this project and believe the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) process is sufficient.	386-1	431
I do not believe a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is necessary.	386-2	20
Riverview dairy should be granted the permit for expansion.	387-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This is why I support their expansion efforts	387-2	431
I want to express my support to the West River Dairy Expansion project	388-1	431
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	389-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	389-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	389-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	389-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	389-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	389-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	389-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement	389-8	1
Minnesota's water is the most important resource we have!	390-1	432
I've moved from western Wisconsin in this past year, so I know first hand the effects of CAFOs. Don't let corporate money get in the way of protecting water for all.	390-2	432
It is extremely important to me that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement	391-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous.	391-2	134
Riverview, in addition to the devastating ethical and inhumane nature of dairy farming would have a negative impact on the surrounding natural environment in the form of millions of gallons of water used.	391-3	195
Riverview, would have an enormous waste output in a critical migratory bird habitat.	391-4	172
Riverview, would have groundwater impacts that have not yet been evaluated by the DNR via a hydrologic survey and we don't know what impact such massive water withdrawals would have on aquifers.	391-5	196
If this expansion were to happen, there would be catastrophic impact to sensitive waters in the Pomme de Terre watershed.	391-6	182
Continuing this effort without a full understanding of water quality impacts is wrong and not right for Minnesota.	391-7	388
Continuing this effort without a full understanding of habitat impacts is wrong and not right for Minnesota.	391-8	172
I demand that the MPCA require a full environmental impact statement for review.	391-9	1
I again reiterate that this is in effort to mitigate additional damages that would be brought to the surrounding animals and environment in addition to the already treacherous atrocities committed each day against the cows subject to dairy farming.	391-10	432
Please do the right thing here.	391-11	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
As a very concerned citizen who lives and farms by one of their sites other then this one I can't emphasize enough that they need to be stopped from further expansion at this site and other sites in the future	392-1	432
I'm very concerned about our environment and our water quality from the stain they put on everything.	392-2	388
I'm very concerned about our environment and our water supply from the stain they put on everything.	392-3	195
I know there has been manure spills that have been cleaned up before they are reported to the MPCA.	392-4	385
I have watched what use to be a very peaceful and safe area to live and farm in to become a very unsafe area to live and farm in because of them.	392-5	397
Our quality of the environment is deteriorating very from fast from them now.	392-7	167
The traffic increase from them is really high and basically hazardous. State highways 29 and 40 have heavy traffic use from them all the year along.	392-8	304
The manure smell at many times is really bad at times of the year and can be smelt from a distance of 4-5 miles away.	392-9	369
the roadways from the trucks that are hauling it.	392-10	385
I can't emphasize enough about our environment.	392-11	167
I can't emphasize enough about our water supply.	392-12	195
I can't emphasize enough about our quality of water.	392-13	388
I can't emphasize enough about our environment and our water supply. Both are very precious resources.	392-14	195
I see the bad side and ill side of these large dairies everyday now by living and farming by one.	392-15	432
I'm all for livestock and farming/ag in general but this isn't farming or milking cows at all.	392-16	432
They need to be required to do a EIS.	392-17	1
Who is really benefiting from these large scale dairies from this entity?	392-18	432
As a very concerned citizen I can't empathize enough that this has to be stopped before it's all too late for everyone and our environment. I'm afraid it's already too late almost.	392-19	432
They say an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Riverview, LLP's operation has the potential to pollute nearby already-fragile waterways. And a proposal that would generate over 200 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually–plus 26,400 tons of solid manure–should be examined with great care.	393-1	29
The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped—making it risky to permit large withdrawal.	393-2	196
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	393-3	34
We Minnesotans take pride in our clean environment and this factory farm has the potential to create long-term, negative consequences to our land.	393-4	176
We Minnesotans take pride in our clean environment and this factory farm has the potential to create long-term, negative consequences to our water.	393-5	387
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	393-6	1
I'd rather see more community gardens.	394-1	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
A dairy of this size should be required to meet high standards, both in production and environmental stewardship.	395-1	434
It should be required to file an EIS and to maintain the highest standards in its operation.	395-2	1
I frankly am concerned that, because of its size and influence, ir won't.	395-3	434
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	396-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	396-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	396-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	396-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	396-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	396-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	396-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	396-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	397-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now:	397-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	397-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	397-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	397-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	397-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	397-7	34

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	397-8	1
Stop! No body wants this.	398-1	432
Ruining our water!!!	398-2	387
Ruining our land!!!	398-3	176
Ruining our environment!!!	398-4	167
Disgusting	398-5	432
I would like to require an environmental assessment for this project.	399-1	1
The harms that factory farming has on people are massive and it wouldn't be in the best interests of anyone to have this farm.	399-2	403
The harms that factory farming has on the environment are massive and it wouldn't be in the best interests of anyone to have this farm.	399-3	167
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	400-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	400-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	400-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	400-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	400-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	400-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	400-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	400-8	1
Please don't allow this project to move forward without an environmental impact review.	400-9	1
The MPCA's repeated refusal to order EIS reviews for extremely largescale feedlot projects is an absolute failure to honor the intent and purpose of MEPA, and the protections it provides. If you don't believe me, ask John Herman and Chuck Dayton.	401-1	16

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Environmental Impact Statements under the law are simply more extensive reviews that projects of this complexity must warrant, and applicants must undergo.	401-2	1
Proposals even beyond the multi-thousand animal unit scale, and into the tens of thousands of animal unit scale will soon end up exposing the negligence of the agency in failing to order EIS level reviews when they are so blatantly warranted.	401-3	15
Facilities of this magnitude in other states have literally displaced material human populations through their depletion of aquifers.	401-4	232
Facilities of this magnitude in other states have literally displaced material human populations through their depletion of surface water bodies.	401-5	273
Facilities of this magnitude in other states have literally displaced material human populations through other environmental harms.	401-6	56
environmental review processes by the MPCA will be drawn to the surface.	401-7	53
The thousands of documented pleas the MPCA has received from Minnesota residents to honor entitled protections under MEPA may finally command the attention they have always deserved.	401-8	54
Natural resources in America's West are depleting at a level that makes the future construction of facilities such as proposed unviable in those regions.	401-9	432
The "shit-storm" is coming to Minnesota. Our only shelter, we as residents, and the MPCA as the accountable authority, will be a new adherence to intended conventions of Minnesota Environmental Review regarding NPDES permits, specifically ordering EIS statements when they are appropriate.	401-10	1
We do support the 11,000 cow expansion of West River Dairy.	402-1	431
I do not support an Environmental Impact Study for the expansion	402-2	20
Please do not permit this dairy farm for expansion.	403-1	33
This large a number of cattle is environmentally a disaster where it is located.	403-2	167
This large a number of cattle is totally inhumane to the animals where it is located.	403-3	74
This large a number of cattle is unhealthy for the community where it is located.	403-4	395
This large a facility is totally unacceptable. I think you know that too so don't permit it.	403-5	33
I am a farmer and this size project will absolutely have an outsized environmental impact on Minnesota's water.	404-1	434
I am a farmer and this size project will absolutely have an outsized environmental impact on Minnesota's soil.	404-2	434
I am a farmer and this size project will absolutely have an outsized environmental impact on Minnesota's air.	404-3	434
I work closely with my county Soil and Water Conservation District and am Minnesota Agricultural Water Quality Certified because it is the responsible thing to do.	404-4	403
We have the right to farm, but I know that how I farm affects my neighbors.	404-5	400
I expect reasonable regulation of any industry that impacts public health and well being.	404-6	48
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	405-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	405-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	405-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	405-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	405-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	405-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	405-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	405-8	1
Morris is an important community that has touched many more lives than just the people currently living there. Every town sees people coming and go, especially college towns. They deserve an independent environmental impact study to be done to see what the estimated impact to the surrounding community would be if this unprecedentedly large farm were opened. No matter how small or large a community is, every single one deserves an environmentally safe place to live.	405-9	397
Riverview Dairy must be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	406-1	1
A farm that large will cause serious environmental issues including massive water use.	406-2	195
A farm that large will cause serious environmental issues including possible poisoning of groundwater.	406-3	193
As a resident of Stevens County, I am very troubled by the possible expansion of the West River Dairy.	407-1	432
The sheer enormity of this proposed expansion warrants a full Environmental Impact Statement.	407-2	1
The City of Morris is already effected by the smell of the dairy, especially on summer days, and doubling the herd will only make this problem worse.	407-3	83
And that's not even touching on the millions of gallons of manure waste that would be generated.	407-4	391
I am also against the conglomeration in the ag industry and the squeezing out of smaller family farms, the backbone of rural Minnesota, with anti-competitive practices.	407-5	400
The expansion also seeks to use a tremendous amount of the area's water.	407-6	195
Riverview already has a track record of questionable ethical practices regarding the use of water and overpumping at their Arizona operation.	407-7	194
The amount of pumping they want to do annually in West Central Minnesota would equal about 75% of the amount of water that is pumped for the entire city of Morris.	407-8	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
There are also a number of wildlife protection areas nearby the dairy and manure spills -- which Riverview has had in recent years in this area -- would be disastrous for these lovely areas.	407-9	174
Our family has taken walks and enjoyed these protected areas over the years and we would not want to see it harmed or damaged.	407-10	174
In short, a full Environmental Impact Statement must be required before this proposal by Riverview moves forward.	407-11	1
The MPCA must require a full EIS!	408-1	1
Negatives of this proposal--massive water use.	408-2	195
Negatives of this proposal--huge wastewater output.	408-3	391
Negatives of this proposal--ground water impacts.	408-4	195
Negatives of this proposal-- sensitive, already impaired waters.	408-5	266
I am a resident of Stevens County. I am very troubled by the possible expansion of the West River Dairy.	409-1	432
The size of the proposed operation is too big for our community.	409-2	434
MPCA needs to scutinize the environmental effects on our community.	409-3	397
MPCA needs to scutinize the hydrological effects on our community.	409-4	191
MPCA needs to scutinize the pollution effects on our community.	409-5	397
MPCA needs to scutinize the economic effects on our community.	409-6	398
This proposal by Riverview, LLP, must undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	409-7	1
Riverview has a recent history of manure spills in western Minnesota.	409-8	373
In Arizona it paid $11 million to residents affected by dairy water overpumping.	409-9	432
The proposed Stevens County site sits within 5 miles of eight different protected waterfowl and wildlife areas and is a part of Pomme De Terre River Watershed, 25 miles from its confluence with the Minnesota River. A facility of this scale located in such a vulnerable area calls for a thorough environmental review.	409-10	174
The city of Morris has already a smell of manure from existing West River Dairy on many days of the year. Building CAFO that will hold over 20,000 animal units will make this problem worse.	409-11	369
I am against squeezing out small farmers and replacing them with huge dairy conglomerates.	409-12	397
Small farmers know how to be better stewards of the land than massive dairy operations.	409-13	432
I am also concerned about water overuse .	409-14	195
I am also concerned about contamination of surrounding areas by millions of gallons of manure waste disposal.	409-15	326
In summary, I am calling for a full Environmental Impact Statement before the Riverview expansion proposal moves forward.	409-16	1
The proposed expansion of the West River Dairy is a bad idea.	410-1	432
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	411-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. This expansion would also further erode the ability of small dairies to survive. Having grown up in Marshall, MN, with friends who worked dairy farms, it is heartbreaking to witness the destruction of their way of life in favor of mega operations that are brutal for workers, animals, surrounding communities, and the environment. Here's what we know now:	411-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	411-3	195
—Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	411-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	411-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	411-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	411-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	411-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	412-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	412-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	412-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	412-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	412-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	412-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	412-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	412-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	413-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	413-2	134

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	413-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	413-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	413-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	413-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	413-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	413-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	414-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	414-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	414-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	414-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	414-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	414-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	414-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	414-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	415-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	415-2	134
magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	415-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	415-4	391

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	415-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	415-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	415-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	415-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	416-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	416-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	416-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	416-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	416-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	416-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	416-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	416-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	417-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we Know now.	417-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	417-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	417-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	417-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	417-6	266

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	417-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	417-8	1
THE RIVERVIEW DAIRY PROJECT MUST BE REQUIRED TO GET AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.	418-1	1
And they must be prevented from wrecking our water.	418-2	432
And they must be prevented from wrecking our air.	418-3	432
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	419-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	419-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	419-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	419-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	419-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	419-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	419-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	419-8	1
Please do all necessary steps to make sure water and environmental concerns are addressed before allowing Riverview Dairy from expanding.	420-1	435
Protect Minnesota's environment for future generations.	420-3	432
Minnesota's water is under threat with this project.	420-2a	387
Minnesota's environment is under threat with this project.	420-2b	167
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	421-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what I have learned-	421-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	421-3	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	421-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	421-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	421-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	421-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	421-8	1
I don't live near this proposed project, but I do live in a rural area, and I grew up in a different rural area, and I understand what large animal confinement operations can do to a community.	422-1	397
First of all, the animals suffer.	422-2	74
Stressed and crowded animals do not give healthy milk.	422-3	74
Air and water quality suffer.	422-4	432
Kids can't play outside because of the stench.	422-5	397
Property values decrease.	422-6	397
I am asking that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement for the West River Dairy expansion.	422-7	1
At a time when federal environmental regulations are being rolled back, we need to step up and make sure that Minnesota remains a state that takes care of our lands.	422-8	432
This project would set a dangerous precedent in our state.	422-9	432
Rural communities deserve clean air and clean water and safe and healthy foods	422-10	397
This proposed operation is the first of its size in Minnesota. It would be nearly double the size of the next largest operation in our state in term	423-1	397
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	423-2	397
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	423-3	397
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	423-4	397
No feedlot has ever undergone an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in Minnesota. Each time the MPCA has determined that an operation should undergo one, the operator that requested the permit has withdrawn their application. And all of those operations that were determined to need an EIS were significantly smaller than Riverview's proposed operation will be.	423-5	16
If built, the Riverview operation would be allowed to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year from an off-site well. For reference, the City of Morris, which is home to over 5,000 people, is permitted to pump up to 300 million gallons of water a year.	423-6	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Once constructed, the facility would produce 202,744,000 gallons of liquid manure and wastewater a year and 26,400 tons of solid manure a year.	423-7	391
The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has not yet completed a mapping of Stevens County's groundwater resources and aquifers for their County Geologic Atlas Series. In fact, they have not even begun the hydrological survey of the county.	423-8	196
The Pomme de Terre watershed, where this expansion is proposed, is already considered a sensitive watershed. The MPCA already lists the two closest waterways to the facility, the Pomme de Terre River and an unnamed creek, as impaired, and this proposal would only exacerbate the impairment.	423-9	266
As a local resident and community member, I'm very concerned about the potential environmental impacts of a project of this size.	424-1	432
This project would apparently more than double the size of Riverview's dairy operation in Stevens County, with the final size being almost twice as large as the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units.	424-2	432
A proposal of this type seems worthy of some careful consideration about its possible impacts.	424-3	432
Riverview had a previous manure spill in 2025 and we should be mindful of what could happen when things do not go exactly according to plan with an operation of this size.	424-4	432
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	425-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	425-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	425-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	425-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	425-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	425-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	425-7	34
VIt is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	425-8	1
Please require Riverview Dairy to submit an environmental impact statement.	426-1	1
It is nearly twice the size of current operations in the state, and the environmental damage could be enormous.	426-2	134
The water usage would dramatically increase with unknown groundwater impacts as the DNR hasn't mapped groundwater resources in Stevens County.	426-3	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The nearby Pomme de Terre River are already listed as impaired. The tremendous increase in liquid manure could further damage the river's ecosystem.	426-4	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of the groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	426-5	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	426-6	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	427-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	427-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	427-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	427-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	427-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	427-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	427-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	427-8	1
I do not agree with allowing expansion.	428-1	432
At the very least the likely impacts to to be assessed and reported for informed decision making.	428-2	1
This needs to be a decision based on community wellbeing and health.	428-3	397
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	429-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	429-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	429-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	429-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	429-5	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	429-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	429-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	429-8	1
Please STOP this massive, inhumane treatment of animals!	430-1	432
Please STOP this massive, inhumane treatment of environment!	430-2	432
Please STOP the West River Dairy Expansion.	430-3	432
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	431-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	431-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	431-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	431-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	431-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	431-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	431-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	431-8	1
I attended college at the University of Minnesota Morris, and I believe it is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	432-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	432-2	432
Massive water use: Riverview would pump up to 226 million gallons/year from an off-site well-nearly as much as the entire City of Morris (permitted for 300 million gallons/year for 5,000+ residents).	432-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	432-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped—making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	432-5	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: The expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek-are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	432-6	182
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	432-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	432-8	29
Do not expand this farm!	433-1	432
The environmental damage would be horrible.	433-2	167
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	434-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	434-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	434-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	434-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	434-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	434-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	434-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	434-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	435-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	435-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	435-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	435-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	435-5	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	435-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	435-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	435-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	436-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	436-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	436-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	436-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	436-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	436-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	436-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	436-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	437-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	437-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	437-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	437-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	437-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	437-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	437-7	34

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	437-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	438-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	438-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	438-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	438-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	438-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	438-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	438-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	438-8	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	439-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous.	439-2	134
Many communities living within the vicinity of CAFOs have poor health outcomes as a direct result of the waste escapes into the air and ground water.	439-3	397
As a former public health professional I know these impacts will be vast and will negatively impact the health of communities for generations.	439-4	397
For the safety of all, the Riverview Dairy project must be required to get an Environmental Impact Statement.	440-1	1
I don't understand how this could move forward without an EAW to inform decision makers on impacts to neighbors, the community at large, and the local watershed (possibly even beyond).	441-1	432
Environmental externalities can no longer be ignored while while corporations extract wealth from our communities.	441-2	432
As a small family my farmer I would like to see more energy and $ go into keeping families on the land and keep rural America alive and vibrant.	442-1	397
These huge corporation farms harm MN.	442-2	403
These huge corporation farms the land.	442-3	403
These huge corporation farms harm the local communities.	442-4	397
I support the dairy expansion.	443-1	431
I would like to express my opposition to this project.	444-1	432
The threat to local Waters both above ground must be considered	444-2	289

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The threat to local Waters both below ground must be considered	444-3	182
what will happen to dispose of the massive amount of feces and waste created.	444-4	346
I am requesting you do an Environmental Impact Statement Study of the River West Dairy Expansion.	445-1	1
I support the Land Stewardship Projects concern about this proposed huge farm and it's impact on the land, people, cows, and community.	445-2	432
Consider ALL effected by this decision.	445-3	397
Small is Beautiful!	445-4	432
Factory farms go against everything the Minnesotan people and communities stand for.	446-1	397
They [Minnesotan's] believe in community.	446-2	403
They [Minnesotan's] believe in environment.	446-3	403
They [Minnesotan's] believe in health.	446-4	403
They [Minnesotan's] believe in wellbeing.	446-5	403
Large scale factory farms are terrible for environment	446-6	432
Large scale factory farms are terrible for animals	446-7	74
Large scale factory farms are terrible for surrounding family farms	446-8	397
family farming is what our agriculture is built on and we need to do better in making it easier for small farms family farms to keep their land, to grow, to thrive. When they thrive we thrive.	446-9	397
No one wants a creepy sad industrial farm in our beautiful state.	446-10	432
The West River Dairy Expansion proposal must have a full Environmental Impact Assessment.	447-1	1
The way of life which the citizens of Minnesota value is based on clean water and clean air.	447-2	432
Concentrating so many dairy cows in one place will result in environmental damage.	447-3	167
This high cost is not worth the end result- a high volumn of low-quality milk.	447-4	398
Hi, I am very concerned about this expansion. Please find my comments below.	448-1	432
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	448-2	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	448-3	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	448-4	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	448-5	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	448-6	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	448-7	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	448-8	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	448-9	1
An EIS is a must for something this huge and impactful.	449-1	15
My family home and surrounding land on Frog Lake (Gorter Lake on a map), with familial ownership dating back to the early 1920's to present, sits one mile north of the Riverview LLP dairy. I voiced my concern when it was originally planned and talked to the MPCA at that time, as well. Despite my disapproval and that of many others in the community, the dairy operation went forward.	450-1	432
My concerns over the water table are still at the forefront of my mind, especially since they have increased their capacity from their original plan and now have much larger wants.	450-2	195
My concerns over the tremendous amounts of animal waste are still at the forefront of my mind, especially since they have increased their capacity from their original plan and now have much larger wants.	450-3	391
They have outbid the small farmer to gain more land when land is sold.	450-4	397
What are the working conditions in their barns and what wages do they offer that causes them to bypass American workers and seek cheaper labor and veterinarians from Mexico?	450-5	403
Our beautiful lake, Frog Lake, next to where my late parents' home sits and that I now own, is a wonderful place for waterfowl and game. Artists, naturalists, and conservationists have visited, written about, and painted the wildlife that are regular visitors to the lake, farm and prairie lands in the area. Because of those people and the wildlife, this area has become known to people around the state of Minnesota and the country. The abundance of varied waterfowl is amazing.	450-6	432
What is not amazing is the odor that is carried on the wind from the Riverview Dairy (West River Dairy) one mile away. The odor is so offensive at times that you can't stay in the area. Enjoying the outdoors or having your windows open is impossible.	450-7	83
Most people don't know that the life of a dairy cow at a place like Riverview's is cut short by living all their life on a concrete slab, never being outside to graze in the pasture, and being milked 2 or 3 times per day. Have they not learned anything about how a dairy farm should be operated?	450-8	74
My parents left their home to me when they passed away as a place where my children and grandchildren could come to enjoy the beauty of the surrounding area and the family ties that connect us to this land. My brother continued farming this land after our dad passed away and he has now passed that legacy to his son and two grandsons. The Riverview Dairy (West River Dairy Expansion), just one mile away from where they live and farm, will be an even bigger threat to their health and livelihood if this operation increases capacity.	450-9	397
Let me end by saying this: When money is your god, your hunger to obtain it overtakes your ability for sound reason and compassion.	450-10	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is hard to know where to begin when you are trying to save a place that is part of your own childhood and the area where your mother and extended family were raised and where some still live. When I say "save" that is not an overstatement.	451-1	397
West River Dairy, overseen by Riverview LLP, and its proposed expansion threatens the health of the land in the surrounding area.	451-2	432
West River Dairy, overseen by Riverview LLP, and its proposed expansion threatens the health of the water in the surrounding area.	451-3	193
West River Dairy, overseen by Riverview LLP, and its proposed expansion threatens the health of the wildlife in the surrounding area.	451-4	173
West River Dairy, overseen by Riverview LLP, and its proposed expansion threatens the health of the the people who live in the surrounding area.	451-5	397
West River Dairy, overseen by Riverview LLP, and its proposed expansion threatens the health of the people who visit the surrounding area.	451-6	397
Let me correct that slightly by saying it has ALREADY threatened those things and people since its inception, but now GRAVELY threatens the land.	451-7	432
Let me correct that slightly by saying it has ALREADY threatened those things and people since its inception, but now GRAVELY threatens the water.	451-8	289
Let me correct that slightly by saying it has ALREADY threatened those things and people since its inception, but now GRAVELY threatens the wildlife inhabitants.	451-9	173
Let me correct that slightly by saying it has ALREADY threatened those things and people since its inception, but now GRAVELY threatens the people.	451-10	397
I truly believe it is greed that has been the motivation behind this dairy and the almighty dollar is now threatening an expansion of gross proportions. Gross in every sense of the word.	451-11	432
I visit the area where my mom grew up - just one mile away from West River Dairy - several times a year, as do several of my siblings and their families. Every time, since the day the dairy operation began, we have to cross our fingers that the smell from the dairy doesn't hinder or completely wreck our plans during our time at Frog Lake (Gorter Lake on the map) while visiting family nearby and staying at what was my grandparents' home which my mom owns now.	451-12	435
The lights from the dairy can be easily seen across the field at night, that's how close it is.	451-13	397
My grandfather, Alfred Holslin, bought farmland back in the early 1920's and was married and began raising a family in the 1930's in the area that I am talking about that is so near the West River Dairy and proposed expansion. That legacy of farming was passed down to my uncle, Maurice Holslin, and continues to be carried on by my cousin, Mark Holslin, and his sons, Justin and William Holslin. Not only does an operation like West River Dairy and its overseer, Riverview, LLP, threaten the things I previously mentioned, but it also has a choke hold on the family farms in America.	451-14	397
The average farmer can't compete with corporate or factory farms when it comes to buying land to expand their own operations.	451-15	397

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
When I think about a Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO), such as what is being proposed to expand, I think about my grandpa Al Holslin and how upset he would be over the confinement of such a large amount of animals for "maximizing efficiency" and in knowing what kind of decimation these operations cause to the land, the water, the animals, and the people exposed to it. This dairy and the proposed expansion is crushing my grandfather's dream for future generations. This is just one story. There are more.	451-16	397
Please listen. Don't allow the expansion to go forward.	451-17	432
An EIS should be ordered for this project due to its massive size, which is *11 times* larger than the minimum threshold for an EAW, its likely impacts on ground water and surface water, and the amount of greenhouse gases that are likely to be emitted.	452-1	15
The estimated GHG of 66,324 tons per year is speculative and incomplete.	452-2	104
A full EIS is necessary to determine the true impacts of this proposed operation.	452-3	1
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	453-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	453-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	453-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	453-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	453-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	453-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	453-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact.	453-8	1
I grew up in Morris and attended high school with the Riverview owners.	454-1	435
Do your job as pollution control agents for Minnesota taxpayers and prevent the massive and unnecessary expansion of a greedy operation by irreligious people that will pollute the air you protect.	454-2	432
Do your job as pollution control agents for Minnesota taxpayers and prevent the massive and unnecessary expansion of a greedy operation by irreligious people that will pollute the soil you protect.	454-3	432
It does not serve the residents of Stevens County nor the land.	454-4	432
My concerns regarding this project center on animal welfare and environmental impact.	455-1	74
CAFOs pose well known and documented environmental risk due to manure management.	455-2	349

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
CAFOs pose well known and documented environmental risk as a result of destruction of grazing land.	455-3	171
CAFOs pose well known and documented environmental risk as a result of destruction of wildlife habitat.	455-4	172
Housing nearly 20,000 cows in such a small area is also an obvious animal welfare issue. Cows are biologically designed to graze, not to feed on grains in confinement. This poses many known health risks to the animals and is inherently cruel; collectively we should be moving away from this model of dairying.	455-5	74
Allowing this project to go forward would benefit only the company who will profit from the destruction of the land, the inhumane treatment of the animals, and the many risks to the environment (immediate, long term, and downsteam), and provide no to very little benefit to the people living in its vicinity or Minnesotans at large.	455-6	432
It would be very impressive should Riverview Dairy choose to move to a grazing model of dairy farming, which honors the lives of the cows and benefits our shared environment.	455-7	435
Riverview Dairy must submit an environmental impact statement.	456-1	1
Dairy operations are notorious for water consumption.	456-2	195
Dairy operations are notorious for point source water pollution.	456-3	264
Without an EIS, we will not know the potential harms to weigh against economic benefits.	456-4	1
Large scale factory farming is detrimental to society.	457-1	397
Large scale factory farming is detrimental to small farms.	457-2	397
Large scale factory farming is detrimental to ecosystems.	457-3	165
It's vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	458-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now:	458-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	458-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	458-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	458-5	196
A completed hydrologic survey and geologic atlas will also help understand if the large amount of liquid manure and other pollutants could contaminate drinking water sources.	458-6	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	458-7	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	458-8	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	458-9	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Let's conduct some due diligence.	459-1	29
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	459-2	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	459-3	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	459-4	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	459-5	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	459-6	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	459-7	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	459-8	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	459-9	1
The proposed Riverview CAFO threatens soil.	460-1	183
The proposed Riverview CAFO threatens water quality.	460-2	388
The proposed Riverview CAFO threatens air quality.	460-3	81
The proposed Riverview CAFO threatens human health.	460-4	395
The proposed Riverview CAFO threatens independent family dairy farms.	460-5	398
A proposal of this magnitude, with its attendant threats, requires a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	460-6	1
I worked for the Diocese of New Ulm for 25 years, directing the Social Concerns and Family Life Offices. Over those years I witnessed farm crises by large-scale hog and dairy operations.	460-8	400
I worked for the Diocese of New Ulm for 25 years, directing the Social Concerns and Family Life Offices. Over those years I witnessed the erosion of rural communities by large-scale hog and dairy operations.	460-9	397
I worked for the Diocese of New Ulm for 25 years, directing the Social Concerns and Family Life Offices. Over those years I witnessed the concentration of agricultural production into fewer and fewer hands by large-scale hog and dairy operations.	460-10	400
I worked for the Diocese of New Ulm for 25 years, directing the Social Concerns and Family Life Offices. Over those years I witnessed the pollution of water by large-scale hog and dairy operations.	460-11	264
I worked for the Diocese of New Ulm for 25 years, directing the Social Concerns and Family Life Offices. Over those years I witnessed the pollution of soil by large-scale hog and dairy operations.	460-12	183

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I worked for the Diocese of New Ulm for 25 years, directing the Social Concerns and Family Life Offices. Over those years I witnessed the pollution of air by large-scale hog and dairy operations.	460-13	81
The Diocese of New Ulm is a fifteen county area. The Minnesota River runs diagonally through the area. How will the Riverview proposal affect the watershed feeding the Minnesota River?	460-14	298
How will it affect the water quality of neighboring towns?	460-15	195
How will it affect the air quality of neighboring towns?	460-16	81
How will it affect the the health of neighbors, including students attending the University of Minnesota, Morris?	460-17	395
A full EIS is needed.	460-18	1
PLEASE, PLEASE, Do not allow the mega-huge dairy farm in Stevens County.	461-1	432
We don't need more environmental damage.	461-2	167
These can be smaller and spread out more land wise.	461-3	432
The owners of West River Dairy must be required to file an EIS.	462-1	1
They must prove that the massive amount of manure this operation will produce will not negatively impact the groundwater systems in the area	462-2	386
they must prove they have a sanitary plan for disposing of all the dead animals this operation will produce.	462-3	77
Please do not approve this project without an EIS.	463-1	1
I am concerned about water usage	463-2	195
I am concerned about water usage waste management	463-3	195
I also have concerns about the size of these farming operations and related health of the animals.	463-4	74
contaminate nearby groundwater with nitrogen and phosphorus.	464-1	386
Housing this many dairy cows in one area would produce a very large amount of manure. If not carefully managed, manure runoff will contaminate nearby rivers with nitrogen and phosphorus.	464-2	289
Housing this many dairy cows in one area would produce a very large amount of manure. If not carefully managed, manure runoff will contaminate nearby lakes with nitrogen and phosphorus.	464-3	289
Along with its environmental impacts large dairy operations can also reduce quality of life in the surrounding areas.	464-4	397
Manure produces strong odors and release gases that affect local air quality.	464-5	81
The expansion will increase truck traffic in the community	464-6	304
The expansion will increase noise in the community	464-7	249
The expansion will increase other disturbances in the community	464-8	397
This project will harm the environment and reduce the quality of life of Steven's County residents. The residents that you are expecting to sacrifice their quality of life will have no control over how noise and manure are managed, nor will they benefit from this expansion.	464-9	397
I would like comment in favor of Riverviews expansion.	465-1	431
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	466-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	466-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	466-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	466-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	466-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	466-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	466-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	466-8	1
Managing and land-applying hundreds of millions of gallons of manure each year presents meaningful risks to soil health if nutrients are over-applied.	467-2	371
Managing and land-applying hundreds of millions of gallons of manure each year presents meaningful risks to soil healthif storage systems fail.	467-3	385
Managing and land-applying hundreds of millions of gallons of manure each year presents meaningful risks to groundwater if nutrients are over-applied.	467-4	193
Managing and land-applying hundreds of millions of gallons of manure each year presents meaningful risks to groundwater if storage systems fail.	467-5	194
Managing and land-applying hundreds of millions of gallons of manure each year presents meaningful risks to nearby waterways if nutrients are over-applied.	467-6	274
Managing and land-applying hundreds of millions of gallons of manure each year presents meaningful risks to nearby waterways if storage systems fail.	467-7	270
The project’s projected water use—hundreds of millions of gallons annually—also raises important questions about the long-term sustainability of groundwater withdrawals in westcentral Minnesota, particularly during drought conditions.	467-8	195
Given the proximity of the operation to sensitive watersheds and conservation lands, there is a legitimate concern that nutrient runoff or other environmental impacts could affect nearby ecosystems and wildlife habitat.	467-9	165
In addition to environmental considerations, the scale of the project could alter the character of the local agricultural economy by further concentrating dairy production into very large operations, potentially placing additional pressure on smaller regional farms.	467-10	398

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Rural residents may also experience quality-of-life impacts associated with increased truck traffic of an industrial-scale livestock facility.	467-11	181
Rural residents may also experience quality-of-life impacts associated with odors of an industrial-scale livestock facility.	467-12	83
Rural residents may also experience quality-of-life impacts associated with other by-products of an industrial-scale livestock facility.	467-13	181
Given the size and potential cumulative impacts of this project, it would be prudent to require a more comprehensive environmental review to ensure that all long-term effects on water resources, ecosystems, and rural communities are carefully evaluated before any expansion moves forward.	467-14	29
I grew up in southwest Minnesota and am a proponent of the agriculture community. I chose a career path as a soil scientist because of my love for agriculture and rural communities. This is not a pro- or anti-agricultural issue when weighing this decision. This is a common sense issue and is a fundamental question of what the future of agriculture could or should be. The proposed expansion of West River Dairy does not align with a long-term vision for a resilient and sustainable agricultural community in west-central Minnesota. Sustainable agriculture depends on systems that distribute opportunities broadly, protect shared natural resources, and support diverse, locally rooted farms. Expanding a single dairy operation to nearly 19,000 cows moves in the opposite direction by concentrating production, environmental risk, and economic power into one large corporate entity.	467-15	131
Rather than strengthening the fabric of rural agriculture, projects of this scale often accelerate consolidation and make it more difficult for smaller and mid-sized family farms to compete or remain viable. This model reflects the priorities of industrial agriculture and corporate capitalism—maximizing scale and efficiency—rather than building a diversified agricultural landscape that supports farmers, communities, and ecosystems over the long term.	467-16	398
If we are serious about the future of agriculture in Minnesota, we should be investing in systems that promote stewardship of soil and water, strengthen regional food economies, and create opportunities for many farmers rather than concentrating production in a few massive facilities.	467-17	398
A project of this scale raises important questions about whether our agricultural development choices are guided by long-term sustainability or by short-term economic gain.	467-18	398
At the very least, this project requires an EIS to give local residents a say in what kind of agriculture dominates their community.	467-19	1
The proposed expansion of West River Dairy near Morris raises significant concerns about the environmental impacts associated with such a large-scale livestock operation. Increasing the herd to nearly 19,000 cows would create one of the largest dairy facilities in Minnesota and dramatically increase the volume of manure generated and stored on site.	467-1a	167
I am writing in regard to water quality threats that a very large confinement dairy operation would pose to Stevens County. My connection to the area is that I graduated from the University of Minnesota-Morris in 1998. I was once startled to encounter cows standing in the Pomme de Terre River as I canoed around a bend in the river with a friend. Manure dropping directly in the river is not great, and that was a small herd.	468-1	408

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I also grew up on a farm myself and am familiar with many of the issues facing farmers and rural communities. Concentration in agriculture has greatly reduced the number of farms and led to consolidation of schools, hospitals, and businesses in rural areas in my lifetime.	468-2	398
The proposed expansion would be like having 180 conventional dairy farms concentrated in one place, but it's only promising about 40 extra jobs.	468-3	398
The potential for a hazardous release of manure would be much greater	468-4	385
The people hired to work on the farm do not have the same incentive to care for the land the way that an owner-operator would.	468-5	400
The people hired to work on the farm do not have the same incentive to care for the animals the way that an owner-operator would.	468-6	74
The people hired to work on the farm do not have the same incentive to care for the facilities the way that an owner-operator would.	468-7	435
Climate change may also make flooding events more severe	468-8	100
All of these factors increase the risk of environmental damage posed by this project. Because of the elevated environmental risk this project would impose on Stevens County, I ask that Riverview be required to do a full Environmental Impact Statement.	468-9	1
Hello, as a neighbor in Darnen township, I support this project for the expansion.	469-1	431
I support the expansion of the West River Dairy.	470-1	431
I encourage MPCA to approve this permit and allow growth in my community!	470-2	431
I fully support the West River Expansion.	471-1	431
I support the Riverview expansion and believe it will continue to reflect the same level of care and professionalism.	472-1	431
I am writing this in support of the West River Dairy expansion.	473-1	431
An operation like this must require care of our environment and the impacts it will have on it. I am voting for requiring and environmental impact statement from this company sharing how they intend to clean and return water to the aquifers they're pulling out of.	474-1	2
How is waste being managed properly?	474-2	346
And any other environmental issues that come along with such a large operation without natural buffers.	474-3	167
I do not support large corporations taking away jobs and land from small farmers and local communities.	474-4	398
I am opposed to this proposed huge dairy feedlot in Stevens County.	475-1	432
What are you thinking of having that many cattle along the river?	475-2	432
I grew up in Chippewa County and love cows that funded my college tuition.....but this is unhealthy for them and the people who live in Minnesota.	475-3	74
Water contamination is never a good thing.	475-4	388
This big a herd is not good.	475-5	434

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Please require the massive Riverview Dairy project to get an Environmental Impact Statement.	476-1	1
I am elderly and will live near this massive project. Riverview would pump up to 226 million gallons/year from an off-site well - they will take our water!	476-2	195
And they will generate huge amounts of waste, with unknown groundwater impacts.	476-3	193
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	476-4	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	476-5	1
This will affect my health!	476-6	395
This will affect my drinking water!	476-7	193
Allow expansion. Allow the free market to work.	477-1	431
I am writing about this proposed expansion. While I do not live in Stevens County I live in Minnesota and view this plan as an incredible precedent going in the wrong direction.	478-1	432
The only benefits I see are for the business. The animals will not benefit from this.	478-2	73
The only benefits I see are for the business. The landwill not benefit from this.	478-3	176
The only benefits I see are for the business. The neighbors will not benefit from this.	478-4	397
The only benefits I see are for the business. The the water will not benefit from this.	478-5	406
And over time I wonder if the quality of the milk will be found to be compromised by this type of farming.	478-6	398
I support the West River Dairy expansion	479-1	431
I hope they receive the necessary approvals.	479-2	431
Massive industrial dairy operations are a danger to our environment.	480-1	167
Massive industrial dairy operations are a danger to our rural economy.	480-2	398
I am opposed to this "unprecedented " request that would allow more pollution into the land of beautiful west central Minnesota.	481-2	176
This business also appears to be monopolizing the wellbeing of many of our small farmers.	481-4	400
Vote NO!	481-5	432
MN DNR is currently reviewing groundwater appropriation permit application 2025-1502 for 226 million gallons per year (MGY) at a proposed maximum pumping rate of 1000 gallons per minute (gpm) for the West River Dairy Expansion. Please note permit 2025-1502, using well unique well number (UN#) 740629, would (if approved) replace and modify permit 2008-0230.	482-1	190

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Water has never been appropriated from the UN# 740629 associated with permit 2008-0230 (proposed to be used for permit 2025-1502). Groundwater availability is moderate to limited in this area. As identified in permit 2008-0230, the groundwater appropriation from this well can directly impact the river and is subject to existing permit conditions based on the river flow.	482-2	436
MN DNR is completing a re-evaluation of stream flow in the Pomme de Terre River. We expect to include permit conditions based on stream flow. Conditions will be modified from those currently included with 2008-0230, which may include restrictions on the ability to appropriate water during summer months.	482-3	436
Additionally, we will evaluate the impacts of water appropriation on rare features in the Pomme de Terre River downstream of the appropriation site.	482-4	163
The EAW did not consider impacts from the potential groundwater appropriation at UN#740629 on the Pomme de Terre River in section 12.B.4. Surface Waters. Our review of the aquifer test completed on UN# 740629 suggests that the water table aquifer is strongly connected to the Pomme de Terre River. The long-term average flow in the Pomme de Terre River is likely to be reduced by the average pumping rate of UN #740629. If water appropriation permit 2025-1502 is authorized, permit conditions, including restrictions on pumping when streamflow is below 10% of the median monthly base flow, are anticipated. Conditions to maintain baseflow will be considered to protect ecology, public health, and the needs of downstream users of higher priority.	482-5	436
The current West River Dairy operation relies on two groundwater appropriation permits associated with the operation: · Permit 2004-1023: 95 MGY for livestock watering from four wells located near the current dairy operation. This permit includes groundwater-level monitoring conditions. · Permit 2009-0492: 21.3 MGY for livestock watering and 64.4 MGY for agricultural irrigation from one well located in the proposed expansion project area. This permit may need to be amended to reflect changes in land use.	482-6	438
The EAW does not describe how the existing permitted wells, particularly the one located on the proposed expansion site (2009-0492), will be integrated with the new facility. If the permit holder requests to increase the volume of permits 2004-1023 or 2009-0492, aquifer testing may be required to ensure sustainable water use.	482-7	192
The EAW indicates in section 12.B.3.d that the wells for the existing facility and the off-site well are located in separate aquifers. The shallow and deep aquifers in this area are part of one connected system, and water availability from these aquifers is limited. The proposed water sources do not constitute a diversified groundwater source approach. Due to the aquifer connections, cumulative existing and proposed water appropriation will be considered during water appropriation permitting.	482-8	437
MN DNR has also received and is reviewing a Dam Safety Permit application, 2026-0133, associated with the water storage ponds identified in item 9 of the EAW. This permit application was received on January 29, 2026.	482-9	257
As a farmer and community member, I am very concerned about the number of gigantic animal operations in our region.	483-1	434

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The "concentration" aspect of these industrial actors means that they simply cannot spread their manure on enough acres to manage, and if they get close it will mean huge amounts of wear and tear on our roads as heavy trucks filled with manure drive over them.	483-2	306
Additionally, it is not clear that in the event of a mass mortality event, the business has access to necessary levels of carcass disposal.	483-3	78
This feedlot is already dangerously large, so any additional expansion would put the surrounding community at risk.	483-4	397
Further, we do not know what risks this type of operation poses to groundwater.	483-5	191
This expansion requires an EIS by any common sense metric,	483-6	1
the law should be change to make such an assessment [EIS] automatic when any permit of this size is requested.	483-7	19
I would like to express my support for the West River Expansion.	484-1	431
I vote No!	485-1	432
It's too big.	485-2	434
Please pay attention to other huge feed lots across our country and the negative impact they have on the environment.	485-3	56
Please pay attention to other huge feed lots across our country and the negative impact they have on the people who live nearby.	485-4	397
I'm not in favor of expanding the dairy.	486-1	432
The effects on the environment would be horrible	486-2	167
the treatment of the animals would be disrespectful.	486-3	74
Please do not approve.	486-4	33
The site is too close to the Pomme de Terre River, the river would likely be polluted by run-off and could alter ecosystem.	487-1	182
I vote no to expansion due to proximity to river and risk of pollution.	487-2	33
I am a former resident of Morris, MN and oppose this expansion on the grounds that it is 1) unnecessary (except to increase the profits of Riverview Dairy)	488-1	432
I am a former resident of Morris, MN and oppose this expansion on the grounds that it is 2) directly harmful to family dairy farms	488-2	398
I am a former resident of Morris, MN and oppose this expansion on the grounds that it is 3) an environmental insult in terms of enormous water use.	488-3	195
I am a former resident of Morris, MN and oppose this expansion on the grounds that it is 3) an environmental insult in terms of production of astronomical amounts of manure.	488-4	391
The promise of growth (more jobs) in west central MN is miniscule due to the highly automated operations Riverview uses and certainly does not outweigh the harm to the natural prairie ecosystem.	488-5	398
The "need" for more dairy could and should be met by greater support for our family farms, which are considerably less harmful to the environment.	488-6	398
An environmental impact statement for such a gross expansion should be required for any operations this large, at minimum.	488-7	19

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Irregardless of Riverview's past performance, their desire to be considerate and responsible neighbors cannot compensate for a massive environmental impact.	488-8	167
The manure containment system for this expansion is sufficient "except in conditions of weather extremes." Today's March 18, 2026, Star Tribune weather report by Paul Douglas states: "Welcome to the United States of Weather Extremes." Even before the dairy expands, it's a reality and a given that the manure containment systems will fail, because they aren't built for weather extremes, and weather extremes are a fact of life now.	490-1	392
I'm 72, and in my lifetime, MN lakes and rivers have gone from being swimmable and fishable to being covered with blue-green algae from overflow of fertilizer from fields and animal factory farms.	490-2	294
That's the case from ice out in spring to the freeze in winter.	490-3	294
There aren't a few weeks of good swimming anymore in summer.	490-4	265
The MPCA has already allowed the quality of life in Minnesota to be destroyed in favor of profits for animal factory farms. We Minnesotans paid too high a price for thirty cents off a package of meat or a gallon of milk. We lost what makes Minnesota great in our lifetime.	490-5	398
Future generations will be rolling in shit. Thanks a lot, MPCA! You knew what you were doing.	490-6	365
You were not doing your job for the state of Minnesota. And you did a number on us in favor of animal factory farms.	490-7	435
Is your mandate to promote industry over livability?	490-8	435
How about the poor neighbors to the dairy? Can they sell their land for the same amount of money as they would have gotten before the dair	490-10	398
How about the poor neighbors to the dairy? What will their land be worth after the expansion?	490-11	398
What's the water table like around the dairy?	490-12	214
A.I. data centers will draw down the water table statewide.	490-13	211
How about that aquifer under us from the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian border? Is it drawn down beyond use yet?	490-14	203
What do we do when the aquifer is gone, or polluted?	490-15	207
What good is the MPCA to the people of Minnesota?	490-16	435
I hope you'll do your jobs to the best of your ability and disallow an expansion of this animal factory.	490-17	33
Shoppers prefer milk humanely produced. When calves are given cow's blood to drink instead of cow's milk, that's not humane.	490-18	73
Milk produced by cows that are housed skin to skin in dark barns in conditions conducive to turning bird flu or any disease spread among them into an extremely powerful pathogen, endangering human life, we don't want that. You shouldn't either. You are supposed to be protecting us, not pushing the limits of what corporations can get away with, to the detriment of our environment and health.	490-19	72
It's not ok for you to expand West River Dairy.	490-20	434

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
If you approve it anyway, to the detriment of Minnesota, make the dairy ship the manure to farms in other states, instead of dumping it all on this county and this state. How many tons?	490-21	62
The animal factory system generates 5 tons of manure per year for every man, woman and child in the U.S.	490-22	310
The statement on your website above this comment line on March 17, 2026, stated that the manure containment systems for the expansion are sufficient except in the case of extreme storm events. We are living with global warming, which is rapidly making weather events more extreme and more frequent. There will be an increasing number of extreme storm events. We're seeing them already, year-round.	491-1	392
It is no longer possible to swim in most MN waterways due to blue-green algae caused by feces runoff from MN land. It just takes a few flooding events per year to spread feces into waterways.	491-2	294
Right now, more than 5 tons of animal waste annually is generated for every man, woman and child in the U.S. per Dr. Michael Greger in his 2020 book, "How to Survive a Pandemic."	491-6	310
And even though the MPCA's only concern is pollution, the State has a strong health interest in preventing another pandemic, and businesses have a strong financial interest in preventing another pandemic.	491-7	395
And cow milk isn't even that healthy, due to the pregnancy hormones in it. A huge Swedish nutritional study of tens of thousands of people over decades found that people who drank a cup of milk per day die at a higher rate than those who don't. You can Google it and find it.	491-8	73
Do your job for the people of Minnesota. You don't exist only for the corporations of Minnesota to make a killing off destroying our state. We don't want to trade fresh air, clean water, swimmable and fishable rivers and lakes, and our health for thirty cents off a carton of milk or off a pound of meat.	491-9	137
Our environment is already destroyed under your oversight. Please don't make it even worse.	491-10	137
I am concerned about the true environmental impact of the proposed expansion and would like the MPCA to require a full Environmental Impact Statement before the project can go forward.	492-1	1
A project of this scope demands careful and exacting review of cumulative impacts, including existing animal units of all operations within the county and watershed, the increased demand on area water resources with potential threats to existing wells.	492-2	202
A project of this scope demands careful and exacting review of cumulative impacts, including existing animal units of all operations within the county and watershed, the additional reduction in regional air quality.	492-3	80
A project of this scope demands careful and exacting review of cumulative impacts, including existing animal units of all operations within the county and watershed, the increased threat to protected wildlife.	492-4	175
A project of this scope demands careful and exacting review of cumulative impacts, including existing animal units of all operations within the county and watershed, the environmental resources located nearby.	492-5	136
I believe the unprecedented scope of this project demands an unprecedented examination of its potential impact.	492-6	433
I would like to understand the reason for Riverview LLC desire to put another feedlot in Minnesota. Do they need more money to offset the 11MM judgement in Arizona?	493-1	435

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Minnesota doesn't need another feedlot. Especially from a company with multiple safety issues.	493-2	434
Additionally, before a decision is made an EIS is needed, to determine the effect on nearby protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas.	493-3	7
If MPCA okays this expansion of the feedlot for the dairy, how will you safeguard the drinking water from nitrates? A.I. says: "Stevens County, like many areas in Minnesota, may face issues with nitrate contamination in groundwater, primarily due to agricultural activities and other human-made sources. Elevated nitrate levels can pose health risks, particularly to infants." and "Nitrate levels in Stevens County's drinking water have been reported to exceed the Environmental Working Group's health guideline by significant amounts, with some tests showing levels 12 to 31 times above the guideline of 0.14 parts per million. This indicates a serious concern for water quality in the area."	494-1	193
Nitrate pollution in the drinking water is already a problem in Stevens County. Don't make it worse by approving this feedlot expansion.	494-2	193
Air pollution?	494-3	81
Water pollution?	494-4	388
Pollution of the land from excessive manure?	494-5	352
Please protect the quality of life of the people of Minnesota. That is your reason to exist. Please honor it.	494-7	395
Corporations must find ways to be profitable without destroying our quality of life. You need to guarantee us a decent quality of life, and the quality of life for the people living within a 10 mile radius of that dairy has been severely degraded.	494-8	395
You are the check on environmental destruction. Please veto this expansion.	494-9	33
There is nothing the dairy can do to sufficiently mitigate its danger to the environment b/c it has no protection against extreme weather events, and those are becoming more common and frequent every day.	494-10	100
Minnesota doesn't need another feedlot. Especially from a company with multiple safety issues.	495-1	435
Do they need more money to offset the 11MM judgement in Arizona?	495-2	435
Additionally, before a decision is made an EIS is needed, to determine the effect on nearby protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas.	495-3	7
I am firmly opposed to Riverview LLP feedlot expansion in Minnesota, especially in such a sensitive ecosystem.	495-4	432
I support the project and am confident that local water resources can continue to be managed responsibly as it moves forward.	496-1	431
After having read an article in the Chokio Review, I am appalled at the fact that this expansion wasn't brought to anyone's attention sooner.	497-1	432
I also find it ridiculous that this expansion doesn't even require an environmental impact study done, with all the manure this business produces and the runoff etc., it shouldn't be in question that this study should be MANDATORY!!!	497-2	19
I also heard that they claim all the manure will be stored on site... If they consider stored on site to mean in fields such as the one next to our property, then I know that means they will locate a giant pile of manure right in the path of someone's place.	497-3	360

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Every time that they pile it right to the south of our place the strong south wind we always have during the summer blows that manure dust and debris right to our place. We end up breathing it all in and I also hate to think how it contaminates our garden produce.	497-4	88
You can't tell me that's healthy for us or our pets.	497-5	88
Also, where is all this water they use for their operation coming from?	497-6	197
You can't tell me that excessive water use isn't going to affect the water table for everyone else in the nearby area.	497-7	195
This shouldn't even be something you feel you can entertain in the slightest.	497-9	33
I don't want anyone else having to through the same headaches we've had to go through either. In other words, I'm highly against this expansion.	497-10	432
I also believe that we should be protecting our natural beauty and resources and there is a wildlife protection area.	497-8a	174
I also believe that we should be protecting our natural beauty and resources and the Pomme De Terre watershed near that area etc.	497-8b	182
This needs an full industrial scale environmental review as it is industrial in size.	498-1	29
Clearly 25k+ cattle is a huge sanitation risk.	498-2	395
As such, the risk needs a full industrial scale review.	498-3	29
I support approval of the West River Dairy expansion.	499-1	431
I live within 5 miles of West River Dairy. I believe that both Riverview and West River are run responsibly with an eye to preserving our environment. However, an expansion of the proposed magnitude requires substantial more environmental resources than are already being used. I favor an environmental impact study.	500-1	1
More than doubling the number of cows on a site should not be a default decision by the PCA.	500-2	434
Because River View/West River is a responsible company, I think the owners would want to initiate a study to reassure residents like me that the hazardous issues and over taxed resources would be addressed.	500-3	31
I am writing to express my shock over the size of the proposed dairy in Morris, and to urge the MPCA to turn down their license to expand.	501-1	33
Factory farming pollutes our water systems, and despite extensive storage systems, leaks are inevitable.	501-2	149
A dairy of this size will use too much water.	501-3	195
A dairy of this size will inevitably contaminate our air.	501-4	81
This kind of factory farm is part of what drives climate change.	501-5	103
Moreover, it is the kind of farm that can create a bio-hazard. What if some kind of virus takes hold, and that many cows have to be euthanized. It's a tragedy waiting to happen.	501-6	72
Milk is consumed less now, partly because of consumers' concerns about large dairy farms.	501-7	398
Why should we risk polluting our land and air to export our milk to other countries? That's what this expansion is about.	501-8	398
Please do not allow this dairy to expand. It will only set a new precedent for other dairies around the state who are in competition.	501-9	32

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
We need to fight climate change in all ways, including in our food production systems.	501-10	106
Lastly, I'm an animal rights advocate and I can only imagine the kind of lives those cows live, locked inside large barns, their bodies given antibiotics to avoid viruses, milked until they're no longer useful, and then discarded. It's a moral failure in our country.	501-11	74
I strongly urge the agency to conduct an EIS on this proposed expansion before making a decision for the health of Minnesota's lands, its waters, its people, and its animals that would be at and around this site.	502-1	1
Thank you for your consideration and the work that you do to protect our state's amazing resources for this and future generations!	502-2	435
My mother owns acreage in synnes township that a watershed runs through. This land has been rotated between crops and crp since my grandfather purchased the property. Our family believes in conservation, sustainable agriculture, and keeping up good relations with adjoining landowners.	503-1	162
I believe if river view moves in and starts using excessive amounts of water it may negativity effect our land.	503-2	176
I believe if river view moves in and starts using excessive amounts of water it may negativity effect the wildlife that thrives there.	503-3	173
I believe if river view moves in and starts using excessive amounts of water it may negativity effect the small farmers that depend on the land for their income.	503-4	398
I believe if river view moves in and creates unsustainable sewage issues it may negativity effect our land.	503-5	176
I believe if river view moves in and creates unsustainable sewage issues it may negativity effect the wildlife that thrives there.	503-6	173
I believe if river view moves in and creates unsustainable sewage issues it may negativity effect the small farmers that depend on the land for their income.	503-7	398
I have seen a drastic habitat loss in the last decade in this area. Wildlife that was once abundant in a large range is now confined to small pockets of habitat. Our farms are one of those small pockets. I would hate to see a large scale dairy operation ruin any more habitat that is already in such short supply.	503-8	172
I submitted this comment on 3/20/26 and you deleted it. I'm resubmitting it. The MPCA deleted the comment I made on Tuesday, 3/17/26, so, outraged, I followed up with more comments on 3/18 & 3/19.	504-1	435
But what I have to say shouldn't be muzzled because it applies to the dangers to Minnesotans of animal/poultry factory farm practices. They have a direct bearing on this expansion request. And the MPCA is the government bureau with the oversight to regulate animal and poultry factory farms. So take my comment. And act to protect Minnesotans.	504-2	16
I note that the head of the MPCA when the MN public was just discovering 3M's PFAs pollution came to the MPCA from 3M. So perhaps the current leadership at MPCA is from the corporate animal factory farm sector, and they're in a position to try to hide from us the dangers they actually pose to us.	504-3	228
NYT best-selling nutrition expert, Dr. Michael Greger, started out as an epidemiologist. One of the world's leading epidemiologists is Dr. Michael Osterholm, at the University of Minnesota.	504-4	435

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
In 2020, Dr. Michael Greger published, "How to Survive a Pandemic," about the next pandemic, possibly as soon as within 5 years, that might be a bird flu pandemic, that he predicted would probably be generated in an animal/poultry factory farm. He went in detail in the book about why viruses and bacteria become extremely lethal when generated in a system where the hosts are packed body to body, in dark, airless enclosures. Yes, dark, airless enclosures, packed body to body, causes weight to be put on fastest for poultry, cutting meat production time in half.	504-5	72
Greger told us calves are weaned on cow blood, which is protein nutritious, rather than on milk, which farmers can sell.	504-6	73
Cattle (beef and dairy?) are fed chicken manure, which doesn't affect the taste of the meat of the cattle butchered for meat.	504-7	73
Cattle are fed highly subsidized corn and soybeans which causes e coli to be produced in their stomachs, and the e coli endangers the consumer when he eats hamburger.	504-8	395
The reason this is relevant to MPCA, pollution control, is that you are the government bureau that can green light or limit animal and poultry factory farms.	504-9	73
Stink, smell and shit aren't the only things you should be paying attention to. The likelihood of animal factory farms generating pandemics is in your wheelhouse, too, within your responsibity.	504-10	72
Dr. Michael Osterholm published a book in December 2025 called, "The Big One," about the upcoming pandemic which might take 1/3 of mankind's lives. I couldn't bear to finish Dr. Greger's book or to get past a few chapters of Dr. Osterholm's book. I advise you to talk with Dr. Michael Greger and to Dr. Michael Osterholm about how animal/poultry factory farms can be modified to minimize their generation of pandemics.	504-11	72
As a living being, I ask you to make the factory farms you regulate act humanely toward their living products.	504-12	74
I am against this in all ways.	505-1	432
We are driving small farms out of the state. Nobody can compete with these coperations.	505-2	398
The environmental impact is terrible and disgusting.	505-3	167
The possibility of contamination of the water shed which would destroy how many peoples lives.	505-4	290
This cannot happen.	505-5	432
I strongly urge you to dismiss any plans to proceed with the proposal to dramatically increase the size of the Riverview LLP dairy operation near Morris MN which would be more than 60 times the size of the average Minnesota dairy.	506-1	33
Problems with these massive dairy operations center around water	506-2	387
Problems with these massive dairy operations center around manure.	506-3	359
They also drive out smaller family-run dairies which have smaller environmental and community impacts.	506-4	398
Giant dairy operations require massive amounts of water and water is our most valuable resource.	506-5	195
We must put laws in place to protect the water.	506-6	19
Manure in these mega dairies is collected and diluted into a concentrated liquid sludge that has to be stored or spread on nearby fields which can destroy the soil.	506-7	183
Manure in these mega dairies is collected and diluted into a concentrated liquid sludge that has to be stored or spread on nearby fields which can destroy the water.	506-8	387

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Manure in these mega dairies is collected and diluted into a concentrated liquid sludge that has to be stored or spread on nearby fields which can destroy the air.	506-9	81
We used to have a dairy farm but could not stay in operation due to the takeover by mega farms.	506-10	398
The mega agriculture industry in nothing but greed and monopoly.	506-11	398
They destroy our water.	506-12	387
They destroy our land.	506-13	176
They destroy our air quality.	506-14	81
They destroy our economy.	506-15	432
They destroy our communities.	506-16	432
How much have these industries paid to political election campaigns to buy votes that serve their interests? These actions are criminal and should be treated as such.	506-17	432
Again, I strongly urge you to dismiss any plans to proceed with the proposal to dramatically increase the size of the Riverview LLP dairy operation near Morris MN. Do your job.	506-18	432
This proposed operation is the first of its size in Minnesota. It would be nearly double the size of the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers and rural communities.	507-1	397
According to the documents filed by Riverview, the proposed operation would require: 1. To supply water for the operation the facility would be allowed to pump 226 million gallons from an off-site well per year.	507-4	195
Riverview has a recent history of a manure spill in western Minnesota.	507-7	155
In Arizona, the company agreed to pay $11 million to residents affected by the dairy's over-pumping.	507-8	432
The proposed Stevens County site sits within five miles of eight different protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas and is part of the Pomme de Terre River watershed, just 25 miles from its confluence with the Minnesota River.	507-9	174
A facility of this scale located in such a vulnerable area calls for a thorough environmental review	507-10	434
Just as importantly, an EIS of the West River Dairy Expansion proposal would address socio-economic impacts.	507-11	14
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	507-12	398
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	507-13	398
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	507-14	398
An EIS must be requied for this project.	507-15	1
The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency must recognize the fundamentally new nature of this threat and give this permit greater scrutiny than it ever has to previous proposals.	507-2a	15
This proposal by Riverview, LLP must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	507-2b	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on water quality to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	507-3a	2
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on water quantity to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	507-3b	3
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on local roads to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	507-3c	8
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on existing independent family dairy farms to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	507-3d	12
I'm writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	508-1	430
I respectfully encourage the MPCA to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	508-2	431
There should be a Thorough Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) done on this project.	509-1	1
There should be extensive considerations for all corresponding impacts this potential expansion could have on the groundwater.	509-3	193
There should be extensive considerations for all corresponding impacts this potential expansion could have on the surface water.	509-4	289
There should be extensive considerations for all corresponding impacts this potential expansion could have on the air quality.	509-5	81
There should be extensive considerations for all corresponding impacts this potential expansion could have on the safety concerns for the surrounding community.	509-6	397
We have a degrading infrastructure this wont help with that.	509-7	397
We don't need any more corporate farms especially for an industry that isn't needed to be expanded.	509-8	397
The Dairy industry is a highly subsidized industry due to the Money Worshipping Corporations that have continually taken advantage of the loopholes and the backing of the federal government to bail them out every time its needed. The time to wake up was 25 years ago I'm afraid.	509-9	397
I've attached with this letter an article that will help explain my prior paragraph.	509-10	435
I hope you make the right decision in this matter.	509-11	435
Riverview is proposing to pump 226 million gal. of water a year- almost as much as 5,000 people of Morris, that's not counting the numbers of private rural wells probably effected by their proposal.	510-1	195
We also know as a fact, they are already in lawsuits for pumping MORE than their application allowed in other states.	510-2	194
Their proposal is well above the environmental capacity load.	510-3	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Waterfowl protected areas are not only important for local economy but is important for migrating fowl on a global scale. It is also representative of the "canary in the coal mines". (what happens to the lower food chain happens to us) These NEED protecting for our own protection.	510-4	174
MPCA's mission statement commits to "Protect and IMPROVE the environment and ENHANCES human health by monitoring environmental quality, planning for climate change and ENFORCING regulations to PREVENT (not just monitor) pollution of air, land and water. "	510-5	432
Animal numbers has the effect of increasing climate change and Minnesota's climate is one of the fastest changing climates in the nation already.	510-6	103
Riverview has past and current problems in other states of not completing a truly transparent EIS (Environmental Impact Statement). Considering their breaking the conditions of their accepted applications in other states and their current lawsuits; residents from other states are warning Minnesotans.	510-7	432
This creates a monopoly of a mega company that threatens and creates the loss of family farms and local rural economy; causing damages that they try to mitigate by paying out fines and offering jobs.	510-8	398
This does not solve environmental problems people will continue to suffer.	510-9	432
You do NOT have to live in the area or the Minnesota River watershed to be affected by pollution of groundwater and the aquifer. Aquifers run much further than most people realize, affecting more people than just those who live near by.	510-10	432
I ask you, I plead with you to take seriously your mission and be proactive and not just reactive AFTER the damage is done. We do not want another Water Gremlin type problem that is far reaching.	510-11	229
As a biologist, fisherman, and an avid hunter, I strongly oppose this expansion.	511-1	432
Large scale dairy farms and feedlots are notorious for contaminating downstream water bodies on a large scale.	511-2	264
Large scale dairy farms and feedlots are notorious for leaching into the groundwater.	511-3	193
This is a much larger footprint than the original plans anticipate.	511-4	432
These giant corporations have no problems paying fines, and the problem does not get fixed. Instead, signs are posted warning of the contamination and people can no longer recreate and/or consume fish and waterfowl from the contaminated water bodies.	511-5	435
As an individual, I have friends who own small Minnesota dairy farms. It is their livelihood and has been for generations. Minnesota has already effectively eliminated many small farming operations and, unless their goal is to add small dairy operations to the list, this must not be allowed to happen.	511-6	397
Choose lifelong Minnesotans over Big Ag.	511-7	397
Based on what I have seen, I support the proposed expansion of the dairy farm.	512-1	431
I approve the West River Dairy expansion.	513-1	431
I am writing this in support of Riverview Dairy and the expansion.	514-1	431
The West River Dairy Expansion is of a scale that obviously probably impacts its surroundings in a significant way.	515-1	432
It is a no-brainer that the environmental impact needs to be understood thoroughly here. Please do so.	515-2	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
CUI Bono? [Who Benefits] Who is the beneficiary of this project?	516-1	403
It is obvious that all harm and risk remains in the community where the project is proposeed.	516-2	432
There is no legitimate reason to allow this size expansion when there are other scale levels of dairy production in the region.	516-3	432
Overwhelm is never a good strategy.	516-4	432
Profit for known (and possibly not known) actors make the case for short term decisions, but the long term degradation of the region will not be compensated for when the profits have been removed from the region.	516-5	398
I am opposed to the huge West Dairy expansion in Steven's county in MN.	517-1	432
Riverview has a history of waste spills and the resulting environmental damage.	517-2	155
A full environmental impact study must be completed before this is approved.	517-3	1
These corporate CAFO's pollute waterways.	517-4	264
These corporate CAFO's pollute groundwater.	517-5	193
These corporate CAFO's pollute wells.	517-6	193
Small and medium size farms go out of business.	517-7	397
Small towns and their economies suffer.	517-8	397
I am a land owner in Syness township where the proposed expansion of Riverview Dairy is to take place. My concerns include excessive stress and possible near depletion of the Pomme de Terre watershed.	518-1	276
My concerns include the volume of liquid manure and the magnitude of land required to offload it.	518-2	311
My concerns include the impact this expansion will have on neighboring land owners whether they are farming or renting their property.	518-3	397
The impact on wildlife and the wetlands that define this area would be disastrous. Both of these naturally occurring environmental factors have already been diminished over the years due to farming practices.	518-4	173
Not that many years ago this township was rich in a natural habitat that fostered the continued migration of huge numbers of waterfowl as well as protective habitat for deer and other land animals. Today the elimination of this natural habitat has created major problems for wildlife including changes in migration patterns.	518-5	172
As a land owner I also anticipate the negative impact this expansion would have on the land value of property in the township.	518-7	398
A return to the land held by many young people would be discouraged by neighboring fields of manure and the constant threat that one day their wells would run dry and they would be unable to water their own livestock and themselves.	518-8	397
I grew up on the Pomme de Terre river bottom, south of Morris. My father taught Sociology and my grandfather worked for US Fish & Wildlife, so I understand water quality issues. And as you well know, this is not just a Morris area issue. Large and small farmers along the Pomme de Terre – PDT river valley have moved fence lines away from the river, but decades later, there are still issues with high levels of bacteria in the PDT. So the problems are more complex than just moving fence lines. From what I understand, field tiles are buried 18" under topsoil, drain into ditches and then directly into river systems. Toxic manure pit slurry (also from other animal and bird facilities) is sprayed on fields or injected 8 inches under the topsoil.	519-1	272
Current manure handling should be re-considered in all your decisions, statewide.	519-2	357

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
What controls will you put on these open sewer lines to prevent it ending up in ground water or in the Mississippi River?	519-4	284
My point, large factory facilities create heavier impact on water quality; profits should NOT be the only consideration.	519-3a	388
My point, large factory facilities create heavier impact on wildlife; profits should NOT be the only consideration.	519-3b	173
This is getting way out of hand. Put a stop to this nonsense! There is absolutely no need for this excess.	520-1	432
I wholeheartedly oppose this facility.	521-1	432
It is not good for the animals.	521-2	74
It is not good for the land.	521-3	176
It is not good for the other small farms across the state.	521-4	398
I do not live near here, but I feel for any neighbors near the current facility of such massive size.	521-5	397
I vote no on this expansion.	522-1	432
As a small farmer myself I feel strongly that mega farms do more harm than good.	522-2	432
As a dairy farmer in Minnesota and a farmer advocate please stop Riverview and affilates from further expansion. The expansion is creating a monopoly in the dairy industry pushing many family farms out of business due to the high volume of milk they flood the market with.	523-1	398
Competition in the industry is good but not at the rate at which Riverview is accelerating.	523-2	398
Riverview is not considering the impact they have on Minnesota's dairy industry	523-3	398
they are not helping local economies by what they are doing.	523-4	398
As a small farm family we buy local, sell local, hire local, and support local.	523-5	432
Riverview fills all of their needs "in house" and finds the cheapest suppliers not necessarily supporting local communities or even Minnesota.	523-6	397
Please stop Riverview from further expansion in Minnesota or there will be a monopoly and more unforseen consequences to Minnesota's dairy industry.	523-7	398
Large dairy farms need to be treated like industrial factories not farms.	524-1	432
Furthermore the dairy herd should be spread over many owners and many locations to minimize the liability of food security.	524-2	398
Furthermore the dairy herd should be spread over many owners and many locations to minimize the environmental impact.	524-3	162
Simply based on the huge size of this project and its negative impact on smaller dairy operations I strongly object to this project being approved.	525-1	432
We need to keep more Minnesotans active in our farm community.	525-2	397
We do not want to turn over all food production to large businesses.	525-3	397

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The size of this proposed dairy operation is such that a detailed environmental assessment is essential.	525-4	1
The Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy thanks the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency for the opportunity to submit the attached comment on the proposed West Dairy Expansion. IATP believes that the proposed project should undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	526-1	1
The expansion would make the dairy the largest in the state, by far.	526-2	434
It is critical that we fully understand how the proposed project effects the environment.	526-3	29
It is critical that we fully understand how the proposed project effects climate change.	526-4	103
It is critical that we fully understand how the proposed project effects the state's dairy farmers.	526-5	400
I am writing to express my support for the proposed expansion at West River Dairy.	527-1	431
I support this project and encourage its approval.	527-2	431
I support this project because Minnesota needs farms of all sizes.	528-1	431
I am writing to support the proposed expansion at West River Dairy.	529-1	431
We don't need more mega dairy farms.	530-1	397
They hurt our rural communities.	530-2	397
They don't buy local	530-3	398
they make it harder for small farmers to compete	530-4	398
they damage the environment	530-5	167
Where does all that methane end up?	530-6	94
Where does all that manure end up?	530-7	346
Plus they use massive amounts fertilizer and other chemicals to grow the feed for these cattle.	530-8	243
We need to have smaller farms using regenerative ag to get our farm ecology back in balance.	530-9	162
This expansion will cause massive amounts of damage instead.	530-10	432
Rural Minnesota has been ravaged enough by industrial scale agriculture, especially dairy.	531-1	398
It has driven out small family farms,	531-2	398
is an environmental risk	531-3	167
a biological threat	531-4	397
is responsible for the depopulation of rural towns , schools and hospitals.	531-5	397
Enough. This should be a resounding NO !	531-6	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Riverview LLP is proposing to expand in Steven's county. (West River Dairy Expansion) I am a land owner 15 miles away from this CAFO. It is important to study the impact of this expansion and requires an EIS.	532-1	1
We who own land know that pollution from these CAFO are impacting our ground water.	532-2	435
We who own land know that pollution from these CAFO are impacting our land health.	532-3	435
We who own land know that pollution from these CAFO are impacting our communities.	532-4	435
The Pomme de Terre River watershed is within25 miles from its confluence with the Minnesota River, as an example.	532-5	277
Plus the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources does not have a complete map of Steven's County groundwater resources and aquifers.	532-6	196
Accountability is the job of MPCA. Do not allow this expansion based on unknowns.	532-7	435
EIS needs to be completed before expansion.	532-8	1
I am in favor of West River Dairy expansion.	533-1	431
I support the West River expansion.	534-1	431
I am in full support of the expansion!	535-1	431
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy expansion.	536-1	431
Great to see western MN expansions that add jobs and value for this area.	537-1	431
i would like to say that i am in support of the expansion.	538-1	431
I support continuing through the regular permitting process.	539-1	431
I am writing to express my support for the expansion of this company.	540-1	431
I am writing in support of the proposed expansion of West River Dairy.	541-1	431
In order for Minnesota to have strong rural communities, we need to preserve the beneficial economic impact of small and medium sized family farms.	542-1	397
The approval of such an extreme large-scale operation such as the West River Dairy expansion only serves a single corporate interest not the economic and environmental well-being of rural communities.	542-2	397
Environmental protection needs to be a top concern, especially for an operation that would be the largest scale operation in Minnesota if approved.	542-3	432
The requirement of an EIS is the responsible action needed to be taken by the MPCA and to not do so would be an extreme disservice to Minnesota residents.	542-4	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
All of the previous operations previously determined to need an EIS were significantly smaller than West River's proposed operation.	542-5	46
The protection of water is a key concern in Minnesota! A corporate interest with a poor environmental record should not be allowed to pollute such an important resource. It is gravely irresponsible to other water users and residents of the area to move forward with this permit process without a full understanding of the potential impacts, especially in a sensitive watershed.	542-6	29
I submit these comments as a life-long resident of Minnesota who grew up on a farm. Since an ecology course taken in 1982, I have understood the importance of water as a resource. The two well renown ecology professors who taught the course implored us to be diligent about the protection of Minnesota's water. These professors correctly predicted the future attempted misuse of Minnesota's valuable resource - water.	542-7	400
I am writing this letter in support of the West River Dairy Expansion.	543-1	431
I would like to give my support for the expansion of West River Dairy	544-1	431
I fully support the expansion of West River dairy because this group has proven to go above and beyond in many ways	545-1	431
On behalf of the Midwest Council on Agriculture, we respectfully submit this letter in support of Riverview LLP’s proposed dairy expansion at West River Dairy near Morris, Minnesota.	546-1	431
I am writing in strong support of Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	547-1	431
Given the rigor and sufficiency of Minnesota's existing environmental review process, no Environmental Impact Statement is needed for this project.	547-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of the West River Dairy expansion.	547-3	431
I fully support West River Dairy expansion.	548-1	431
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	549-1	431
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	549-2	431
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	549-3	20
I am in favor of the expansion of the West River dairy.	550-1	431
I support continuing through the regular permitting process.	550-2	431
I am writing in support of Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	551-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	551-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project	551-3	431
I am writing to express my support for the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	552-1	431
I believe the existing review process is sufficient and that an Environmental Impact Statement is unnecessary.	552-2	20
I respectfully urge the agency to approve the West River Dairy Expansion, which supports local agriculture, strengthens rural communities, and reflects sound environmental stewardship.	552-3	431
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be REQUIRED to submit an environmental impact statement.	553-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operation in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous.	553-2	434

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Riverview would pump up to 226 million gallons/year from an off-site well, nearly as much as the entire City of Morris (which is permitted for 300 million gallons/year for 5,000+ residents). This is a massive water use project.	553-3	195
The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure. This is a huge waste output.	553-4	391
There are unknown groundwater impacts: the DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped, making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	553-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	553-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	553-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a FULL Environmental Impact Statement.	553-8	1
I really want this project to start because of the greatness it can bring to the community.	554-1	431
I want this project to open up because it will bring opportunities to the community.	555-1	431
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	556-1	431
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	556-2	431
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	556-3	20
I support the expansion of West River Dairy.	557-1	431
I am in favor of the expansion of West River Dairy.	558-1	431
I am writing in support of Riverviews proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	559-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	559-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	559-3	431
I am writing to express my support for the proposed West River Dairy Expansion in Stevens County.	560-1	431
I support moving this project forward.	560-2	431
I would have no concerns with an expansion for Westriver Dairy and I fully support the proposal.	561-1	431
I would have no concern with Riverviews plan to expand there dairy operations.	563-1	431
I am writing in support of Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	564-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	564-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	564-3	431
I am writing in support of Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	565-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	565-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	565-3	431
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	566-1	431
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	566-2	20
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	566-3	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Riverview made me a better person, and I appreciate the opportunity to learn from this country. I love my job!	567-1	431
Riverview is an excellent company in which it provides a culture of opportunities in which it takes care of the well-being of each person in the same way it is treated with great respect and a strong ethics in the care of cows I am very happy to be part of this great company	568-1	431
I am writing to express my support for the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	569-1	431
I fully and respectfully support the approval of the West River Dairy Expansion.	569-2	431
an Environmental Impact Statement is not at all necessary.	569-3	20
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy expansion.	570-1	431
and I am writing to express my support for the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	571-1	431
I respectfully support the approval of the West River Dairy Expansion.	571-2	430
I fully support the expansion of the West River dairy!	572-1	431
I am in favor of the expansion.	573-1	431
We fully support the expansion of West River Dairy.	574-1	431
The way we treat our animals is a reflection of who we are as human beings. There is no possible way to humanely treat 18,000 cows. This is wrong. According to the Animal Humane Society, one of the rights of animals is the freedom to express normal behavior. You will be violating this right if you allow this expansion.	575-1	74
Please do not allow this expansion.	575-2	432
I am very, very concerned about this proposed immense dairy that is being proposed to be located near Morris, Mn.	576-1	432
The damage to the environmentwould be extreme and irreversible!	576-2	167
The damage to wildlife and waterfowl areas would be extreme and irreversible!	576-3	174
The amount of water required would affect the water table in the area and the effects on the Pomme de Terre water shed must be very carefully considered.	576-4	182
Environmental effects must be very thoroughly checked and considered!!	576-5	29
Also, the effect on small to midsized dairy farms would be unfair and damaging!	576-6	398
Please be careful of irreversible outcomes of this decision!	576-7	432
As an organization and myself we fully support Riverview Dairy's proposal to develop and permit this new facility.	577-1	431
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	578-1	431
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	578-2	430
I believe that an EIS is not necessary.	578-3	20
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	579-1	431
I support the expansion at West River Dairy.	580-1	431
I just read an article regarding a proposed major increase in size of a dairy farm operation near Morris. It is my opinion that this should be adamantly opposed especially due to excess water consumption.	581-2	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I just read an article regarding a proposed major increase in size of a dairy farm operation near Morris. It is my opinion that this should be adamantly opposed especially due to excess water contamination.	581-3	388
Aren't all humans dependent on clean water for our very survival and, therefore, shouldn't we be good stewards of its balanced care?	581-4	395
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	582-1	431
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	582-2	430
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	582-3	20
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	583-1	431
In closing, I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	583-2	430
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	583-3	20
I am writing to provide my support for the proposed West River Dairy Expansion	584-1	431
Please do an EIS before hand. There is a lot at stake here.	585-1	1
Im not as elegantly voiced as some individuals but please hear my voice as well. We live nearby and are concerned about many things involved woth this project. The amount of water they want to take is almost as much as the city of Morris! That's frightening, especially for people that live off wells around this area.	585-2	195
Not to mention the wildlife in the area. There is also too much land they want to destroy that is a habitat for many water fowl in the area. That would be devastating.	585-3	173
The smell would also be terrible.	585-4	83
I dont trust that they would abide by everything they are saying they would.. in other locations of theirs they have already over pumped and polluted the land.	585-5	155
It also won't supply that many more jobs at all.	585-6	398
My main concern is the auquafir.	585-7	190
My main concern is the pollution.	585-8	146
My main concern is the loss of habitat.	585-9	172
Please enforce a thorough investigation. I know this won't stop it yet but we need to start somewhere.	585-10	29
I support the West River Dairy expansion!	586-1	431
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	587-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	587-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	587-3	430
We are writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	588-1	431
In closing, we respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	588-2	430
We also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	588-3	20
Having been a small family dairy farmer and still helping daily on family dairies I am strongly against the expansion of the large dairy Cafos.	589-1	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Water usage problems are without a doubt some of the more troubling aspects of these operations.	589-2	195
Manure application problems are without a doubt some of the more troubling aspects of these operations.	589-3	371
Also there is currently an oversupply of milk that is driving prices down to all dairy farmers. Who in their right mind wants to create more milk and lower prices on their own product.	589-4	398
We have already decimated the small farming communities in Minnesota.	589-5	400
We here complaints about how far a veterinarian or machinery dealer or dairy parts facility are from these large dairies.	589-6	398
More expansion of dairy will only cause more destruction to Minnesota and its people.	589-7	397
I am writing in strong support of Riverview Dairy's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	590-1	431
I do not believe an Environmental Impact Statement is necessary for this project.	590-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of Riverview Dairy's expansion.	590-3	430
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	591-1	431
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	591-2	430
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	591-3	20
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	592-1	431
I believe the current review process is sufficient and that additional regulatory steps, such as a requirement for an environmental impact statement (EIS), are unnecessary.	592-2	20
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	592-3	430
I am writing in support of Riverview and their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	593-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	593-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	593-3	430
Being a land owner, I am concerned for the safety of our environment.	594-1	167
Being a land owner, I am concerned for the safety of our air.	594-2	81
Being a land owner, I am concerned for the safety of our water.	594-3	387
Being a land owner, I am concerned for the safety of our soil.	594-4	183
This expansion of 11,000 dairy cows needs to have an EIS completed and evaluated before any permit can be granted.	594-5	1
The people need to know if it would compromise our air quality that would be released onto the land.	594-6	81
The people need to know if it would negative effects on acquafirs that would be released onto the land.	594-7	289
The people need to know if it would compromise the condition of water that would be released onto the land.	594-8	289
The people need to know if it would compromise our air quality that would be released onto ditches.	594-9	81
The people need to know if it would negative effects on acquafirs that would be released onto ditches.	594-10	289
The people need to know if it would compromise the condition of water that would be released onto ditches.	594-11	289
The people need to know if it would compromise our air quality that would be released onto the lakes.	594-12	81
The people need to know if it would negative effects on acquafirs that would be released onto the lakes.	594-13	219
The people need to know if it would compromise the condition of water that would be released onto the lakes.	594-14	289

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Besides bigger isn't necessarily better for anyone including the dairy cows.	594-15	73
Many Mn small dairy farmers have had to sell their cows which is sad and unfair because of the monopoly on the price of milk sold by the huge dairy operators.	594-16	398
Please prevent this exspansion from happening.	594-17	432
The state benefits when we have smaller farms and businesses.	594-18	400
I am writing in FULL SUPPORT of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	595-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	595-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and APPROVAL of this important project.	595-3	430
I am writing to express my support for Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	596-1	431
Based on my understanding of the project and Minnesota's environmental review framework, it is my understanding that an environmental impact statement (EIS) may not be required.	596-2	20
As you complete your review, I respectfully encourage the Agency to consider the project's economic benefits alongside its proposed environmental safeguards.	596-3	430
I think it is a good thing for me and my operation it gives me some extra employment opportunity.	597-1	431
We are writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	598-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	598-2	20
We respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	598-3	430
I am in favor of the West River Dairy Expansion.	599-1	431
You don't need an EIS.	599-2	20
Riverview is a good steward of the land and a respected owner of cattle. The water usage stated is the 'no rain' amount that must be used for consumption if no rain occurs. Over 50% of water used during normal rain years comes from impervious runoff with on site storage. Just one example of forward thinking by a corporation.	600-1	431
Riverview is super beneficial to all local farmers. On our farm we haul about 300,000 bushel of corn to them every year for grinding. We also have the chop 800 acres of corn. We are very pleased with having them in our local area.	601-1	431
I stand with Riverview as they navigate the permitting process for the West River Dairy expansion. Im confident in their commitment to responsible stewardship, environmental compliance, and supporting Minnesotas agricultural community.	602-1	431
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	603-1	431
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	603-2	20
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	603-3	20
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	604-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	604-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	604-3	431
We are concerned about the increased amount of and area which will be used for manure application.	605-1	311

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Some of this land will be adjacent to and is tiled to drain to Page Lake--which would contaminate the lake.	605-2	292
Also, the manure application initially and for the first few days--greatly affects the air quality making breathing it unpleasant at best. This seems to be caused by the applicators which when turning at the ends of the fields, raise above the dirt and spread the liquid on top of the ground.	605-3	370
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	606-1	431
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	606-2	431
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	606-3	20
Minnesota is known for its quality of water. Though industrial pollution is less today than 60 years ago, agricultural and residential runoff has greatly contributed to the decline of water quality.	607-1	388
Recreating by canoe on smaller waters makes one realize how they have deteriorated over the years. Once clear waters are now a soupy, smelly mess by midsummer.	607-2	388
While small scale dairy operations are suffering from unsustainably low milk prices it seems counterintuitive to promote large scale dairy operations. These operations force family dairy operations out of business causing declining vitality of small communities all over the farming communities. I digress.	607-3	397
The scale of the factory dairy farms produces so much concentrated waste in a small area that it is always a risk for loss of containment.	607-4	385
Historically, small farms could manage the manure and use it on their land with far less risk of watershed or aquifer contamination.	607-5	383
That cannot be said for these large scale operations. Concentrated turkey, hog and dairy operations are of great concern to me.	607-6	432
I witnessed, living in Montana, how mining operations promised "foolproof" containment only for the taxpayer to pick up the mitigation costs after the company and its well golden parachuted executives were off the hook.	607-7	432
How long will it be before I have to operate a costly decontamination system for my well	607-8	263
How long will it be before I have to endure the smell.	607-9	83
How long will it be before I have to endure low quality waterwayss.	607-10	263
How long will it be before I have to endure low quality lakes.	607-11	263
I urge that this permit be denied.	607-12	33
I am concerned about the environmental effects of intensive land use by large farming operations.	608-1	167
Rather than be served by a few giant dairies, I feel the public is better off with smaller operations spread throughout the state. The manure can be more widely distributed, resulting is a lessened environmental impact.	608-2	383
Rather than be served by a few giant dairies, I feel the public is better off with smaller operations spread throughout the state. The industry will not be controlled by just a few providers.	608-3	398

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	609-1	431
The expansion of the West River site makes a lot of sense and I know they will be as careful with this project as any of the many dairies they have constructed in the recent past.	610-1	431
The water usage is a concern. If Morris grows or has dry years, the Dairy using potentially 75% of the water would create problems for the area. I believe the Dairy needs to scale back their size and not ne allowed to use more than 50% of the water.	611-1	195
The size is also a concern regarding the land in the area.	611-2	434
The size is also a concern regarding the water in the area.	611-3	133
The reasons I support the permit for the West River Dairy expansion	612-1	431
I am writing in support of Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	613-1	431
I feel Riverview will be a benefit to any community. They have had lasting beneficial impacts on our community.	614-1	431
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	615-1	431
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	615-2	431
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	615-3	20
I am a former resident of Stevens County and neighbor to Riverview. I have many family members in the area and have plans to return to the community. I was also part of the contingency that was successful in requiring a full environmental impact review that shut down their planned expansion south of Chokio in Baker township 10+ years ago. You're Welcome Stevens County! The biggest issue then, as it is now, is water. The aquifer simply wasn't meant to sustain this density of animals.	616-1	191
Stevens County has enough cows.	616-2	434

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The market is saturated already with Milk.	616-3	398
Has anyone taken a critical look into the finances of these megadairies.	616-4	398
Milk prices are subsidized by the federal government and the market is saturated.	616-5	398
have never supported $50M-$100M capital investments. They are financed with new investors and that is why they have to keep building them. Constant expansion to avoid the inevitable collapse when the bill comes due.	616-6	398
All of this at the expense of our aquifer and the environment.	616-7	193
Essentially a Ponzi scheme to eat up resources and drive out small business and keep milk prices compressed. Definitely not the free markets at work.	616-8	398
I am sure that Riverview is a good steward in the community. I can't argue one way or another because I don't live there.	616-9	397
If I ran the company I would make sure I invested heavily in making sure the labor and resources I were exploiting felt like they were valued.	616-10	397
I saw a lot of comments from local businesses talking about the economic engine that Riverview is and how happy they were doing business with them. It is never good to have your customer base this consolidated. If I were a business and Riverview was my only customer, I am not going to be around long. Riverview will only be around as long as they can find new investors to keep the expansion ahead of the bill.	616-11	398
We are a neighboring resident only a few miles to the West of the West River Dairy. When they put that first dairy in, our well water started with black silt in the water. We ended up having to dig a brand new well.	617-1	193
If they put that many more dairy cows in, that is going to take more water than it is already.	617-2	195
If they put that many more dairy cows in, that is going to take land to get rid of the manure.	617-3	346
we should worry about run off into our streams.	617-4	272
we should worry about run off into our lakes.	617-5	272
I am not in favor of the expansion.	617-6	432
In closing, we respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy expansion.	618-1	430
This project supports local agriculture, strengthens rural communities, and reflects a responsible approach to environmental stewardship.	618-2	431
I am writing in strong support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	619-1	431
I believe the current review process is sufficient and that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not necessary.	619-2	20
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	619-3	430

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I support the West River Dairy expansion	620-1	431
Riverview is an excellent company that not only supports its people but also the entire community.	621-1	431
This MUST NOT BE ALLOWED.	622-1	432
That many animals will create an enormous burden on the local and area environment, perhaps the regional environment.	622-2	167
They will contaminate air with an excess of waste.	622-3	81
They will contaminate water with an excess of waste.	622-4	388
They will contaminate soil with an excess of waste.	622-5	183
At least as important is that a huge number of animals CANNOT be properly cared-for. This is going to be "cruelty on the hoof".	622-6	74
They will use an excess of antibiotics to control disease that wouldn't happen if the critters had appropriate room to move around in, and weren't so concentrated.	622-7	72
Such a large expansion needs to be carefully considered. The environmental impact of a massive increase in the operation of Riverview dairy, while monetarily beneficial, would have potentially irreversible effects on the place we live, and needs to be carefully calculated and researched with a deep sense of stewardship rather than profit.	623-1	29
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	624-1	431
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion. This project supports local agriculture, strengthens rural communities, and reflects a responsible approach to environmental stewardship.	624-2	430
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	624-3	20
100% against this!	625-1	432
How can you even consider this without a EIS study when there would end up having 26,397 animals in one site. Where is the common sense?	625-2	15
The Pomme De Terre Water shed is nearby.	625-3	182
I am writing to express my strong support for Riverview Dairies and their proposed West River Dairy expansion.	626-1	431
I am writing in support of Riverview’s proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	627-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	627-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	627-3	430
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	628-1	431
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	628-2	430

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I also believe that an EIS is ill-disposed to benefit the community, the environment, and the State.	628-3	20
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	629-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	629-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	629-3	430
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	630-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	630-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	630-3	430
family. First let me address the 1000 lb gorilla, manure. Riverview has done everything in the past to apply the manure in a safe and responsible manner. If there was a issue, it was taken care of. Manure is not so much a waste product but a commodity, it is beneficial to the fields it is applied to and the farmers using it.	631-1	343
Next Issue: Water. This is where I am not in support. I live 3 miles from West River and 3 miles from the next well site. Others in our area have seen issues with their wells in the past. Using more water is not an option. My question to those granting said permit is who is to be held responsible if our wells go dry? Is this in writing? And uphold-able in a court of law.	631-2	224
For this reason I am not in support of the expansion.	631-3	432
I strongly urge this to proceed.	632-1	430
I live in Stevens County and am concerned about the environmental impact of such a large dairy operation.	633-1	167
How will this affect our ground water and the overall usage of water.	633-2	195
Has an economic plan been put into place as this will certainly further put smaller herd dairy farmers under additional financial stress. Small farms are the back bone of our agricultural economy.	633-3	398
Where will additional farm workers live as there is a shortage of housing in Morris.	633-4	397
This dairy operation is large enough.	633-6	434
Completely oppose.	634-1	432
It blatantly defies common sense that this will not produce unmanageable amounts of manure.	634-2	346
It blatantly defies common sense that this will not produce unmanageable amounts of water contamination.	634-3	388
It blatantly defies common sense that this will not produce unmanageable amounts of soil contamination.	634-4	183

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It blatantly defies common sense that this will not produce unmanageable amounts of deleterious impact on infrastructure.	634-5	397
It would not pass a serious investigation on the environmental and economic impact, so I hope the regulatory entities are serious in reviewing this	634-6	29
I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed West River Dairy expansion.	635-1	431
I do not believe an Environmental Impact Statement is necessary for the proposed project.	635-2	20
I strongly encourage the MPCA and other regulatory agencies to grant Riverview its necessary permits without further delay.	635-3	430
Enough is enough! Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations are bad for rural economies.	636-2	398
Enough is enough! Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations are bad for the animals raised under these conditions.	636-3	74
As the state regulatory agency permitting and regulating these operations, you must do more to protect the people of Minnesota from this destructive industry.	636-4	395
Is there no upper limit to the number of animals allowed on a CAFO site?	636-5	434
Why are these operations getting bigger and bigger when the water quality in the areas near these operations is becoming more and more	636-6	19
Why are these operations getting bigger and bigger when the air quality in the areas near these operations is becoming more and more polluted? This is cause and effect and it doesn't take an expert to see that regulations are too slack or are not being enforced.	636-7	81

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Regarding, the proposed West River Dairy Expansion I am asking you as an agency to demand a full Environmental Impact Statement for this project. I believe careful analysis needs to be done before issuing a permit for any Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation, but when the number of animals on an existing CAFO is going to be more than doubled a simple Environmental Assessment is not adequate.	636-8	15
Can we even hold Riverview LLP accountable in any case of environment damage in the future? If we cannot guarantee the accountability, then we must not let Riverview LLP have this opportunity to abuse the environment.	637-2	150
Please do not grant this permit to the Riverview, LLP.	637-3	33
The expansion is only going to benefits the pockets of its owner and investors. It will not benefit the real stakeholders- the environment.	637-1a	167
I'm very much in favor of this requested expansion project.	638-1	431
Modern dairy farmers have not only proven that proper wastewater management is possible, but that it is beneficial to the surrounding community, watershed, and the farmers themselves.	639-1	431
This expansion project is a great opportunity to provide jobs in a high-quality employer in the area and meet demand for food.	640-1	431
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	641-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	641-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	641-3	430
I'm writing in support of their expansion at West River Dairy in Stevens County.	642-1	431
In my opinion, the current environmental review process is more than adequate, and I don't see a need for an additional EIS.	642-2	20
I'd encourage you to approve the project.	642-3	430
Please assess properly what this will do to the land.	643-1	176
Please assess properly what this will do to small businesses.	643-2	397
Please assess properly what this will do to Minnesota as a whole.	643-3	401
I oppose having this giant CAFO in Minnesota.	644-1	432
These sprawling industrial facilities jeopardize our natural resources.	644-2	180
These sprawling industrial facilities jeopardize animal welfare.	644-3	74

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
These sprawling industrial facilities jeopardize our public health.	644-4	395
The environmental harm caused by these massive operations is especially troubling. At Riverview's proposed facility, vast quantities of manure would generate significant greenhouse gas emissions.	644-5	103
The environmental harm caused by these massive operations is especially troubling. At Riverview's proposed facility, vast quantities of manure would likely seep into nearby waterways, posing a threat to our state's iconic lakes and rivers.	644-6	289
This risk is reinforced by Riverview's history of manure spills in western Minnesota.	644-7	373
That pollution also threatens the health of Minnesotans. Manure runoff can contaminate drinking water with nitrates, which is especially dangerous for infants.	644-8	193
It also releases phosphorus that can lead to algae blooms, making lakes unsafe for swimming. In 2015, a child was hospitalized and a dog died after exposure to toxic algae while swimming in an Alexandria lake. Tragedies like this are preventable by curbing agricultural runoff.	644-9	294
I support the West River Dairy	645-1	431
Please do not bring suffering that comes with this type of farm to people.	646-1	395
Please do not bring suffering that comes with this type of farm to animals.	646-2	74
Please do not bring suffering that comes with this type of farm to environment.	646-3	167
Just say no!	646-4	432
I am writing in support of Riverview's West River Dairy expansion.	647-1	431
I am writing to express my support for the proposed expansion of West River Dairy near Morris, Minnesota.	648-1	431
Requiring an Environmental Impact Statement beyond the already comprehensive Environmental Assessment Worksheet process would be redundant given the available data and Riverview's well-documented compliance history.	648-2	20
I respectfully urge the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	648-3	430
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	649-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	649-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	649-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	649-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	649-5	196

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	649-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	649-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	649-8	1
I strongly oppose the West River Dairy Expansion.	650-1	432
I am writing to express my deep concern about and strong opposition to this proposed dairy expansion.	651-1	432
I oppose factory farms (CAFOs), as they jeopardize animal welfare.	651-3	74
I oppose factory farms (CAFOs), as they jeopardize our public health.	651-4	395
Countless dangers would come with this expansion, like polluting air.	651-5	81
Countless dangers would come with this expansion, like polluting waterways.	651-6	289
Countless dangers would come with this expansion, like rural residents facing health risks in proximity to a factory farm.	651-7	397
Countless dangers would come with this expansion, like crowded conditions and spreading of zoonotic diseases.	651-8	72

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Countless dangers would come with this expansion, like the greatly increased animal suffering.	651-9	74
This is unsafe for all of us.	651-10	395
Please hear the voices of concerned Minnesotans, speaking for ourselves and for animals and the earth.	651-11	432
I am very concerned about this proposed expansion due to the effects on the animals themselves.	652-1	74
I am very concerned about this proposed expansion due to the effects on the neighbors' air quality.	652-2	81
I am very concerned about this proposed expansion due to the effects on the water quality.	652-3	388
CAFO operations routinely disrupt the quality of life of the surrounding people due to the amount of waste a concentrated amount of animals produce.	652-4	181
CAFO operations routinely disrupt the quality of life of the surrounding people due to the accompanying issues like increased traffic by milk tanker trucks.	652-5	181
I also highly doubt this many animals on one farm can live a healthy, disease-free life.	652-6	72
Please know I am a big-time dairy fan- my family drinks about 2 gallons a week of milk- and I am very much opposed to this project.	652-7	432
Please study the issue to determine if this many animals can live in close quarters without disrupting the air in the surrounding area.	652-8	81
Please study the issue to determine if this many animals can live in close quarters without disrupting the water in the surrounding area.	652-9	423
Please study the issue to determine if this many animals can live in close quarters without disrupting the quality of life of the people in the surrounding area.	652-10	395
I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed construction of what would be the largest factory farm in Minnesota's history. The sheer scale of this facility makes my concerns even more urgent.	653-1	432
First, a factory farm of this magnitude would pose an unprecedented environmental threat to our state.	653-2	167
The enormous volume of waste generated would put our waterways at far greater risk than anything Minnesota has seen before. Once that damage is done, it cannot easily be undone.	653-3	289
The enormous volume of waste generated would put our air quality at far greater risk than anything Minnesota has seen before. Once that damage is done, it cannot easily be undone.	653-4	81

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The enormous volume of waste generated would put our ecosystems at far greater risk than anything Minnesota has seen before. Once that damage is done, it cannot easily be undone.	653-5	165
Second, despite its massive size, this type of operation is notorious for offering low-wage, unsafe working conditions.	653-6	397
Employees often from vulnerable communities face physical hazards, limited benefits, and little job security.	653-7	395
Bigger does not mean better for Minnesota workers.	653-8	432
Finally, a facility of this scale would subject an extraordinary number of animals to severe and inhumane conditions, confining them in overcrowded spaces with no regard for their welfare. This is simply not in line with the values Minnesotans hold dear.	653-9	74
We have one chance to stop this before it is built. I urge the Agency to deny this proposal and protect our land, our people, and our animals.	653-10	33
I strongly support moving forward with the expansion of the west river dairy.	654-1	431
A EIS is not necessary for this project Riverview wants the best for the environment and neighbors.	654-2	20
Please move forward with the project I support.	654-3	430
These mega farms are horrific... have you not seen the footage? Because many still refuse to acknowledge animals as feeling creatures with rights to live free from cruelty I will share. Mother cows are impregnated bu human hands which is disgusting over and over so they get	655-1	74
Then people drag their newborn calf away while the mother bellows for weeks.	655-2	74
They kill the calf often just letting them die in a pile or smashing their heads.	655-3	74
Some get to live in a crate to become veal or grow a little to become milk producers.	655-4	74
They are beaten even sexually assaulted. Yes it's true. Underpaid workers often vent on these poor animals.	655-5	74
The air is terrible and they are loosely regulated.	655-6	81
Huge polluters these mega farms are. The air.	655-7	81
Huge polluters these mega farms are. The ground.	655-8	218

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
All the irons and fecal matter gets spread around to eventually destroy rivers and streams.	655-9	272
We should be getting off animal products as they are inhumane and unsustainable.	655-10	73
People don't want this. Please do your research. Watch some footage. It's not all about money.	655-11	432
Please do NOT allow this to be built. This is absolutely irresponsible and unethical in every way.	656-1	432
I vehemently oppose this. It is horrific.	657-1	432
The pollution from such a large number of cows is well documented.	657-2	146
Not to mention, how would they ensure the humane treatment of over 18,000 cows and how would the state enforce this?	657-3	74
Is there oversight for what will be done with all of the non milk producing calves born to these 18,000 cows?	657-4	79
I am submitting this comment in strong support of the West River Dairy expansion.	658-1	431
I am submitting this comment in strong support of the issuance of the NPDES Individual Feedlot Permit for this Project.	658-2	430
To create an area of 26,000 cows is an environmental disaster waiting to happen.	659-1	167
Please do not approve such a blow to the average dairy farmer and their conservation practices.	659-2	400
I am writing today to express my full support for the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	660-1	431
I believe the current review process is sufficient and that an EIS is not necessary.	660-2	20
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion to continue supporting local agriculture and the families who depend on it.	660-3	430
I strongly oppose the expansion of the West River dairy due to the animal cruelty.	661-2	74
There should never be this many animals in one spot.	661-3	74

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Sensible animal husbandry can provide the needs to our community without using "factory" methods, which are inhumane and unworthy of Minnesotans.	661-5	74
I will gladly pay more for my gallon of milk if I know that it is sourced from a responsible producer.	661-6	73
I also reject the idea that this facility can deal with the massive amount of waste in a sustainable fashion.	661-7	272
Please do not let this expansion proceed.	661-8	33
The pollution to our water is unacceptable in a state that values natural resources.	661-4a	387
The pollution to our air is unacceptable in a state that values natural resources.	661-4b	81
After reading through many comments, it appears that Riverview is a responsible corporation. That being said most of the positive comments are also from people who will directly or indirectly benefit from this expansion.	662-1	435
My biggest concern is the environmental impact to the area, primarily water quality.	662-2	388
the impact on smaller farms is also a concern.	662-4	400
An EIS is definitely needed for a project of this size.	662-5	1
The health of livestock	662-3a	73
The welfare of livestock	662-3b	74
My concern is the enormous size of this project, which would seem to increase the impact on a variety of environmental factors.	663-1	132
I think a full environmental review is warranted to evaluate the potential air pollution.	663-2	29
I think a full environmental review is warranted to evaluate the potential water pollution.	663-3	29
I think a full environmental review is warranted to evaluate the potential soil runoff.	663-4	29
I think a full environmental review is warranted to evaluate the potential groundwater runoff.	663-5	193

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I think a full environmental review is warranted to evaluate the potential energy use.	663-6	29
I think a full environmental review is warranted to evaluate the potential noise pollution.	663-7	248
I am concerned about animal welfare in a project of this magnitude.	663-8	74
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	664-1	431
I am from Winona and was very aware of the Daley Farm request from Lewiston, MN to increase their dairy expansion. On the same vein, I believe this request would have a great impact on local farms.	665-1	400
I am from Winona and was very aware of the Daley Farm request from Lewiston, MN to increase their dairy expansion. On the same vein, I believe this request would have a great impact the great possibility of manure run-off.	665-2	349
I am from Winona and was very aware of the Daley Farm request from Lewiston, MN to increase their dairy expansion. On the same vein, I believe this request would have a great impact on local contamination of groundwater and wells.	665-3	193
Having worked as a Public Health Nurse in Winona County, such a huge operation has health risks for the general population specifically that of bird flu and swine flu.	665-4	395
Treasuring our lakes in the state should be a high priority for all and contamination of our lakes and streams is not a route that we want to take.	665-5	295
Please do not approve this expansion.	666-1	432
It also harms the animals themselves through the inhumane, unnatural treatment of the living beings.	666-2	74
And what is the purpose when there's a global OVERSUPPLY of milk?	666-3	432
This letter is being composed in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	667-1	431
We are encouraging approval of the West River Dairy Expansion as we are confident of Riverview's commitment to operate within the necessary regulations.	667-2	430
The environmental review should be a sufficient enough process without an unnecessary EIS.	667-3	20
There is no doubt many more things that they have positively contributed to this area	668-1	431
CAFO operations are harmful for not just the sentient animals who feel pain, fear, and stress.	669-1	74

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
CAFO operations are harmful for the workers.	669-2	395
CAFO operations are harmful for the environment.	669-3	167
Workers are often harmed through lax regulation of safety (see JBS plant strike and plenty of other documentation).	669-4	398
Workers are often harmed through the PTSD of slaughtering thousands of animals.	669-5	395
The environmental conditions devastate the living conditions of surrounding properties.	669-6	181
The environmental conditions impacting water supply.	669-7	195
The environmental conditions impacting breathable air.	669-8	88
For me, no factory operation is ethical, but one of this size and scale are easy for all people to be against.	669-9	403
Being an organic home Gardner for over 50 years I know the importance of toxins!	670-1	145
Being an organic home Gardner for over 50 years I know the importance of water health!	670-2	295
Being an organic home Gardner for over 50 years I know the importance of animal health!	670-3	74
All affect my environment and what is done farther from my home DOES have affects locally.	670-4	167
The potential for overcrowding and disease is tremendous especially on a project this size.	670-5	434
Open a separate farm somewhere else-they don't because it would cost the company more and lower profits all with no concern for the actual animals.	670-6	432
Open a separate farm somewhere else-they don't because it would cost the company more and lower profits all with no concern for the environment.	670-7	162
We can and should do better for our State and health of our extended communities.	670-8	397
I grew up on a dairy and hog farm in Chisago County Minnesota, graduated from the U of M College of Agriculture and worked as an investigator with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for 30+ years. During those 30+ years, I spent 20 years in CA working alongside of	671-1	395

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I certainly hope that at the very least you require an Environmental Impact Statement before final decision is made.	671-3	1
Otherwise the permit should definitely not be approved.	671-4	33
The disposing of the manure on these large CAFO's is, and will continue to be, a major concern and problem. The ground can handle only so much before runoff into waterways takes place. And it is bound to happen when you have manure from thousands of cattle to dispose of.	671-2a	289
The disposing of the manure on these large CAFO's is, and will continue to be, a major concern and problem. The ground can handle only so much before seepage into aquifers takes place. And it is bound to happen when you have manure from thousands of cattle to dispose of.	671-2b	386
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	672-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	672-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	672-3	430
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	673-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	673-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	673-3	430
I do not think that large an expansion is necessary small farmers in the area would be impacted.	674-1	400
I do not think that large an expansion is necessary bad environmental damage.	674-2	167
neighbors near there would be subjected to noise due to this expansion.	674-3	249
neighbors near there would be subjected to odor due to this expansion.	674-4	83
I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	675-1	431
rural Minnesota.	675-2	430
projects like the proposed expansion of West River Dairy are important to the strength and future of rural Minnesota.	676-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I support this project and encourage the MPCA to allow it to move forward.	676-2	430
We support allowing the project to proceed through the normal review and permitting pathway, provided the MPCA determines that applicable legal and environmental standards can be met and maintained.	677-1	430
I am writing on behalf of I&S Group, Inc. (ISG) in support of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet prepared for Riverview Dairy.	678-1	431
For these reasons, we support the adequacy and conclusions of the EAW and believe it appropriately supports informed decision-making for	678-2	20
Hello, Many comments made during this public comment period point to Riverview being well run and following the Minnesota laws. No	679-1	19
Common sense tells us that this many animals will have an impact	679-2	434
common sense also tells us the milk market does not need more milk.	679-3	400
In a scenario like this we are just robbing peter to pay paul. Why not spend the time to see how these short sited economic decisions impact where we live?	679-4	432
Riverview LLP is proposing to expand in Steven's county (West River Dairy Expansion). I am a farmland owner 15 miles away from this CAFO. It is important to study the impact of this expansion and requires an EIS.	680-1	1
We who own land know that pollution from these CAFOs are impacting our ground water.	680-2	218
We who own land know that pollution from these CAFOs are impacting our land.	680-3	176
We who own land know that pollution from these CAFOs are impacting our health.	680-4	395
We who own land know that pollution from these CAFOs are impacting our communities.	680-5	397
The Pomme de Terre River watershed is within25 miles from its confluence with the Minnesota River, as an example.	680-6	277
In addition, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources does not have a complete map of Stevens County groundwater resources and aquifers.	680-7	196
Accountability is the job of MPCA. Do not allow this expansion based on unknowns.	680-8	432
EIS needs to be completed before expansion.	680-9	1
I am writing in support of the proposed 11,000 cow dairy feedlot in Section 1 of Synnes Township in Stevens County.	681-1	431
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	682-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	682-2	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	682-3	430
i do not think one farm should have thst many animal units on one site.	683-1	434
A dairy farm this size would keep any young farmers from ever getting a chance to farm .	683-2	400
They buy any land that comes up for sale and they increase the rent in the land they do not own .	683-3	435
This country was built on small family farms .	683-4	400
The communities suffer when u have these mega farms .	683-5	397
The churches will close the schools will close because they control all the land and they chase everyone away .	683-6	397
If we have to have these big dairy farms let's at least spread them around do they don't completely dominate the community.	683-7	397
I have had the opportunity to live very close to several riverview sites and wittnes first hand all of the activities: Animal care, Environmental stewardship, Neighbor relationships, Community interactions. The list is long and from what I see it's top notch.	684-1	431
I have no doubt that Riverview would operate this new facility with the same care and integrity for which they are already known.	685-1	431
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	686-1	431
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	686-2	430
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	686-3	20
I'm opposed to this expansion.	687-1	432
Cows treated like factory producers	687-2	432
mega amounts of manure	687-3	391
just the thought of it makes me worried about polluting our lakes.	687-4	272
just the thought of it makes me worried about polluting our rivers.	687-5	272

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It needs to be denied.	687-6	33
I would definitely recommend approval of a permit to expand West River Dairy as there is nobody better than Riverview when it comes to taking care of dairy cows and living up to the expectations of our communities!	688-1	430
I am in 100% support of the expansion.	689-1	431
I am writing this letter in support of Riverview's expansion at West River Dairy.	690-1	431
It is vital that the Riverview Dairy be required to submit an environmental impact statement.	691-1	1
It is nearly twice as big as any current operations in the state, and its environmental harm would be enormous. Here's what we know now.	691-2	134
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	691-3	195
Huge waste output: The facility would generate about 202.7 million gallons of liquid manure and wastewater annually, plus 26,400 tons of solid manure.	691-4	391
Unknown groundwater impacts: The DNR hasn't begun the hydrologic survey or completed the County Geologic Atlas for Stevens County, so aquifers and groundwater resources aren't mapped — making it risky to permit large withdrawals now.	691-5	196
Sensitive, already-impaired waters: the expansion sits in the Pomme de Terre Watershed, designated sensitive; the nearest waters-the Pomme de Terre River and a nearby unnamed creek - are already listed as impaired. The project would likely worsen these impairments.	691-6	266
Advancing permits without a full understanding of groundwater and water-quality risks is irresponsible.	691-7	34
It is critical that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	691-8	1
Riverview should be required to complete an environmental impact statement regarding this proposed facility.	692-1	1
The people of Morris deserve a clear statement on the effect this operation will have on our water supply availability.	692-2	195
The people of Morris deserve a clear statement on the effect this operation will have on our water supply quality.	692-3	388
This facility will also be near the Pomme de Terre watershed	692-4	182

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
part of Stevens County's Soil and Water Protection District.	692-5	417
This facility will also be near so many more protected spaces.	692-6	174
Not only is this a threat to our water, this is a threat to local farmers.	692-7	400
This large of a facility will have major impacts on smaller dairy farms in the area.	692-8	400
We need to consider the long term effects of this expansion.	692-9	432
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy expansion.	693-1	431
I believe that the rigorous review that is in place is sufficient and additional regulatory burdens are not needed.	693-2	20
I strongly support the approval of West River Dairy Expansion,	693-3	430
I respectfully encourage your support of this important project.	694-1	431
I respectfully encourage your approval of this important project.	694-2	430
I am writing to express my strong support for the Riverview Dairy expansion project.	695-1	431
I strongly support the Riverview Dairy expansion project and respectfully encourage its approval.	695-2	430
I live by Lake Reno in Pope County just a few miles from Alexandria. Alexandria already had a child die of toxic lake algae exposure.	696-1	294
It is actually hard for me to imagine a dairy herd of even a 100 cattle. I'm 80. I grew up milking a few cows. Of course, those days are gone! However, contemplating over 18,000 dairy cattle raises my every instinct of danger and fear.	696-2	434
Danger to our Public Health and Natural Resources: where in this world/landscape does all that daily manure, poop and urine of 18,885 cattle go? Toxic poison in our lakes and streams?	696-3	346
Toxic poison in our lakes?	696-4	294
Toxic poison in our streams?	696-5	294
Poop stinks. 18,885 Cows everyday. Oh my gosh, I bet that's wonderful on a hot stifling day in July. Every day.	696-6	370
Danger to our Animal Welfare: Yes we need to feed the world. Yes, we need to maximize our dairy industry. It can never be "like it was". But factoring 18,885 dairy cows into one facility is cruel.	696-7	74
Cleanliness alone is huge.	696-8	432
Danger of Viral Disease is Huge.	696-9	72
But just a few miles from me on Lake Reno we already do have a huge cattle feedlot.	696-10	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am writing to express my strong support for the West River Dairy Expansion.	697-1	431
We encourage the MPCA to maintain its commitment to a science-based and data-driven process. The current environmental review for this project is comprehensive. We believe the existing regulatory tools—including the EAW and the potential for individual permits with specific conditions—are sufficient to ensure the protection of Minnesota's water and natural resources.	698-1	430
Proper Jurisdiction: The environmental review process is designed to assess significant environmental impacts, not to dictate public policy regarding the size or structure of dairy farms.	698-2	19
Legislative Authority: We believe the Minnesota Legislature is the appropriate body to determine broader economic policies that support the dairy industry and its farmers.	698-3	19
Regulatory Integrity: Utilizing the environmental permitting process to address economic competition issues is inappropriate and risks undermining the integrity of the state's regulatory system.	698-4	19
Minnesota's dairy sector thrives when there is a transparent, predictable, and rigorous permitting process. We support the MPCA's use of the established EAW process to evaluate this project and encourage a final decision based on the technical merits and data presented throughout this review.	698-5	20
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	699-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	699-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	699-3	430
I am writing to express my support for the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	700-1	431
I believe the current review process is sufficient and that additional regulatory burdens are unnecessary.	700-2	20
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	700-3	430
We value their partnership immensely and hope that the agency considers these vital economic and community contributions during this feedback process.	701-1	431
I am opposed to this project because of the large number of animals they plan to have.	702-1	434
Air quality should be addressed.	702-2	81
water quality should be addressed.	702-3	388
water availability should be addressed.	702-4	195
A feedlot of this size will impact residents many miles in every direction from the feedlot i.e. Smell.	702-5	83
There should be environmental studies carried out by State and Federal agencies.	702-6	29
Please deny this permit request from Riverview Dairy.	702-7	33
The West River dairy expansion will be too taxing on our environmental resources. I say no!	703-1	167

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am writing in support of Riverview LLP's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	704-1	431
I am respectfully submitting my comments about corporate farming. I oppose West River Dairy expansion as the proposed size of the expansion will be unable to keep environmental safety.	705-1	434
I am respectfully submitting my comments about corporate farming. I oppose West River Dairy expansion as the proposed size of the expansion is extremely damaging to small family dairy operations.	705-2	400
I am respectfully submitting my comments about corporate farming. I oppose West River Dairy expansion as the proposed size of the expansion is cruel to the dairy animals.	705-3	74
I grew up on a family Holstein dairy operation. Animal husbandry was always practiced on our farm. Our cows were milked two times per day. Between the morning and evening milkings, our cows were let out of the barn to feed on pasture grass and get fresh air and sunshine for the health of the animals. Animals on these corporate farms are denied fresh air and are merely MACHINES for continued breeding until they are physically exhausted. Then they are disposed of (which SADLY may be the best part of their lives). We surely owe our domesticated animals much more empathy than this!	705-4	74
When did we begin to put corporate profits above concerns for family farmers and the animals we are entrusted to care for?	705-5	73
The tradeoffs for the benefit of huge corporations and their owners/shareholders should not override all other concerns!	705-6	432
Please deny all corporate farms in Minnesota the ability to expand and - even to exist.	705-7	33
I want to speak in strong support of the West River Dairy expansion.	706-1	431
I am writing in strong support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	707-1	431
I am in support of Riverview's expansion project	708-1	431
I don't believe that the EIS is necessary.	708-2	20
I am submitting this comment to urge the rejection of the proposed livestock facility expansion.	709-1	33
A facility of this size creates an unmanageable amount of waste that threatens Minnesota's groundwater.	709-2	193
A facility of this size creates an unmanageable amount of waste that threatens Minnesota's local ecosystems.	709-3	165
Beyond the environmental impact, I am concerned about the welfare of the animals involved	709-4	74
Beyond the environmental impact, I am concerned about the degradation of the surrounding wild animal habitats.	709-5	172
We should be moving toward more sustainable and ethical agricultural practices, not doubling down on industrial factory farming.	709-6	432
I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed West River Dairy expansion.	710-1	431
I respectfully ask that the MPCA approve the West River Dairy expansion.	710-2	430
I also believe the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) process has been comprehensive and su□icient, and that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not necessary.	710-3	20
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	711-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	711-2	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	711-3	430
I am writing in strong support of the proposed West River Dairy expansion near Morris.	712-1	431
The environmental review process has been thorough.	712-2	20
I respectfully urge the MPCA to approve this expansion	712-3	430
The West River Dairy expansion should not be approved.	713-1	33
Throughout Minnesota, and the whole nation, family farm operations and small scale independent agricultural enterprises are being squeezed or out and out destroyed by the large scale industrial model of agriculture, in the name of increased efficiency and profitability for stakeholders.	713-2	400
The degradation of the land are externalities that are invariably left for the community or state to deal with.	713-3	397
The degradation of the ground water are externalities that are invariably left for the community or state to deal with.	713-4	240
The degradation of the air are externalities that are invariably left for the community or state to deal with.	713-5	81
The degradation of the habitats are externalities that are invariably left for the community or state to deal with.	713-6	172
The industrial model of agriculture devastates their local economies resulting in impoverished and dying small towns with few prospects for people in those regions.	713-7	398
Ethically, there is much to oppose this feedlot expansion, from the inhumane treatment of the cows and their offspring.	713-8	74
Ethically, there is much to oppose this feedlot expansion to the questionable treatment of the employees who do not reap the economic benefits that these factory operations provide to the few.	713-9	398
somewhere, and there are no benign disposal options.	713-10	346
Please include my name in those that OPPOSE the expansion of the West River Dairy!!!	714-1	432
This enlargement project is just too large for the area.	714-2	434
Often, we hear of large dairy operations that have manure "leaks" that pollute the area.	714-3	353
We also have polluted ground water that have also been impacted by these "accidents".	714-4	239
We also have polluted lakes that have also been impacted by these "accidents".	714-5	285
We have a cabin in an adjacent county and would hate to have this expansion set a precedent in additional areas of the state.	714-6	433
Please oppose this expansion!	714-7	432
I am writing in strong support of the proposed West River Dairy expansion near Morris.	715-1	431
I respectfully urge the MPCA to approve this expansion.	715-2	430
Riverview Dairy is a strong example of modern, environmentally conscious farm management. Based on what I've seen, I'm confident the new facility will be maintained with the same level of cleanliness, care, and professionalism	716-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	717-1	431
In closing, I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	717-2	430
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	717-3	20
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	718-1	431
In closing, I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	718-2	430
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	718-3	20
Riverview does not have Minneostans in mind for this expansion.	719-1	434
They do no support community farmers.	719-2	400
This expansion is an ecological disaster waiting to happen.	719-3	166
Riverview has already had manure leakage in a manure storage tank	719-4	373
their hog and dairy farms use at least 570 million gallons of water annually.	719-5	195
The proposed expansion would pump and store up to an additional 226 million gallons.	719-6	195
We do not need to sacrifice our fresh water for these massive factories.	719-7	227
Please vote no. For our water. For our future.	719-8	432
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	720-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	720-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	720-3	430
This expansion is very concerning. A project of this size should require an environmental impact statement. The citizens of Minnesota should be able to expect this level of oversight from the MCPA.	721-1	434
I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the proposed West River Dairy Expansion in Stevens County. While I understand the importance of agriculture to Minnesota's economy, I have serious concerns about the scale of this project and its potential impacts on animal welfare.	722-1	434
I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the proposed West River Dairy Expansion in Stevens County. While I understand the importance of agriculture to Minnesota's economy, I have serious concerns about the scale of this project and its potential impacts on the environment.	722-2	133
An operation of this size, housing nearly 19,000 dairy cows, raises significant questions about the humane treatment of animals. Industrial-scale dairies often limit natural behaviors, increase stress, and can lead to higher rates of injury and illness if not carefully managed. I urge the MPCA to closely evaluate how animal welfare standards will be maintained at this facility and whether current oversight is sufficient at this scale.	722-3	74
Additionally, the environmental risks are substantial.	722-4	167
Large dairy operations produce enormous quantities of manure, which can threaten groundwater quality if not properly handled.	722-5	193
Large dairy operations produce enormous quantities of manure, which can threaten surface water quality if not properly handled.	722-6	289

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Large dairy operations produce enormous quantities of manure, which can threaten air quality if not properly handled.	722-7	81
In a rural area like Stevens County, where many residents rely on well water, the potential for contamination is especially concerning.	722-8	193
Odorcould also negatively impact nearby communities.	722-9	83
Odorcould also negatively impact nearby ecosystems.	722-10	83
Emissions could also negatively impact nearby communities.	722-11	81
Emissions could also negatively impact nearby ecosystems.	722-12	81
Nutrient runoff could also negatively impact nearby communities.	722-13	272
Nutrient runoff could also negatively impact nearby ecosystems.	722-14	272
I respectfully ask the MPCA to ensure that this Environmental Assessment Worksheet fully and transparently addresses these concerns, and to require the highest standards of environmental protection and animal care before any permits are considered.	722-15	32
I am writing in support of Riverview LLP's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	723-1	431
I am not in favor of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	724-1	432
My three main reasons include animal welfare.	724-2	74
My three main reasons include manure runoff with all the environmental concerns associated with that.	724-3	167
My three main reasons include I oppose factory farming.	724-4	432
I strongly support the proposed expansion of the West River Dairy in Stevens County.	725-1	431
After review and research of this situation and reading many of these comments, if this expansion is such a benefit for the community, no one should be afraid to do an EIS.	726-1	31
Many commenting in support seem to be businesses involved directly with Riverview and others related to the business which is not impartial by any means. One can have the best intentions and character but deeper study can only assist with determining if this huge expansion is right for our area at this time.	726-2	431
Looking at Riverview's history in SD, ND, AZ and their ND impacts into Canada- there seems to be some strong opposition to projects already completed and also those with permits for expansions ready to be started. Some have been met with legal opposition. It would seem wise of MN to look a bit deeper into this now than pay a price later.	726-3	56
I would be concerned about water usage and the overall water tables ability to trend through changing environmental impacts.	726-4	195
I would be concerned about where expansion stops.	726-5	434
Two major Riverview locations are already situated approximately 12 miles near each other, one being another currently expanding to offer milk plant service.	726-6	432
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	727-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	727-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	727-3	430

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am a resident living within a few miles of the proposed West River Dairy expansion in Synnes Township. I am writing to respectfully request that the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency require a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) before any permits are approved for this project.	728-1	1
My primary concern is water—the quantity being withdrawn.	728-2	190
My primary concern is water—the quality that will remain for nearby residents.	728-3	193
The scale of this proposed expansion raises serious questions about groundwater sustainability. The amount of water required for a facility of this size has the potential to impact local aquifers, private wells, and long-term water availability in our area.	728-4	190
As a nearby resident who relies on groundwater, I am deeply concerned that the current level of environmental review does not fully evaluate these risks.	728-5	26
Equally important are the potential health impacts associated with this project. I am the parent of a medically complex adult child with special needs. Recent lab work has shown elevated levels of pesticides in his system. This makes environmental exposures a critical and personal concern for our family. Any increase in contaminants—whether through manure application, runoff, groundwater movement, or air emissions—could further compromise his already fragile health.	728-6	395
Given the scale of this operation, the volume of manure to be generated and applied to surrounding land, and the uncertainty around cumulative impacts, I do not believe that an Environmental Assessment Worksheet provides sufficient analysis.	728-7	26
This decision will have long-term consequences for our community's health.	728-9	395
This decision will have long-term consequences for our water resources.	728-10	387
This decision will have long-term consequences for our quality of life.	728-11	397
As someone directly affected and responsible for protecting a medically vulnerable child, I urge the MPCA to take a precautionary approach and require a full Environmental Impact Statement.	728-12	1
A full EIS is necessary to: Thoroughly evaluate groundwater withdrawal impacts on local wells and aquifers	728-8a	3
A full EIS is necessary to: Assess the risk of contamination from manure, nutrients, and associated chemicals	728-8b	2
A full EIS is necessary to: Examine cumulative environmental and health impacts over time Consider the vulnerability of sensitive populations, including children and individuals with pre-existing health conditions.	728-8c	10
Allowing this expansion is immoral.	729-1	434
They are damaging the dairy industry everyday.	729-2	398
There is already too much milk on the market and they just keep growing and for what?	729-3	398
They don't care for the livestock they're all just managers with who knows what agenda.	729-4	74
Nothing positive comes from them continuously expanding.	729-5	434
Rumor has it that instead of paying investors they just keep growing, like a giant ponzi scheme.	729-6	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Allowing them to continue is unreasonable.	729-7	432
At the very least, I am in favor of requiring an EIS for this project before any further decisions are made on allowing the expansion.	730-1	1
I lived in Stevens County for 30 years. It's unfortunate that Riverview does not have the integrity to support in depth studies of the impacts of increasing their already massive operations.	730-2	31
I would hope that the company leaders would model caring for their neighbors.	730-3	397
I would hope that the company leaders would model caring for smaller dairy operations.	730-4	400
I would hope that the company leaders would model caring for the environment.	730-5	167
They apparently don't rate those concerns higher than making more money.	730-6	432
Multiple EIS's should be done for a proposed dairy of this magnatude!	731-1	19
This dairy may likely have generational impacts to the local environment and needs to be thoroughly reviewed!	731-2	29
This dairy may likely have generational impacts to the local watershead and needs to be thoroughly reviewed!	731-3	29
I am a resident of and farm land owner in Stevens County. I care about our environment for us and future residents of generations to come. An EIS definitely needs to be done on this proposed project.	732-1	1
Why wouldn't one be done on a project of this size?	732-2	32
Why wouldn't Riverview welcome that?	732-3	31
I am concerned that this project could affect ground water supply for others much like happened in Arizona with this same company. There Riverview dug wells as deep as needed while others not associated with them often could not afford to when their wells went dry. It isn't obvious to me `that Riverview cared about surrounding residents lack of water caused by their business in Arizona. Let's not have that happen here.	732-4	194
A full environmental review of the proposed facility should be done to protect resources and help Riverview be good stewards of those resources.	732-5	29
I strongly support this project and believe it reflects the kind of thoughtful agricultural growth that can benefit both the local community and the broader region.	733-1	431
I'm of the opinion that Riverview must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement for their proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	735-1	1
That potential number of cows all located in one concentrated area would produce a very large amount of manure.	735-2	391
That potential number of cows all located in one concentrated area would require vast amounts of water, posing a large risk to the local groundwater resources.	735-3	386
We need to know of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed expansion before it can move forward.	735-4	29
They are a good neighbor and have had a positive impact on my farming operation.	736-1	431
The proposed Riverview expansion represents a meaningful economic benefit to the region.	737-1	431
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	738-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	738-2	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	738-3	430
Please require a full environmental impact statement on the proposed expansion of West River Dairy. Riverview Dairy is already the largest factory farm in the state with a history of manure spills.	739-1	17
This expansion would generate significant greenhouse gas emissions .	739-2	103
The manure runoff would lead to increased nitrates and phosphorus.	739-3	368
The state needs to consider the impact on our waterways.	739-4	289
The state needs to consider the impact on human health.	739-5	395
I want to reiterate my enthusiastic support for this project and thank you for your consideration in this matter.	740-1	431
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	741-1	431
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	741-2	430
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	741-3	20
I am writing this letter concerning the expansion of Riverview Dairy, which is about 2 ½ miles south of me. I have lived here since 1982.	742-1	434
The odor from manure.	742-2	83
Dust from the roads both township and county.	742-3	97
My well water.	742-4	195
The movement of cattle – both cows and calves. In state – out state.	742-6	73
The effect on the land year after year.	742-7	176
The effect on surface water. There are lots of lakes, sloughs, creeks and rivers in this area. Also protected areas like wet lands and waterfowl areas. Where does the water (tiled or not) run into?	742-8	289
Who keeps track of spills, water quality, and so forth. Are they independent of the dairies??	742-9	160
Groundwater depletion and contamination: Large dairies of this scale require millions of gallons of water annually, placing pressure on aquifers already stressed by agricultural use.	743-2	195
Groundwater depletion and contamination: Nitrate contamination from manure is a documented risk in regions with similar operations, threatening drinking water safety for rural households and municipal systems.	743-3	193
Surface water pollution: Runoff from manure storage increases the risk of phosphorus and nitrogen loading into nearby rivers, streams, and wetlands. This contributes to algal blooms, fish kills, and long-term ecosystem degradation.	743-4	281
Surface water pollution: Runoff land application increases the risk of phosphorus and nitrogen loading into nearby rivers, streams, and wetlands. This contributes to algal blooms, fish kills, and long-term ecosystem degradation.	743-5	272
Surface water pollution: Runoff fromfeed storage areas increases the risk of phosphorus and nitrogen loading into nearby rivers, streams, and wetlands. This contributes to algal blooms, fish kills, and long-term ecosystem degradation.	743-6	280
Air quality impacts: Emissions of ammonia from large dairies can harm respiratory health. These impacts are especially concerning for nearby residents, schools, and vulnerable populations.	743-7	86

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Air quality impacts: Emissions of ammonia from large dairies can reduce quality of life. These impacts are especially concerning for nearby residents, schools, and vulnerable populations.	743-8	86
Air quality impacts: Emissions of ammonia from large dairies can contribute to climate change. These impacts are especially concerning for nearby residents, schools, and vulnerable populations.	743-9	86
Air quality impacts: Emissions of hydrogen sulfide from large dairies can harm respiratory health. These impacts are especially concerning for nearby residents, schools, and vulnerable populations.	743-10	85
Air quality impacts: Emissions of hydrogen sulfide from large dairies can reduce quality of life. These impacts are especially concerning for nearby residents, schools, and vulnerable populations.	743-11	85
Air quality impacts: Emissions of hydrogen sulfide from large dairies can contribute to climate change. These impacts are especially concerning for nearby residents, schools, and vulnerable populations.	743-12	85
Air quality impacts: Emissions of methane from large dairies can harm respiratory health. These impacts are especially concerning for nearby residents, schools, and vulnerable populations.	743-13	84
Air quality impacts: Emissions of methane from large dairies canreduce quality of life. These impacts are especially concerning for nearby residents, schools, and vulnerable populations.	743-14	84
Air quality impacts: Emissions of methane from large dairies can contribute to climate change. These impacts are especially concerning for nearby residents, schools, and vulnerable populations.	743-15	84
Air quality impacts: Emissions of particulate matter from large dairies can harm respiratory health. These impacts are especially concerning for nearby residents, schools, and vulnerable populations.	743-16	87
Air quality impacts: Emissions of particulate matter from large dairies reduce quality of life. These impacts are especially concerning for nearby residents, schools, and vulnerable populations.	743-17	87
Air quality impacts: Emissions of particulate matter from large dairies can contribute to climate change. These impacts are especially concerning for nearby residents, schools, and vulnerable populations.	743-18	87
Local infrastructure strain: Heavy truck traffic associated with feed delivery, manure hauling, and milk transport accelerates road deterioration and increases maintenance costs for county and township governments.	743-19	308
Depressed property values: Numerous studies show that proximity to large concentrated animal feeding operations {CAFOs) reduces residential property values due to odor, noise, and perceived health risks.	743-20	398
Harm to independent farmers: Sadly, Minnesota is losing many dairy farms annually due to unreliable and most often below cost of production milk prices. Massive dairy operations like this one affects the market in a way that small and medium sizes family farms are put out of business and off the land. Any new producers will find it hard for a creamery to accept their milk because of the large amount of milk that is produced by these larger dairies. Loss of family farms have a trickle down effect on the local economy which affects Main Street Minnesota.	743-21	400
Riverview LLP's Dairy is one of the largest milk producers in the country. They own 16 permitted dairy Concentrated Feeding Operations (CAFOs) in Minnesota. The cumulative environmental burden-including groundwater withdrawals, manure spreading, and air emissions-must be evaluated comprehensively.	743-22	23

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Approving this type of expansion without a full EIS would ignore the broader regional impacts and set a troubling precedent for unchecked growth of industrial-scale livestock operations.	743-23	14
On behalf of Minnesota National Farmers with our state board voting on this action, I am writing to request that the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency require a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS} before any permit is approved for the expansion of the Riverview LLP's West River Dairy in Stevens County. The scale of this expansion poses significant environmental risks that cannot be adequately evaluated through a simple Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW).	743-1a	1
On behalf of Minnesota National Farmers with our state board voting on this action, I am writing to request that the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency require a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS} before any permit is approved for the expansion of the Riverview LLP's West River Dairy in Stevens County. The scale of this expansion poses significant economic risks that cannot be adequately evaluated through a simple Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW).	743-1b	14
On behalf of Minnesota National Farmers with our state board voting on this action, I am writing to request that the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency require a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS} before any permit is approved for the expansion of the Riverview LLP's West River Dairy in Stevens County. The scale of this expansion poses significant community risks that cannot be adequately evaluated through a simple Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW).	743-1c	13
Given the scale of the proposed expansion a full EIS is not only justified but necessary. An EIS would provide: •A thorough analysis of cumulative impacts •Transparent evaluation of alternatives •Opportunities for meaningful public participation •A science-based foundation for regulatory decision-making For these reasons, I respectfully urge the MPCA to require a full Environmental Impact Statement before considering any permit approval for Riverview LLP's West River Dairy expansion.	743-24a	15
Given the the potential for significant environmental harm, a full EIS is not only justified but necessary. An EIS would provide: •A thorough analysis of cumulative impacts •Transparent evaluation of alternatives •Opportunities for meaningful public participation •A science-based foundation for regulatory decision-making For these reasons, I respectfully urge the MPCA to require a full Environmental Impact Statement before considering any permit approval for Riverview LLP's West River Dairy expansion.	743-24b	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Given the long-term economic consequences for local communities, a full EIS is not only justified but necessary. An EIS would provide: •A thorough analysis of cumulative impacts •Transparent evaluation of alternatives •Opportunities for meaningful public participation •A science-based foundation for regulatory decision-making For these reasons, I respectfully urge the MPCA to require a full Environmental Impact Statement before considering any permit approval for Riverview LLP's West River Dairy expansion.	743-24c	14
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	744-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	744-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	744-3	430
Please complete an Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed Riverview Dairy Expansion.	745-1	1
What impact will rivers face?	745-3	289
What impact will streams face?	745-4	289
What impact will aquifers face?	745-5	195
What impact will wells face?	745-6	195
Land ownership and rental arrangements are becoming more concentrated among a small group of individuals or entities that are associated with the dairies.	745-7	398
How will the roads stand up to the constant heavy traffic of the equipment and trucks used during their harvest of hay ledge and silage? The equipment moves regardless of the weather or road conditions.	745-8	308
I encourage you to protect the future of our land and environment.	745-9	432
The decisions made now will have a profound impact on the quality of life for future generations.	745-10	432
We all need to open our eyes and see what is happening!	745-11	432
If this massive expansion is approved, what is to stop them from expanding every existing dairy?	745-12	434
There are still many unanswered questions about the impact of large dairy farms on communities, such as nearby towns.	745-13	397
There are still many unanswered questions about the impact of large dairy farms on communities, such as nearby businesses.	745-14	398
There are still many unanswered questions about the impact of large dairy farms on communities, such as nearby schools.	745-15	397
There are still many unanswered questions about the impact of large dairy farms on communities, such as nearby churches.	745-16	397
There are still many unanswered questions about the impact of large dairy farms on communities, such as nearby cooperatives.	745-17	398
There are still many unanswered questions about the impact of large dairy farms on communities, such as nearby grain elevators.	745-18	398
So, again I ask, please complete an Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed Riverview Dairy Expansion.	745-19	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
My family lives in an area with 6 Riverview Dairies. Given the high concentration of dairies and heavy daily water use, how will water quality in 5, 10, or 20 years.	745-2a	388
My family lives in an area with 6 Riverview Dairies. Given the high concentration of dairies and heavy daily water use, how will water supply change in 5, 10, or 20 years.	745-2b	195
The dairy industry couldn't even survive without generous support from taxpayers, and this is how they repay us? Polluting our air and water?	746-1	432
Rural Minnesota smells like feces because of farms like this.	746-2	83
Bring back the sea of grass, save the soil and the pollinators.	746-3	161
We're headed for global famine by the end of the century if we keep allowing industries like this to trash our only planet.	746-4	143
This is way too big of a livestock operation. Can the company divide it into smaller pieces?	747-1	434
Also, it would present unfair competition with traditional family farms.	747-2	398
What will become of Princess Kay if all that's left are giant corporations?	747-3	400
I am writing to support this project	748-1	431
I am confident that the EAW document provides a thorough and well supported analysis of the project's potential impacts.	748-2	20
I am writing to express my support for Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	749-1	431
I respectfully encourage the MPCA to support and approve this project.	749-2	430
An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not necessary because the EAW provides the agency with the information it needs for this type of project, per Minn. Rule 4410.4300.	750-1	20
The Minnesota Chamber supports the expansion and the benefits it will provide and looks forward to the next step in the process.	750-2	431
We are looking forward to a long and valuable partnership with Riverview and are excited for the opportunities that lay ahead.	751-1	430
I'm a concerned citizen of Minnesota that recently learned about the proposed expansion of the dairy farm. I feel the potential impact on our MN natural resources by this private company's expansion of operations is potentially enormous.	752-1	180
To me, this very much warrants further exploration and closer examination of the details of this situation. I think a comprehensive environmental review of West River's plans would be extremely appropriate given the magnitude of impact this could have.	752-2	1
The scope of this dairy farm expansion is unique.	752-3	434
I support getting an Environmental Impact Statement before any permit approval and I hope you do too.	752-4	1
I strongly support the West River Dairy Expansion near Morris, Minnesota by Riverview Dairy.	753-1	430
I am in support of this as this is another project for rural Minnesota that provides new jobs, local economic growth, and an investment that will be there for generations to come that supports many other local residents and industries.	754-1	430
A dairy farm of this size is not a farm, it's an industrial facility.	755-1	434
The treatment of 18,000 animals in a production facility is inhumane. This is not farming!	755-3	74

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
We need to support sustainable and healthy agriculture and actual farms, not industrial facilities.	755-4	74
I am concerned both about the potential pollution that this facility could cause to our ground water	755-5	193
as well as the precedent. It could set for other facilities in our state.	755-6	432
Our ground water is too precious to risk it!	755-7	227
The water use potential is outrageous.	755-2a	195
The water pollution potential is outrageous.	755-2b	388
I oppose this expansion because it puts public health at risk.	756-2	395
I oppose this expansion because it increases the elimination of family farms.	756-3	400
I oppose this expansion because I do not support the poor animal welfare that happens at these large farms.	756-4	74
This is not how we should be operating dairy farms. It is inhumane and disgusting.	756-5	74
Our water and our treatment of the life that sustains us should be priority.	756-7	295
I strongly oppose the West River Dairy Expansion and would be deeply disappointed if the MPCA provided a permit for this facility.	756-8	33
I am strongly opposed to the proposed expansion of the West River Dairy which would create a "farm" totaling 18,855 dairy cows (over 26,000 + AU).	757-1	432
I grew up on a small dairy farm in southeastern Ottertail County. Our livestock were treated humanely.	757-2	74
I grew up on a small dairy farm in southeastern Ottertail County. Our land was stewarded sustainably.	757-3	159
I grew up on a small dairy farm in southeastern Ottertail County. Our profits were fair and competitive.	757-4	158
I grew up on a small dairy farm in southeastern Ottertail County. We were committed to a community that depended upon one another for mutual success.	757-5	397
I feel that such a mega-farm, as proposed, is not consistent with the values of average Minnesota farmers, nor of the important agricultural history of our state.	757-6	397
I am writing to respectfully request that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed West River Dairy expansion project.	758-1	1
I am a Stevens County livestock farmer, and former dairy farmer, with firsthand experience of the effect that consolidation in the dairy industry has had on limiting access to markets for small and mid-sized dairy farms.	758-2	400
Given the unprecedented scale of this project, a more comprehensive environmental review is both reasonable and necessary. A project of this magnitude carries the potential for significant environmental effects that extend beyond what can be adequately evaluated in an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW).	758-3	26
I am particularly concerned about the projected water use and the cumulative impact on regional aquifers. An EIS would provide a more detailed assessment of these demands and their sustainability over time.	758-4	3
Additionally, the potential impacts on groundwater and surface water quality in the region warrants deeper examination. The proposed manure storage raises important questions about nutrient runoff and nitrate contamination.	758-5	193

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Additionally, the potential impacts on groundwater and surface water quality in the region warrants deeper examination. The proposed land application plan raises important questions about nutrient runoff and nitrate contamination.	758-6	272
Given the vulnerability of local water resources, including those connected to the Pomme de Terre watershed, these risks deserve a more rigorous and transparent analysis.	758-7	29
Beyond environmental concerns, the size and scope of this project raise broader questions about the long term socioecomonic impact across the state and region. I am passionate about thriving rural communities and feel strongly that we all benefit from more farmers on the land.	758-8	398
In this instance specifically, an EIS feels like commonsense guardrails that serve the greater good. An EIS would ensure that all potential impacts are thoroughly studied, that alternatives are meaningfully considered, and that the public has a fuller opportunity to engage with the decision-making process. Given the significance of this proposal, anything less would fall short of the level of scrutiny this project deserves.	758-9	1
Concerning the West river Dairy Expansion, an environmental impact study needs to be done.	759-1	1
Morris is located along the watershed that channels many streams and lakes into the Pomme de Terre River. Many of these waterways are categorized as impaired by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency because they failed to meet water quality standards.	759-2	266
Riverview's expansion would more than double its liquid manure storage capacity in Morris, from 102 million gallons to 250 million gallons.	759-3	334
This expansion needs further review.	759-4	29
This is a bad idea all around.	760-1	432
The site is in an environmentally sensitive watershed,	760-2	422
there aren't people to work in the dairy,	760-3	432
and most importantly we don't need it.	760-4	432
Please vote "no".	760-5	432
Absolutely an EIS for starters; tho I live in Wisconsin now, I am well aware of the huge negative impacts CAFOs have everywhere	761-1	1
there are good reasons for supporting small farms,	761-2	400
understanding why we need to limit our appetites for meat and dairy	761-3	403
including running out of water,	761-4	195
the spread of disease among animals,	761-5	72
the use of antibiotics which will affect human health	761-6	395
and the pollution to air from the enormous amounts of manure	761-7	81
and the pollution to water from the enormous amounts of manure	761-8	388
and the pollution to soil from the enormous amounts of manure	761-9	183
Biohazards need to be considered as well	761-10	135

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
and the treatment of animals is reprehensible.	761-11	74
I don't believe current analysis by West Dairy would meet the standards we perhaps need to raise.	761-12	26
Thank you for the EIS! We are trying to get more of them in Wisconsin as well as strong ordinances.	761-13	43
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	762-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	762-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	762-3	430
I am writing today in support of the Riverview application to expand West River Dairy.	763-1	431
I encourage the MPCA to grant this permit to Riverview.	763-2	430
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	764-1	431
This dairy expansion recently came to my attention, and it's very concerning to me as a citizen of Minnesota.	765-1	432
I value our beautiful land.	765-2	176
I value our clean water.	765-2	388
I fear a massive dairy of this size will only increase water consumption.	765-3	220
I fear a massive dairy of this size will only increase nitrate levels.	765-4	153
These are decisions that can't be reversed and could have lasting environmental effects.	765-5	167
I've also been a lifelong supporter of our local co-ops, so I value small family farming and cooperative farming.	765-6	400
These corporate dairies are putting local small farms across the state out of business.	765-7	400
On top of those considerations, I also have concerns about the animal welfare of a dairy that size. Animals are treated like numbers and dollar signs, which isn't the direction we need to be moving as a community.	765-8	74
I support the Land Stewardship Project's recommendation that this proposal by Riverview, LLP must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	766-1	1
A facility of this scale located in such a vulnerable area calls for a thorough environmental review	766-2	29
and just as importantly, an EIS of the West River Dairy Expansion proposal would address socio-economic impacts.	766-3	14
Industrial-Scale Projects Need Industrial-Scale Review!	766-4	29
There needs to be analysis regarding water availability across industries given aquifers stretch across the region, the state and across state lines. Riverview is not happening in a vacuum, it is happening in the context of data centers that are also popping up exponentially wanting to draw from the same water sources as Riverview and use similar and higher amounts of water.	767-1	211
We're also facing the same battle with them in trying to have it be required that they also must complete an EIS-not a single one of the now 20 some hyperscale proposals has completed an EIS and 7 are in court.	767-2	211
75% of Minnesotans rely on groundwater for their source of drinking water.	767-3	204

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The MPCAs own site lists 1800 old, unpermitted, mostly unlined solid waste dump sites that are contaminating our groundwater, with 43 construction and demolition dump sites being monitored only as of 2010 showing arsenic, boron and manganese at levels beyond human and environmental standards and mitigation efforts are not helping. That's only 43 out of 1800 that are even monitored?	767-4	223
And the data centers alone could use millions of gallons of water a day each plus chemical contamination from industrial wastewater they claim is nonexistent (Pine Island) and they're not doing an EIS, and now Riverview wants 316 MGY plus contamination from manure.	767-5	211
It is absolutely essential that MPCA require an EIS if it stakes any claim at all to caring about protecting clean water.	767-6	1
Groundwater contamination issues shud b forefront of such expansion.	768-1	193
That much manure in one location, creates potential problems overtime.	768-2	326
Is a digester plan involved.	768-3	435
Maybe the greatest issue will be the affect on smaller dairies. A farm of this magnitude will get all the business breaks smaller dairies will b unable to compete with	768-4	400
The concentration of 18,855 dairy cows at one site and storage and spreading of the resulting liquid manure creates a risk of contamination of groundwater in the Pomme de Terre rivershed.	769-1	193
The concentration of 18,855 dairy cows at one site and storage and spreading of the resulting liquid manure creates a risk of contamination of surface water in the Pomme de Terre rivershed.	769-2	289
An expansion of this size should be investigated more fully before a permit to construct and operate a facility with this many animals goes forward.	769-3	29
I'm interested in MN investing in less dairy expansion and more wildlife conservation.	770-1	432
There are awesome wildlife areas in Morris MN that I am worried could be impacted long term	770-2	432
Concern over one business owning 1/3 of the dairy cows in Minnesota.	771-1	398
Also concerns over that much manure in one area	771-2	326
Also concerns over that much water demand.	771-3	195
I am a dairy farmer, and I am writing in support of Riverview LLP's proposed expansion of West River Dairy near Morris, Minnesota.	772-1	431
I am writing because a growing milk supply benefits every dairy farmer in this state, and because Minnesota's environmental regulations are comprehensive, robust, and fully capable of protecting the environment without the need for an Environmental Impact Statement.	772-2	20
Please allow this project to move forward without further delay so that Minnesota's dairy industry can continue to grow — for our communities and for the next generation of farm families.	772-3	430
I am writing in support of the proposed expansion.	773-1	431
I am commenting to support Riverview's expansion project near Morris.	774-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am writing on behalf of Valley Queen Cheese Factory, Inc. to formally express our strong support for the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's approval of Riverview LLP's permit application for the proposed expansion of the West River Dairy.	775-1	431
respectfully encourages the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to approve Riverview LLP's permit application for the West River Dairy expansion.	775-2	430
I am writing on behalf of Dooley's Natural Gas in support of the proposed 11,000 cow dairy in Section 1 of Synnes Township in Stevens County.	776-1	431
I am writing as a concerned resident to strongly urge the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) to require a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed expansion of Riverview, LLP's dairy concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO) in Stevens County.	777-1	1
Due to the unprecedented magnitude of this proposal, Minnesotans deserve the highest level of environmental review available. This would be the largest livestock operation in state history, and a project of this scale warrants far greater scrutiny than a standard review process provides.	777-2	29
I have been a volunteer lake and stream monitor for the MPCA since 2019. I monitor Barrett Lake, which is part of the Pomme de Terre watershed downstream of the proposed site, and I have also monitored the Pomme de Terre River where it enters Barrett Lake. Over that time, I have observed a decline in water quality. Even without a facility of this size upstream, there are already many weeks each year when Barrett Lake is not suitable for recreation. The addition of a 26,000+ animal operation raises serious concerns about further degradation.	777-3	388
A facility of this size would require substantial water use. Given the location within the Pomme de Terre River watershed, near already impaired waters, the risks of nutrient runoff must be thoroughly evaluated.	777-4	272
A facility of this size would require substantial water use. Given the location within the Pomme de Terre River watershed, near already impaired waters, the risks of groundwater contamination must be thoroughly evaluated.	777-5	193
A facility of this size would require substantial water use. Given the location within the Pomme de Terre River watershed, near already impaired waters, the risks of accidental spills must be thoroughly evaluated.	777-6	285
A facility of this size would generate an enormous volume of manure. Given the location within the Pomme de Terre River watershed, near already impaired waters, the risks of accidental spills must be thoroughly evaluated.	777-7	285
A facility of this size would generate an enormous volume of manure. Given the location within the Pomme de Terre River watershed, near already impaired waters, the risks groundwater contamination must be thoroughly evaluated.	777-8	182
A facility of this size would generate an enormous volume of manure. Given the location within the Pomme de Terre River watershed, near already impaired waters, the risks of accidental spills must be thoroughly evaluated.	777-9	285
The site is within five miles of multiple protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas. These are sensitive ecosystems that could be significantly impacted by contamination or runoff.	777-10	174
Riverview has experienced manure management issues in the past, including a 2025 leak at its Meadow Star Dairy facility in Kandiyohi County. This history underscores the need for careful, comprehensive review.	777-11	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
An operation more than 60 times larger than the average Minnesota dairy farm could accelerate consolidation, harm small and mid-sized farms and alter the character of rural communities.	777-12	398
Residents may also experience increased traffic.	777-13	304
Residents may also experience increased odor.	777-14	83
Residents may also experience increased air quality concerns.	777-15	81
Residents may also experience increased potential declines in property values.	777-16	398
For all of these reasons, I respectfully request that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement before proceeding with any approvals for this project.	777-18	1
I value living in this area and the natural resources it offers. However, a project of this scale raises serious concerns about long-term environmental quality.	777-17a	167
I am writing this communication to express my full support for the expansion of the Riverview West River dairy expansion.	778-1	431
The current review process is completely adequate and an EIS is not necessary.	778-2	20
I'm against forcing animals into these crowded, non pastured, conditions for the sake of more efficient milk production.	779-1	403
Cows should be out in green pastures under sunshine & called in twice a day to be milked, like I was raised on our small hobby farm.	779-2	73
I no longer support dairy from these big industrialized facilities. Grass fed naturally is where food production is going...catch a clue... It's much healthier for us & our children & the animals.	779-3	73
Hello and thank you for allowing the public to comment on this project. In my opinion this project should not be allowed to proceed.	780-1	432
I believe that this project is environmentally dangerous in terms of the mammoth amount of manure that it will distribute.	780-2	326
I believe that this project is environmentally dangerous in terms of the quantity of water needed to support it.	780-3	195
An EIS should absolutely be required before any further steps are taken.	780-4	1
In addition, I believe that CAFO's are inhumane.	780-5	403
In addition, I believe that CAFO's are a severe risk for zoonotic infections.	780-6	72
In addition, I believe that CAFO's are a public health risk in terms of increasing antibiotic resistance.	780-7	395
Lastly, these huge confinement operations have been the death knell to the small dairyman (woman) .	780-8	400
Lastly, these huge confinement operations have been the death knell to the small rural communities that support them.	780-9	397
We can do so much better!	780-10	432
- I am commenting to express concern about the proposed Riverview West River dairy. This 18,500 cow facility would add to Riverview's already extensive operations in Minnesota, where the company houses more than 133,000 cows—about one third of the state's dairy herd.	781-1	434
Continued consolidation on this scale has contributed to the steep decline of family dairies, which are essential to the economic and social health of rural communities.	781-2	400
A single facility of this size also carries significant environmental risks, including manure management.	781-3	346

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
A single facility of this size also carries significant environmental risks, including water use.	781-4	195
A single facility of this size also carries significant environmental risks, including air quality impacts.	781-5	81
These cumulative effects should be carefully evaluated. [including manure management]	781-6	331
These cumulative effects should be carefully evaluated. [including water use]	781-7	195
These cumulative effects should be carefully evaluated. [including air quality impacts]	781-8	80
I urge the MPCA to fully consider both the environmental and community consequences before approving a project of this magnitude.	781-9	28
These large livestock produce huge pollution to ground water risk.	782-1	218
These large livestock produce huge manure spill risk.	782-2	385
These large livestock produce crowded living conditions for livestock.	782-3	74
I strongly support their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens county.	783-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	783-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project	783-3	430
I support their expansion project in Stevens County	784-1	431
I want to continue living in a state with higher standards than other states. I want to be proud of the environmental firsts Minnesota can show in this Era of backsliding.	785-1	432
I vehemently oppose this expansion.	786-1	432
Small, regenerative farms are the only future I want to see in farming.	786-2	400
We should be supporting small, local farmers, not promoting and allowing for massive operations like this one.	787-1	400
This is beyond the environmental impact of having so many animals in a small area,	787-2	432
it is also about caring about our local farm families that have been around for generations.	787-3	400
Mass production is not the answer.	787-4	434
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	788-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	788-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	788-3	430
Do not allow this monstrosity to expand!!!	789-1	434
Horrific for animals	789-2	74
Horrific for the environment	789-3	167
I am writing in earnest opposition of this expansion	790-1	432
in favor of an obligatory EIS.	790-2	1
Progress can no longer equal capital growth and expansion if we are to continue to inhabit this planet.	790-3	432
Shortsighted economics are causing incredible suffering to numerous species whose sentience should not be ignored.	790-4	398
Agricultural workers in feedlots incredible health risks.	790-5	398
West River Dairy and CAFOs in general need to be phased out, not expanded!	790-6	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
They displace small scale MN family farms,	790-7	400
reduce rural property values,	790-8	398
impose numerous environmental impacts including water quality degradation	790-9	388
impose numerous environmental impacts including air quality degradation	790-10	81
inflict public health concerns such as respiratory illnesses and disease transmission.	790-11	395
The long-term pollution impacts cannot be overlooked while regulations aimed at tracking manure application face backlash.	790-12	375
As is obvious in the letters of support, the only people in favor of this expansion are those who will fatten their wallets out of the deal.	790-13	432
MPCA must enforce policy that protects our planet and people. "Only when the last tree has been cut down, the last fish caught, and the last stream poisoned, will you realize you cannot eat money."	790-14	55
I am writing in strong support of Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	791-1	431
An Environmental Impact Statement does not appear necessary given the existing review framework and the demonstrated track record of operations like this one.	791-2	20
We respectfully urge the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to support approval of this important project.	791-3	430
The proposed Riverview Dairy expansion is so huge that it should be required to complete an Environmental Impact Statement before a permit is granted by the MPCA.	792-1	15
I fully support the proposed project	793-1	431
I do not see the need for a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	793-2	20
I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed expansion of the Riverview dairy operation in Morris, Minnesota.	794-1	432
As a concerned citizen who worked for over 40 years as a Registered Professional Engineer, I believe this project—which would become the largest livestock farm in state history—poses unacceptable risks to our local environment.	794-2	167
As a concerned citizen who worked for over 40 years as a Registered Professional Engineer, I believe this project—which would become the largest livestock farm in state history—poses unacceptable risks to our groundwater.	794-3	246
As a concerned citizen who worked for over 40 years as a Registered Professional Engineer, I believe this project—which would become the largest livestock farm in state history—poses unacceptable risks to the health of our community.	794-4	395
My primary concerns include: Water Depletion: The facility is permitted to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year. This massive appropriation rivals the consumption of the entire City of Morris (permitted for 300 million gallons) and threatens to deplete local groundwater and impact the Pomme de Terre River.	794-5	195
My primary concerns include: Nitrate Pollution: The collection and application of manure from such a massive number of animals significantly increases the risk of nitrates leaking into groundwater.	794-6	193

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
My primary concerns include: Nitrate Pollution: Given Riverview's history of manure spills in western Minnesota, I am deeply concerned about the long-term safety of our drinking water, and the impact that will have on the cancer rates of those living in the area.	794-7	373
My primary concerns include: Inadequate Environmental Review: I join organizations like the Land Stewardship Project in calling for a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The current Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) is insufficient to address the unprecedented scale of this facility and its cumulative impacts on the region's land and water.	794-8	15
I urge the MPCA to deny the current permit and require a more rigorous environmental review to protect the health and resources of Stevens County residents.	794-9	33
The impact of these large scale corporate farms and livestock enclosures on the health of our groundwater aquifers needs to be of concern to ALL Minnesotans!	794-10	218
I have switched from regular ultra pasteurized milk to low temp pasteurized milk from small farms. I am opposed to larger and larger dairy farms.	795-1	432
It seems like smaller dairy farms could employ as many people and it would be boom to small business.	795-2	398
It also seems that raw and low temp pasteurized milk are coming back into favor.	795-3	403
Please don't let this large dairy take over more small dairy farms!	795-4	432
I am opposed to this operation for several reasons.	796-1	432
Having this many animals on a feedlot is inhumane treatment.	796-2	74
The waste from them would be damaging to the environment	796-3	167
I would never drink an ounce of milk from such an operation.	796-4	403
Restorative, regenerative farming is the best way to treat animals and the soil they live on.	796-5	403
Please turn this proposal down.	796-6	33
I support the West River Dairy expansion.	797-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	797-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project and believe the expansion will continue to reflect the same level of care and professionalism Riverview has demonstrated time and again.	797-3	430
I am writing to dissuade the use of an EIS with regards to the expansion of Riverview in Stevens County.	798-1	20
I am in favor of the expansion of the dairy.	799-1	431
I am in favor of the expansion.	800-1	431
I am in favor of this expansion. Great company.	801-1	431
For what reason does Riverview need to keep expanding their dairies?	802-1	435
They are already running small farmers out of business.	802-2	398
The same small dairies that built communities. The same communities that are becoming ghost towns because places like riverview dairies don't support local infrastructure.	802-3	400
Veterinary, construction, etc., are done in house and don't support members of local community.	802-4	397

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
They say they create jobs but bring in more illegal immigrants for cheap labor.	802-5	398
They use their size and scale to push others around. Basically taking over AMPI (Associated Milk Producers Inc.) and claiming a $2cwt premium over other producers for a "volume discount".	802-6	398
With milk prices already where they are, how can other dairy producers compete?	802-7	398
With dairies of such scale comes greater risk of pollution as well. Look at the what has already happened when an upright manure silo exploded at the Meadowstar location in Pennock, Mn. Shrapnel of the silo and hundreds of thousands of gallons of liquid manure littered the ground.	802-8	385
Not to mention that anybody nearby when that happened would have been killed.	802-9	395
Loss of nitrates from such manure spills end up in our water.	802-10	385
This affects wildlife	802-11	173
have the potential to lead to cancerous cases, diminishing the quality of life	802-12	395
How can we let systems like this continue to go into place?	802-13	432
Riverview does not support local community infrastructure.	802-14	397
Riverview is not good for environment.	802-15	167
I am very concerned about the negative impact on the environment if West River Dairy is allowed to expand as requested.	803-1	167
It goes against everything I have learned about Minnesota farms working towards sustainability.	803-2	403
The extra manure would contribute to climate change.	803-3	103
The extra manure would contribute to water pollution.	803-4	272
The extra manure would contribute to air pollution.	803-5	81
The extra methane would contribute to climate change.	803-6	94
The extra methane would contribute to water pollution.	803-7	419
The extra methane would contribute to air pollution.	803-8	81
Can the neighbors enjoy breathing in fresh country air near the dairy as it is now?	803-9	394
And the humane treatment of cows would be a great challenge with so many extra livestock.	803-10	74
Expansion also jeopardizes the livelihood of smaller dairy farms.	803-11	400
There are so many reasons against it. Please do not approve.	803-12	432
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	804-1	431
I believe the current review process is sufficient and that additional regulatory burdens, including an EIS, are unnecessary.	804-2	20
I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy	804-3	430
I would like to not only express my support for the expansion project at West River Dairy, but also give my personal & professional experiences interacting with Riverview directly & indirectly.	805-1	431
Thank you for your consideration of supporting & approving the West River Dairy.	805-2	430
Growth is necessary as demand rises	806-1	431
I want to express my support to the West River Dairy Expansion project	807-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I'm in favor of their expansion!	808-1	431
This proposal is harmful to man.	809-1	395
This proposal is harmful to beast.	809-2	74
We all need clean water.	809-3	295
We all need clean air.	809-4	81
Please do not permit this.	809-5	33
I am writing to formally request that the MPCA mandate a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed West River Dairy expansion.	810-1	1
As the largest livestock operation in Minnesota's history, the cumulative environmental risks—specifically regarding Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs)—far exceed the scope of the current Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW). The Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) and the MPCA classify hormones as CECs. MDH data indicates that these substances already affect 90% of tested Minnesota lakes, and a U.S. Geological Survey study found the Mississippi River in Minnesota has the highest rate of "feminized" fish--male fish that develop female characteristics, such as eggs in their testes. The cause is attributed to endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs) that act as estrogens, causing sexual disruption.	810-2	432
The scale of the West River Dairy expansion poses the following significant risks: - Hormone Output: Pregnant and lactating cows produce large amounts of estrogen and related hormones. An 18,000-cow herd produces approximately 15 pounds of estrogen daily. Hormones are potent in very small concentrations. In addition, large dairies routinely use synthetic hormones to maximize lactation and control the cows' reproductive cycles, which further increases this biological load.	810-3	74
The scale of the West River Dairy expansion poses the following significant risks: - Environmental Persistence: Estrogens in dairy wastewater are notably persistent and often fail to biodegrade under the anaerobic conditions found in manure storage lagoons.	810-4	412
The scale of the West River Dairy expansion poses the following significant risks: - Public Health Implications: These hormones bioaccumulate in the food chain. Human exposure through contaminated drinking water is linked to impaired fertility, developmental malformations, and hormone-sensitive cancers.	810-5	395
The scale of the West River Dairy expansion poses the following significant risks: - Private Wells: Rural residents relying on private wells are particularly vulnerable. No one monitors our wells for safety, so the full financial and health burden of testing and harm falls directly on us.	810-6	396
Most municipal systems are incapable of filtering out these contaminants, so well owners are particularly disadvantaged by lack of regulatory oversight to keep our water safe. We deserve better.	810-7	396
Our state prides itself on its water, pure water at that. If our water is no longer drinkable because others have profited from making it so, regulation and justice must prevail.	810-8	396
Having grown up along Shakopee Creek in the adjacent watershed to the proposed expansion, I have witnessed the degradation of local watersheds firsthand; the Shakopee is now a designated critical nutrient hotspot.	810-9	435

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Nearby is Dublin Dairy, one of Riverview LLP's 8000 cow dairies. Do we have CEC [Contaminants of Emerging Concern] data for Shakopee Creek?	810-10	404
A blueprint for protecting our water may become apparent if we choose to look. Perhaps we have hardly begun to accurately assess the environmental impact of dairies of this size, placing them ahead of CEC data collection and the safety of our drinking water.	810-11	396
A blueprint forpreventing contamination may become apparent if we choose to look. Perhaps we have hardly begun to accurately assess the environmental impact of dairies of this size, placing them ahead of CEC data collection and the safety of our drinking water.	810-12	396
If this expansion is green-lighted, hormones and endocrine disruptors will enter our water system at an unprecedented scale, affecting us all.	810-13	395
Along with raising already elevated levels of nitrogen, phosphorus, and E. coli, the West River Dairy expansion represents a permanent threat to regional water security.	810-14	387
I urge the MPCA to require a comprehensive EIS to study these cumulative impacts.	810-15	11
I support this expansion because it is good to see dairy growing in our community's.	811-1	431
The damage that this facility would do to the environment...especially to the water quality should be enough to deny a permit to this organization.	812-1	33
The unnatural environment created for these animals to live in sounds like an animal concentration camp.	812-2	74
Our state should not be condoning this kind of treatment.	812-3	432
Please deny this request for expansion.	812-4	33
I support the expansion	813-1	431
I find it interesting that you write 'we value your comments'. I have been attending numerous county meeting, shared videos about public comments against CAFOs, attended numerous meeting and discussions and the opinion of people don't reach the decision makers interested in purely money and profit.	814-1	432
I find it disgusting and appalling that treating livestock in these manners of concentrated animal feeding operations where animals are trapped inside, the manure is collected below them because they never leave and their conditions are horrific.	814-2	74
But, why should we care about animals? It's about money, right? Profit, right?	814-3	403
What about the environment? Why should we care about that? It's about money, right? Profit, right?	814-4	403
Do we need to care that the animal waste has to go somewhere and that regulations of how that is handled safely without impacts to pollution is not even close to being safe and regulated?	814-5	375
Do we need to care that the animal waste has to go somewhere and that regulations of how that is handled safely without harm to our rivers is not even close to being safe and regulated?	814-6	375
Do we need to care that the animal waste has to go somewhere and that regulations of how that is handled safely without harm to our lakes is not even close to being safe and regulated?	814-7	375

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Do we need to care that the animal waste has to go somewhere and that regulations of how that is handled safely without impacts to groundwater is not even close to being safe and regulated?	814-8	375
What about setting a precedent for this area that prioritizes care of animals...does that matter?	814-9	74
What about setting a precedent for this area that prioritizes care of our waters...does that matter?	814-10	295
What about setting a precedent for this area that prioritizes care of our communities...does that matter?	814-11	397
Or, is it profit and greed all put under the nice umbrella of 'economic growth' and 'feeding the people'.	814-12	403
There are better ways that don't harm animals.	814-13	74
There are better ways that don't harm land.	814-14	148
There are better ways that don't harm water.	814-15	407
There are better ways that don't harm people.	814-16	395
These large operations are overtaking small family farms. Is that what you want? It seems so.	814-17	400
These large operations are bringing traffic. Is that what you want? It seems so.	814-18	304
These large operations are bringing pollution. Is that what you want? It seems so.	814-19	146
These large operations are overtaking roads. Is that what you want? It seems so.	814-20	304
These large operations are bringing extra impact to local community structures. Is that what you want? It seems so.	814-21	397
The voice of a CAFO owner, seems to continually outweigh the voice of many. And, animals don't have a voice so it is as if they don't count. It's disgusting.	814-22	403
It's time that MPCA takes a stand on stopping the pollution. What?! Stopping pollution? That's crazy.	814-23	432
It seems like you're open to discussing pollution and degradation of our natural systems and the animals that we live and rely on for a company's growth and expansion.	814-24	432
This is not just one decision but the tipping point of many more to follow. It's like an open door saying, hey, all you CAFO's, come on over to West Central Minnesota. They don't have the courage to stand up and demand something different. A better way. It's a free for all to use and abuse and when we've used it up, maybe we'll move up to Canada? I mean, Iowa is already taking it in the shorts with their CAFO's.	814-25	432
I'm fairly confident no one has read this. But, if you have, seriously, do not let this expansion happen. It's disgusting, appalling, and needs to be rejected.	814-26	432
Please, please, stand up for what is right and just to our animals.	814-27	403
Please, please, stand up for what is right and just to our communities.	814-28	397
Please, please, stand up for what is right and just to our lakes.	814-29	295
Please, please, stand up for what is right and just to our rivers.	814-30	295
Please, please, stand up for what is right and just to our natural world.	814-31	137
There is no turning back from this decision.	814-32	435
In 1995, Minnesota had 9,000 dairy farms. By 2025, that number has fallen to 1,605. As farms have grown larger, many small family dairies have disappeared, and our rural communities feel that loss in real ways.	815-1	400

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Among the organic farms, only two remain, and both are struggling.	815-2	400
Riverview says this 18,500 cow facility would create 40 jobs. Yet the same number of cows could support around 70 conventional family farms. Those are families who hire local help, support small businesses, build relationships, and keep small towns alive.	815-3	400
I do have concerns about the environmental impact of concentrating so many animals in one place.	815-4	434
But I am also concerned about what is lost when family farms disappear.	815-5	400
There is something so good about families caring for animals with purpose.	815-6	400
There is something so good about families tending the land with purpose.	815-7	400
There is something so good about families working together with purpose.	815-8	400
Family economies grow strong families.	815-9	400
Family economies grow strong communities.	815-10	400
Please consider supporting family farms over corporate agriculture.	815-11	400
I encourage the MPCA to complete an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the West River Dairy Expansion.	816-1	1
I was born in Morris (Stevens County) and lived there until I was 20. I have visited the area most months of my life to see family and friends.	816-2	435
I am concerned how such a large concentration of animals will impact groundwater from greatly expanded pumping.	816-4	190
I am concerned how such a large concentration of animals will impact surface water from manure.	816-5	272
I am concerned how such a large concentration of animals will impact quality of life in the area (e.g., increased truck/heavy equipment traffic).	816-6	181
I am concerned how such a large concentration of animals will impact quality of life in the area (e.g., air quality).	816-7	81
I am concerned how such a large concentration of animals will impact quality of life in the area (e.g., noise).	816-8	181
I am concerned how such a large concentration of animals will impact pressure on smaller on farms.	816-9	400
I am a small family dairy farm owner in MN. I am writing to hopefully make someone understand that expansions like River View should NEVER be allowed.	817-1	432
River View is not a family farm they are a factory.	817-2	432
They pollute and destroy the water supply at that capacity	817-3	193
they destroy farm land with no care	817-4	168
they destroy roads	817-5	308
they do not supply local revenue or employ locals	817-6	398
They push cows to unnecessary limits with no care to their well being.	817-7	74
Farms of this magnitude are ridiculous and reckless. They put real families, with real farming abilities and ties out of business.	817-8	400
We do not need factory farms we need real dairy farmers, real families, real caring, hardworking dedicated small town farmers who are dedicated to their families and their communities.	817-9	400

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This is the time to stop all this before its too late you want to see the real impacts of this talk to the real farmers, it's time to end factory farming.	817-10	400
That large of an operation would change the land.	818-2	176
That large of an operation would change the water.	818-3	387
The large amount of manure it would produce and being used as fertilizer could lead to nitrates leaking into groundwater.	818-4	367
There are several rivers and other waters in the area.	818-5	277
There would be risks of manure spills and there have been manure spills at other operations.	818-6	385
There would be excessive smell (stink)	818-7	83
it would lower the land values in the area for miles around.	818-8	398
Riverview has enough dairy operations in Minnesota already.	818-9	432
It is already difficult enough for farmers to compete and this would make it worse,	818-10	400
and be a detriment to the land.	818-11	176
and be a detriment to the water.	818-12	387
I think an Environmental Impact Statement needs to be required for the West River Dairy Expansion so that everyone would know the impact to the water.	818-1a	2
I think an Environmental Impact Statement needs to be required for the West River Dairy Expansion so that everyone would know the impact to the land.	818-1b	6
I think an Environmental Impact Statement needs to be required for the West River Dairy Expansion so that everyone would know the impact to the neighbors.	818-1c	13
I think an Environmental Impact Statement needs to be required for the West River Dairy Expansion so that everyone would know the impact to the other dairy farmers.	818-1d	12
There is no reason why this mega project should be allowed without an independently performed Environmental Impact Statement.	819-1	18
There are a number of rivers in the area that would be negatively impacted by a manure spill as has happened in other operations of this size.	819-2	285
There are a number of waters in the area that would be negatively impacted by a manure spill as has happened in other operations of this size.	819-3	285
The local population in the area would be impacted by the excessive smells on a regular basis with these smells drifting to heavily populated areas as well.	819-4	83
Property values would also be impacted negatively.	819-5	398
This large of an operation would also make it more difficult for local farmers to compete being that it will have such a large number of dairy cattle.	819-6	400
Critical backbone of our community, generating jobs, and helping the economy!	820-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I submit the following comments in support of an environmental impact statement (EIS) for expansion and future development of large animal projects, such as the one proposed by Riverview Dairy.	821-1	15
Dangerous Nitrate Levels A 2017 report showed that samplings of private wells in Dodge County between 1995 and 2016 found that 21 percent of private wells contained nitrate "above background concentrations," and 7 percent contained nitrate above the legal drinking water limit of ten parts per million. The county acknowledged that contamination was more prevalent in areas of Dodge "with shallow soils over limestone and over sand aquifers."	821-2	396
Dangerous Nitrate Levels Groundwater leaching impacts public water supplies in neighboring towns and cities, and pollution in local rivers and streams is an uncontained hazard.	821-3	396
In 2019 the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency issued a report about pollution in the Minnesota River, which eventually flows to the Mississippi. The report identified livestock manure runoff as a primary culprit behind an emerging environmental emergency that, per local press coverage of the report, is "degrading our superstar Minnesota River to sewer status."	821-4	396
Corporate Consolidation and the Decline of Rural America	821-5	398
Harassment on the Prairie	821-6	435
Please require a full Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	822-1	1
The thought of over 20,000 animal units in one location is blowing my mind. I have several concerns. Will that many animals in one place require more vaccines per animal compared to an average herd?	822-2	72
The thought of over 20,000 animal units in one location is blowing my mind. I have several concerns. Will that many animals in one place require more antibiotics per animal compared to an average herd?	822-3	72
The thought of over 20,000 animal units in one location is blowing my mind. I have several concerns. Will that many animals in one place require more disinfectants per animal compared to an average herd?	822-4	72
Will the cows consume so much water that the aquifer that feeds the well for my residence will dry up? I can't afford to pay for a new, deep well.	822-5	195
How likely is manure spillage and contamination of streams and rivers?	822-6	285
How likely is manure spillage and contamination of other people's drinking water?	822-7	193
Can the dairy be held liable for other people's contaminated or dry wells?	822-8	224
How far will the wind carry the manure smell?	822-9	83
How far will the wind carry the feed dust generated at the dairy?	822-10	96
When the owners of nearby farm sites want to sell their property, will they have trouble finding buyers?	822-11	398
Will local property values decline?	822-12	398
Will the additional truck traffic to haul in haylage, silage, and other feeds and to haul out milk and waste damage the nearby roads, increasing the property tax burden of Stevens County residents and nearby townships' residents?	822-13	300

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Will local farmers haul more grain to the dairy, so ethanol plants will have to buy corn from farther away, increasing the need to repair roads in the region?	822-14	303
Will small family dairy farms all go broke?	822-15	400
Since this livestock operation would be nearly double the size of the next largest livestock operation in Minnesota and huge compared to an average Minnesota dairy, please give this permit lots of scrutiny.	822-16	29
I would encourage a decision by the agencies involved to approve the West River Dairy expansion.	823-1	430
With the rigorous safeguards for environmental security well documented in this EAW, the request for an EIS would be considered overreach.	823-2	20
I am writing to express my support for the proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	824-1	431
Given the rigor and thoroughness of the state's environmental review process, we believe that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not necessary for this project.	824-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important expansion.	824-3	430
I believe this expansion to the largest livestock operation in the state warrants an Environmental Impact Study to ensure a robust examination of all the impacts on the land, water and community.	825-1	15
Water use. 226 million gallons per year is huge. Can the acquifer sustain that draw without negatively impacting other users?	825-2	190
Water use. 226 million gallons per year is huge. Will Riverview's draw and the accessibility of water for others be monitored?	825-3	190
Water use. 226 million gallons per year is huge. What are the likely impacts of accelerated climate change? Can Riverview count on the capture part of their projected water supply and do they have a plan B as rainfall becomes more and more variable?	825-4	195
Projected amounts of liquid manure will require 13,200 acres of land. That's going to require substantial distances for the manure to travel especially in an area with quite a few CAFOs already. And, the proximity to numerous Waterfowl Areas is concerning.	825-5	311
On the socioeconomic impacts there are concerns including and beyond driving family dairy farms out of business.	825-6	398
In this time of accelerating climate change we are seeing increased transport of viruses from far flung places, new to this area. Covid should have taught us lessons about the dangers to our food supply concentration of production and processing present. Avian flu has already shown it has capacity to jump from birds to dairy cattle to humans. Caution ought to be the coin of the realm regarding increasing animal concentration.	825-7	72
This expansion needs the robust review and Environmental Impact Study can provide.	825-8	1
Today I'm an owner and partner in Riverview, using what I've learned to support the people I work alongside every day.	826-1	431
Demanding an EIS would not only cause undue burden, but also set a terrible example that good dairy operators are now punished for growing and expanding their businesses when there is already an extensive process that needs to be followed and the EAW is a great tool that is nation-leading in its robustness as is.	827-1	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Based on our cooperation to date, we have confidence in Riverview's ability to develop and operate this facility in a responsible manner, and we believe the project will make a meaningful contribution to the future of the dairy sector and the communities it serves.	828-1	431
I am opposed to factory farming and request that you not allow this factory farm to move forward.	829-1	432
In addition to the suffering Of animals, factory farms cause	829-2	74
factory farms cause environmental harm and damage.	829-3	167
Based on my experience, they are a reliable, professional, highly capable organization that cares about their employees, the environment and communities around them.	830-1	431
I strongly support the expansion of West River Dairy!	831-1	431
Also, this expansion would push out even more small dairy farmers.	832-4	400
This is exactly the opposite of what should be happening with our farming operations. Bigger is not necessarily better, money/profit should not be the determining factor in advocating for the common good.	833-1	400
We live in a democracy and it's about time we started acting like it. The Riverview expansion needs a environmental review taking into consideration humans are not the only sentient beings on the planet.	833-2	74
Knowing the Pomme de Terre river, its watershed and the surrounding communities I can only believe that expanding this business would be reckless and enormously detrimental (if not catastrophic) to both the environment and resources of the area.	834-1	432
This proposal must not go forward.	834-2	432
As a Minnesota resident I oppose factory farms.	835-1	432
They are highly inhumane	835-2	74
a source of pollution	835-3	146
put family owned farms at risk.	835-4	400
I am writing in strong support of the proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County	836-1	431
I am confident that no EIS is needed	836-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	836-3	430
I'm writing in opposition of this expansion at this site and all other sites owned by Riverview.	837-1	432
Riverview is a huge environmental concern	837-3	167
huge concern to our local communities.	837-4	397
Riverview is like a locust if they can't expand at west river they will move onto a different site they own.	837-5	432
I have saw comments from school boards saying they are welcoming this west river expansion. Ok so question here what do all these H2A/ people here on a work visa actually do for the schools and local communities and economy? Besides absolutely nothing!	837-6	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It's the process of limitation when 1 of these riverview dairy sites is built in an area. Riverview doesn't wanna work with a bunch of smaller farmers. They wanna work with 1-2 farming operations that control the vast majority of the acres in that area. So begins the decline to our schools	837-7	397
It's the process of limitation when 1 of these riverview dairy sites is built in an area. Riverview doesn't wanna work with a bunch of smaller farmers. They wanna work with 1-2 farming operations that control the vast majority of the acres in that area. So begins the decline toour small towns and small town businesses	837-8	397
It's the process of limitation when 1 of these riverview dairy sites is built in an area. Riverview doesn't wanna work with a bunch of smaller farmers. They wanna work with 1-2 farming operations that control the vast majority of the acres in that area. So begins the decline to our rural area in a 5-7 mile radius of that site.	837-9	397
When 1 of these sites is built in an area it's pretty much the death of that area because nobody wants to live to close to them sites and hardly no one can farm in that area in anymore but 1-2 guys who will over pay to buy and rent any amount of ground from 80 acres to 800 acres to have sowed up for the dairy.	837-10	397
There is several farming operations in them areas that would love to grow their farming operations and bring in the next generation but can't compete land wise anymore against the guys that are heavily involved with the riverview dairy sites.	837-11	400
Just think if it wasn't for them riverview dairy's and their need to have all this ground for they dairy and their need to have all this foreign labor weather working at the dairy or all this foreign labor need for the guys that are heavily involved in the dairy's to farm all them acres. There could be a lot more local guys that are from generational farms that would be able to farm more or able to farm full time and our communities would be a lot better off instead of having 1-2 individuals and all their foreign labor trying to control it all. Let that sink in!	837-12	400
I have noticed the area west of Willmar, MN has become a hotspot for riverview. There is 6 of them in 25 mile and east and west stretch and 6 miles north and south. That area was once really lively and peaceful but has become very stagnant because of riverview. Any ground that moves in that area that wasn't associated with the dairy's there as far as being used to grow feed on or put manure on will be and it's all going to select few individuals who are heavily involved with riverview. They have done absolutely nothing for that area but make a select few guys extremely big acre wise and drive out a lot of younger people and generational farms. Pretty soon that area will be a huge environmental risk if it is not already a huge environmental risk.	837-13	167
They had a manure spill at one of them sites in that area in the fall of 2024 that they cleaned up before they reported it to the Mpca. They claim it was 50,000 gallons of mainly water. 50,000 gallons of mainly doesn't cover an area of 60 plus acres and crust 1.5ft deep in a field and go into 2 separate drainage ditches a quarter mile apart.	837-14	373
For all the riverview employees and guys that are heavily involved in riverview(sold them land to build sites, manure pumping, grow a lot feed and very involved with the chopping) your comments should have little credit to them. What is good for you guys has been never been good for the neighborhood, neighbors and communities. It's only been good for your bottom line and your checkbook.	837-15	397

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I have saw comments from people that it gives a younger person a chance come back home and farm. On what? Driving truck for someone with no advancement ever besides being a truck driver or a farm hand. People that wanna farm they would rather own and rent land themselves instead of being a truck driver and chopper operator for the extremely big riverview farmer. Pretty much death of a dream when one of these dairy sites is built to any younger people and generational farmers.	837-16	397
If riverview can keep expanding at an alarming rate there will nothing left to our rural areas and our natural resources will be gone and same with our communities.	837-17	397
I think it's time to put a stop them before it's all to late.	837-18	432
If they are the company they say they are and same with all their supporters they should have no problem doing an EIS. I think it would be ill fated if an EIS is not done.	837-19	1
It seems if you speak out against Riverview and their supporters you get a target put on your back and a bounty on your farming operation and all sorts other non stop harassment from riverview and their supporters.	837-20	432
To be fair to everyone I think EIS needs to be done there and at all their other sites.	837-2a	32
If riverview is the company they say they are and many of their supporters claim they are. They should have no problem doing EIS.	837-2b	31
Due to the scale of this project I believe a full environmental review is paramount.	838-1	29
My dad grew up on Barrett Lake and my family has a home there now. We have seen the water decline over time and want to make sure this project doesn't cause the decline to escalate.	838-2	289
A full and thorough review is needed before something of this scale is approved.	838-3	29
The town needs 100% transparency before moving forward.	838-4	32
This expanision comes at a cost to our other smaller dairy farms in and around Morris	839-1	400
This expanision comes at a cost to the sustainability of the aquifer to provide enough water for our future.	839-2	195
Groundwater contamination is also a huge concern	839-3	193
I do not feel that this project is what is in the best interests of Morris and our surrounding communities.	839-4	397
I am writing in support of Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Steven's County.	840-1	431
I write to express our full support for the expansion of Riverview's West River Dairy in Stevens County, Minnesota.	841-1	431
We do not believe additional environmental review is necessary and would discourage any effort to weaponize the environmental permitting process to address unrelated economic policy concerns.	841-2	20
We urge the MPCA to move forward with confidence, grounded in science and data, and to support Riverview's expansion as a model of responsible dairy growth in Minnesota.	841-3	430
I am writing in strong support of the proposed expansion of Riverview's West River Dairy in Stevens County, Minnesota.	842-1	431
I do not believe additional environmental review beyond what is already underway is warranted.	842-2	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
To be direct: environmental review a tool for evaluating environmental impacts, not for adjudicating market dynamics or farm size policy. Using the environmental review process to address broader economic policy questions would be a misuse of that process and would undermine the credibility of Minnesota's regulatory framework. Legislation and rulemaking are the appropriate venues for those discussions.	842-3	19
I encourage the MPCA to apply the science and data before it, use the full range of tools at its disposal to protect Minnesota waters, and proceed with confidence in the existing process.	842-4	430
Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) are degrading Minnesota's air.	843-1	81
Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) are degrading Minnesota's water.	843-2	264
Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) are disproportionately harming rural and low income communities through chronic public health impacts such as respiratory illness.	843-3	394
Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) are disproportionately harming rural and low income communities through chronic public health impacts such as contaminated drinking water.	843-4	396
Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) are disproportionately harming rural and low income communities through chronic public health impacts such as reduced quality of life.	843-5	395
These operations externalize their true costs onto the public, while the ecological damage continues to compound year after year.	843-6	166
Minnesota has an opportunity and responsibility to move in a different direction. Restoring native prairies and oak savannahs would rebuild soil health, protect waterways, sequester carbon, and provide critical habitat for pollinators that our food system depends on. These ecosystems once defined the region and can again serve as a foundation for sustainable land stewardship rather than industrial exploitation.	843-7	435
Meanwhile, the conventional dairy industry has been in structural decline for decades, surviving largely through repeated government bailouts rather than long-term economic viability. Propping up a failing model only delays the transition to more resilient, diversified, and farmer-centered agricultural systems.	843-8	435
If current trends continue—prioritizing short-term production over ecological limits—we risk accelerating soil loss.	843-9	183
If current trends continue—prioritizing short-term production over ecological limits—we risk accelerating biodiversity collapse.	843-10	163
If current trends continue—prioritizing short-term production over ecological limits—we risk accelerating climate instability.	843-11	164
The long-term consequence is a global food system increasingly vulnerable to failure. Allowing extractive industries to continue degrading land and water is not just environmentally reckless; it is a threat to future food security. Protecting our ecosystems today is inseparable from preventing hunger and catastrophe tomorrow.	843-12	170
I agree to built this expansion because Riverview have really good core values and help our community in many ways like give job opportunity, buy locols supplies and help people from the towns also.	844-1	431
I am writing in support of Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	845-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The expansion of West River dairy would boost our local economy. It would provide more farmers in the area with the opertunity for manure.	846-1	431
We here at Meixel Farms, and Meixel Truck sales support the west river dairy expansion.	847-1	431
Riverview is a great company, I'm excited hearing this because I know will be many families benefits from this project, I have the opportunity to work with Riverview for more than 15 years, and this company has everything that a family needs to grow, full job (stable job) good benefits,Healt insurance,Dental insurance,HSA, 401K.	848-1	431
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy expansion.	849-1	431
In my experience, the existing review and permitting system is thorough and appropriate, and I believe it provides sufficient oversight for this project.	849-2	20
I am writing to express my serious concerns regarding the proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	850-1	432
As this project would create a facility twice the size of any existing livestock operation in Minnesota, I strongly urge the MPCA to require a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) before proceeding with any permitting.	850-2	15
An operation of this magnitude—reaching over 26,000 animal units—is far outside the state's historical "envelope of experience." Proceeding with such an unprecedented expansion without the most rigorous level of review is a significant risk to our region.	850-3	433
My specific concerns include: Scale and Precedent: This facility would be nearly double the size of the next largest CAFO in Minnesota and 60 times the size of the average Minnesota dairy. This is a fundamentally new type of industrial operation that requires industrial-scale scrutiny.	850-4	433
My specific concerns include: Water Usage and Quality: The proposal to pump 226 million gallons of water annually—nearly reaching the consumption levels of the entire City of Morris—poses a major threat to our local aquifers.	850-5	195
My specific concerns include: Water Usage and Quality: Furthermore, the proximity to the Pomme de Terre River watershed and several protected wildlife areas makes the potential for pollution from the 250 million gallons of stored manure a critical concern.	850-6	290
My specific concerns include: Socio-Economic Impact: Riverview already accounts for approximately one-third of the dairy cows in Minnesota. Allowing further consolidation at this scale is unhealthy for market competition and directly threatens the viability of small, family-run farms that are the backbone of our rural economy and culture.	850-7	400
Given the scale of this project and the potential for irreversible environmental and economic harm, a standard Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) is insufficient. We must understand the full impact through an EIS before moving forward.	850-8	15
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy expansion.	851-1	431
I value that these processes are in place, and I believe the current review and permitting system provides appropriate and thorough oversight.	851-2	20
its important to support the livestock industry in our state.	852-1	431
i do not want EIS.	852-2	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	853-1	431
In closing, I respectfully encourage the appropriate agencies to approve the West River Dairy Expansion.	853-2	430
I also believe that an EIS is not necessary.	853-3	20
Very thankful for their dedication to producing high quality dairy products right here in our backyard!	854-1	431
I am writing as a resident and student in Morris with concerns regarding the proposed Riverview West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	855-1	432
Given the scale of this project, I believe that a full Environmental Impact Statement must be conducted before any approval is considered.	855-2	15
The potential long-term environmental impacts on groundwater are too significant to be addressed through a limited review process alone.	855-3	26
The potential long-term environmental impacts on surface water are too significant to be addressed through a limited review process alone.	855-4	26
The potential long-term environmental impacts on the overall health of our local ecosystem, are too significant to be addressed through a limited review process alone.	855-5	26
There is much we don't know about our water systems, and they are already vulnerable as is.	855-6	387
In addition to environmental concerns, there are also broader implications for local agriculture. Expanding an operation of this size has the potential to change the local dairy market, placing increased pressure on small and mid-sized farms that are already facing economic challenges. The long-term sustainability of our local agricultural community should be prioritized, and not on economic gains.	855-7	398
As someone who lives, studies, and participates in this community, it is my hope that the decision makers take a precautionary and thorough approach to preserve our water systems and for the wellbeing of the community.	855-8	397
I am writing in support of the West River Dairy expansion.	856-1	431
We need to support our small family farms for so very may reasons! In 1995, Minnesota had 9,000 dairy farms. By 2025, that number has fallen to 1,605. As farms have grown larger, many small family dairies have disappeared, and our rural communities feel that loss in real ways.	857-1	400
Riverview says this 18,500 cow facility would create 40 jobs. Yet the same number of cows could support around 70 conventional family farms (or 3,000 micro raw milk dairies like us!!!). Those are families who hire local help.	857-2	400
Riverview says this 18,500 cow facility would create 40 jobs. Yet the same number of cows could support around 70 conventional family farms (or 3,000 micro raw milk dairies like us!!!). Those are families who support small businesses.	857-3	400
Riverview says this 18,500 cow facility would create 40 jobs. Yet the same number of cows could support around 70 conventional family farms (or 3,000 micro raw milk dairies like us!!!). Those are families who build relationships.	857-4	400
Riverview says this 18,500 cow facility would create 40 jobs. Yet the same number of cows could support around 70 conventional family farms (or 3,000 micro raw milk dairies like us!!!). Those are families who keep small towns alive.	857-5	400
Please do Not allow this proposal to happen. It would devastate our small towns and all of us who live and work together.	857-6	400

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
It would have a huge impact on the people.	857-7	395
It would have a huge impact on the land.	857-8	176
It would have a huge impact on the environment as a whole.	857-9	167
Please we do not want this.	857-10	432
I am deeply concerned over the proposed expansion of West River Dairy operations.	858-1	432
I respectfully ask that you preform an Environmental Impact Statement on this dairy expansion. The dairy expansion is massive and that alone should trigger an EIS.	858-2	15
The location of this dairy operation needs to be studied. It is within a short distance from several important protected waterfowl areas.	858-3	174
Also, a river is also close to the expansion site. What will happen to those places if a leak from the ponds holding cattle waste would occur? Those stated areas will be ruined.	858-4	252
There will be tremendous amounts of water used by this operation	858-5	195
all of our small town farmers will suffer from this huge dairy farm.	858-6	400
I cannot believe this expansion is even being considered! A feedlot of 18,855 cows is the population of a city. An 11,000-cow dairy is a city.	859-1	434
How many small farmers will be put out of business because of this expansion?	859-2	400
The lives of these cows don't mean a thing. The cows are not widgets, they are sentient creatures. A feedlot is not a farm, it is a concentration camp. Do these cows pasture, see the light of day? I don't think so. I know a little something about cows as I grew up on a dairy farm in Morrison County.	859-3	74
Please do not allow this expansion. For the sake of small dairy farmers	859-4	400
Please do not allow this expansion. For the sake of the cows themselves	859-6	74
Please do not allow this expansion.	859-7	432
I recommend you watch Cow, a 2021 British documentary film by Andrea Arnold, revolving around the life of a dairy cow. It's not pleasant.	859-8	403
I support Riverview's West River Dairy expansion project.	860-1	431
I believe an EIS is not necessary.	860-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	860-3	430
I give my support to Riverview expanding their site at West River.	861-1	431
I am completely opposed to this expansion.	862-1	432
The actual and potential hazards are massive.	862-2	432
The increased traffic is mind boggling.	862-3	304
The increased manure handling is mind boggling.	862-4	346
I'm deeply concerned about the unprecedented scale of this proposal,	863-1	433
as well as the company's track record with damaging water resources in the southwestern US.	863-2	194

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This project must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	863-3	1
Please take the potential implications seriously for the sake of all our community's health and wellbeing.	863-4	395
I am totally against this expansion.	864-1	432
Cows are not 'units'. They are living creatures that feel pain and mental stress. Confining cows the way Riverview does is not only immoral, but also a very sad reflection on how our species disregards basic compassion towards other living creatures that we share this planet with.	864-2	74
It is impossible to operate a CAFO like this and not be environmentally destructive which is what your agency is supposed to prevent.	864-3	137
According to Farm Action, dairy farms have grown increasingly consolidated with a small percentage of large operations producing the majority of the milk supply. 2.5% of dairies (the 834 dairy operations with more than 2,500 cows) produce nearly 45% of American raw milk annually. Dairy Farmers of America (DFA) aggregates and markets around 30% of the country's raw milk from over 14,000 dairies. The eight largest milk cooperatives together account for more than 54% of annual milk production. Domestic Milk Processors CR4: 39-41% DFA: 15% Land O'Lakes: 10-12% Saputo Inc.: 7% Nestle: 7% Fluid Milk Sales CR3: 83% DFA: 39.1% Land O'Lakes: 35.2% California Dairies: 8.8%	865-1	400
Further concentration in the dairy industry threatens smaller dairy operations.	865-2	400
Further placing control of our food and dairy supply in the hands of a few corporate operators threatens our food supply and our national security.	865-3	400
No, this is just too big a dairy for a responsible operation.	866-1	434
This is a profit-driven proposal for concentration of cows that would make it unlikely that considerations about manure run-off would be part of the operation.	866-2	377
This is a profit-driven proposal for concentration of cows that would make it unlikely that considerations about healthy animals would be part of the operation.	866-3	74
Well-managed dairies know the value of animals fed on grass, not grain. This expansion does not seem to fit that possibility.	866-4	74

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
and they know how to incorporate the potentially-valuable manure into land-enriching compost. This expansion does not seem to fit that possibility.	866-5	325
Minnesota should be encouraging farmers who want to provide a healthy product to us consumers by way of responsible land stewardship and animal management--not jsut looking to make more money by increasing their economy-of-scale.	866-6	400
The Riverview dairy cattle expansion should not even be considered unless the business prepares a full environmental impact statement.	867-1	1
This is not just a dairy expansion proposed, it is a huge animal factory expansion with a potential for disastrous impacts on groundwater for a large geographic area.	867-2	218
The environmental impacts could be widespread in the soil.	867-3	183
The environmental impacts could be widespread in the air.	867-4	81
The environmental impacts could be widespread in the surface water.	867-5	289
The environmental impacts could be widespread in the the groundwater.	867-6	218
We have evidence of environmental damage done by largescale livestock facilities all over the nation, so why would we want to risk Minnesota's natural resources by allowing this gigantic animal factory.	867-7	56
The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency should stop this now instead of working to control the pollution it will undoubtedly cause down the road.	867-8	33
I have been a STRONG opponent to factory farms.	868-1	432
They are BAD for the environment	868-2	167
They are BAD for the cows (if unhealthy for cows... unhealthy for humans) As a society we are very unhealthy and THIS is one of the causes.	868-3	74
Another is GMO's, as well as chemicals in farming instead of organic/sustainable farming practices.	868-4	403
I'm a kidney cancer survivor caused by TCE in my drinking water.	868-5	396
My only child died at 9 mo 26 days old is saving our place at Ft Snelling National Cemetery because of it.	868-6	395
I get sick if I don't focus on organic foods or at least non GMO.	868-7	403
In the past we have grown our own veggies and we only did organic farming.	868-8	403
DO NOT APPROVE OF THIS HORRIBLE PROJECT!!!	868-9	432
I am so opposed to the West River Dairy Expansion.	869-1	432
What an eyesore	869-2	432
a problem of smells	869-3	432
a problem of water use	869-4	195
inhumane animal care and environmental pollution.	869-5	74
Minnesota is a better state than polluting land.	869-6	432
Thank you for taking comments about the proposed Riverview Dairy expansion project. The gigantic scale of the proposal rings alarm bells for me, so I am vehemently opposed.	870-1	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
As a good first step, there must be a full and rigorous Environmental Impact investigation and report.	870-2	1
That EIS should assess the effects of thousands of dairy cows on the environment, both locally and regionally.	870-3	1
There are also economic impacts, because this is a corporate entity that will control markets and squeeze out smaller family operations with its sheer size.	870-4	400
To approve of the Riverview Dairy project without a thorough evaluation of all consequences is not recommended.	870-5	34
I am not a close neighbor of the site, but if approved it would set a precedent for similar factory farms in my area, the SE Minnesota karst geology (driftless) region.	870-6	400
PLEASE deny any new permits for Riverview Dairy.	870-7	33
Huge animal confinement of any kind has gotten way out of control. It's unhealthy for the animals.	871-1	74
Huge animal confinement of any kind has gotten way out of control. It's unhealthy for the enviroment.	871-2	73
Huge animal confinement of any kind has gotten way out of control. It's unhealthy for humans.	871-3	395
The stench in the air most days is unbearable if you live within a short distance of these farms or buildings.	871-4	83
It's disgusting and should have never been allowed in the 1st place.	871-5	432
We also need to get rid of all farmers on country boards. I've found from experience that they don't care about the enviroment period. They don't even follow their own rules. It's all about money. As long as they don't have to put up with the smell or the destruction of the enviroment next to them they give the permit to the mega farmer. I'm sick of it.	871-6	435
I grew up on what was then considered a large beef operation of around 1000 head of cattle. The very idea of a confined operation of the size proposed by Riverview is appalling. Please do not let this expansion go forward.	872-1	432
Thank you for your attention and consideration of all the implications of this dairy proposal for people and the environment.	872-2	432
I am writing to encourage you to deny the permit for the West River Dairy Expansion, a proposed massive operation.	873-1	33
The environmental impacts of CAFO's is well known and cannot be denied. Negative impacts to water quality, are not what the community or the state of Mn need.	873-2	264
The environmental impacts of CAFO's is well known and cannot be denied. increased antibiotic resistance are not what the community or the state of Mn need.	873-4	72
The environmental impacts of CAFO's is well known and cannot be denied. nutrient pollution to land from the massive waste are not what the community or the state of Mn need.	873-5	349
I urge you to deny this permit.	873-6	33
The United States continues to experience business consolidation within the agriculture sector. An example is that only four companies control 100% of the beef processing industry. This does not help the family farm at all, in fact it puts additional strain upon the farms existence.	874-1	400
We cannot let further consolidation happen within our states dairy industry. Our county, the largest in Minnesota, now has only two or three dairy operations.	874-2	400
These small family operations contribute so much to our local economies.	874-3	400

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
So to allow an expansion of the West River facility is another nail in the coffin in our states and local small family dairy operations.	874-4	400
I say no to the permit!	874-5	33
I live in Stevens county. I grew up here and live in the farm my grandfather grew up on in this county. Our farm is near an existing riverside operation just across the border into Traverse County and we have learned that Riverview is also trying to expand another operation by our farm in addition to this one. I am concerned about how this operation will impact our water quality in this community.	875-1	388
I live in Stevens county. I grew up here and live in the farm my grandfather grew up on in this county. Our farm is near an existing riverside operation just across the border into Traverse County and we have learned that Riverview is also trying to expand another operation by our farm in addition to this one. I am concerned about how this operation will impact our water quantity in this community.	875-2	190
We have already had to start testing our water on our farm because the well that I drank from as a kid is now contaminated.	875-3	193
The information presented in this EAW does not reassure me that Riverview will do what it needs to do to protect our water in Stevens county.	875-4	26
The information provided in the EAW about water, even after the aquifer test that was initially left out was added, is outdated and insufficient.	875-5	191
An EIS must be required. It is the only way to get the information that my self and my community need to feel this project can go forward safely.	875-6	1
Factory farms are a danger to our farmland.	876-1	400
Factory farms are a danger to our animals.	876-2	74
Factory farms are a danger to our people.	876-3	395
The concentration of animals and their waste is not manageable in the magnitude proposed.	876-4	326
Please stop this.	876-5	432
Having lived in rural areas for much of my life, small businesses, whether they are agricultural, recreational, or anything that offers a comfortable livelihood, a safe place to live and raise a family, is an essential choice for any person. Increasing the size of farms/dairies is a distressing indication that the values of rural individuals are being dismissed, in favor of corporations that make profit the sole reason for existing.	877-1	403
What that consolidation means is that communities lose their residents who are no longer able to make a living.	877-2	398
Small, rural communities have been a safe, affordable choice for people who want to know their neighbors, to be there to help when needed, to enjoy each other's presence, and to raise children in an environment that values the land they thrive on, rather than the need to be bigger and richer.	877-3	398
Allowing a massive dairy to become even bigger is a move that nullifies those values, and it contributes to the destruction of the very land we treasure.	877-4	398
i am disgusted. too many cows.	878-1	434

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
not enough work for workers,	878-2	398
not enough family farmers	878-3	400
again, disgusted.	878-4	403
The environmental impact of this would be devastating. this is the largest cafo i have ever heard of.	878-5	167
inhumane.	878-6	403
makes me want to give up all hope.	878-7	403
do not bow down to this corporation.	878-8	403
deny their giant cafo please for the love of nature.	878-9	33
For these reasons, I support the expansion.	879-1	431
I am writing in support of Riverview's dairy expansion at West River Dairy	880-1	431
to oppose the imposition of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in this case.	880-2	20
I urge the MPCA to approve this project without an EIS requirement.	880-3	430
I vehemently oppose this expansion.	881-1	432
It will be an environmental hazard that poisons our communities.	881-2	397
I cannot articulate how much damage this will do!	881-3	432
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	882-1	431
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	882-2	430
The current EAW review would be absolutely thorough enough to answer all realistic questions enough to support the project.	883-1	20
To whom it may concern: this expansion concerns every person in our state. Please do not approve this extensive expansion.	884-1	432
When is large enough enough? If approved this time, others will push for theirs.	884-2	435
We're fighting data centers which are destructors of the environment.	884-3	435
Agrobusiness is too much for the environment to handle.	884-4	167
My name is Mike Quale; I want to express my support for their operation and their proposed expansion in Stevens County.	885-1	431
However, I take comfort in knowing that an operation like Riverview has already done more than their share of due diligence on a project of this nature, including the necessary research in the background, permitting, etc. to make sure that this is done in the correct way. This type of operation already operates under strict regulatory oversight, & the systems are in place to meet MPCA requirements.	886-1	431
I am a citizen of the state for 40 years and I wish to register my opposition to the RiverviewLLC cowfarm proposal.	887-1	432
This proposed increase would have a severe effect upon the state, causing for example overloading of manure in water and alga blooms	887-2	294
This proposed increase would have a severe effect upon the state, risks to humans from possible health issues,	887-3	395
This proposed increase would have a severe effect upon the state, greenhouse gas issues	887-4	103
Please vote AGAINST this proposal when it comes up.	887-5	432
I want to express my personal support for the expansion of Riverview's West River Dairy in Stevens County.	888-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
We do not believe an Environmental Impact Statement or additional review layers are necessary or appropriate here.	888-2	20
I encourage the MPCA to proceed based on the science, trust the process, and support the kind of responsible dairy growth that keeps Minnesota competitive and keeps farm families on the land.	888-3	430
The Riverview Dairy expansion requires, at a minimum, an environmental review.	889-1	29
Coming from a farm community, I cannot conceive of what it will take to safely remove manure for that many animals.	889-2	346
And the cruelty of confinement is inhumane.	889-3	74
In Minnesota and across the country, increasing attention is being drawn to the animal agriculture industry and the anti-competitive practices that are being used to benefit a small minority of parties along the food supply chain.	890-1	400
From lower milk check amounts and issues related to accessing processing at a fair price, to higher prices at the grocery store, everyone — farmers, the communities they are a part of, and eaters — is being negatively affected by this.	890-2	400
The fact that we don't know the likely impacts of the West River Dairy expansion on air quality begs the necessity of a full, objective and timely environmental analysis. I urge the MPCA to allow this.	891-1	4
The fact that we don't know the likely impacts of the West River Dairy expansion on soil pollution begs the necessity of a full, objective and timely environmental analysis. I urge the MPCA to allow this.	891-2	6
The fact that we don't know the likely impacts of the West River Dairy expansion on water quality begs the necessity of a full, objective and timely environmental analysis. I urge the MPCA to allow this.	891-3	2
Riverview has a recent history of manure spills in western Minnesota.	892-1	373
In Arizona, the company also recently agreed to pay $11 million to residents affected by the dairy's overpumping.	892-2	194
The proposed Stevens County site sits within five miles of eight different protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas	892-3	174
is located as part of the Pomme de Terre River watershed, just 25 miles from its confluence with the Minnesota River.	892-4	277
A facility of this scale located in such a vulnerable area calls for a thorough environmental review.	892-5	15
The Riverview CAFO Proposal Needs an EIS prior to building the first livestock operation in the state to hold over 20,000 animal units.	893-1	15
This operation, which is proposed for Stevens County, would be nearly double the size of the next largest livestock operation in the state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers.	893-2	400
This operation, which is proposed for Stevens County, would be nearly double the size of the next largest livestock operation in the state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to the water.	893-3	134
This operation, which is proposed for Stevens County, would be nearly double the size of the next largest livestock operation in the state in terms of animal units. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to rural communities.	893-4	397
The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), the agency that issues feedlot permits, must recognize the fundamentally new nature of this threat and give this permit greater scrutiny than it has to previous proposals. In short, this proposal must be required to undergo a full environmental impact statement process.	893-5	15

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Riverview, based out of Morris, Minn., is one of the largest milk producers in the country. The firm now owns 16 permitted dairy CAFOs in Minnesota alone, and these facilities house a total of more than 135,000 cows, according to the Star Tribune. That accounts for nearly a third of the state's entire dairy herd. Riverview also has a major presence in North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, New Mexico, and Arizona.	894-1	400
According to the documents filed by Riverview, the proposed operation would: Be allowed to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year from an off-site well. For reference, the City of Morris, which is home to over 5,000 people, is permitted to pump up to 300 million gallons of water a year.	894-3	195
According to the documents filed by Riverview, the proposed operation would: Have liquid manure storage encompassing 250 million gallons of waste. Require 13,200 acres of farmland for manure application.	894-4	311
This project must not go forward without an Environmental Impact Statement and review.	894-5	1
Riverview has a recent history of manure spills in western Minnesota.	894-6	373
In Arizona, the company also recently agreed to pay $11 million to residents affected by the dairy's overpumping.	894-7	194
The proposed Stevens County site sits within five miles of eight different protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas	894-8	174
is located as part of the Pomme de Terre River watershed, just 25 miles from its confluence with the Minnesota River.	894-9	277
A facility of this scale located in such a vulnerable area calls for a thorough environmental review.	894-10	29
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	894-12	400
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	894-13	400
In Minnesota and across the country, increasing attention is being drawn to the animal agriculture industry and the anti-competitive practices that are being used to benefit a small minority of parties along the food supply chain. From lower milk check amounts and issues related to accessing processing at a fair price, to higher prices at the grocery store, everyone — farmers, the communities they are a part of, and eaters — is being negatively affected by this.	894-14	400
Just as importantly, an EIS of the West River Dairy Expansion proposal would address socio-economic impacts.	894-11a	14
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on water quality to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	894-2a	2
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on water quantity to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	894-2b	3
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on local roads to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	894-2c	8
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on existing independent family dairy farms to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	894-2d	12
This project begs extreme scrutiny for the potential of many and varied negative impacts it will most certainly have on traditional, smaller scale farming operations.	895-1	400

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This project begs extreme scrutiny for the potential of many and varied negative impacts it will most certainly have on appropriate land use.	895-2	177
This project begs extreme scrutiny for the potential of many and varied negative impacts it will most certainly have on water supply (sucking up a staggering volume).	895-3	195
This project begs extreme scrutiny for the potential of many and varied negative impacts it will most certainly have on pollution from soil runoff.	895-4	388
This project begs extreme scrutiny for the potential of many and varied negative impacts it will most certainly have on massively excessive manure handling and spreading/disposal of giant amounts of waste.	895-5	346
This is not the kind of industrial farming that benefits anyone other than the corporation that reaps profits at the expense of everyone who seeks a safe water supply.	895-6	406
This is not the kind of industrial farming that benefits anyone other than the corporation that reaps profits at the expense of everyone who seeks healthy soil.	895-7	183
This is not the kind of industrial farming that benefits anyone other than the corporation that reaps profits at the expense of everyone who seeks an environment undiminished by overuse.	895-8	167
This is not the kind of industrial farming that benefits anyone other than the corporation that reaps profits at the expense of everyone who seeks an environment undiminished by pollution.	895-9	167
This is not the kind of industrial farming that benefits anyone other than the corporation that reaps profits at the expense of everyone who seeks a safe food supply.	895-10	170
Allowing this kind of operation exhibits an utter disregard for families seeking a fair shake in the agricultural economy.	895-11	400
This proposal by Riverview must be required to undergo a full environmental impact statement (EIS).	896-1	1
This expanded Riverview facility would be more than 60 times the size of the average Minnesota dairy. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers.	896-2	400
This expanded Riverview facility would be more than 60 times the size of the average Minnesota dairy. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to rural communities.	896-3	397
The health of our ag land and wellness of our communities is at risk with this expansion.	896-4	397
This project must go thru industrial scale review to ensure compliance, transparency and communication.	896-5	29
This is a HUGE undertaking - DON'T MESS IT UP! Protect your citizens, communities, and rural lands: In Minnesota and across the country, increasing attention is being drawn to the animal agriculture industry and the anti-competitive practices that are being used to benefit a small minority of parties along the food supply chain.	897-1	432
From lower milk check amounts and issues related to accessing processing at a fair price, to higher prices at the grocery store, everyone — farmers, the communities they are a part of, and eaters — is being negatively affected by this.	897-2	400
If built, the facility will hold 18,855 dairy cattle, bringing the total animal units to 26,397 in one place. This proposed expansion would be nearly double the size of the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units.	898-1	435

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This expanded Riverview facility would be more than 60 times the size of the average Minnesota dairy, which had fewer than 280 cows in 2025. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers.	898-2	400
This expanded Riverview facility would be more than 60 times the size of the average Minnesota dairy, which had fewer than 280 cows in 2025. This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to rural communities.	898-3	397
Riverview, based out of Morris, Minn., is one of the largest milk producers in the country. The firm now owns 16 permitted dairy CAFOs in Minnesota alone, and these facilities house a total of more than 135,000 cows, according to the Star Tribune. That accounts for nearly a third of the state's entire dairy herd. Riverview also has a major presence in North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, New Mexico, and Arizona.	898-4	400
The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), which is the agency that issues Minnesota's feedlot permits, must recognize the fundamentally new nature of this threat and give this permit greater scrutiny than it ever has to previous proposals. This proposal by Riverview must be required to undergo a full environmental impact statement (EIS).	898-5	15
Large CAFOs are an affront to family farmers and our soil and water.	899-1	400
Riverview represents the wrong direction for Minnesota agriculture.	899-2	400
Please require the CAFO to go through a full environmental impact process.	899-3	1
This expansion is enormous and needs to be reviewed in depth before proceeding. The proposal should undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	900-1	15
I strongly disapprove the use of CAFO facilities,	901-1	432
they are cruel to the animals	901-2	74
harmful to our environment.	901-3	167
There is nothing that could convince me that this is an appropriate way to farm.	901-4	403
I am writing to express our strong support for Riverview’s proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	902-1	431
We do not believe an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is necessary in this case.	902-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	902-3	430
I strongly encourage the MPCA to conduct a very thorough environmental review for this gigantic operation.	903-1	29
I think we need to be more supportive of smaller, family farms frankly.	903-2	400
But at least please don't rubber stamp this factory farm.	903-3	33
I am writing to offer my support for Riverview’s proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	904-1	431
I respectfully encourage you to approve and support the West River Dairy expansion.	904-2	430
I am very concerned about the expansion of CAFOs in Minnesota.	905-1	432
They pollute area waters.	905-2	388
They make large areas unlivable because of the toxic air quality.	905-3	81
They put small producers out of business.	905-4	400
They have a record of intimidating and harassing farmers that object to these gigantic operations.	905-5	400

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
For a variety of reasons, I think it is imperative that the MPCA require a full environmental impact statement to assess the dangers posed by the proposal to expand the West River Dairy operations.	905-6	1
I have many concerns about this expansion and believe that a full environmental impact report is absolutely necessary.	906-1	1
This expansion would keep cows in total confinement which raises serious animal rights concerns.	906-2	74
In addition, increasing livestock production of this scale with generate massive amounts of manure,	906-3	391
In addition, increasing livestock production of this scale, increasing the risk of toxic algae blooms.	906-4	294
In addition, increasing livestock production of this scale, increasing the risk of water pollution.	906-4	388
It will put a strain on already taxed water resources using up to 100-226 million gallons annually.	906-5	195
It will put a strain on already taxed water resources using up to 100-226 million gallons annually.	906-5	195
The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency estimates that 56 percent of surface waters do not meet basic water quality standards	906-6	299
and that crop and livestock production contribute to 85 percent of the state's water pollution.	906-7	415
Please do not move forward with this project.	906-8	432
Yes, we need a full environmental impact statement!!	907-1	1
This CAFO proposal needs an environmental review, a SERIOUS environmental review!	908-1	29
Almost twice the number of cows as the current largest operation in the state?	908-2	435
As much water as the city of Morris?	908-3	195
I don't know why we're even considering this proposal -- CAFOs are terrible for the animals.	908-4	74
I don't know why we're even considering this proposal -- CAFOs are terrible for the neighbors.	908-5	397
I don't know why we're even considering this proposal -- CAFOs are terrible for small farmers.	908-6	400
I don't know why we're even considering this proposal -- CAFOs are terrible for the environment.	908-7	167
At the very least, this proposal should not move forward without a strict environmental review and regular, thorough inspections to ensure that their 250 million gallon waste storage (!!!) is not leaking.	908-8	29
Actually, don't bother with the review -- just do the right thing and deny this proposal!	908-9	33
Please do not expand	909-1	432
please complete a full environmental review.	909-2	1
I am very concerned about the proposed dairy in the area near Morris, Minnesota.	910-1	432
It is more than double the animal units of the next largest dairy operation in Minnesota. As such, it risks more harm to the area than our current CAFOs.	910-2	432
It would be located near several sensitive wildlife areas where manure could do a lot of harm.	910-3	174
The company already has a track record of harmful spills in other states.	910-4	373
The company is also asking for a permit to use almost as much water as the nearby city.	910-5	435
With such a large operation, Riverview, LLP must be required to submit a full EIS	910-6	1
and the EPA needs to do an in-depth examination before deciding on whether to issue a permit.	910-7	49

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am writing as a concerned citizen, landowner, and farmer in MN regarding the West River Dairy Expansion.	911-1	432
My concerns are environmental.	911-2	167
My concerns are economic.	911-3	398
My concerns are the overall health of the MN community.	911-4	395
Nationally and in MN, we are in an economic farm crisis with small farms struggling to pay their bills and continue their farming livelihood due to low market prices and high costs of inputs, rental price of land, and difficulty competing against a few larger and larger farm operations.	911-5	400
An expansion of this size is not of an economic benefit to MN. It continues a trend of inequality in agriculture with just a few farmers monopolizing the market and animals, while the smaller farms are often kept out of markets, milk trucks won't come to their farm, they can't compete on land rental prices, milk prices plummet, and ultimately smaller farmers can't compete and stay in business.	911-6	400
Our land, economy, and communities suffer when family farms go out of business and business is consolidated into a few.	911-7	400
Environmentally, this is altogether too many animals	911-8	434
Environmentally, this is altogether too much water usage	911-9	195
Environmentally, this is altogether too much manure consolidated into one location	911-10	326
It is an outrageous and egregious example of consolidation.	911-11	434
This site is within 5 miles of 8 different protected waterfowl and wildlife protection areas.	911-12	174
There needs to be a full environmental review in the form of an EIS so that local residents have the opportunity to weigh in on the impacts this project may have on them.	911-13	1
There needs to be a full environmental review in the form of an EIS so that local residents have the opportunity to weigh in on the impacts this project may have on their farms.	911-14	12
There needs to be a full environmental review in the form of an EIS so that local residents have the opportunity to weigh in on the impacts this project may have on their community	911-15	13
There needs to be a full environmental review in the form of an EIS so that local residents have the opportunity to weigh in on the impacts this project may have on the wildlife.	911-16	7
There needs to be a full environmental review in the form of an EIS so that local residents have the opportunity to weigh in on the impacts this project may have on the landscape.	911-17	6
If there are no environmental issues with having 26,397 animal units in one location, then let the EIS process illustrate that and give citizens an opportunity to weigh in for further review.	911-18	15
If there are no community issues with having 26,397 animal units in one location, then let the EIS process illustrate that and give citizens an opportunity to weigh in for further review.	911-19	13
If there are no economic issues with having 26,397 animal units in one location, then let the EIS process illustrate that and give citizens an opportunity to weigh in for further review.	911-20	14

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
We need full transparency and accountability in this permitting process. Otherwise it looks like the largest dairy operation in MN gets to leverage their market monopoly, influence, and power to favor their individual business over what is best for the community.	911-21	397
We need full transparency and accountability in this permitting process. Otherwise it looks like the largest dairy operation in MN gets to leverage their market monopoly, influence, and power to favor their individual business over what is best for theenvironment.	911-22	188
We need full transparency and accountability in this permitting process. Otherwise it looks like the largest dairy operation in MN gets to leverage their market monopoly, influence, and power to favor their individual business over what is best for the local farming community.	911-23	397
The SIZE of the Riverview expansion project is OUTRAGIOUS and NOT WANTed in STEVENS COUNTY.	912-1	434
Being a proud area farm resident for most of my 80 years, as well as the generations before me. I VALUE our MANY LAKES.	912-2	295
Being a proud area farm resident for most of my 80 years, as well as the generations before me. I VALUE the outcome of the grain and smaller farms we have in the area now and into future.	912-3	400
Also have a HUGE concern for the ODOR.	912-4	83
Also have a HUGE concern for the WATER.	912-5	387
Also have a HUGE concern for the HEAL TH ISSUES.	912-6	395
Also have a HUGE concern about the aquifer in the future.	912-7	190
We need everyone to make up a community, not just the BIG Companies.	912-8	397
Regardless of the outcome of the reports. My answer is NO! NO! NO! To the LARGE EXPANSION.	912-9	432
The MPCA must recognize the fundamentally new nature of the Riverview Dairy Expansion threat to our land resources and give this permit greater scrutiny than it ever has to previous proposals.	913-1	29
The MPCA must recognize the fundamentally new nature of the Riverview Dairy Expansion threat to our water resources and give this permit greater scrutiny than it ever has to previous proposals.	913-2	29
This proposal by Riverview, LLP must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	913-3	1
Riverview has a recent history of manure spills in western Minnesota.	913-4	373
In Arizona, the company also recently agreed to pay $11 million to residents affected by the dairy's overpumping.	913-5	194
There are 8 different protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas within 5 miles of the new location	913-6	174
is located as part of the Pomme de Terre River watershed, just 25 miles from its confluence with the Minnesota River.	913-7	277
A facility of this scale located in such a vulnerable area calls for a thorough environmental review.	913-8	29
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices - an EIS would help address the socio-economic impacts of this project.	913-9	400

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land. This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating local economies in the process.	913-10	400
PLEASE conduct a full EIS - thank you for your time and consideration.	913-11	1
We are so lucky to have the natural resources we have in MN and the greater Midwest and need to do all we can to take care of it.	913-12	432
I would like to give my support to Riverview LLP, thank you for your time.	914-1	431
The impact of the amount of water for the 18,000 dairy operation is a major impact.	915-1	387
Also, the fact that the manure is spread over such a large area is another reason for environmental impact study.	915-2	15
I know this is just looking at the environment, but I would like to know how many farmworkers will be employed and also what they will be paid. Do they have other benefits like health care, vacation, overtime pay, etc.	915-3	395
my last comment is that we are already subsidizing milk because we have a glut of it do we really need more dairy?	915-4	435
And if we do, where is the product going, what market will it be in, and how does it affect the existing market now?	915-5	398
Minnesota's approach to managing water resources is lax, to the detriment of taxpaying citizens. Corporations benefit far more than citizens from our shared resources. Examples: Riverview Dairy. Data centers. Pivot irrigation.	916-1	19
In a recent tour of Riverview's Waubun facility, our group was told that the test for whether the dairy was depleting groundwater was to run the facility at average capacity water usage - not peak and monitor nearby residential wells for 6 days to see if they ran dry. If not, the water use permit would be granted. And while there was ongoing monitoring of water quality on site after operations began, there was no ongoing monitoring of the source water (aquifer) or of surrounding water quality.	916-2	405
Riverview touts the "closed ecosystem" of their facilities - wastewater and solid waste are recycled and pumped underground back to adjacent farms, who serve the dairy. That doesn't support the continuation of the aquifer/water source and landowners that depend on it.	916-3	195
With climate change data the past 30 years we know not expect aquifers to recharge, or for water sources to become more plentiful.	916-4	209
Reduce the amount of water these large facilities are permitted to use. You're supporting big business at the harm of Minnesota's residents.	916-5	195
I'm truly disappointed in your decision to fight this preliminary permitting process for Riverview LLP or any other Livestock facility for the following thoughts and reasons.	917-1	431
This is a horrible, environmentally unfriendly idea.	918-1	167
Dairy is becoming less popular, not more.	918-2	435
I am against this expansion.	919-1	432
In addition to the harms of water usage.	919-2	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
In addition to the harms of potential pollution, it would harm the economy because of the huge scale taking away the ability of smaller farmers to compete.	919-3	398
In addition it would harm the economy because of the huge scale taking away the ability of smaller farmers to compete.	919-4	398
Please deny their request.	919-5	432
I am writing to express my strong support for Riverview Farms' plans to expand their West River Dairy operation.	920-1	431
this expansion does not warrant a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)	920-2	20
As a kosher supervisor for the entire Midwest, River View Farms is an excellent asset to the farming industry; that only improves that market when expanded.	921-1	431
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	922-1	431
I strongly encourage the MPCA to approve this project and allow the expansion to move forward.	922-2	430
I am writing to share my support for the proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	923-1	431
I do not believe an Environmental Impact Statement is necessary for this project.	923-2	20
I respectfully ask that you support and approve the West River Dairy expansion.	923-3	430
Aside from the obvious pollution issues, mega-dairies like this saturate the market, driving smaller producers out of business.	924-1	400
And of course, there's the well-known fact that factory farming is harmful to the animals farmed. They are treated like products, not living beings.	924-2	74
I oppose the approval of a dairy operation of this size in this location.	925-1	432
The concentration of animals is unhealthy	925-2	395
the competition with local dairy operations is unacceptable	925-3	400
Any investigation should go beyond an Environmental Assessment Worksheet and should include extensive testing for airborne pollution and thorough examination beyond a cursory look at the potential harm.	925-4	4
Any investigation should go beyond an Environmental Assessment Worksheet and should include extensive testing for water-carried pollution and thorough examination beyond a cursory look at the potential harm.	925-5	2
Community members and advocacy organizations have raised questions about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: Manure volume: 18,855 cows would produce an estimated 285,000 gallons of manure every day — about 520,000 tons per year — nearly 40% of Morris's daily water use.	926-1	346
Community members and advocacy organizations have raised questions about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: Groundwater risks: Potential contamination from manure storage and land application.	926-2	386
Community members and advocacy organizations have raised questions about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: Drinking water: Increased nitrate levels that can threaten private wells and public health	926-3	193

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Community members and advocacy organizations have raised questions about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: Air quality: Odor and emissions that affect the quality of life for nearby residents	926-4	83
Community members and advocacy organizations have raised questions about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: Farm consolidation: Pressure on small and mid sized family farms and a continued "get big or get out" model	926-5	400
Community members and advocacy organizations have raised questions about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: Cumulative impacts: Multiple large CAFOs are concentrated in one region, with limited oversight	926-6	400
Community members and advocacy organizations have raised questions about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: Market Saturation: Mega-dairies like Riverview dominate the milk market, and expanding this facility would further flood it, making it even harder for small farms to survive	926-7	400
The idea of putting almost 19,000 cows in one confinement setup seems absurd, but I think it's important to be open to business growth and expansion and to make informed decisions based on data.	927-1	400
With that being said, moving forward on a project like this without completing a full EIS is irresponsible and would be a dereliction of duty for state officials overseeing the project if permitted.	927-2	1
We only get one shot at getting this right. Please do the right thing. Complete and EIS so that the decision makers have the best possible data to make the best decision for the people of Stevens County and the citizens of Minnesota.	927-3	1
We love agriculture, but not all ag business models are good for the environment.	927-4	167
We love agriculture, but not all ag business models are good for their neighbors.	927-5	397
A full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed, only a more in-depth review can fully assess the unique risks posed by such a massive dairy operation. Reasons listed below. Manure volume: 18,855 cows would produce an estimated 285,000 gallons of manure every day — about 520,000 tons per year — nearly 40% of Morris's daily water use	928-1	15
A full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed, only a more in-depth review can fully assess the unique risks posed by such a massive dairy operation. Reasons listed below. Groundwater risks: Potential contamination from manure storage and land application	928-2	15
A full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed, only a more in-depth review can fully assess the unique risks posed by such a massive dairy operation. Reasons listed below. Drinking water: Increased nitrate levels that can threaten private wells and public health	928-3	2
A full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed, only a more in-depth review can fully assess the unique risks posed by such a massive dairy operation. Reasons listed below. Air quality: Odor and emissions that affect the quality of life for nearby residents	928-4	4
A full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed, only a more in-depth review can fully assess the unique risks posed by such a massive dairy operation. Reasons listed below. Farm consolidation: Pressure on small and mid sized family farms and a continued "get big or get out" model	928-5	12

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
A full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed, only a more in-depth review can fully assess the unique risks posed by such a massive dairy operation. Reasons listed below. Cumulative impacts: Multiple large CAFOs are concentrated in one region, with limited oversight	928-6	11
A full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed, only a more in-depth review can fully assess the unique risks posed by such a massive dairy operation. Reasons listed below. Market Saturation: Mega-dairies like Riverview dominate the milk market, and expanding this facility would further flood it, making it even harder for small farms to survive	928-7	14
I was born and raised and educated in neighboring Wisconsin, but have worked and lived in the Washington, DC suburbs since 1977. I am extremely concerned about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: \Manure volume: 18,855 cows would produce an estimated 285,000 gallons of manure every day--about 520,000 tons per year--nearly 40% of Morris's daily water use.	929-1	346
I was born and raised and educated in neighboring Wisconsin, but have worked and lived in the Washington, DC suburbs since 1977. I am extremely concerned about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: Groundwater risks: Potential contamination from manure storage and land application.	929-2	386
I was born and raised and educated in neighboring Wisconsin, but have worked and lived in the Washington, DC suburbs since 1977. I am extremely concerned about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: Drinking water: Increased nitrate levels that can threaten private wells and public health.	929-3	193
I was born and raised and educated in neighboring Wisconsin, but have worked and lived in the Washington, DC suburbs since 1977. I am extremely concerned about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: Air quality: Odor and emissions that affect the quality of life for nearby residents.	929-4	83
I was born and raised and educated in neighboring Wisconsin, but have worked and lived in the Washington, DC suburbs since 1977. I am extremely concerned about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: I was born and raised and educated in neighboring Wisconsin, but have worked and lived in the Washington, DC suburbs since 1977. I am extremely concerned about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including:	929-5	395
I was born and raised and educated in neighboring Wisconsin, but have worked and lived in the Washington, DC suburbs since 1977. I am extremely concerned about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: Cumulative impacts: Multiple large CAFOs are concentrated in one region, with limited oversight.	929-6	435
I was born and raised and educated in neighboring Wisconsin, but have worked and lived in the Washington, DC suburbs since 1977. I am extremely concerned about whether the impacts of an operation this large can be managed safely, including: Market Saturation: Mega-dairies like Riverview dominate the milk market, and expanding this facility would furtherflood it, making it even harder for small farms to survive.	929-7	400
For all of the above solidly fact-based reasons, I respectfully but sincerely urge the MPCA to reject the expansion of this CAFO.	929-8	432
This would be a monopoly that would alter the market and push out smaller dairies.	930-1	400

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I request an extensive EIS	930-2	1
I request an animal welfare issues investigation of current operation. It looks like they are not caring for current animals by the look of their calves especially, let alone thousands more!	930-3	74
I don't think we should be bearing the costs of this mega CAFO. Their manure plan is not adequate. I live near Minnesota River and can see the impacts of current nutrient load and hydrology.	930-4	351
Pomme de Terre River watershed. This watershed already shows documented nutrient stress, including elevated nitrate levels in local surface waters and connected basins. Given these existing conditions, the proposal should be evaluated not in isolation, but in terms of cumulative nutrient loading.	930-5	256
Nitrate Loading and Existing Impairment: The addition of manure from a significantly expanded herd, applied across approximately 13,000 acres, will increase total nitrogen inputs in a watershed that is already exhibiting nitrate concerns. Even with best management practices, it is well established that a portion of applied nitrogen is not taken up by crops and is instead transported via leaching and runoff. * I request that MPCA require a quantitative cumulative nitrogen loading analysis demonstrating that this project will not worsen existing nitrate conditions in receiving waters.	930-6	356
Tile Drainage and Rapid Transport Pathways: The project area includes extensive subsurface tile drainage, which creates direct hydrologic pathways from fields to ditches and streams. This significantly reduces natural attenuation and increases nitrate delivery to surface waters. * I request that MPCA require specific analysis of tile-drain contributions to nitrate transport, rather than relying solely on general nutrient management assumptions.	930-7	292
Groundwater Protection: The region relies heavily on groundwater for drinking water. Land application of manure at this scale presents a risk of nitrate leaching to aquifers, particularly in vulnerable soils. I request that MPCA require: * Expanded groundwater monitoring wells in application areas * A clear nitrate threshold response plan if levels increase	930-8	193
Manure Storage Risk and Extreme Weather: While the proposal includes lined manure storage basins, extreme precipitation events are increasing in frequency and intensity. Overflow or application during saturated conditions could result in significant nutrient releases. * I request evaluation of climate-adjusted storage capacity and land application timing safeguards.	930-9	339
Water Quantity Impacts: The proposed groundwater appropriation (over 200 million gallons annually) raises concerns about local aquifer drawdown and potential impacts to connected surface waters and wetlands. * I request a cumulative water balance analysis evaluating impacts to nearby water bodies and ecological systems.	930-10	195
Anti-Degradation and Downstream Impacts: As the Minnesota River system is already impaired in many reaches, additional upstream nutrient loading may contribute to downstream degradation. * MPCA should evaluate this project under anti-degradation standards, ensuring it does not contribute to further impairment.	930-11	319

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Conclusion: Given existing nitrate concerns in this watershed, approval of this expansion without robust, site-specific cumulative impact analysis would pose a significant risk to both surface water and groundwater quality. I urge MPCA to require additional study, monitoring, and enforceable safeguards before considering permit approval.	930-12	42
Manure volume: 18,855 cows would produce an estimated 285,000 gallons of manure every day — about 520,000 tons per year — nearly 40% of Morris's daily water use	930-13	346
Groundwater risks: Potential contamination from manure storage and land application	930-14	386
Drinking water: Increased nitrate levels that can threaten private wells and public health	930-15	193
Air quality: Odor and emissions that affect the quality of life for nearby residents	930-16	83
Farm consolidation: Pressure on small and mid sized family farms and a continued "get big or get out" model	930-17	400
Cumulative impacts: Multiple large CAFOs are concentrated in one region, with limited oversight	930-18	397
Market Saturation: Mega-dairies like Riverview dominate the milk market, and expanding this facility would further flood it, making it even harder for small farms to survive	930-19	400
Riverview Dairy LLC has the right in our capitalistic and democratic society to propose an expansion of operations. This current herd expansion at a single location, however, is extraordinary in the resources required to plan, build and maintain this unprecedented project proposal. The consequences of this project for the wider human community need to be carefully studied in proportion to the proposal.	931-1	433
Riverview Dairy LLC has the right in our capitalistic and democratic society to propose an expansion of operations. This current herd expansion at a single location, however, is extraordinary in the resources required to plan, build and maintain this unprecedented project proposal. The consequences of this project for the wider natural community need to be carefully studied in proportion to the proposal.	931-2	433
Riverview Dairy LLC has the right in our capitalistic and democratic society to propose an expansion of operations. This current herd expansion at a single location, however, is extraordinary in the resources required to plan, build and maintain this unprecedented project proposal. The consequences of this project for the air need to be carefully studied in proportion to the proposal.	931-3	80
Riverview Dairy LLC has the right in our capitalistic and democratic society to propose an expansion of operations. This current herd expansion at a single location, however, is extraordinary in the resources required to plan, build and maintain this unprecedented project proposal. The consequences of this project for the soil need to be carefully studied in proportion to the proposal.	931-5	433
Riverview Dairy LLC has the right in our capitalistic and democratic society to propose an expansion of operations. This current herd expansion at a single location, however, is extraordinary in the resources required to plan, build and maintain this unprecedented project proposal. The consequences of this project for the infrastructure need to be carefully studied in proportion to the proposal.	931-6	433
Therefore I urge a full environmental review. Half measures will avail the wider context nothing in the face of this unprecedented request.	931-7	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This MEGA dairy operation will seriously impact water quality across the region.	932-1	388
Water is a commonly held resource, critical for life and health, and it doesn't respect county or municipal boundaries. Minnesota is made of water and we cannot keep exploiting it.	932-2	295
Please respect the rights of other dairy farmers	932-3	400
the health and welfare of children and families	932-4	395
the water quality of Minnesota.	932-5	388
Riverview is simply too large an operation for the land to support!	932-6	132
Riverview is simply too large an operation for the water to support!	932-7	195
Riverview is simply too large an operation for the health of residents throughout the state!	932-8	395
I have concerns about whether the impacts of an operation as large as the West River Dairy Expansion can be managed safely, including: Manure volume: 18,855 cows would produce an estimated 285,000 gallons of manure every day — about 520,000 tons per year — nearly 40% of Morris's daily water use	933-1	346
I have concerns about whether the impacts of an operation as large as the West River Dairy Expansion can be managed safely, including: Groundwater risks: Potential contamination from manure storage and land application	933-2	193
I have concerns about whether the impacts of an operation as large as the West River Dairy Expansion can be managed safely, including: Drinking water: Increased nitrate levels that can threaten private wells and public health	933-3	193
I have concerns about whether the impacts of an operation as large as the West River Dairy Expansion can be managed safely, including: Air quality: Odor and emissions that affect the quality of life for nearby residents	933-4	83
- I have concerns about whether the impacts of an operation as large as the West River Dairy Expansion can be managed safely, including: Farm consolidation: Pressure on small and mid sized family farms and a continued "get big or get out" model	933-5	400
I have concerns about whether the impacts of an operation as large as the West River Dairy Expansion can be managed safely, including: Cumulative impacts: Multiple large CAFOs are concentrated in one region, with limited oversight	933-6	397
I have concerns about whether the impacts of an operation as large as the West River Dairy Expansion can be managed safely, including: Market Saturation: Mega-dairies like Riverview dominate the milk market, and expanding this facility would further flood it, making it even harder for small farms to survive	933-7	398
There are many things to consider on this issue. Large CAFO consolidations threaten small farmers and basically crowd out the small farm enterprise market-share wise and in available land and possibly permitting as well.	934-1	400
Manure is always a logistic issue. How is this (285,00 tons a day) going to be handled and controlled?	934-2	346
Is it going to seep through its containment area and get into groundwater?	934-3	193
Will nitrates eventually get into local drinking water?	934-4	193
Air quality is a concern for local home-owning residents. People with lung and breathing issues will have a difficult adjustment, and maybe having to move.	934-6	394

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am not against dairy farming, but I know from experience that the bigger the animal agriculture system, the more chance there is of pollution,	934-7	146
I am not against dairy farming, but I know from experience that the bigger the animal agriculture system, the more chance there is of disease increases and the need for more antibiotics arises. That is why we have the high antibiotic resistance factor of bacteria and in other human pathogens today. Creating more opportunity for pathogens to become resistant to antibiotic chemicals is a bad idea. Show me a CAFO that does not use large quantities of preventive anti-pathogenic chemicals today. There are none.	934-8	72
Concerned about the expansion of the West River Dairy and what it could mean for our water.	935-1	387
Concerned about the expansion of the West River Dairy and what it could mean for our air.	935-2	81
Concerned about the expansion of the West River Dairy and what it could mean for our soil.	935-3	183
Please be sure to carefully understand the possible long-term impacts on our environment.	935-4	167
Please be sure to carefully understand the possible long-term impacts on our communities.	935-5	397
Several years ago I listened to a SWCD (Soil & Water Conservation) official talk about measured nitrate contamination of aquifers in the Karst Region of SE Minnesota; Lets get SWCD comments on an EAW (Environmental Assessment Worksheet).	936-1	241
This type of consolidation in agriculture is not good for our environment.	937-1	167
This type of consolidation in agriculture is not good for our rural communities.	937-2	397
This type of consolidation in agriculture is not good for water quality.	937-3	388
This type of consolidation in agriculture is not good for water availability.	937-4	195
This type of consolidation in agriculture is not good for animal welfare.	937-5	74
I oppose the expansion.	937-6	432
I support the expansion of Riverviews West River site.	938-1	431
I believe the current review process is sufficient and that additional regulatory steps, such as a requirement for an environmental impact statement (EIS), are unnecessary.	938-2	20
With such a large cow population (11,000), the need for a complete Environmental Impact Statement(EIS) is obvious.	939-1	15
Such an immense feedlot has a strong potential for water pollution.	939-2	388
Such an immense feedlot has a strong potential for groundwater pollution.	939-3	193
Such an immense feedlot has a strong potential for land pollution (where manure wastes are stored).	939-4	149
Such an immense feedlot has a strong potential for air pollution (methane gas).	939-5	94
Considering past applications of the environmental laws in Minnesota, enforcement of existing laws has been spotty.	939-6	60
As a Minnesota resident and taxpayer, I urge the MPCA to follow best practices and require an EIS before any enlargement of the facility is approved.	939-7	1
I write to you today to share I do not support the expansion of the West River Dairy CAFO Operation.	940-1	432
I think this project is about more than Synnes Township. A dairy this size affect the markets for milk in all of Minnesota. Dairy is very important to my area of the state, our rolling pastures and fertile soils make it about perfect for dairy farming.	941-1	398

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This huge project is detrimental to the milk markets and will drive dairy out of my part of the state.	941-2	398
It will without a doubt pollute the shallowest aquifier.	941-3	193
It will without a doubt pollute the surrouding streams.	941-4	272
I also have a family member who lives in a valley 3 miles from a 2000 head dairy. There are many days they can't go outside as the stench is so strong, especially in the spring and fall when they apply slurry from the pits.	941-5	83
I can't imagine how awful this operation stinks. It stinks this bad because it's completely unnatural way to raise animals.	941-6	83
This dairy and it's feed suppliers will use huge farm equipment, which means bigger fields, and more erosion.	941-7	185
They will farm more marginal lands intensively not because it makes economic sense, but just because it's more convenient for the larger equipment.	941-8	179
That's what is happening around our area. Riverview Farms is not a farm, it is a corporate conglomerate.	941-9	398
No Environmental Impact Statement is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	942-1	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important expansion project.	942-2	430
The proposed West River Dairy Expansion should not be approved.	943-1	432
In addition to the harmful effects to the environment	943-2	167
it is also animal abuse!! Cows need space for exercise and herd socialization.	943-3	74
No one needs a farm that large!! Case closed!!	943-4	432
Minnesota's largest dairy producer, Riverview LLP, has applied to build the first livestock facility in Minnesota. If built, the facility will hold 18,855 dairy cattle, bringing the total animal units to 26,397 in one place. This proposed expansion would be nearly double the size of the next largest livestock operation in our state in terms of animal units.	944-1	435
This expanded Riverview facility would be more than 60 times the size of the average Minnesota dairy, which had fewer than 280 cows in 2025.	944-2	435
This makes it a fundamentally new and particularly powerful threat to Minnesota farmers and rural communities.	944-3	400
Riverview, based out of Morris, Minn., is one of the largest milk producers in the country. The firm now owns 16 permitted dairy CAFOs in Minnesota alone, and these facilities house a total of more than 135,000 cows, according to the Star Tribune. That accounts for nearly a third of the state's entire dairy herd. Riverview also has a major presence in North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, New Mexico, and Arizona.	944-4	435
The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), which is the agency that issues Minnesota's feedlot permits, must recognize the fundamentally new nature of this threat and give this permit greater scrutiny than it ever has to previous proposals. This proposal by Riverview must be required to undergo a full environmental impact statement (EIS).	944-5	15
We should be supporting more family run dairy farms.	944-6	400
I respectfully submit this letter in support of Riverview LLP's proposed expansion of West River Dairy near Morris, Minnesota.	945-1	431
In my opinion, based on my review of the EAW and the draft feedlot permit, no EIS is needed.	945-2	20
I fully support the expansion of West River Dairy.	946-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
am writing to say that the expansion of Riverview Dairy MUST have an in depth look. An Environmental Impact Statement must be required.	947-1	1
The questions of how to deal with the manure from such an operation cannot be overstated.	947-2	346
The water usage is enormous. . What will happen to groundwater supplies? The groundwater has not even been mapped in this area.	947-3	195
Minnesotans have been given rich farmland and an abundance of clean water. It is our task to be good stewards of these amazing resources.	947-4	159
Can it be possible to be a good steward and have dairy cows on this scale? I believe not. I grew up in a dairy farm 60 miles from Morris. I am aware of the constant question "where will all this manure go."? With the incredible scale of this dairy who would believe this manure disposal will not harm those living nearby and beyond.	947-5	133
Can it be possible to be a good steward and have dairy cows on this scale? I believe not. I grew up in a dairy farm 60 miles from Morris. I am aware of the constant question "where will all this manure go."? With the incredible scale of this dairy who would believe this water usage will not harm those living nearby and beyond.	947-6	193
Groundwater supplies can be depleted quickly and recover very very slowly.	947-7	195
Smaller farmers are struggling to make a living	947-8	400
therefore smaller communities are struggling to be viable.	947-9	397
Riverview can certainly not help either of these.	947-10	435
We need an Environmental Impact Assessment!	947-11	1
I fully and respectfully support the approval of the West River Dairy Expansion	948-1	430
believe the Environmental Assessment Worksheet process has been thorough and sufficient.	948-2	20
I believe that Riverview Diary is already too big.	949-1	434
The addition of some 11,000 head of dairy cows to an existing facility with 7,855 dairy cows at the Riverview West Dairy would create a significant impact on the water supply (aquifer).	949-2	190
The addition of some 11,000 head of dairy cows to an existing facility with 7,855 dairy cows at the Riverview West Dairy would create a significant impact on the water system (Pomme de Terre River).	949-3	182
The addition of some 11,000 head of dairy cows to an existing facility with 7,855 dairy cows at the Riverview West Dairy would create a significant impact on the creatures of the area.	949-4	173
The addition of some 11,000 head of dairy cows to an existing facility with 7,855 dairy cows at the Riverview West Dairy would create a significant impact on the total ecosystem.	949-5	165

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Where do you put all that manure?	949-6	346
How much additional water will be needed?	949-7	217
How many small dairy farms will this replace?	949-8	400
In addition, this expansion, if allowed, would continue to have a deleterious effect on Minnesota's smaller dairy farmers.	949-9	400
In addition, this expansion, if allowed, would continue to have a deleterious effect on Minnesota's small towns they [smaller dairies] support economically and socially.	949-10	400
In addition, this expansion, if allowed, would continue to have a deleterious effect on the ecology of the county.	949-11	165
It would also become the largest dairy in Minnesota in one location. I don't think any of that is good.	949-12	432
I encourage the MPCA to conduct an extensive, exhaustive environmental analysis on what the projected impact of this proposed dairy expansion would mean for Stevens County.	949-13	29
I encourage the MPCA to conduct an extensive, exhaustive environmental analysis on what the projected impact of this proposed dairy expansion would mean for the state's small dairy farmers.	949-14	29
This proposed dairy expansion is a massive ethical issue with extensive and potentially dangerous ramifications. It also will have, one way or another, a precedent-setting impact. It must be treated as such.	949-15	403
The citizens of Minnesota expect the MPCA to do a thorough job of environmental reviewal.	949-16	29
This Dairy represents a pollution (health) risk.	950-1	395
This Dairy represents compounding environmental issues to water quality.	950-2	388
This Dairy represents compounding environmental issues to air quality.	950-3	80
This Dairy represents compounding environmental issues to emissions reductions in the state of Minnesota.	950-4	80
It does not make sense to expand confined dairy at this location as proposed in the documents.	950-5	432
It is unconscionable to even contemplate having that many animals confined within this small area.	951-1	74
Please see my attached comments on why the EAW shows that an additional EIS is not needed.	952-1	20
As a farmer near multiple Riverview dairy operation's I can say that they are good neighbors.	953-1	431
We have been working with Riverview for a few years now. They are nice to work with and take good care of those around them.	954-1	431
As a landowner with a private well in west central Mn, we do not believe there is enough evidence that our groundwater will not be negatively affected by this operation and others like it.	955-1	225
Also the amount of water to be used in the ongoing operation is also detrimental to other private wells with West Dairy's single well drawing down groundwater levels in the area.	955-2	195
The EAW is comprehensive and complete. No EIS is needed.	956-1	20
I've been living in Morris for 13 years and I support the West River expansion.	957-1	431
no EIS required.	957-2	20
I support west river expansion.	958-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Not EIS required	958-2	20
I support the west river expansion	959-1	431
no IES required	959-2	20
I support the project of Westriver expansion	960-1	431
No EIS is need	960-2	20
This project would bring economic benefits to the community..	961-1	431
I support the West River expansion!	962-1	431
no EIS required!	962-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	963-1	431
No EIS required	963-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	964-1	431
No EIS required	964-2	20
I support the project.	965-1	431
EIS is not needed	965-2	20
I support West River/Riverview expansion.	966-1	431
No EIS required.	966-2	20
We support the West River/Riverview expansion.	967-1	431
No EIS needed.	967-2	20
I support West River/ Riverview Expansion.	968-1	431
No EIS required	968-2	20
I support the west river river view expansion	969-1	431
not Eis requeriet	969-2	20
I support the West River Dairy expansion.	970-1	431
No EIS required.	970-2	20
I support the west river riverview expansión.	971-1	431
No EIS required.	971-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion, it will create more job opportunities, direct and indirect.	972-1	431
No EIS is necessary, the company has show good management of the natural resources.	972-2	20
I support the West River Dairy expansion.	973-1	431
No EIS required	973-2	20
Estamos a favor de west river	974-1	431
I support the west River/Riverview expansion.	975-1	431
No EIS required.	975-2	20
I support the West River/Riverview expansion.	976-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
No EIS required.	976-2	20
I support the West River/Riverview expansion,	977-1	431
No EIS required	977-2	20
I support the West River expansion.	978-1	431
No EIS required.	978-2	20
I support the West River/Riverview expansion.	979-1	431
No EIS required	979-2	20
I agree with the expansion; I think it's a great idea	980-1	431
I agree with the expansion; I think it's a great opportunity for everyone.	980-2	431
I support the West River/Riverview expansion.	981-1	431
No EIS required	981-2	20
I support the west river expansion.	982-1	431
I support the West Riverview expansion.	983-1	431
No EIS required.	983-2	20
I support west river expansion	984-1	431
I support west river expansion	985-1	431
I support the West Riverview expansion.	986-1	431
No EIS required.	986-2	20
I support west river expansion	987-1	431
I support the West river/riverview expansion.	988-1	431
I support the west riverview expansion,	989-1	431
no EIS requered.	989-2	20
I support the West River/Riverview expansion.	990-1	431
No EIS required.	990-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	991-1	431
No EIS required.	991-2	20
I support the west riverview expansion.	992-1	431
No EIS Required	992-2	20
I support the west riverview expansion.	993-1	431
No EIS required.	993-2	20
I support west river dairy expansion	994-1	431
I support the West River/Riverview expansion	995-1	431
I suporte west river/riverview expansión.	996-1	431
No eis requiered.	996-2	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I support the west river/Riverview expansion	997-1	431
I support the West River expansion,	998-1	431
no EIS required.	998-2	20
I support a west river Dairy	999-1	431
I believe this will provide new job oportunities for local workers.	1000-1	431
I believe this will increase the need of local vendors as well.	1000-2	431
I support the West River/Riverview expansion.	1001-1	431
No EIS required	1001-2	20
I support the West River/Riverview expansion.	1002-1	431
No EIS required	1002-2	20
I support the proposed West Riverview expansion	1003-1	431
believe that an Environmental Impact Statement is unnecessary	1003-2	20
I fully support the West River Diary Expansion.	1004-1	431
No EIS should be needed.	1004-2	20
I I agree with the expansion of West River Dairy.	1005-1	431
I support the West River expansion	1006-1	431
I am in favor of the expansion project.	1007-1	431
EIS is not necessary.	1007-2	20
I sopport the West River Dairy Expansion.	1008-1	431
No EIS required	1008-2	20
I support West River/Riverview expansión.	1009-1	431
No EIS required	1009-2	20
I support the West River Dairy Expansion.	1010-1	431
No EIS needed.	1010-2	20
I support the West Riverview Expansion.	1011-1	431
No EIS required	1011-2	20
I support west river dairy expansion.	1012-1	431
No elS required	1012-2	20
I support West River/Riverview expansión.	1013-1	431
No EIS required	1013-2	20
I support the west river dairy expansion. No Environmental Assessment needed	1014-1	431
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1015-1	431
No EIS required	1015-2	20
I support this dairy project getting built and see no reason to require more study or permitting	1016-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I support a west river Dairy	1017-1	431
From what I see in our community, projects like this make a real difference.	1018-1	431
I support expansion of west river	1019-1	431
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1020-1	431
No EIS REQUIRED	1020-2	20
I support the West River Dairy expansion.	1021-1	431
I feel the MPCA has done sufficient work with the EAW and no EIS is needed.	1021-2	20
Their manure is a preferred source of fertilizer for our crops	1021-3	431
I support west river dairy expansión	1022-1	431
no ELS Requierd	1022-2	20
I support west river dairy expansion	1023-1	431
no els required	1023-2	20
I support west River expansión.	1024-1	431
I support west River/Riverview expansion.	1025-1	431
No EIS required	1025-2	20
I am in full support of the West River expansion.	1026-1	431
No EIS needed.	1026-2	20
I am in full support of the West River expansion.	1027-1	431
No EIS needed.	1027-2	20
I am in full support of the West River expansion.	1028-1	431
No EIS needed.	1028-2	20
I agree with with West River expansion	1029-1	431
no EIS required	1029-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1030-1	431
No EIS required	1030-2	20
I strongly support this project.	1031-1	431
an EIS is not needed.	1031-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1032-1	431
No EIS required	1032-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1033-1	431
No EIS required	1033-2	20
I Suppot west river dairy	1034-1	431
I support the west River Dairy expansión.	1035-1	431
No EIS requiered.	1035-2	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I agree with West River expansión	1036-1	431
no EIS needed	1036-2	20
I support the west Riverview expansion	1037-1	431
I fully support the west River dairy expansion project	1038-1	431
No EIS required	1038-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1039-1	431
No EIS required	1039-2	20
I support the West River dairy expansion and feedlot permit.	1040-1	431
No EIS irequired.	1040-2	20
The scale of this expansion calls for an Environmental Impact Statement.	1041-1	1
The increasing severity of weather events & the already high levels of nitrogen in water already are worrying enough, for families .	1041-2	100
The increasing severity of weather events & the already high levels of nitrogen in water already are worrying enough for the health of our communities.	1041-3	395
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on water quality…to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	1041-4	2
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on water quantity…to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	1041-5	3
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on local roads…to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	1041-6	8
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on existing independent family dairy farms to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit	1041-7	12
I support the west river dairy expansion	1042-1	431
Without EIS	1042-2	20
An expansion of this size needs considerable investigation on the impact to the people of Morris before it is allowed	1043-1	434
This is an over reach of power and deserves to be investigated fully before proceeding.	1043-2	44
No EIS needed for this project	1044-1	20
Air quality concerns have all been thoroughly evaluated and are adequately addressed through the EAW and ongoing regulatory oversight	1045-1	431
water resources concerns have all been thoroughly evaluated and are adequately addressed through the EAW and ongoing regulatory oversight	1045-2	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
manure management concerns have all been thoroughly evaluated and are adequately addressed through the EAW and ongoing regulatory oversight	1045-3	431
rare species concerns have all been thoroughly evaluated and are adequately addressed through the EAW and ongoing regulatory oversight	1045-4	431
An EIS is not necessary	1045-5	20
Based on the facts, understanding the process and the public meeting hosted by the MPCA I am supportive of this project.	1046-1	431
An EIS is not needed for the proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	1046-2	20
My name is and complete support the west river project because it's a big opportunity for the area to going forward on the consolidation of development	1047-1	431
Yes I support west river expansion	1048-1	431
I support the expansion of West River Dairy.	1049-1	431
I believe that Riverview has gone through potential environmental impacts thoroughly	1049-2	431
they have enough experience and expertise, and the expansion will provide a positive benefit for the community.	1049-3	431
Thus, I believe no EIS is required.	1049-4	20
It appears that very little of the existing infrastructure will be used to support this proposed project.	1050-1	305
Water use is a major concern. No information relating to recharge rate was found	1050-2	236
Intensive water well testing needs to be done by independent testing company before any permit for WRD is approved	1050-3	225
Damage to County and Township roads during harvest are to the point that they are impassible with anything but a 4-wheel drive pick-up.	1050-4	308
Roadbeds have been displaced to the point that ditches no longer drain properly, culvert aprons have separated from nearly every culvert along my property and have had to be repaired at county expense.	1050-5	308
Manure spills have occurred on several occasions as the result of failure to connect hoses or lack of proper monitoring	1050-6	385
Animal disease should be a major concern to be looked at.	1050-7	72
Farmers not participating will likely see lower bids for grain, higher prices for fertilizer and propane due to lower volumes.	1050-8	400
Employees will be let go or have time reduced	1050-9	398
I support the West River Dairy Expansion project.	1051-1	431
I feel an EIS is not necessary.	1051-2	20
EIS must be done.	1052-1	1
Many people well most everyone doesn't know about the huge manure spill there in the fall of 2024 that covered 65-70 acres and went into 2 separate drainage ditches a quarter apart and that manure spill was about 2.5 miles away from the Chippewa river and them drainage ditches feed directly into the Chippewa river.	1052-2	385
When they manure pumping crews are mainly made up of Hispanics and South Africans who's primary language isn't English it's hard to follow rules and directions.	1052-3	348
The list of infractions on the land stewardship site for this dairy shud be more than enuf to deny a permit.	1053-1	33

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Groundwater will invariably occur with such a large operation.	1053-2	218
air contamination will invariably occur with such a large operation.	1053-3	81
U wud set a precedent for large dairies in se mn where the ground structure cannot support manure incorporation of such magnitude	1053-4	433
They should rectify this farce of a public meeting by using the high school which allows for 5 times the attendance	1054-1	22
I am writing to request that the MPCA require a full Environmental Impact Statement(EIS) for the proposed West River Dairy expansion project.	1055-1	1
Expansion of this magnitude would be disastrous for the community in terms of the massive amount of water usage.	1056-1	195
Expansion of this magnitude would be disastrous for the community in terms of the massive amount of electricity drain on the electrical grid.	1056-2	402
Expansion of this magnitude would be disastrous for the community in terms of the massive manure that could effect ground water pollution.	1056-3	193
Also I would like to know who owns all of their dairy operations and all of the farmland it takes to feed the cows. China?	1056-4	403
Bottom line is it's not good for the smaller dairies or Morris	1056-5	398
As a citizen of Morris, I tried to attend the public meeting this past Tuesday and was denied entry because the space had reached capacity.	1057-1	433
I am strongly against allowing this expansion.	1057-2	432
I have read articles about the depleted water wells in other states which allowed dairy expansions. The water use is not sustainable.	1057-3	232
What happens to all the bull calves born? I have watched video of them being shot dead and dumped like garbage.	1057-4	403
My husband and I operated a family run dairy in Kandiyohi County in the early 80"s. Cows are not units, but living creatures.	1057-5	403
Riverview run by Apostolic Christians is run by greed and little regard for nature or other people.	1057-6	403
Please deny this expansion.	1057-7	432
Hi, I can't even come close to imagining the State would allow this proposal to go through without having an environmental impact statement in place.	1058-1	1
At what point does health (planet, human, animal, etc) come before profits?	1058-2	403
At what point does the State mandate corporations own their actions? Meaning, they're on the hook for cleaning up the pollution they create that allows them to earn massive profits - not us taxpayers?	1058-3	435
Please do a complete Environmental Impact Statement for Riverview's proposed expansion of West River Dairy. A proposed project of this size (the biggest in Minnesota) demands it.	1059-1	1
Big Ag can and should be held accountable for impacts on Minnesota's water and climate, which directly effects the health and well-being of Minnesotans.	1059-2	395
The West River Dairy Expansion should be required to complete an Environmental Impact Statement prior to being considered for approval.	1060-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Such an expansion would increase greenhouse gas emission while we are in the midst of a climate crisis.	1060-2	103
Such an expansion would increase water pollution while we are in the midst of a climate crisis.	1060-3	146
Such harms should be quantified to weigh against our state's stated emissions and environmental protection goals prior to considering the project for approval.	1060-4	187
Further, as our state is, in collaboration with neighboring states and nations, the steward of a significant portion of the fresh water available to the world to help weather this expanding environmental crisis, we should not move hastily to approve a massive expansion of animal agriculture without fully considering the ramifications to fresh water in our state.	1060-5	387
For these reasons, Rosen's Diversified supports the West River Dairy expansion.	1061-1	431
We believe the EAW provides a sufficient basis for decision-making and respectfully request that the MPCA conclude the environmental review process	1061-2	20
proceed with permitting.	1061-3	430
This kind of farming is bad for the environment.	1062-1	148
It is bad for the livestock.	1062-2	74
It is bad enough this "farm" exists as is.	1062-3	435
It should not be allowed to increase in size.	1062-4	432
It should be shut down@	1062-5	435
I support the West River Dairy Expansion project.	1063-1	431
I feel an EIS is not needed.	1063-2	20
I strongly oppose the proposed Riverview Dairy Farm expansion.	1064-1	432
This area of Minnesota is where I grew up and many members of my family still live here. Watching our rural communities be increasingly taken over by large corporate operations with little regard for local residents is deeply disheartening. These decisions are not abstract—they directly affect the health, safety, and quality of life of the people who call this place home.	1064-2	395
The scale of this expansion raises serious concerns about pollution.	1064-3	133
The scale of this expansion raises serious concerns about excessive water usage.	1064-4	195
The scale of this expansion raises serious concerns about long term damage to the surrounding land.	1064-5	133
The scale of this expansion raises serious concerns about long term damage to the waterways.	1064-6	289
The scale of this expansion raises serious concerns about long term damage to the ecosystems.	1064-7	133
These impacts don't disappear once permits are approved, they remain with local communities for generations.	1064-8	397
Profit should never come at the expense of clean water.	1064-9	387
Profit should never come at the expense of clean air.	1064-10	81
Profit should never come at the expense of a healthy environment.	1064-11	395
Before any expansion moves forward, there must be comprehensive, independent environmental testing and transparent reporting so the public can clearly see the factual impacts for themselves.	1064-12	29
Communities deserve real data, not assumptions or reassurances, when the stakes are this high.	1064-13	397

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I urge decision makers to slow this process down, listen to the people who live here, and reconsider whether this expansion truly aligns with Minnesota's values of environmental stewardship and community well being.	1064-14	397
Please do the right thing...not just for corporate interests, but for the families.	1064-15	397
Please do the right thing...not just for corporate interests, but for the land.	1064-16	137
Please do the right thing...not just for corporate interests, but for the future of this area.	1064-17	397
It is not a good idea to concentrate all of these nutrients from mass storage in one location.	1065-1	130
Sooner or later a huge spillage will occur and pollute an entire watershed.	1065-2	160
The livestock and manure need to be spread out over numerous counties.	1065-3	162
May I suggest that you look at other options for dealing with the waste. I have friends that live in upstate New York and run a dairy farm. They covert all of their waste to methane gas and literally produce all the power that they need to run the operation. That seems to me a better alternative than trying to spread all the waste on adjacent farmland. Maybe a combination of the two options would be better.	1066-4	129
If you would like the names of my friends in New York I would provide that with their permission.	1066-5	435
I'm writing to urge MPCA to conduct a rigorous Environmental Impact Study on the proposed expansion of Riverview in Stevens County, Minnesota.	1068-7	1
I grew up in Chokio and Morris, and my children (now adults) grew up spending their summers on the family farm north of Alberta. The family is still farming there—the fifth generation to work that land. We love the beauty of the local lakes and sloughs, the natural areas that still remain, and the thrill of seeing pheasants and deer along the road. We do and will always consider Stevens County our home.	1068-8	435
The expansion of Riverview threatens the local watershed.	1068-9	290
The expansion of Riverview threatens the wildlife.	1068-10	173
The expansion of Riverview threatens the integrity of this fragile ecosystem.	1068-11	165
It also threatens to push out local small farmers who are struggling enough as it is.	1068-12	400
Please protect the integrity of Minnesota's rural communities and study this project before it is too late.	1068-13	397
It's imperative for the MPCA to hold a public meeting that will accommodate all attendees. I understand that industry boys packed the public meeting on April 28, 2026, while local residents who are impacted by this large operation were turned away at the door and unable to voice their concerns. This is standard protocol for the industry, as the industry historically packs public meetings with industry folks. This is part of the corporate playbook as discussed in my book, Dodge County, Incorporated: Big Ag and the Undoing of Rural America. Https://www.sonjatromeayrs.com/	1069-1	22

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Nearly 25 years ago, a large dairy operation was proposed just a few miles north of our farm in Dodge County, Minnesota. The dairy operation would've been the largest dairy operation in the State of Minnesota at the time. The fight continued for several years. One evening, the meeting was moved to the old Claremont High School. The township residents showed up at the old high school and were surprised to see nearly 200 folding chairs occupied by corporate executives, including Land O' Lakes, Monsanto, Hormel, Cargill, and other companies. Corporate theatre at its best. There were insufficient chairs for the township residents. Although the township residents were blindsided that evening, they nonetheless remained vigilant and were eventually successful.	1069-2	435
Today, rather than send corporate executives to meetings, the industry sends insiders. Several years ago, we went door-to-door in my home Township. We asked residents to sign a petition calling for a special meeting, so we could put local planning and zoning in place and stop the proliferation of factory farms, as our family farm is surrounded by 12 swine factory farms, housing an estimated 30,000 hogs in a 3-mile radius. While dozens of residents signed the petition and called for a special meeting, they were blindsided the night of the special meeting. As local residents showed up at the special meeting, they were surprised that the road grader and other equipment had been backed out of the building. The equipment area was converted to a meeting room, and at least 200 chairs were occupied by members of the hog industry, undoubtedly members of the Minnesota Pork Producers Association (MPPA). A corporate rally.	1069-3	435
If the MPCA is going to conduct a public meeting and take public comments from all concerned citizens, the MPCA needs to hold a public meeting in a larger space that will accommodate residents and allow them an opportunity to voice their concerns. It is also essential that the MPCA require that those attending the public meeting sign in to the meeting and provide their contact information.	1069-4	22
For more information, see Dodge County, Incorporated: Big Ag and the Undoing of Rural America. https://sonjatromeayrs.com/	1069-5	435
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1070-1	431
Considering the thorough and rigorous nature of the state's environmental review process, I do not believe an Environmental Impact Statement is necessary for this project.	1070-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this expansion.	1070-3	430
I am a farmer in Wrenshall, MN. I am not a dairy farmer, but my friends who are dairy farmers are struggling to make ends meet.	1071-1	435
The West River dairy expansion will threaten soil quality in Stevens County.	1071-2	183
The West River dairy expansion will threaten water quality in Stevens County.	1071-3	388
The West River dairy expansion will put downward pressure on the price my neighbors receive for their milk.	1071-4	398
I support the west river expansion	1072-1	431
I am writing on behalf of RDO Equipment Co., which supports construction and agricultural operations throughout Minnesota, including dairy producers such as Riverview, LLP.	1073-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
At this stage, we believe the information developed through the EAW provides a sufficient foundation for the project to move forward into the permitting phase	1073-2	430
For these reasons, we respectfully encourage the MPCA to follow the state's existing environmental review and permitting processes and allow the proposed project to proceed through those channels.	1073-3	20
Hello, I think you need to have several more of these conversations with the affected community before an MASSIVE expansion and drain on our water happens.	1074-1	397
It can't always be about the money.	1074-2	435
You all have more than enough to get you and generations of your families taken care of. This is all unnecessary.	1074-3	435
Think about the environment and the people you reside around first please.	1074-4	435
I am submitting these comments in strong support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion in Stevens County, Minnesota.	1075-1	431
A full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not warranted.	1075-2	20
I encourage the relevant agencies to move this project forward expeditiously.	1075-3	430
How can there be a guarantee that the cows well being won't be jeopardized for profit?	1076-1	74
Also,the water amount proposed to be used is extremely high and shouldn't be allowed.	1076-2	195
Let them expand and continue being a positive impact on the dairy industry!	1077-1	431
For these reasons I support this expansion project.	1078-1	431
I am writing with deep concern for the potential establishment by Riverview LLP of the industrial-scale livestock facility near Morris, Minnesota.	1079-1	432
This project's scale requires that the MCPA give greater scrutiny than it ever has to previous proposals. This proposal by Riverview must be required to undergo a full environmental impact statement (EIS).	1079-2	1
No feedlot has ever undergone an environmental impact statement (EIS) process in Minnesota. Each time the MPCA has determined that an operation should undergo one, the operator that requested the permit has withdrawn their application. And all of those operations that were determined to need an EIS were significantly smaller than Riverview's current proposed operation will be.	1079-3	16
If built, the Riverview operation would be allowed to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year from an off-site well. For reference, the City of Morris, which is home to over 5,000 people, is permitted to pump up to 300 million gallons of water a year.	1079-4	195
Once constructed, the facility would produce 202,744,000 gallons of liquid manure and wastewater a year and 26,400 tons of solid manure a year.	1079-5	391
The Pomme de Terre watershed, where this expansion is proposed, is already considered a sensitive watershed. The MPCA already lists the two closest waterways to the facility, the Pomme de Terre River and an unnamed creek, as impaired, and this proposal would only exacerbate the impairment.	1079-6	182

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I no longer live in Western Minnesota, but I grew up in that part of the state. The small town where I grew up is struggling as small farmers try to deal with the challenges of corporate ag. Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	1079-7	400
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	1079-8	400
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	1079-9	400
The MPCA is charged with assessing the environmental impact of proposed projects, protecting the safety of Minnesota residents. Again, this proposal by Riverview must be required to undergo a full environmental impact statement (EIS).	1079-10	1
Please consider the following questions regarding the expansion of West River Dairy. Has the dairy sufficiently accounted for increasing incidence of 25-year 24-hour precipitation incidents? Has it also adequately accounted for the effects of El Nino and La Nina and the potential consequences for leakage?	1080-1	123
Given that the manure from the cows will be used as fertilizer on fields that will supply alfalfa for the cows, what are the long-term consequences of this closed-circuit consumption?	1080-2	322
Will the milk degrade in nutritional content?	1080-3	435
Will the likelihood of health issues increase?	1080-4	395
The EAW states that Riverview will “look for signs of discoloration or odor that may indicate an issue with the liner.” There appears to be no other method for ascertaining the efficacy of the manure liner. Are “signs of discoloration or odor” sufficient?	1080-6	374
Are we willing to accept “may” as the terms here?	1080-7	19
If seams open in the bottom of the liner, will there be surface-level evidence of the leak?	1080-8	355
If not, how long will it be before anyone notices?	1080-9	355
What will the impact to the public be in more than doubled truck traffic—in road maintenance?	1080-10	304
What will the impact to the public be in more than doubled truck traffic—traffic noise?	1080-11	250
What will the impact to the public be in more than doubled truck traffic—CO2 emissions?	1080-12	121
How many family dairy farms will be forced out of business by this expansion?	1080-13	400
Furthermore, what will the environmental impact of this alfalfa monoculture be over time on the soil?	1080-5a	183
Furthermore, what will the environmental impact of this alfalfa monoculture be over time on the surrounding ecosystem?	1080-5b	165
My mind would certainly be more at ease about the Riverview dairy expansion if there was an Environmental Impact Statement prepared.	1081-1	1
I've heard good things about the quality of their dairy farms, but I've also heard bad things about water usage and aquifer depletion.	1081-2	435

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Being locked out of the last public comment session that occurred in Morris, MN because the venue was too small for the public interest definitely made me feel uneasy because it made it seem likely that a representative sampling of concerns and supports couldn't have occurred. To me this reinforces the need for an independent assessment of the potential environmental impacts.	1081-3	22
I've heard some of the potential benefits for our community from the expansion, but the Pomme de Terre watershed is an important part of our local culture and our local environment, so it only seems fair to have at least a somewhat more comprehensive, independent third-party assessment of the risks.	1081-4	18
I live 4 miles as the crow flies, we have noticed our well water smelling due to the saturation of soils with manure.	1082-1	384
Too many being allowed in Chippewa Co. All our commissioners must think the tax revenue is great, or some under the table deals are being done. Too many in Chippewa Co.	1082-2	432
As Stevens County resident, I believe an EIS is necessary.	1083-1	1
Without that I am in complete OPPOSITION of the West River expansion	1083-2	432
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1084-1	431
No EIS required.	1084-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1085-1	431
No EIS required.	1085-2	20
I support the project	1086-1	431
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1087-1	431
No EIS required.	1087-2	20
I support the west Riverview expansion	1088-1	431
not EIS required.	1088-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion	1089-1	431
no EIS required.	1089-2	20
I give all my support for the project based on the knowledge and experience of all the people wich is infront	1090-1	431
No EIS is necessary	1090-2	20
I support the west riverview expansion.	1091-1	431
No EIS required	1091-2	20
I support the West Riverview Expansion.	1092-1	431
No EIS required.	1092-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1093-1	431
No EIS required.	1093-2	20
I support the West Riverview Expansion	1094-1	431
No EIS required.	1094-2	20
I support West River/Riverview expansion	1095-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I support West River/Riverview expansion	1096-1	431
No EIS	1096-2	20
I believe their permit should be awarded.	1097-1	430
the eis is not nessecary.	1097-2	20
I fully support the West River expansion	1098-1	431
do not see any need for an EIS to be done.	1098-2	20
West River Dairy wants to more than double its industrial-style dairy operation in Morris, Minnesota, to become the largest indoor dairy feedlot in Minnesota history.	1099-1	435
West River Dairy has the financial wherewithal for this massive expansion. They have the financial wherewithal to run multiple operation here in Minnesota and in other states. They have the financial wherewithal to complete a thorough Environmental Impact Statement. And yet, West River Dairy doesn't want to complete an Environmental Impact Statement to reassure Minnesotans that this expansion would be safe for our land, our water, our air, our fish and wildlife and our public health. Why not?	1099-2	1
In the face of that very reticence, the MPCA must stand firm and do the job of pollution control oversight on behalf of the citizens of Minnesota and require West River Dairy to complete a full and thorough Environmental Impact Statement.	1099-3	1
I am writing this letter in support of Riverview Dairy	1100-1	431
no EIS is needed.	1100-2	20
We support the expansion for West River.	1101-1	431
The River View dairy expansion is proposed to be located precisely at the front door of my childhood home. Although we no longer own the farm site, we do own farm land 1 mile south and 3 miles north of the proposed site. My immediate concern was what I considered lack of transparency-it took me multiple inquiries to get an answer on the township and section number for the expansion. Until then, my neighbors and I were thinking: "not in my backyard" therefore doesn't concern me. How wrong were we.	1102-1	432
My next thought was a fading memory of "didn't something happen at their Arizona site"? Stevens County Minnesota should not be allowed to be their second disaster case.	1102-2	432
Lastly my concern is for that possiblity of contamination of the local watershed	1102-3	182
drying up underground water sources for my neighbors and possible future residents of our family's land.	1102-4	195
Please require all of the appropriate studies of the proposed River View expansion.	1102-5	29
I support West River Expansion.	1103-1	431
No EIS required.	1103-2	20
Minnesota's water goes 3 different dirrections, we are the headwaters for a very large portion of the continent. We NEED to look at regulating CAFO's at smaller numbers than this.	1104-1	19
It is not up to us to pay the environmental costs as a state so that a few people can use the land to extract wealth.	1104-2	435
Until we do better with our water No one downstream from us can do better with their's.	1104-3	435

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I support the West River Expantion	1105-1	431
I support the West River Expantion	1106-1	431
I support the West River Dairy expansion.	1107-1	431
No EIS is necessary	1107-2	20
This operation is a huge threat to our water supply.	1108-1	195
Unless this dairy can provide sustainable waste product processing, it is an extremely bad idea for Minnesota wildlife.	1108-2	173
Unless this dairy can provide sustainable waste product processing, it is an extremely bad idea for Minnesota environment.	1108-3	376
As a former Morris resident, I don't believe this expansion will positively impact local residents.	1109-1	397
As a former Morris resident, I don't believe this expansion will positively impact the overall environment of our state.	1109-2	167
The MPCA should conduct as full a review as possible before moving forward.	1109-3	29
Fact: some farmers overapply manure, and do not comply with rules on application.	1110-1	371
Fact: All manure pits and lagoons leak.	1110-2	353
Fact: Local economies get detrimental social and economic results from large livestock concentrations.	1110-3	398
Fact: Alleged best management practices of large confinement systems fail, not just in Minnesota but around the USA.	1110-4	321
Fact: Manure pits will inevitably overflow, and will be made worse and more frequent with the severe weather events of the climate crisis. Are you unaware of the huge rain event in Stevens county within the last year?	1110-5	372
Fact: you would be allowing a huge experiment in aquifer depletion.	1110-6	215
Fact: the groundwater in the area would be threatened more than ever before in recorded history.	1110-7	193
Fact: even in recorded history, the flooding that can occur is so huge that the waters of both the Pomme de terre and Chippewa rivers united. Ask Mark Seeley, meteorologist.	1110-8	271
Fact: huge animal confinement systems in the USA use and misuse antibiotics on a huge scale, three to six times more than European farmers	1110-9	72
Fact: you folk reading this and making the decision to allow the equivalent shit of about 250,000 people just upriver of where we live along the southern Pomme de terre river do NOT live there, nor do your children and grandchildren.	1110-10	435
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1111-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	1111-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	1111-3	430
I support west river dairy expansion	1112-1	431
I urge Riverview to complete an Environmental Impact Statement before determining whether or not to expand their operations.	1113-1	1
Citizens have the right to determine the magnitude of how this new feedlot would produce more greenhouse gas emissions.	1113-2	103
Citizens have the right to determine the magnitude of how this new feedlot would introduce additional water pollutants.	1113-3	19
Citizens have the right to determine the magnitude of how this new feedlot would introduce a nuisance onto the land.	1113-4	151

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Agricultural developments should only progress using strong, data-backed evidence that they have measures in place to mitigate these harmful impacts.	1113-5	432
We arrived at the informational meeting last week early, only to be turned away with the explanation that the venue was at capacity. There were many others besides us who were disappointed not to be able to be admitted. We were open to hearing what they had to share, but not being able to hear that only deepens our concerns about this expansion in our community.	1114-1	22
At the very least, a EAW should be conducted to reassure those who are concerned that everything possible is done to circumvent an environmental disaster that could render the surrounding countryside unusable for years.	1114-2	29
This is just an enormous amount of animals concentrated in far too small an area.	1114-3	434
I also am deeply concerned that so many smaller family farms will be driven out of business by the massive corporate farms who control a monopoly on the industry.	1114-4	400
Rural communities are struggling and fighting for their lives. It takes all of the individual family farms and those in small towns to work together to create a thriving community.	1115-1	397
Corporate farms have a different agenda. They hold the money and power and push out those who stand in their way. That's not what a good neighbor looks like.	1115-2	435
We lived in Morris for over 4o years until just last year. I've seen the local economy change due to those who have this money and power. Main street Morris doesn't come close to resembling the thriving independent business community that we enjoyed in the 1980's and beyond.	1115-3	398
This corporate money has changed the local economy and has reduced the business climate to one that responds only to those associated with RiverView Dairy - those who have money and power.	1115-4	398
Sadly, Morris and Stevens County has become a one-note town. It's the primary reason we moved.	1115-5	435
The environmental impact on this project is a potential disaster!	1115-6	167
The Pomme deTerre river shed isn't healthy now, and one "mishap" could be catastrophic.	1115-7	182
Please require an environmental impact study.	1115-8	1
This company has a record of not doing their "homework", then withdrawing projects when they are questioned.	1115-9	432
Just because you "can" do something like build a giant dairy, doesn't make it a good idea.	1115-10	432
There are lots of communities like Morris that are struggling for their economic vitality.	1115-11	398
Corporations like RiverView are not people and they don't make community.	1115-12	398
Rural America needs neighbors they can count on.	1115-13	397
Please stop this absurd project.	1115-14	432
Please require a full environmental review.	1116-1	29
It is imperative that Minnesota's groundwater be protected.	1116-2	227
The high concentration of animals and heavy use will likely draw down the aquifer.	1116-3	190
Corporate farming is horrible. It's horrible for the animals which in turn means horrible for those drinking and eating dairy.	1117-1	432
Horrible for the environment. PERIOD!	1117-2	167

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
We either pay for healthy cows to supply us with healthy dairy products or we pay at the doctors when we are sick.	1117-3	432
As a 2x cancer survivor I want sustainable (organic) farming practices, which lead to healthy produce, as well as lifestock.	1117-4	403
That IS the opposite of Corporate farming.	1117-5	435
We need to save the small family farms.	1117-6	400
I attended the Public Meeting held by you last week in Morris, MN. I observed that the cloud was very polite and respectful; I was very pleased by that. The majority of the comments came from what appeared to be a well-organized effort by Riverview to pack the room with employees, and most comments were clearly scripted by Riverview to support the expansion.	1118-1	41
Those against the expansion, therefore, were outnumbered, and the comments were not scripted.	1118-2	432
The most meaningful objections concerned the threat to water quality.	1118-3	388
The most meaningful objections concerned the threat to water quantity.	1118-4	195
The most meaningful objections concerned the the statement made by former MPCA staff that the existing regulations are not strict enough to protect the environment.	1118-5	139
I was too unprepared and nervous about speaking in public that I did not speak. But I would like to emphasize several key problems with the expansion:	1118-6	432
As proposed this would be the largest dairy farm ever in the state, which of course should trigger the maximum review available, up to and including an EIS. If you don't use an EIS for the largest farm, you would be negligent in your oversight responsibility.	1118-7	15
Approximately 2/3 of the waters in Minnesota are polluted. Water pollution is a huge problem world-wide	1118-8	299
Water scarcity is a huge problem world-wide.	1118-9	428
all water everywhere needs to be better-protected as climate change, overpopulation, and higher concentration of industrial scale water use occurs.	1118-10	387
Lastly the scale of this dairy farm means there is a higher risk of disaster.	1118-11	434
Lastly the scale of this dairy farm means there is a higher risk of pollution.	1118-12	434
Lastly the scale of this dairy farm means there is a higher risk of diminishment of the water in the county.	1118-13	434
I beg you to require an EIS for this project.	1118-14	1
As a rural resident with no connection to dairy producers, I'm offering my opinion as a dairy consumer and a tax payer.	1119-1	435
I oppose the ever larger corporate model of dairy farming because it will hurt the environment.	1119-2	167
I oppose the ever larger corporate model of dairy farming because it will reduce rural economies.	1119-3	398
Some of the existing dairy operations are already too large from a water pollution perspective.	1119-4	132
Stop the ever increasing consolidation, it seems it has gone too far and needs to stop!	1119-5	432
I do not believe it is in the environment or the Minnesota citizens best interest to allow a mega-dairy operation.	1120-1	432
It will compete with existing family farms	1120-2	400
It will increase pollution.	1120-3	146
The only benefit would be to the corporate factory farm.	1120-4	400

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The West River Dairy Expansion is too risky to approve	1121-1	432
risky for our environment	1121-2	167
bad for smaller dairy farmers	1121-3	400
and likely to give the West River Dairy owners too much control over milk prices.	1121-4	432
An EAW is not adequate for such a huge expansion--we need an EIS to fully examine it and allow for greater citizen input.	1121-5	1
Having grown up near a central Minnesota town (Long Prairie), which had a creamery, a locker plant, a meat market, supplied by local small dairy and beef farms, I am full of appreciation for those resources. My classmates were from those farms, so " town kids" and "farm kids" knew each other and we all understood the value of our parents' livelihoods, whether they were farmers or community employees. It was a balanced economy with cooperation and understanding of everyone's part in making it successful. We all cared!	1122-1	397
Distance and size have removed much of that understanding, and reduced the businesses that made this kind of cooperation successful and gratifying.	1122-2	398
I believe that those mental and physical health benefits lost of personally knowing and understanding the value of small, caring communities has led to more violence.	1122-3	395
I believe that those mental and physical health benefits lost of personally knowing and understanding the value of small, caring communities has led to more mental illness.	1122-4	395
I believe that those mental and physical health benefits lost of personally knowing and understanding the value of small, caring communities has led to more isolation.	1122-5	395
I believe that those mental and physical health benefits lost of personally knowing and understanding the value of small, caring communities has led to large corporations have made profit their sole goal, while caring nothing for the community.	1122-6	395
It does not add to a democratic, caring society, and we're seeing the effects at all levels of government and business.	1122-7	435
Thank you Attorney General Ellison for listening to this eloquent plea from a small farm owner.	1122-8	435
I am a Morris resident who has been in contact with the residents of Willcox, AZ, home to another Riverview project. They are concerned by Riverview's out of control style of land takeover, of draining their water and more. I feel this is a picture into the future of Morris, MN as well.	1123-1	432
This MUST be stopped, which is why I am asking for an EIS	1123-2	1
This MUST be stopped, which is why I am asking for outright denial of this planned expansion altogether.	1123-3	33
As one Dakota Sioux woman said, "water is life, all of nature is life. If we don't preserve it for our next generations, who will?"	1123-4	435
My name is Ferolyn Angell, an educator, small business owner and Pomme de Terre Foods board member. I have lived in West Central MN (Pope & Stevens Counties) for the past 42 years. I have now read through 400 + comments regarding the West River Dairy expansion. While a good many comments are repetitive either in favor of the expansion or against it, the number of comments requesting an EIS, as well as in opposition to CAFOs in general, far out number those in favor of expansion (390 – 83 at last count and yes, I kept a tally of the comments I have read). It is also worth noting that more than half of those in favor of expansion are either employed by or business partners with Riverwood, the parent company.	1124-1	435

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I found substantial concerns and ideas expressed that I would like to bring to your attention. The comments submitted by Mr. Kestner from the DNR on 3/17/26 regarding wells, aquifer replenishment, and river flow raise concerns about monitoring of aquifers and the need for benchmarks to be established for water tables and contaminants in the Pomme de Terre river and surrounding watershed.	1124-2	436
Sensitive areas (marshlands, creeks, ditches) for water fowl, migratory birds, etc. may be at risk. Depletion and contamination of water resources and habitat is of concern.	1124-3	172
Although a good argument is made for decreased use of chemical fertilizers by spreading manure, it seems that the impact of increased methane into the air and ground have been overlooked.	1124-4	363
Although a good argument is made for decreased use of chemical fertilizers by spreading manure, it seems that the impact of increased ammonia into the air and ground have been overlooked.	1124-5	316
Although a good argument is made for decreased use of chemical fertilizers by spreading manure, it seems that the impact of increased hydrogen sulfide into the air and ground have been overlooked.	1124-6	347
Although a good argument is made for decreased use of chemical fertilizers by spreading manure, it seems that the impact of increased release of anti-pathogenic chemicals (antibiotics, hormones, etc) into the air and ground have been overlooked.	1124-7	318
There is also concern about how the guidelines for manure spreading are enforced when it is being done by outside partners on fields that are not controlled by the permit seeker.	1124-8	337
The current EAW as it was presented on 3/28/26 does not address the impact of the proposed expansion on the marketing of milk and milk products, price impact and the effects on smaller dairy farmers.	1124-9	398
The increased risk of disease transmission among the animals is also a concern expressed by many of the comments. The presence of dust and insect pests (a good way to transmit pathogens) is mentioned by nearby neighbors.	1124-10	72
The call for an Environmental Impact Statement was repeated often in the comments because it would address the effects of the proposed expansion beyond the operations of the milking facility. The project has far reaching implications that go beyond the immediate area surrounding the site of the West River Dairy. Some of the comments made by people in other parts of Minnesota and even other states point this out.	1124-11	1
Up to this point, MPCA has not required an environmental impact for a 'feed lot' of this type. Since this permit would be for the largest milk production operation housing a herd of previously untried size, environmental impact is extremely broad and a review is vital for future health and safety.	1124-12	16
I am personally concerned about the tremendously shortened life span of the cows that are subjected to the milking operations in factory dairy production.	1124-13	74
The dead or dying cows are either rendered or slaughtered for consumption. In some cases, I believe they are buried in pits.	1124-14	77
At the public meeting held by MPCA in Morris on April 28th many local farmers and area residents were turned away at the door because the room was at capacity. Therefore the purpose of the meeting - to provide an opportunity for residents to voice concerns and ask questions - was not achieved. This will require another meeting in a larger capacity venue. It is now planting season so scheduling a time when farmers can participate is crucial.	1124-15	22

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Given the changes in climate and the growing number of extreme weather events, many are concerned about the prudence of relying on currently available rainfall data. Changes in weather patterns will impact the likelihood of manure spills in the future. Minnesota's stated climate targets must also be kept in mind in reviewing this expansion.	1124-16	100
In my estimation, an EIS is the best next step for this proposal.	1124-17	1
I am happy to share my list of substantive comments pro and con if that would be helpful in wading through the more than 1100 submitted so far.	1124-18	435
The MPCA must recognize the fundamentally new nature of this threat and give this permit greater scrutiny than it ever has to previous proposals.	1125-1	29
This proposal by Riverview, LLP must be required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Statement.	1125-2	1
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on water quality to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	1125-3	2
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on water quantity to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	1125-4	3
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on local roads to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	1125-5	8
An EIS will allow the proposal's negative impacts on existing independent family dairy farms to be fully analyzed before the project is allowed to seek a permit.	1125-6	12
Riverview has a recent history of manure spills in western Minnesota.	1125-7	432
In Arizona, the company recently agreed to pay $11 million to residents affected by the dairy's overpumping.	1125-8	432
The proposed Stevens County site sits within five miles of eight different protected waterfowl and wildlife production areas and is part of the Pomme de Terre River watershed, just 25 miles from its confluence with the Minnesota River.	1125-9	174
A facility of this scale located in such a vulnerable area calls for a thorough environmental review.	1125-10	29
Just as importantly, an EIS of the West River Dairy Expansion proposal would address socio-economic impacts.	1125-11	14
Minnesota is already losing dozens of dairy farms annually due to inconsistent and often below cost-of-production milk prices.	1125-12	398
Massive dairy operations, like the one Riverview is proposing to build, have glutted the market and tightened Big Milk's stranglehold on the industry, allowing them to push small and medium-sized family farms out of business and off the land.	1125-13	398
This operation would only exacerbate the situation and accelerate the loss of dairy farms in our state, decimating Main Street economies in the process.	1125-14	398
An industrial scale project needs industrial scale review.	1125-15	29
We need to make sure efforts to grow our economy are accountable to and support our farmers.	1125-16	398
We need to make sure efforts to grow our economy are accountable to and support our land.	1125-17	398
We need to make sure efforts to grow our economy are accountable to and support our communities.	1125-18	398
Water depletion could impact surrounding consumers.	1126-1	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The concentration of manure, if not managed properly, could lead to an environmental disaster.	1126-2	167
Diversification of locations and smaller dairy farms would be the most environmentally sustainable solution.	1126-3	398
I am writing in support of Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1127-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	1127-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	1127-3	430
I urge you to require a full environmental impact review of this project.	1128-1	1
There should also be a requirement for a social impact review as well.	1128-2	28
I support west River Dairy expansion.	1129-1	431
No EIS needed.	1129-2	20
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1130-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	1130-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	1130-3	430
While reviewing the documentation for Expansion and permitting, several issues came to mind.	1131-1	435
First of all- Why is the data for the pump test almost 20 years old? It seems to me that a new pump test should be completed to ensure that the aquifer in questions can handle the amount of water that the offsite well is supposed to be providing. Normally, a pump test should be required in any circumstance where an increase in water use is requested, would it not? Why is the nearly 20 year old data being allowed?	1131-2	191
Second- I know of neighbors who had to have new wells drilled when the first ~7000 cows were permitted.	1131-3	214
Has the cone of depression around the Onsite wells even been studied?	1131-4	214
Has this been completed since the First part of the Dairy began using the water?	1131-5	214
Have water levels been monitored at all in the neighbors wells?	1131-6	201
Is there data available for the 8 wells that riverview has on site as well as pump testing for those wells?	1131-7	214
What about monitoring for water usage?	1131-8	195
Adding over 11,000 animals units is not going to help the aquifers where these 8 wells are located either. Have studies been done on the increased water that will be drawn from the on-site wells?	1131-9	214
Three of the 8 Riverview onsite wells are at between 136(a2) and 141 feet in depth. Well H and Well B are 164,166 feet deep. The other wells onsite are screened at nearly 300 feet. How many different aqufers are involved?	1131-10	198
What is know about them?	1131-11	435
To the best of my knowledge the aquifers in this area of Minnesota have not been well studied. If these aquifers are further drawn down with the increase in the number of animals, Where is the water supposed to come from?	1131-12	195
The Dairy will have a storage tank. What will the neighbors have?	1131-13	224
Is the Dairy tapping into the Souix aquifer/ or a section of the Sioux Aquifer (which is the largest aquifer in this region of the United States)?	1131-14	199
What will happen if it is connected to the Sioux Aquifer? A free for all?	1131-15	200

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Third: According to the capacity levels for the holding areas the total number of animals on site should be 7856. The actual number of animals onsite is 10995!!!!! According to the NPDES PERMIT. THREE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED THRITY NINE OVER THE CAPACITY! OVER CAPACITY!!!!! NOW. What is going to Happen if they get the go ahead to expand? 50,000 animals?????? EXPAND ALL OF THE OTHER DAIRYS? This is NOT Acceptable!	1131-16	434
Fourth: Using earthen barriers in the holding areas for manure. What will be put into place for monitoring them to make certain that they do not leak, burst, overflow?	1131-17	355
What is the PROVEN life of holding areas like these?	1131-18	320
Fifth- packing the house for the meeting is not acceptable either. Many people were turned away who had questions and concerns and as Minnesotans, We have that right to ask them and to have them answered by the MPCA. I would lke to request another meeting! This is not Just, Moral or fair to all.	1131-19	41
People Want an EIS for this site and an EIS Should be required for this site.	1131-20	1
Please make your decisions with the future of All of us in mind, and our Children and Their Children. Make Certain. that this area is kept safe and the waters and ecosystems are kept healthy for those coming after us.	1131-21	397
It is well known that some farmers over apply manure, and do not comply with rules on application.	1132-2	371
All manure pits and lagoons leak.	1132-3	353
Local economies get detrimental social and economic results from large livestock concentrations.	1132-4	397
Our health and the health of area wildlife and creatures living in the river are all impacted, as well as our enjoyment of outdoor activities such as canoeing and kayaking in this river, swimming, fishing and holding family gatherings centered around the beauty of the river.	1132-5	73
Alleged best management practices of large confinement systems fail, not just in Minnesota but around the USA.	1132-6	321
Manure pits will inevitably overflow and will be made worse and more frequent with the severe weather events of the climate crisis.	1132-7	372
This expansion would be allowing a huge experiment in aquifer depletion.	1132-8	195
The groundwater in the area would be threatened more than ever before in recorded history.	1132-9	218
Even in recorded history, the flooding that can occur is so huge that the waters of both the Pomme de Terre and nearby Chippewa rivers united. This has been verified by meteorologist, Mark Seeley.	1132-10	271
Huge animal confinement systems in the USA use and misuse antibiotics on a huge scale, three to six times more than European farmers.	1132-11	317
Those of you reading this and making the decision to allow the equivalent feces of about 250,000 people just upriver of where we live along the southern Pomme de terre river do NOT live there, nor do your children and grandchildren.	1132-12	333
Below are several factors that my family, who lives in rural Minnesota near the Pomme de Terre River, is aware of concerning how expansion of the West River Dairy would negatively affect this river.	1132-1a	182
Below are several factors that my family, who lives in rural Minnesota near the Pomme de Terre River, is aware of concerning how expansion of the West River Dairy would negatively affect the rural environment surrounding it.	1132-1b	167

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The EIS is not necessary for Riverview's West River expansion. MPCA's EAW should be more than sufficient.	1133-1	20
Not only the day to day operation is great, look at all the other things the dairy brings to the table.	1134-1	431
I am writing this on behalf of my 4-generation small family farm, which is about a mile from the proposed dairy barn, which already has an 8,000 head barn. On a windy day, the smell is unbearable, I can't imagine what it would be like if they added 10,000 more cattle.	1135-1	369
I believe that they don't just need an EAW, they should be required to have an EIS done, otherwise you will probably have one in your backyard someday too.	1135-2	1
If approved, say goodbye to water that is just touching the surface of the problems.	1135-3	387
If approved, say goodbye to roads that is just touching the surface of the problems.	1135-4	397
If approved, say goodbye to fresh air that is just touching the surface of the problems.	1135-5	81
Large facilities like this do not exist in isolation. Increased manure application raises the risk of nitrate contamination in groundwater, something rural families, like ours, rely on for drinking water	1135-6	153
Increased truck traffic affects local roads that were never designed for heavy, constant loads.	1135-7	304
Odor doesn't respect property lines,	1135-8	369
wildlife habitat that has existed here for decades is altered or lost entirely.	1135-9	172
These impacts fall disproportionately on nearby residents who have little choice but to live with the consequences.	1135-10	397
I will end with this. Small, family-run farms like ours are not asking to stop progress. We are asking for accountability, transparency, and thoughtful decision-making that values people, land, and long-term sustainability over short-term corporate gain.	1135-11	432
I am tired of watching rural communities absorb the costs and pains while others reap the benefits. Something needs to change.	1135-12	432
As a resident of Stevens county and living within 4 miles of Riverviews Dollymont dariy, I have great concerns over Riverviews proposed feedlot expansion.	1136-1	432
If I'm not mistaken, Riverview was only permitted to drill one well at Dollymont and limited in their total capacity to 9000 head of cattle. Dollymont dairy currently has 2 wells and are milking around 11,000 head.	1136-2	212
Of the two wells, both penetrate deep enough to go through the sandstone ledge that protects the larger lower aquafer which lies below mine. My well is 193 feet deep.	1136-3	214
My wife grew up on the farm we now live on, I'm very familiar with the water on this farm. Of the 40+ years of using the water here; it's only been in the past five to six years I've seen the water go from strictly a rusty iron and sand problem to a heavy manganese problem.	1136-4	418
Dollymont has drilled not one but TWO wells to the depth of 273 feet. Which can draw water from my shallower aquifer down through the sandstone into the lower aquifer. How are the residents of this county supposed to trust that Riverview wouldn't violate any permit they file, given their history in Dollymont twsp?	1136-5	212
I propose we need a full EIS to study what effect long term water use of this amount will do to these upper (shallow) aquafers.	1136-6	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Also given the effects of what happened down in Arizona and what's happening with the well on my property, only 4 miles from another dairy; that I consider to be in direct violation of the permit initially proposed I'd say it warrants consideration.	1136-7	432
Any project of this magnitude should be required to provide a fuLL Environmental Impact Statement rather than just an EAW.	1137-1	1
The potential problems of water usage can then be properly assessed.	1137-2	3
The potential problems of Manure management can then be properly assessed.	1137-3	6
The potential problems of potential spills can then be properly assessed.	1137-4	160
This is the worst kind of "farm".	1138-1	432
This is not good for anything: not people.	1138-2	397
This is not good for anything: not farms.	1138-3	400
This is not good for anything: not rural communities.	1138-4	397
This is not good for anything: not consumers.	1138-5	435
This is not good for anything: not cows.	1138-6	74
This is not good for anything: not the environment.	1138-7	167
This is not a good neighbor and puts smaller dairy farms, family farms across the state, in danger.	1138-8	397
No to River Dairy.	1138-9	432
I support Riverview's proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	1139-1	431
The EAW is completed and adequate. All environmental concerns have been addressed and reasonable effort has been made to reduce or mitigate risks.	1139-2	20
Please allow this project to move forward with the EAW.	1139-3	430
I and all people who value the land andthe cattle oppose this unconscionable project. I don't need to recount the reasons.	1140-1	432
The environmental review is sufficient, no EIS needed	1141-1	20
I strongly support the project moving forward	1142-1	431
NO EIS IS NEEDED!	1142-2	20
I strongly support this project moving forward.	1143-1	431
No EIS necessary!	1143-2	20
I support west river expansion.	1144-1	431
No EIS reqquired.	1144-2	20
I support west river expansion.	1145-1	431
No EIS required.	1145-2	20
I am writing to support the West River expansion	1146-1	431
urge the approval of the permit	1146-2	430
without the need of the EIS.	1146-3	20
I fully support the West River Dairy Expansion.	1147-1	431
No EIS should be needed.	1147-2	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I support the project	1148-1	431
I support West River Expansion	1149-1	431
No EIS required	1149-2	20
Any project of this size should demand that an EIS be done.	1150-1	1
An EIS was required for a smaller project in Baker Township in Stevens Co. & the Fehr's dropped the project. If these projects are environmentally safe, why would there be opposition to doing the EIS.	1150-2	31
Have you considered the adverse impacts caused by other dairies owned by the Fehr's in both MN and other states? i.e. drinking water, our spreading of manure, etc.	1150-3	56
Cropland for upcoming young farmers is unavailable due to the Fehr's outbidding anyone.	1150-4	400
An EIS would address socio-economic and community concerns.	1150-5	398
I support the West river Expansion.	1151-1	431
No EIS needed.	1151-2	20
We support this project	1152-1	431
No need for EIS	1152-2	20
I support the west river expansion.	1153-1	431
I fully support this project	1154-1	431
I do not believe EIS is needed.	1154-2	20
I support the West River Dairy Expansion	1155-1	431
there is no EIS needed	1155-2	20
I do not believe that an EIS is necessary	1156-1	20
Highly recomend the project	1157-1	431
No need 4 EIS	1157-2	20
We would like to express our support for Riverview Dairy and its planned expansion in Stevens County.	1158-1	431
I support the West Riverview Expansion.	1159-1	431
No EIS required.	1159-2	20
I fully support the West Riverview Dairy expansion	1160-1	431
I fully support no EIS required.	1160-2	20
I support the expantion of West R.	1161-1	431
No EIS required	1161-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1162-1	431
No EIS required.	1162-2	20
I support the West Riverview Expansion.	1163-1	431
No EIS required.	1163-2	20
I support Riverview and there west river expansion.	1164-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
No EIS is needed.	1164-2	20
I am all for the dairy's as they are a great construction to the community.	1165-1	431
I support West River/Riverview expantion.	1166-1	431
No EIS rquired	1166-2	20
I AM WRITING THIS IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED EXPANSION OF WEST RIVER DAIRY IN STEVENS COPUNTY MINNESOTA.	1167-1	431
I support the west river expansion.	1168-1	431
No EIS.	1168-2	20
I support West River/Riverview expansion	1169-1	431
no EIS required	1169-2	20
I am not in support of A EIS they are not needed	1170-1	20
I support the expansion	1171-1	431
NO EIS needed	1171-2	20
I highly support the West River Dairy expansion!	1172-1	431
I think there's no EIS required.	1172-2	20
I support the expansion.	1173-1	431
No EIS needed.	1173-2	20
With the impact on our aquafier and the history of Riverview's treatment of water use needed by anyone but them, please do an evaluation before Stevens County ends up like the Wilcox Basin in Arizona.	1174-1	194
I support the West Riverview expansed	1175-1	431
I support the West Riverview expansed	1176-1	431
I support the expansion.	1177-1	431
No EIS needed	1177-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion	1178-1	431
I support the West Riverview expansion	1179-1	431
I support the project	1180-1	431
No EIS needed	1180-2	20
My family supports the West River Dairy extension because of the economic oportunities for the communty.	1181-1	431
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1182-1	431
No EIS Required	1182-2	20
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1183-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	1183-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	1183-3	430
I support the West Riverview Expansion.	1184-1	431
No EIS Required	1184-2	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I support the West Riverview expansion	1185-1	431
I support the project.	1186-1	431
NO EIS NEEDED!	1186-2	20
I support the Proyect.	1187-1	431
NO EIS NEEDED	1187-2	20
I support the project	1188-1	431
I support West River Dairy expansion.	1189-1	431
No EIS required	1189-2	20
I support the project.	1190-1	431
No to the EIS	1190-2	20
Regarding Riverviews expansion I feel they definitely need an EIS	1191-1	1
Regarding Riverviews expansion I feel they definitely need outright denial	1191-2	33
My main concern is healthy aquifers for many generations to come, by not over pumping	1191-3	190
My main concern is healthy aquifers for many generations to come, by not polluting with high nitrates.	1191-4	193
We need to look at aquifers as the miracle they are, we can draw water from the ground and it is drinkable and life-sustaining. When an aquifer is over pumped it leads to poor water quality and the possibility of collapse, then it loses storage capacity permanently.	1191-5	195
If the aquifer is compromised it affects way more people than can be quantified, possibly forever.	1191-6	195
I am all for science and research, but there comes a time when you need to put on your common sense hat and look at the massive water usage this operation would have. Anytime you compare the water usage of one operation to an entire city it tells you this cannot be allowed.	1191-7	195
What we need in this state is an animal unit cap, because anytime you leave it up to businesses, like Riverview, they push for absolute crazy amounts.	1191-8	432
Anytime you put the making of money ahead of the environment it is not a good thing.	1191-9	432
I hope that people can see a trend here, that Riverview is never happy with their current size, they always want more.	1191-10	432
I support the project.	1192-1	431
No EIS needed	1192-2	20
Your support of this project will have lasting positive outcomes to so many people and the entire area.	1193-1	431
Your approval of this project will have lasting positive outcomes to so many people and the entire area.	1193-2	430
I support the West Riverview.	1194-1	431
No EIS required	1194-2	20
Facts: After "hard fought negotiations" this same dairy agreed to pay $11 Million and make long overdue changes on groundwater use in Arizona. See more facts here and at related media articles: https://www.azag.gov/ag-mayes-announces-riverview-settlement	1195-1	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
We don't need more consolidated farms in the hands of so few. Is this dairy oligarchy?	1196-1	400
This expansion will harm our earth in terms of water quality on the lands supporting the cows.	1196-2	388
This expansion will harm our earth in terms of increased herbicides and pesticides on the lands supporting the cows.	1196-3	183
lease DO NOT permit this expansion.	1196-4	33
As a member of the Land Stewardship Project, I'm concerned about the way our dairy industry is being contracted from small dairies and expanded by large dairies with huge numbers of cows.	1197-1	400
Large numbers of live stock mean more pollution at a specific site.	1197-2	146
Large numbers of live stock mean less crop diversity.	1197-3	152
Large numbers of live stock mean lower prices for family farmers.	1197-4	400
Large numbers of live stock mean fewer farms to support rural economies.	1197-5	398
Corporate farms probably don't buy in town as we did on our 228 acre 28 cow farm.	1197-6	398
Corporate farms probably don't send their children to local schools as we did on our 228 acre 28 cow farm.	1197-7	397
We always had a job for a live in worker or college student who needed the income and room and board provided.	1197-8	397
Corporate farms ar driving small farmers out of the business.	1197-9	400
Corporate farms ar damaging rual communities.	1197-10	397
More small, thriving dairies means stronger rural economies and a more resilient food system.	1197-11	400
I write to urge the MPCA to require Riverview LLC to complete an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) before approving their proposed River West Dairy Expansion.	1198-1	1
This dairy operation, if approved, would be the largest feedlot in Minnesota and 500 times larger than the average dairy farm in Minnesota (Land Stewardship Project 2026).	1198-2	432
An agricultural operation of this unprecedented size deserves especially careful scrutiny in view of its potential to affect the economic, social and environmental conditions of both our local region, and potentially, the nation. Below are just a few of the reasons I believe an EIS is warranted before this project can move forward:	1198-3	433
The most important reason to require an EIS is that the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) filed by Riverview considers only the environmental effects of this proposed dairy expansion. It is not designed to also incorporate analysis of the economic and social effects the expansion is likely to produce.	1198-4	14
The Land Stewardship Project (2026) recently produced a white paper that discusses dairy markets and the effects that production consolidation has on small operators. I find their analysis, echoed by a recent story in The New York Times (Saslow 2026), to be very concerning. Our current dairy market system is obviously broken, with production costs often exceeding earnings.	1198-5	398
Consolidating milk production in the hands of a few huge operators is unlikely help the prospects of small operators.	1198-6	398
Stressing the economics of small operators throughout Minnesota disrupts the lives of farm families (Rural Health Information Hub 2026).	1198-7	398

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Stressing the economics of small operators throughout Minnesota disrupts the economics of small towns (Rural Health Information Hub 2026).	1198-8	398
Stressing the economics of small operators throughout Minnesota leads to an epidemic of mental health issues (Rural Health Information Hub 2026).	1198-9	398
Stressing the economics of small operators throughout Minnesota leads to an epidemic of suicides among farmers (Rural Health Information Hub 2026).	1198-10	398
Only by requiring an EIS can the MPCA thoroughly investigate the important economic and social effects of this project.	1198-11	14
Riverview's EAW acknowledges that ongoing climate change is expected to increase the frequency of heavy precipitation events, in addition to increasing average annual temperatures.	1198-12	100
Riverview's EAW acknowledges that ongoing climate change is expected to increase average annual temperatures.	1198-13	105
They assert that building stormwater retention ponds that are 20% larger than that required to hold water from a 25-year precipitation event will be enough to reliably handle runoff from their impervious surfaces. However, I am not confident that this assertion is justified. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (2024) notes that heavy rainfall events are becoming more frequent in our state, meaning that "25-year" events may occur more often than historically expected. Given the current state of our climate and especially the changes expected in the coming decades (UMN Climate Adaptation Partnership 2026), I believe that, within the context of an EIS, Riverview should be expected to provide modeling of how well projected increases in precipitation (especially heavy rainfall events) would be handled by both their stormwater retention ponds and their manure storage facilities in order to prevent contamination of the Pomme de Terre River and adjacent wetlands.	1198-14	5
Another important effect of climate change is the way that projected warmer and wetter springs (UMN Climate Adaptation Partnership 2026) will affect nutrient retention in fields after fall manure application. Historically, winters and springs were cold enough to keep most of the nitrogen from fall-applied manure in the soil profile. However, data show that unusually warm February and March temperatures (which are likely to become increasingly common in the future) can cause the loss of nearly all the nitrogen from a fall manure application, even if the manure is injected subsurface and treated with a nitrogen stabilizer (A & L Great Lakes Laboratories. 2026; Bayer Crop Science 2025.)	1198-15	122
Where will this nitrogen go? Into the Pomme de Terre River, of course, only exacerbated by the ubiquity of pattern-tile drainage of fields in our region. Your own agency has documented that the middle and lower Pomme de Terre has experienced nitrate-nitrogen increases of 11% annually from 2007-20017, resulting in problems with dissolved oxygen and anthropogenic eutrophication (Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. 2024).	1198-16	272
Manure applications from an operation of this unprecedented size are likely to worsen the condition of the Pomme de Terre, despite the assurances offered in the EAW.	1198-17	182
And, unfortunately, the negative effects don't stop there. Nutrient pollution in tributaries of the Mississippi River annually causes a dead zone in the Gulf of Mexico (NOAA 2022), adversely affecting biodiversity in the Gulf,	1198-18	258
as well as the livelihoods of fisherman and those involved in the region's tourism industry.	1198-19	265

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
An EIS for this project should explore the likelihood of nitrogen loss from field applications of manure in the face of projected climate change.	1198-20	2
I support the West Riverview expansion	1199-1	431
no EIS required	1199-2	20
I support the project.	1200-1	431
No EIS needed.	1200-2	20
I support the project.	1201-1	431
No EIS needed.	1201-2	20
I fully support this project,	1202-1	431
No EIS needed	1202-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1203-1	431
No EIS required	1203-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1204-1	431
Noe EIS required	1204-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1205-1	431
No EIS required.	1205-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1206-1	431
No EIS required.	1206-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1207-1	431
I support the project.	1208-1	20
No EIS needed	1208-2	20
I support the project of Westriver expansion	1209-1	20
No EIS is needed	1209-2	20
I 100% support this project.	1210-1	20
EIS is not needed.	1210-2	20
I support the projec,	1211-1	20
No EIS Needed	1211-2	20
I support West River Expantion projec.	1212-1	20
No EIS Needed	1212-2	20
I support the project,	1213-1	20
no EIS needed.	1213-2	20
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Riverview Dairy expansion project located in Stevens County, MN. Milk trucks drive by our house all the time, one was even gushing milk out a left open valve as it drove by a few years ago.	1214-1	435

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The MPCA was established in 1967 under Republican Governor Harold LeVander to protect air, water, and the land of MN due to growing environmental concerns. Its focus is to prevent and reduce the pollution of air, water, and land. As stated on the MPCA website, the State of MN appropriated $318 million dollars in 2024-2025 from the Clean Water Fund to various water projects in MN.	1214-2	435
I think Attachment 16 MPCA Impaired Waters Map says it all. I see miles and miles of impaired streams, creeks, and rivers downgradient from the designated manure application areas for this project.	1214-3	266
I see two impaired lakes in this attachment	1214-4	266
two impaired wetlands in this attachment.	1214-5	266
The approval of this expansion will potentially add such lovely words as E. coli, Cryptosporidium, Eutrophication, and Giardia to this attachment.	1214-6	266
Do you know how much of the $318 million was spent on investigating and cleaning up the waters of Attachment 16?	1214-7	253
The job of the MPCA is to protect the environment so people can live in it. It is not the job of the MPCA to promote big business and agriculture. If the MPCA truly cares about the environment and waters of MN, then prove it. Require the completion of an Environmental Impact Statement for this expansion, the people of Attachment 16 deserve it.	1214-8	1
I support the West Riverview expansion	1215-1	20
no eis required	1215-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion	1216-1	20
no EIS required	1216-2	20
I support this project	1217-1	20
no EIS is needed	1217-2	20
I support the expansion.	1218-1	20
No EIS needed	1218-2	20
I support the project.	1219-1	20
No EIS is needed.	1219-2	20
I am in support of the project,	1220-1	20
No EIS is needed.	1220-2	20
I support the expansion.	1221-1	20
No EIS needed	1221-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion	1222-1	20
No EIS required	1222-2	20
I support West River Dairy expansion	1223-1	20
No EIS required	1223-2	20
I support West River Dairy expansion	1224-1	20
No EIS Required	1224-2	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I support West River Dairy expansion	1225-1	20
No ELS required	1225-2	20
I'm writing in support of the West River Dairy/feedlot project.	1226-1	431
I respectfully support the approval of this project.	1226-2	430
No EIS required.	1226-3	20
I'm writing in support of the expansion of the West River Dairy/feedlot project.	1227-1	431
No EIS required.	1227-2	20
I support West River Dairy	1228-1	431
I think not necessary EIS	1228-2	20
I support west River Dairy expansion	1229-1	431
No EIS required	1229-2	20
I suport the expansion of West River.	1230-1	431
I support West River Dairy expansion	1231-1	431
No EIS required	1231-2	20
I support West Riverview expansion	1232-1	431
No EIS required	1232-2	20
I support the West River Dairy expansion	1233-1	431
No EIS required.	1233-2	20
I fully support West River Dairy expansion	1234-1	431
I fully support West River Diary expansion	1235-1	431
I support the West Riverview expansion	1236-1	431
I support this project.	1237-1	431
No EIS is needed.	1237-2	20
How big is too big?	1238-1	434
Require an EIS. If there truly is no environmental concern a completed EIS will show that	1238-2	1
yet the EAW documents are filled with concerns about water allotment, catch basins, and manure proximity to bodies of water.	1238-3	147
Simply stated the reluctance to do an EIS implies there is negative environmental impact to be found within the scope of the West River expansion.	1238-4	1
If all the energy that has been put in to avoid an EIS was put towards one, it would be done already.	1238-5	435
The reputation of Riverview has always been to go above what is "required" in order to do good work, here is the chance to do such a thing and it is being fought, why?	1238-6	431
There should be an increased concern for a project of this size within such proximity to impaired waters such as the Pomme de Terre River which continue on into the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers.	1238-7	277

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
As seen with the large manure spill near Pennock a year ago that has gone rather under the radar, accidents can and do happen.	1238-8	385
What happens when an event of similar scale, 1+ million gallons spills again, but this time into field drainage tiling that goes to county ditches and into the Pomme de Terre?	1238-9	385
It is the duty of Minnesotans to ensure we are good stewards of waterways that millions of people both in state and downstream count on.	1238-10	295
These rivers and waterways are crucial to the Midwest in being used to move goods.	1238-11	278
These rivers and waterways are crucial to the Midwest in being used to provide jobs.	1238-12	279
These rivers and waterways are crucial to the Midwest in being used to feed a nation.	1238-13	261
Causing irreversible damage needs to be avoided. Any action that will cause negative impacts should be explored, alternatives found, and plans changed. An EIS should be required.	1238-14	1
The above only touches on the water impacts, there is also road/traffic impacts that need to truly be evaluated.	1238-15	307
The above only touches on the water impacts, there is also site noise impacts that need to truly be evaluated.	1238-16	249
The above only touches on the water impacts, there is also community impacts that need to truly be evaluated.	1238-17	397
Please require an EIS before something goes wrong and can't be undone.	1238-18	1
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1239-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	1239-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	1239-3	430
I support this project	1240-1	431
Do not need EAF	1240-2	20
I support the West Riverview expansion	1241-1	431
I support the west River expancion	1242-1	431
I support the West River expansion	1243-1	431
I support the West Riverview expansion	1244-1	431
I am writing in support of Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1245-1	431
In my opinion, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not necessary,	1245-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	1245-3	430
At McGinnis Appliance, we PROUDLY SUPPORT this project	1246-1	431
No EIS is needed.	1246-2	20
I wanted to express my support for Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1247-1	431
I do not believe an Environmental Impact Statement is necessary for this project.	1247-2	20
I respectfully encourage support and approval of the proposed West River Dairy expansion.	1247-3	430
I strongly support this project.	1248-1	431
An EIS is not needed.	1248-2	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I support this Riverview Project	1249-1	431
no EIS is required. EAW provided should suffice.	1249-2	20
I would strongly encourage permitting to allow for the betterment of rural minnesota.	1250-1	430
I support the project	1251-1	431
No EIS needed.	1251-2	20
After reviewing the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the proposed expansion at West River Dairy, the environmental review of the project is comprehensive and complete.	1252-1	431
I support the project;	1253-1	431
no EIS needed	1253-2	20
A proposal of this magnitude, an increase of this size, must be evaluated as carefully as possible.	1254-1	434
Failing to require an EIS would cut corners and let many legitimate concerns go unaddressed.	1254-2	1
River View should expect to fulfill the most careful examination....not the least.	1254-3	29
Please do your job. Just on the basis of the extreme magnitude alone!	1254-4	432
I can't believe there is any debate about an environmental assessment with an expansion of this size.	1255-1	432
That should be standard operating procedure.	1255-2	435
We shouldn't have to be petitioning for this.	1255-3	432
Of course we want to know how this will impact us. Our very lives depend on it.	1255-4	435
There is no reason this should be stopped from happening.	1256-1	431
Riverview has brought more to the community than just cows to milk, they have brought jobs, manure instead of commercial fertilizer and economic benefits that would not have been here without them.	1257-1	431
As a resident of Morris for 20+ years I am not here to bash Riverview at all. I think they bring a lot of diversity to our community and for that I am grateful. I do think that we as a diverse community need to gather all of the information on how this proposal will affect us. To do so we need independent environmental and economic impact statements from an outside source that is not Riverview.	1258-1	18
We all saw what happened with them in Arizona.	1258-2	435
Please do not put profit above the natural resources in West Central Minnesota.	1258-3	435
Hi I am writing to express my concern with the riverview dairy expansion and request the MPCA do full environmental impact statement.	1259-1	1
I was unable to attend the in person meeting due to it being full by the time I arrived before the start. I am disappointed that I was not able to listen in and gain a better understanding of the EAW and ask any questions. Thus I have had to gather information via this internet and the bias that come from those information sources.	1259-2	22
I witnessed many people not able to attend and gain more information about how the dairy expansion will affect the community both good and bad. Since we (as a community) could not learn I urge the MPCA to do a full environmental impact statement to better protect the residents of Morris and Stevens county.	1259-3	435

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I feel more information is always good and taking precautions always saves time and money in the long run. I have seen this time and time again through my career. Taking time to better prevent an outbreak saves more time and money in the long run.	1259-4	432
My specific concerns about the expansion is surface water contamination.	1259-5	289
My specific concerns about the expansion is ground water contamination.	1259-6	193
The more drainage tile that is put into farm field leads to more flooding as water moves faster than it historically did in the prairie pothole region of MN.	1259-7	424
I have concerns that the expansion will be part of contributing to this flooding as well as being affected by it.	1259-8	414
If manure or other contaminants get into the pomme de terre river that not only affects the Morris community but every other community in the watershed south of us. I would like to see Stevens county set a good example and be a good neighbor to those downstream from us.	1259-9	396
I also have concerns about how riverview will mitigate spills and negative environmental impacts.	1259-10	160
It's well know that leaks, and contamination will occur, it's more a matter of when not if.	1259-11	149
If a EIS is not done will this lower the responsibility that riverview will have to claim? I want to make sure that our environment will be cleaned up in the best way possible and responsible parties be held accountable.	1259-12	150
Thank you for your time and for reading my concerns. I hope you choose to move forward with a full environmental impact statement.	1259-13	1
I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed expansion of the West River Dairy facility near Morris, MN.	1260-14	432
This project, which seeks to increase capacity from 7,855 cows to 18,855 (totaling over 26,000 animal units), is unprecedented in the state of Minnesota. Given the massive scale and the history of this specific site, I urge the MPCA to deny the permit or, at minimum, require a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) before further consideration.	1260-15	15
Water Quality and Watershed Impairment: The facility is located within the Pomme de Terre River watershed, a system already listed as impaired for bacteria and nutrients. Waste Volume: The expansion would result in approximately 250 million gallons of liquid manure storage. The risk of catastrophic failure or "allowable" seepage from clay-lined basins poses a permanent threat to local groundwater and the Pomme de Terre River, which flows into the Minnesota River.	1260-16	149
Water Quality and Watershed Impairment: The facility is located within the Pomme de Terre River watershed, a system already listed as impaired for bacteria and nutrients. Waste Volume: The expansion would result in approximately 250 million gallons of liquid manure storage. The risk of catastrophic failure or "allowable" seepage from clay-lined basins poses a permanent threat to local groundwater and the Pomme de Terre River, which flows into the Minnesota River.	1260-16	149
Water Quality and Watershed Impairment: The facility is located within the Pomme de Terre River watershed, a system already listed as impaired for bacteria and nutrients. Application Risks: In a region prone to heavy spring rains, the saturation of phosphorus and nitrogen in the soil leads to inevitable runoff, worsening toxic algal blooms downstream.	1260-17	182

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Water Quality and Watershed Impairment: The facility is located within the Pomme de Terre River watershed, a system already listed as impaired for bacteria and nutrients. Application Risks: In a region prone to heavy spring rains, the saturation of phosphorus and nitrogen in the soil leads to inevitable runoff, worsening toxic algal blooms downstream.	1260-17	182
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	1260-18	195
Public Health: The emission of hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, and nitrous oxide (N2O) from a facility of nearly 19,000 cows is a significant public health hazard. Respiratory Impact: Neighbors are subjected to particulate matter and noxious gases that are linked to asthma, bronchitis, and other chronic respiratory conditions.	1260-19	394
Public Health: The emission of hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, and nitrous oxide (N2O) from a facility of nearly 19,000 cows is a significant public health hazard. Climate Change: N2O is a greenhouse gas roughly 300 times more potent than CO2. Permitting a single facility to emit such a concentrated volume contradicts Minnesota's stated climate goals.	1260-20	120
Social Justice and Economic Disparity: The expansion of "Mega-Dairies" is not a neutral economic development; it is a driver of rural inequity. •Consolidation vs. Community: By flooding the market with industrial-scale milk production, Riverview systematically pushes small- and mid-sized family farms out of business. This destroys the fabric of rural Stevens County, replacing independent business owners with a transient, low-wage labor model.	1260-21	398
Social Justice and Economic Disparity: The expansion of "Mega-Dairies" is not a neutral economic development; it is a driver of rural inequity. Environmental Justice: Industrial CAFOs are consistently sited in rural areas where residents have fewer resources to fight protracted legal battles. This places the "negative externalities" of corporate profit—pollution, road damage, and smell directly onto the shoulders of local citizens while the profits are exported.	1260-22	399
Social Justice and Economic Disparity: The expansion of "Mega-Dairies" is not a neutral economic development; it is a driver of rural inequity. Lack of Oversight: In 2014, the MPCA Citizens' Board ordered an EIS for a much smaller version of this project. Since that board was abolished, the lack of a mandatory EIS for a project three times larger represents a failure of democratic oversight and a victory for corporate lobbying over public interest.	1260-23	434
The MPCA must recognize that the "West River Dairy Expansion" is not a standard agricultural project; it is an industrial experiment at a scale Minnesota has never seen. I urge that a full EIS be conducted to study the cumulative impacts on our water.	1260-24	2
The MPCA must recognize that the "West River Dairy Expansion" is not a standard agricultural project; it is an industrial experiment at a scale Minnesota has never seen. I urge that a full EIS be conducted to study the cumulative impacts on our climate.	1260-25	11
The MPCA must recognize that the "West River Dairy Expansion" is not a standard agricultural project; it is an industrial experiment at a scale Minnesota has never seen. I urge that a full EIS be conducted to study the cumulative impacts on our rural social structure.	1260-26	15
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion in Synnes Township, Stevens County,	1261-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am writing to respectfully urge the MPCA Commissioner to issue a negative declaration on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement.	1261-2	20
I respectfully urge the MPCA Commissioner allow the project to proceed under its proposed permit conditions.	1261-3	430
I am writing today to express my full support for their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1262-1	431
no Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed.	1262-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	1262-3	430
I support the West River Expansion.	1263-1	431
"This permit requires the facility to be designed, operated, and maintained to prevent discharge to waters, except in an extreme storm event." I have lived in this part of Minnesota for over 50 years. I know West central Minnesota gets extreme weather. This facility, the Riverview LLP West River Dairy, will see extreme storm events and it will cause damages to the surrounding area. Just last summer in two days, July 27 and 28, the City of Morris got over seven inches of rainfall. When the storage ponds at this site over top, the storm water and manure will flow downstream to the east where just across the road is a large county tile drain pipe and draw that flows to the Pomme de Terre River less than four miles away.	1264-1	125
Conversely, I have seen drought when the Pomme de Terre River completely stopped flowing and was reduced to puddles in its channel just downstream from this facility where the well is to be located to supply it.	1264-2	182
An EAW (Environmental Assessment Worksheet) is insufficient for this site. The magnitude of this animal confinement operation, which will be the largest in the state of Minnesota, warrants that an Environmental Impact Statement should be required before a permit for this feedlot expansion can be issued.	1264-3	15
The proposed expansion more than doubles the number of animals held in a confined area, and brings the total to a number that poses an inherent risk to water quality and environmental quality more broadly.	1265-1	134
We need to reverse the way that animals are managed on the landscape in order to reintegrate their waste safely into the ecosystem.	1265-2	378
The proposed dairy expansion does the opposite and in a region of Minnesota facing ongoing challenges of water quality degradation.	1265-3	388
Poor water quality affects Minnesotan public health, impacting present day and future generations.	1265-4	396
Poor water quality affects Minnesotan biodiversity, impacting present day and future generations.	1265-5	163
As a scientist who studies effects of nitrogen on ecosystems, I strongly oppose this expansion.	1265-6	432
I believe it is important to protect the evironment by ensuring proper manure management.	1266-1	358
I believe it is important to protect the evironment by preventing water contamination.	1266-2	421
I believe it is important to protect the evironment by reducing air emissions and odors.	1266-3	81
Ongoing monitoring should be required to minize environmental impact.	1266-4a	42
Ongoing sustainable practices should be required to protect community health.	1266-4b	47
Ongoing monitoring should be required to protect community health.	1266-5a	42
Ongoing sustainable practices should be required to protect community health.	1266-5b	47

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I support the Riverview West River expansion	1267-1	431
I feel like the plan is good and no EIS is needed	1267-2	20
I support the West River Dairy expansion	1268-1	431
No EIS Require	1268-2	20
I soport the West Riverview expansion.	1269-1	431
No EIS Required	1269-2	20
I am in favor of the project.	1270-1	431
I support giving Riverview the feedlot permit.	1270-2	430
The EAW is very thorough. No additional benefit would result from an EIS.	1271-1	20
Please proceed for permit review.	1271-2	430
I support the West River expansion	1272-1	431
without any additional EIS.	1272-2	20
I support the west Riverview Expansion	1273-1	431
No EIS Required	1273-2	20
I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1274-1	431
no EIS is needed.	1274-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this expansion, as it represents a positive step forward for our industry and our rural communities.	1274-3	430
We urge the MPCA to take a comprehensive approach that reflects the long-term health of Minnesota's water, land, climate, and rural communities—doing so would be best accomplished with an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analysis to inform MCPA's decisions.	1275-1	1
Riverview, LLP has applied to expand its West River Dairy animal feedlot to 26,397 animal units, housing 18,855 cows. If approved, this would be the largest feedlot operating in Minnesota. CURE urges the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to mandate that the West River Dairy expansion undergoes an EIS to fully assess the risks of the dairy expansion.	1275-2	1
An EIS would ensure that all potential impacts of the proposed expansion are considered, including impacts to air	1275-3	4
An EIS would ensure that all potential impacts of the proposed expansion are considered, including impacts to water.	1275-4	2
An EIS would ensure that all potential impacts of the proposed expansion are considered, including impacts to soil quality.	1275-5	183
An EIS would ensure that all potential impacts of the proposed expansion are considered, including impacts to the socioeconomic impacts to rural dairy farmers.	1275-6	398
An EIS would ensure that all potential impacts of the proposed expansion are considered, including impacts to the market influence such an operation would have on the milk industry in Minnesota.	1275-7	400
The preparation of an EIS would support the mission of the MPCA to ensure that every Minnesotan has healthy air—all of which may be negatively impacted by a facility of this size. Mitigating these harms is only possible if they are correctly identified and evaluated.	1275-8	394

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The preparation of an EIS would support the mission of the MPCA to ensure that every Minnesotan has sustainable lands—all of which may be negatively impacted by a facility of this size. Mitigating these harms is only possible if they are correctly identified and evaluated.	1275-9	1
The preparation of an EIS would support the mission of the MPCA to ensure that every Minnesotan has clean water—all of which may be negatively impacted by a facility of this size. Mitigating these harms is only possible if they are correctly identified and evaluated.	1275-10	396
The preparation of an EIS would support the mission of the MPCA to ensure that every Minnesotan has the ability to plan for, and not merely react to, drastic climate events—all of which may be negatively impacted by a facility of this size. Mitigating these harms is only possible if they are correctly identified and evaluated.	1275-11	5
According to the state of Minnesota's 2026 Climate Action Framework, manure accounts for 4.1 million metric tons of CO2-equivalent (CO2-e) emissions, the third highest producer of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the state, with nitrous oxide (N2O) from agricultural soil management, including the application of manure as fertilizer, being the leader in GHG emissions at 15.2 million metric tons CO2-e.2 The production of manure—roughly 520,000 tons annually—may result in significant amounts of methane emissions, strongly undermining the state's climate goals.	1275-12	120
Additionally, this manure, when held on the land, threatens soil quality of the entire region.	1275-13	183
Additionally, this manure, when held on the land, threatens the drinking water of the entire region.	1275-14	396
And for an area that has already seen small dairy farms going out of business this expansion further strains the local farming community and consolidates the dairy market in Minnesota.	1275-15	400
CURE believes that an EIS should be performed for not only this expansion, but any future proposals of this size.	1275-16	1
The impacts on the economy and land can only be understood through the kind of rigorous examination in an EIS.	1275-17	14
The scale of the proposed expansion raises serious concerns about groundwater withdrawals in a region already experiencing overuse/stress on aquifers. Large dairy operations require significant volumes of water for animal consumption. Riverview is proposing that 226 million gallons of water a year be extracted from an off-site well. This proposal is more than 100 times that of the neighboring city, and almost as much as the entire City of Morris.	1275-18	195
The scale of the proposed expansion raises serious concerns about groundwater withdrawals in a region already experiencing overuse/stress on aquifers. Large dairy operations require significant volumes of water for cleaning. Riverview is proposing that 226 million gallons of water a year be extracted from an off-site well. This proposal is more than 100 times that of the neighboring city, and almost as much as the entire City of Morris.	1275-19	195
The scale of the proposed expansion raises serious concerns about groundwater withdrawals in a region already experiencing overuse/stress on aquifers. Large dairy operations require significant volumes of water for manure handling. Riverview is proposing that 226 million gallons of water a year be extracted from an off-site well. This proposal is more than 100 times that of the neighboring city, and almost as much as the entire City of Morris.	1275-20	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
While the proposer claims that they "... strive [] to be good stewards of natural resources, including water," the company's recent actions in Arizona contradict this. Earlier this year, the Arizona Attorney General settled with Riverview, forcing the company to pay $11 million to fund new wells and haul water to the residents of Willcox, after depleting the town's water supply for use at the company's Sulphur Springs Valley dairies.	1275-21	194
In this instance, the MPCA should require a detailed, cumulative impact analysis of groundwater use, including potential drawdown effects on neighboring surface waters. Protecting water as a shared public resource must remain a priority over concentrated private industrial use.	1275-22	190
In this instance, the MPCA should require a detailed, cumulative impact analysis of groundwater use, including potential drawdown effects on neighboring surface waters. Protecting water as a shared public resource must remain a priority over concentrated private industrial use.	1275-23	190
In this instance, the MPCA should require a detailed, cumulative impact analysis of groundwater use, including potential drawdown effects on neighboring surface waters. Protecting water as a shared public resource must remain a priority over concentrated private industrial use.	1275-24	190
West River Dairy sits adjacent to the Pomme de Terre River, an impaired waterbody that is already considered one of the most polluted tributaries of the Minnesota River. The MPCA reports that within a 10-year period from 2007 to 2017/2018 there was an annual increase of 11% in nitrate- nitrogen, the leading cause of water pollution in Minnesota. Further review of existing and foreseeable nitrate-nitrogen pollution is vital to determining the potential impacts of the proposed dairy expansion to this already stressed ecosystem.	1275-25	356
Manure production and storage can also have significant impacts on water quality and greenhouse gas emissions. That's why the state's updated Climate Action Framework specifically names fertilizer and manure management, as well as management of agricultural landscapes, as ways to reduce emissions and minimize nitrogen runoff and pollution. Guiding these priorities is Minnesota's goal to reduce statewide GHG emissions by 50% by 2050.	1275-26	120
The expansion appears to be contradictory to these goals, substantially increasing the volume of manure generated by West River Dairy and heightening the risk of nutrient runoff, spills, and leaching into groundwater.	1275-27	193
And because manure emits methane, a potent greenhouse gas, increasing the amount of manure produced is likely to have significant impacts on our state's climate goals.	1275-28	120
The MPCA's Feedlot Permit explains that "This permit requires the facility to be designed, operated, and maintained to prevent discharge to waters, except in an extreme storm event." With extreme rain events becoming more frequent, considerations of the impact of possible discharge to waters need to be considered.	1275-29	100

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The proposed adaptive strategy, as detailed in the EAW—covering Liquid Manure Storage Areas and sizing stormwater basins at 20% above a 25-year, 24-hour storm—does not adequately reflect current climate realities. Out of 12 "mega-rain" events to have occurred in Minnesota since 1860, where 6 inches or more of rain fell during one event, five have taken place since 2000 and the frequency of heavy rain events is expected to double by 2100. Extreme weather events that included heavy rain and flooding occurred around the project location in April and June of 2023 and again in July 2025, demonstrating the increased frequency of unprecedented and unpredictable weather events.	1275-30	123
According to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR), mega-rainfall events like these are now more than 2.5 times as common as they were in the late 20th century, with projections showing continued increases in both frequency and intensity. Designing infrastructure using standards based on outdated precipitation data leaves a high risk of pollution overflow and water contamination.	1275-31	123
Given that extreme precipitation events are growing more frequent and intense, an EIS is needed to ensure the suitability of proposed adaptations and to understand the potential impacts to surrounding aquifers of a discharge during such an event.	1275-32	2
Minnesota's current and predicted forecasted extreme weather events need to be correctly applied to proposed mitigation, for full and accurate evaluation. The current EAW does not do this.	1275-33	100
According to the state of Minnesota's 2026 Climate Action Framework manure accounts for 4.1 million metric tons of CO2-equivalent emissions, the third highest producer of greenhouse gases in the state, with nitrous oxides from agricultural soil management, including the application of manure as fertilizer, being the leader in GHG emissions at 15.2 million metric tons.	1275-34	120
At a time when Minnesota is working to meet climate goals, approving expansions of concentrated animal feeding operations without a full accounting of lifecycle GHG emissions is inconsistent with those commitments. The MPCA should require a thorough climate impact assessment and consider mitigation measures, including limits on herd size growth and investments in emission-reducing technologies.	1275-35	113
The MPCA must ensure that nutrient management plans are not only technically sufficient on paper but enforceable and resilient in practice and that they align with the state's climate goals, specifically: initiative 2.3.2, manage fertilizer and manure to reduce emissions; and 2.4.1 manage agricultural landscapes to minimize nitrogen runoff and pollution. The proposed mitigations for manure management, which include applying manure fertilizer on fields that are in operation and considering rates of application, still introduce increased manure and therefore N2O into the soil, water, and atmosphere.	1275-36	102

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The Pomme de Terre River, just southeast of Morris, is home to one of the last, if not the only remaining reproducing population of Elktoe (Alasmidonta marginata) freshwater mussels in the Minnesota River watershed. Elktoe mussels are listed as threatened on the MN DNR Rare Species Guide. A primary threat to the Elktoe mussel is non-point source loading from agricultural practices including agricultural runoff from fertilized crops and animal waste (manure) introduced into water ways. The Environmental Protection Agency specifically states that freshwater mussels are sensitive to changes in water quality including altered water flow, sedimentation and the introduction of contaminants, including those from land use activities from agriculture. In fact, in a study published by the MPCA, DNR, and Macalester College stated, "We find that current state water quality standards may not be sufficiently protective of mussels." An EIS is the way to evaluate and propose alternatives to management to ensure all possible protective measures are in place.	1275-37	30
The federally protected Northern Long-Eared Bat has also been identified in the project area. According to a White Paper on the Northern Long-Eared Bat from the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians, "Energy extraction activities and agricultural activities are also frequently responsible for harmful and toxic substances entering water networks such as fertilizer runoff, brine, or other chemicals. Bats have been observed using artificial water sources, including industrial holding ponds and pits." An EIS is the only way to thoroughly investigate the agricultural impacts on this federally protected species.	1275-38	7
The continued expansion of Riverview raises concerns about corporate consolidation and the long-term viability of independent family farms. Increasing concentration in the dairy sector can suppress milk prices, limit market access, and reshape rural economies in ways that reduce resilience and local ownership. The local community has already seen a loss of small, family dairy operations that are unable to compete with the market of inexpensive milk that is produced by an operation of this capacity. Statewide, we have lost 1,300 farms in the last two years alone. The economic impacts of corporate consolidation on this scale severely constrain the health and competitiveness of Minnesota's milk market. The MPCA should consider these broader socioeconomic impacts as part of its environmental review, recognizing that environmental sustainability and economic fairness are deeply interconnected.	1275-39	400
The expansion of the West River View Dairy operation would result in the largest confined animal feedlot operation in Minnesota with 18,855 dairy cattle. This will undoubtedly have cumulative impacts on the watershed. The impacts of an operation of this size ripple through natural water systems, including the entirety of the 130-mile long Pomme de Terre River which flows past not only the existing West River Dairy site but also Riverview's Louriston Dairy.	1275-40	23
In closing, CURE asks the MPCA to uphold its responsibility to protect Minnesota's natural resources and communities by applying rigorous scrutiny to this proposal through an EIS.	1275-41	1
The proposed climate adaptation strategies detailed in the EAW require further investigation through an EIS to determine the efficacy of the proposed adaptations.	1275-42	5
Decisions made today will shape water quality, climate resilience, and rural livelihoods for generations. A cautious, science-based approach is not only warranted—it is essential.	1275-43	435
On behalf of Minnesota Famers Union (MFU) and responding to a vote from our Full Board, I write to request that you require an Economic Impact Statement (EIS) for Riverview LLP's permit to expand their West River Dairy in Stevens County.	1276-1	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This scale of expansion is unprecedented in our state and we believe strongly that Minnesotans deserve a fuller examination of its environmental.	1276-2	434
This scale of expansion is unprecedented in our state and we believe strongly that Minnesotans deserve a fuller examination of its economic.	1276-3	434
This scale of expansion is unprecedented in our state and we believe strongly that Minnesotans deserve a fuller examination of its social consequences.	1276-4	434
MFU is a grassroots organization that has represented Minnesota's family farmers, ranchers and rural communities since 1918. Our membership and our Full Board include family dairies, including many who are struggling to stay in business while they shoulder prices below their cost of production. This challenge is not new with the number of Minnesota dairies declining by nearly half in the last decade, dropping from 3,470 in 2016 to just 1,600 farms today. And while farms are declining, cows are consolidating into fewer operations. This one company is permitted for nearly a third of Minnesota's dairy herd.	1276-5	397
This consolidation has consequences not just for those families, but also for rural schools that make life possible in rural Minnesota.	1276-6	397
This consolidation has consequences not just for those families, but also for small businesses that make life possible in rural Minnesota.	1276-7	398
This consolidation has consequences not just for those families, but also for veterinary practices that make life possible in rural Minnesota.	1276-8	398
This consolidation has consequences not just for those families, but also churches that make life possible in rural Minnesota.	1276-9	397
This consolidation has consequences not just for those families, but also for other institutions that make life possible in rural Minnesota.	1276-10	397
According to an analysis from 2020, the average Minnesota dairy generates $1.6 million in economic activity.[1] A more complete analysis of the economic and social consequences of this project is needed.	1276-11	398
Beyond that, we believe there are important environmental concerns that an EIS would more fully address. Our members understand that livestock projects draw water year-round and we want to ensure that we are stewarding this shared resource and safeguarding sufficient supply for neighboring farms.	1276-12	3
We also understand that consolidating livestock increases the potential consequences of a natural disaster.	1276-13	131
We also understand that consolidating livestock increases the potential consequences of a zoonotic disease.	1276-14	72
We also understand that consolidating livestock increases the potential consequences of a human disease affecting workers.	1276-15	395
To close, this project is different than those that are approved through our existing processes. From my memory of that time, when we established our current regulatory framework for feedlots in the late 1990s no-one contemplated a nearly 19,000 cow dairy operation. That is more than 60 times the average size herd in our state.	1276-16	432
This project is different and deserves distinct consideration and the full public comment afforded by an EIS.	1276-17	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
A lot of people are asserting that an EIS is unnecessary for what would be the largest cattle operation in MN. If your teenager insists that they got all As on their report card, yet refused to show it to anyone, should we just believe them? Wouldn't they be proud of their accomplishments and be eager to show the outcome of their hard work?	1277-1	432
It does nothing to promote trust to attempt to avoid scrutiny. There are no good reasons to skip an EIS. Moreover, the Riverview employees that submitted comments in favor of the expansion and skipping the EIS are very biased and would be unaffected by the environmental disaster. But I don't blame them. They are very likely under pressure from their employers to make these comments.	1277-2	1
The proposed significant expansion of the existing Riverview Dairy, bringing the total number of cows to 18,855 (potentially raising the number of Animal Units to 26,397) requires a significant environmental review – a proper Environmental Impact Statement.	1278-1	1
An EIS is the only way to insure that the people pf Minnesota can be confident that this precedent-setting expansion can be thoroughly reviewed for the potential environmental impacts on our soil.	1278-2	6
An EIS is the only way to insure that the people pf Minnesota can be confident that this precedent-setting expansion can be thoroughly reviewed for the potential environmental impacts on our air.	1278-3	4
An EIS is the only way to insure that the people pf Minnesota can be confident that this precedent-setting expansion can be thoroughly reviewed for the potential environmental impacts on our waters.	1278-4	2
An EIS is the only way to insure that the people pf Minnesota can be confident that this precedent-setting expansion can be thoroughly reviewed for the potential environmental impacts on our the socio-economic impacts on our family-run small dairy farms.	1278-5	397
An EIS is the only way to insure that the people pf Minnesota can be confident that this precedent-setting expansion can be thoroughly reviewed for the potential environmental impacts on our Main Street businesses.	1278-6	397
This mega-dairy concentrates too many cows to be permitted without the in-depth assessment process of an EIS.	1278-7	15
This mega-dairy concentrates too much aquifer-drawn water to be permitted without the in-depth assessment process of an EIS.	1278-8	3
This mega-dairy concentrates too much manure to be permitted without the in-depth assessment process of an EIS.	1278-9	6
Too many cows – there is much conversation about the use of electronic data gathering on individual cows and the enhanced genetics and robotic milking that occurs 3 times a day, however, it is disturbing that a dairy CAFO of this size requires a FACILITY 16: RENDERING DEPOT. That is not a facility necessary on the small family-run dairies where every cow gets looked at twice a day – or gets a seasonal break – where the family can provide the direct assessment of each cow's demeanor and health.	1278-10	434
And what about the air quality for the families living within 1+ miles of this giant dairy?	1278-11	81
What will be the impact of the massive amount of manure produced every day at this Riverview expansion?	1278-12	391

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Too much water – Minnesotans can be sure that the 226 million gallons of water per year required for this expansion will have a significant impact on the health of the aquifer, which is also used for private wells & irrigations wells. There is no data on the MN Dept of Ag website about well testing in the townships of Stevens County, which means there is no base line information about the flow rate or recharge rates of the private wells that could be affected by the dairy's drawn-down of water – a draw-down which is equivalent, per year, of the water use of the entire city of Morris, 5000 people.	1278-13	195
An EIS can be used to determine how this potential use of water by Riverview could impact other water users, an essential piece of information.	1278-14	3
The EIS review can also examine how the cost of the DNR water permitting for the profit of this dairy expansion compares to the cost of water to the city of Morris, ultimately paid by its residents.	1278-15	3
Ultimately who will bear the costs of Riverview's water use...could it be local residents, as happened with Riverview's mega-dairy in Arizona : "Her office (Arizona Attorney General Kris Mayes) has entered an agreement with Riverview LLP, a Minnesota-based dairy company that moved into the area over the last decade and quickly became a major driver of the Willcox groundwater basin's decline. Under the agreement, the company is agreeing to reduce its groundwater usage by fallowing 2,000 acres of land and maintaining best practices to conserve water. The company also agreed to deliver $11 million to residents affected by the company's overpumping that will pay to redrill wells, haul water and ensure the community has access to the critical resource. " https://insideclimatenews.org/news/10012026/arizona-agreement-with-dairy-farm-to-cut-groundwater-pumping/?emci=965383e4-2014-f111-a69a-000d3a57593f&emdi=e81935b0-a116-f111-a69a-000d3a1f0a97&ceid=2641375	1278-16	194
Too much manure -- 18,855 cows will produce approximately 285,000 gallons per day –for a total of 202,744,000 gallons per year. Where will that manure go??	1278-17	346
So far, the manure application maps show that all the fields included in the manure application plan are within one township – Synnes in Stevens County.	1278-18	315
There certainly is a problem with millions of gallons of manure application in such a small area – application that is limited by season.	1278-19	380
There certainly is a problem with millions of gallons of manure application in such a small area – application that is limited by weather conditions.	1278-20	393
There certainly is a problem with millions of gallons of manure application in such a small area – application that is limited by truck travel.	1278-21	390
How can it be possible to spread these millions of gallons of manure in a timely fashion?	1278-22	345
In appropriate ag rates?	1278-23	371
Who will supervise all that data?	1278-24	332
What will happen when adverse conditions require emergency drawdowns of manure in storage?	1278-25	335
How many trucks will it take to haul all that manure?	1278-26	306
How many miles over township and county and state roads will that require?	1278-27	306

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Who will pay those costs? Again, the folks who will profit from this operation will not bear the cost of road maintenance, nor the consequences of manure that must be spread unseasonably.	1278-28	300
An EIS is required to answer these questions and to insure that all worst case scenarios can be mitigated.	1278-29	1
Manure storage is a crap shoot – pardon the pun – and even if "covered" can pose serious health concerns to local residents. Lined concrete pits with covers have a certain half-life. "Concrete..., as told me by someone who actually builds manure pits, " is new or it's leaking."	1278-30	353
Noxious, toxic gases are produced in those storage pits and seep into the air – and charge into the surrounding air when the pits are stirred. Here's the problem… "Manure pits that hold livestock and poultry waste give off foul-smelling toxic air pollutants that can be deadly to farmworkers and local residents, who often are powerless to defend the health of their families from the noxious emissions." https://www.ewg.org/news-insights/news/manure-pits-emit-deadly-pollutants	1278-31	336
Having been part of a data-gathering group monitoring emissions from a local hog barn with a buried pit, I can, from experience, say with certainty that emissions occur. And in dairy barns they occur when barns and milking parlors are cleaned and manure moved to storage lagoons, where all those millions of gallons wait...	1278-32	336
An EIS will give local folks a chance to understand the impact of the expansion on air quality and their health.	1278-33	4
Too much manure spread in a small area also leads to water contamination, and with no baseline water testing in the townships of Stevens County and Synnes Township, in particular, local residents with private wells will have no baseline of nitrate testing to insure that their water is healthy to drink. It seems imperative that the MN Dept of Ag proceed with well testing and MPCA proceed with an EIS.	1278-34	396
Benefits? Really? An EIS will tell.	1278-35	432
The proposers suggest that there will be 40 jobs -- "40 families"-- coming with this expansion, but if you think about who really works on these CAFO sites, most are immigrant men, only a few of whom bring their families from their country of origin. These will not be farm families that can contribute to multiple local and Main Street businesses:	1278-36	432
"...family-scale dairy farms can have a far larger positive economic impact in local communities. That's because they support a broad network of local businesses, from veterinarians and feed suppliers to equipment dealers and milk haulers. When these farms disappear, those economic benefits are lost. Research shows that larger industrial-scale operations tend to spend less locally, concentrating economic activity rather than distributing it across rural communities." Land Stewardship Project Myth Buster, December 2019, "Myth: Mega-Dairies = Mega-Benefits for Rural Communities," https://landstewardshipproject.org/repository/1/3116/myth_buster_56_mega_dairy.pdf	1278-37	398

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
And here's something to think about... do we really want to be the home base to the 5th largest global dairy: "Mega-scale dairy farms are primarily concentrated in China, Saudi Arabia, Russia, the United States, and Southeast Asia. These regions combine access to capital, land, and regulatory frameworks that allow this model of scale. Rank Farm / Farm Group Country Raw milk production (t/year) 1 Mudanjiang Mega Dairy Farm China ≈2,000,000 2 Almarai Saudi Arabia ≈1,470,000 3 Modern Dairy China ≈1,280,000 4 EkoNiva Russia ≈1,200,000 5 Riverview LLP USA ≈800,000–1,000,000 6 Rockview Family Farms USA ≈1,000,000 7 Huishan Dairy China ≈800,000 8 Al Safi Dairy Farm Saudi Arabia ≈550,000 9 Greenfields Dairy Farm Indonesia ≈400,000–450,000 10 Fair Oaks Farms USA ≈350,000–400,000	1278-38	434
Why are European dairy farms absent from the global top 10 ranking? One outcome of this ranking is the absence of European Union dairy farms from the global Top-10. This is not due to missing data, but to structural differences in production models. European dairy farming is dominated by family-owned farms, operating under strict environmental, animal-welfare, and land-use regulations. Scale is achieved primarily through cooperative aggregation, rather than through ultra-large, centrally owned farms. As a result, even Europe's largest individual farms fall well below the production thresholds required for inclusion in a global Top-10 ranking based on raw milk output per farm. Nonetheless, the EU's dairy sector is highly efficient and will be addressed in future articles." https://ruminants.ceva.pro/global-dairy-production	1278-39	434
Maybe we want to think about our first model – "family-owned farms... through cooperative aggregation" :	1278-40	432
"In 1890, the Danish American community in Clarks Grove established one of the first cooperative creameries in Minnesota. The Clarks Grove Cooperative Creamery used new technology and a well-organized cooperative system. It became a model for the Minnesota dairy industry. Ten years later, there were more than 550 cooperative creameries in the state." https://www.minnpost.com/mnopedia/2015/06/banding-together-better-butter-clarks-grove-was-one-minnesota-s-first-cooperative-c/	1278-41	432
So many questions can be answered by an EIS.	1278-42	1
So much more information can be gained by an EIS.	1278-43	1
Clearly we need an EIS for this Riverview Dairy expansion proposal.	1278-44	1
I am concerned about the potential negative impact this expansion would have on our local environment.	1279-1	167
I don't feel like there has been enough information gathered about how this expansion would impact the lives of people living nearby or the overall ecosystem in which it would be located.	1279-2	435
I am opposed to this expansion happening without further study.	1279-3	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I support the Riverview West River expansion.	1280-1	431
I feel like the plan is good and no EIS is needed.	1280-2	20
I support West Riverview expansion	1281-1	431
No EIS Required	1281-2	20
I support west River expansion	1282-1	431
I support the West Riverview expansion.	1283-1	431
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1284-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	1284-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	1284-3	430
I am writing in support of the proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1285-1	431
No EIS is needed as the State Environmental Review process is rigorous and sufficient.	1285-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	1285-3	430
I trust Riverview Way more than small dairy farmers when it comes to operating and upholding integral business practices.	1286-1	431
We respectfully urge the MPCA to follow the process established in law and issue a negative declaration on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement.	1287-1	20
I'm writing in support of the West River Dairy expansion project.	1288-1	431
Agribusiness giant Riverview, LLP (“Riverview”) is the largest dairy farming company in Minnesota, the second largest in the United States, and the fifth largest in the world. Riverview’s proposed West River Dairy Expansion project (the “Expansion Project”) in Stevens County would be the largest dairy Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (“CAFO”) in Minnesota, if approved.	1289-1	434
The Expansion Project would swell the existing West River Dairy 7,855-cow facility by adding 11,000 dairy cows to a total of 18,855 dairy cows (26,397 animal units). The 15,400 animal units added by the Expansion Project—standing alone—would be the second largest CAFO by total animal units in Minnesota. The expanded West River Dairy would be the largest CAFO in the State.	1289-2	434
the Environmental Assessment Worksheet(“EAW”) acknowledges that the Expansion Project would add at least 72,000 tons ofgreenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions annually to the existing West River Dairy facility. Yet the EAW fails to fully (1) account for its full GHG emissions footprint,	1289-3	109
the Environmental Assessment Worksheet(“EAW”) acknowledges that the Expansion Project would add at least 72,000 tons ofgreenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions annually to the existing West River Dairy facility. Yet the EAW fails to fully 2) consider the impacts of those emissions	1289-4	98
the Environmental Assessment Worksheet(“EAW”) acknowledges that the Expansion Project would add at least 72,000 tons ofgreenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions annually to the existing West River Dairy facility. Yet the EAW fails to fully (3) consider alternate ways to mitigate those emissions.	1289-05	114

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Even with the incomplete information contained in the EAW, the MPCA should recognize the potential for significant environmental effects and order an Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") to further examine those effects.	1289-6	1
Fully assessing the GHG emissions of the Expansion Project is especially important because the agriculture sector is the second largest source of GHG emissions in Minnesota, responsible for approximately 25% of the State's net emissions.	1289-7	112
the EAW's assessment of water availability relies upon an aquifer test that is nearly two decades old, and the EAW fails to consider the water quality impacts attendant to appropriating over 200 million gallons of water per year from an aquifer hydrologically connected to the Pomme de Terre River.	1289-8	191
the EAW's plan to protect water quality from the massive amount of manure the Expansion Project will add to the Pomme de Terre River Watershed is inadequate.	1289-9	276
The EAW's cumulative effects analysis does not recognize the poor water quality already existing in this part of Minnesota and how the Expansion Project will exacerbate the problem.	1289-10	410
The EAW must include a full assessment of the cumulative effects of applying so much additional manure to fields in a region where surface waters are already impaired with agricultural pollutants	1289-11	331
This is a major environmental effect the EAW entirely overlooks and one MPCA should study through an EIS	1289-13	1
Minnesota will not meet its GHG emission reduction goals without addressing emissions from massive feedlots like the one proposed.	1289-14	120
The massive amount of water the Expansion Project needs and the manure produced by the additional 11,000 cows risk further degrading water quality in the Pomme de Terre River Watershed.	1289-15	276
The massive amount of water the Expansion Project needs and the manure produced by the additional 11,000 cows risk further degrading other natural resources in the Pomme de Terre River Watershed.	1289-16	276
Riverview's rapidly expanding hoofprint is changing rural Minnesota, driving out small and mid-sized dairies who are unable to compete.	1289-17	400

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
To comply with the law and Minnesota public policy, MPCA must consider whether the Expansion Project has the potential to cause significant environmental effects based on the following criteria, set out in Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7: A. Type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects; This comment will show that, applying these criteria, there is the potential for significant environmental effects from the proposed Expansion Project. Consequently, MPCA must order an EIS. B. Cumulative potential effects, including: i. whether the cumulative potential effect is significant; ii. whether the contribution from the project is significant when viewed in connection with other contributions to the cumulative potential effect; iii. the degree to which the project complies with approved mitigation measures specifically designed to address the cumulative potential effect; and iv. the efforts of the proposer to minimize the contributions from the project; C. the extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority. The RGU may rely only on mitigation measures that are specific and that can be reasonably expected to effectively mitigate the identified environmental impacts of the project; and D. the extent to which environmental effects can be anticipated and controlled as a result of other available environmental studies undertaken by public agencies or the project proposer, including other EISs.	1289-18	21
MPCA MUST ORDER AN EIS BECAUSE THE EXPANSION PROJECT'S GHG EMISSIONS HAVE THE POTENTIAL FOR SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	1289-19	2
The Expansion Project's GHG emissions easily clear the threshold for a full EIS. Riverview's own estimate shows a net increase of 72,210 tons of CO_2e per year and approximately 2.17 million tons of CO_2e over the Expansion Project's 30-year life, primarily from enteric fermentation and manure storage. But that estimate is not the outer bound of the Expansion Project's climate impact; it is likely an understatement.	1289-20	104
The EAW relies on conservative inventory-based modeling, analyzes methane only under a 100-year global warming potential ("GWP"), omits or selectively accounts for substantial lifecycle and scope 3 emissions, and claims mitigation credits that are indefinite, unsupported, or overstated.	1289-21	108
the Expansion Project's emissions must be evaluated against Minnesota's persistently high and increasing agricultural methane and nitrous oxide emissions	1289-22	120
the Expansion Project's emissions must be evaluated against the cumulative nature of climate harm,	1289-23	98
the Expansion Project's emissions must be evaluated against the absence of any meaningful regulatory program that will cap, monitor, or reduce feedlot GHG emissions after approval	1289-24	103
Taken together, the type, extent, irreversibility, cumulative effects, inadequate mitigation, and lack of regulatory control all demonstrate that the Expansion Project has the potential for significant environmental effects and that MPCA must order an EIS.	1289-25	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
While even Riverview's estimate describes exceptionally high emissions, the EAW likely understates the extent of the Expansion Project's GHG emissions.	1289-26	104
The EAW uses the MPCA calculator, which in turn relies on models adopted from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"). The underlying methodology results in conservative estimates, including because the methodology requires assumptions and extrapolations based on representative systems.	1289-27	104
Compared to models of carbon dioxide emissions from the fossil fuel industry, the EPA's models of methane emissions from agriculture are considered far less certain, and the resulting estimates have wide confidence intervals.	1289-28	104
Compared to models of carbon dioxide emissions from the fossil fuel industry, the EPA's models of nitrous oxide emissions from agriculture are considered far less certain, and the resulting estimates have wide confidence intervals.	1289-29	104
Since this "bottom up" approach requires many inputs—each with its own uncertainty—the resulting uncertainty of the total emissions estimate can be more than that of any individual input	1289-30	104
The Expansion Project's EAW should acknowledge the uncertainty of its modeling with an uncertainty range.	1289-31	104
The EAW should also include a sensitivity analysis to model scenarios involving variables such as alternative feeds and high or low productivity cases.	1289-32	104
Another problem with the EAW is that it relies only on a 100-year global warming potential (GWP100) value. Even though under GWP100, methane is converted to CO_2e emissions using a factor of 28 (meaning 1 ton of methane is treated as having the same warming impact as 28 tons of CO_2 over a 100-year period), this approach can still obscure the near-term climate impacts of the Expansion Project's emissions. Given that methane is a short-lived but highly potent GHG, the analysis should also present emissions using a 20-year global warming potential (GWP20), which better reflects the Expansion Project's 30-year operational lifetime and the acute warming effects of methane during that period.	1289-33	108
More critically, the Expansion Project's EAW also misses much of the Expansion Project's scope 3 emissions. A company's GHG emissions can be classified into three scopes: Scope 1 emissions are direct emissions from owned or controlled sources. Scope 2 emissions are indirect emissions from the generation of purchased energy. Scope 3 emissions are all indirect emissions (not included in scope 2) that occur in the value chain of the reporting company, including both upstream and downstream emissions	1289-34	109
the EAW narratively identifies that there will be vehicle emissions from contractor and employee commuting, milk hauling, and feed delivery and discusses strategies to mitigate these, it does not include calculated estimates for these specific transport activities in its 72,210 tons/year total.	1289-35	126
Inexplicably, the EAW does not quantify the total annual GHG emissions generated from feed production, but does quantify a specific reduction (or carbon sink credit) related to growing feed	1289-36	110
the upstream reduction from avoided synthetic fertilizer manufacturing (-9,038 tons) and the carbon sink credit for converting land to alfalfa feed (-2,662 tons) are both included in the total as scope 1 adjustments. Such misleading and erroneous calculation methods result in significant asymmetry.	1289-37	111

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Upstream and downstream emissions are included when they decrease the Expansion Project's reported footprint but excluded when they would increase it. Such one-sided accounting does not provide a complete or balanced picture of the Expansion Project's climate impacts and results in a significant understatement of total emissions.	1289-38	104
By omitting these scope 3 sources of emissions, the EAW likely ignores at least half of the Expansion Project's true GHG emissions.	1289-39	109
the EAW's failure to quantify emissions from feed production is problematic and likely contributing to a significant understatement of emissions.	1289-40	104
Because these scope 3 emissions are both foreseeable and substantial, their exclusion and incomplete reporting thwarts MPCA's ability to evaluate the Expansion Project's true climate impact and its consistency with State climate goals. An EIS is required by law and is necessary to assess these lifecycle emissions and their cumulative effects	1289-41	5
GHG emissions from the Expansion Project pose threats of a type and extent that are significant and harmful to Minnesota's environment. The Expansion Project significantly increases, without effective mitigation or offsets, the emission of GHG pollutants contrary to state policy mandating reductions in all sectors.	1289-42	114
Moreover, the harms associated with the Expansion Project's GHG emissions are long-term, cumulative, and effectively irreversible. Accordingly, the type, extent and irreversibility of these potential effects weigh in favor of determining that the Expansion Project has the potential for significant environmental effects.	1289-43	98
the EAW fails to fully grapple with mitigation methods.	1289-44	114
The mitigation plans included in the EAW are not robust and do not fulfill these requirements.	1289-45	114
While some categories of mitigation Riverview identifies may have value in the abstract—for example, certain feed formulations (such as those with lower crude protein and higher digestibility) can reduce enteric methane emissions from ruminants, as can some feed additives, and feed sources developed through lower carbon intensity practices can reduce total feedlot-associated GHGs —they are largely untested and their mitigation potential is limited	1289-46	114
In trying to apply such mitigation practices here, the EAW lacks evidentiary support and enforceable implementation commitments needed to show that they will meaningfully reduce the Expansion Project's actual emissions.	1289-47	114
The mitigations proposed in the EAW are indefinite and incomplete and cannot be reasonably expected to effectively mitigate the identified environmental impacts of the Expansion Project.	1289-48	114
Several of Riverview's proposed mitigation approaches are flawed and unreliable, including its reliance on emissions reductions from alfalfa conversion and ammonia replacement.	1289-49	116

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
As a threshold matter, the theoretical reductions in emissions from row crop conversion cannot count as "mitigations" for purposes of the MPCA determination because emissions from crop production (scope 3) were not included in the calculation of the Expansion Project's emission total. Riverview cannot claim a benefit from the possible GHG emissions avoided by row crop to alfalfa conversion when the EAW fails to identify crop production emissions as operational emissions. These studies show that the EAW cannot simply treat the alfalfa acreage as a fixed, annual emissions-negative credit without further support. Rather than a mitigation that reduces the Expansion Project's emissions, the alfalfa conversion merely generates fewer emissions for the Expansion Project than row crops would.	1289-50	116
The EAW's claim of net negative emission from feed production seems to stem from the following erroneous assumption: The nearby cropland that will be used for feed production for the Project is already in crop production. Since the Project will not trigger new crop production and will create a market for crops already being grown, a reduction in GHG emissions is anticipated due to the shorter transportation distance of those crops to the Project. This assumption ignores the reality that, by removing the supply of row crops already in production to feed the Expansion Project's cattle, market forces will replace the displaced row crops production in another location.	1289-51	117
This indirect land-use change may result in even greater emissions than the emissions reduction from the alfalfa conversion.	1289-52	116
the EAW's alfalfa credit is unsupported because it assumes that 2,200 acres of alfalfa represent a durable conversion from row crops to an emissions-negative feed source.	1289-53	116
it is unclear whether the Expansion Project would actually convert permanent row-crop acreage to long-term alfalfa production, or merely introduce alfalfa temporarily within existing row-crop rotations.	1289-54	116
The EAW does not disclose whether its alfalfa credit is net of N_2O emissions, whether it assumes any site-specific soil carbon sequestration, or whether it accounts for carbon removed from fields through repeated alfalfa harvests and later converted to CO_2 and methane when used as cattle feed.	1289-55	116
The Expansion Project cannot claim alfalfa as an emissions-negative feed source while failing to evaluate the GHG emissions generated by producing, harvesting, and fertilizing that alfalfa.	1289-56	116
The EAW also claims that replacing ammonia fertilizer used on farms in surrounding areas with manure generated by the Expansion Project will mitigate the Expansion Project's emissions, because ammonia from other sources would likely be produced through the energy-intensive Haber-Bosch process. However, the EAW's modeling of emissions from the electricity required by the Haber-Bosch process relies on an emissions factor for the Midwest Reliability Organization West ("MROW") region. The EAW claims that manure generated by the Expansion Project will replace approximately 1,545 tons per year of anhydrous ammonia and therefore reduce emissions by 9,038 tons CO_2 per year. But the EAW does not establish what synthetic fertilizer products are currently used on the receiving fields, where those fertilizers are produced, whether the displaced product would in fact be anhydrous ammonia, or whether manure application would displace synthetic fertilizer on a one-for-one basis. These omissions matter because, while Minnesota is a major ammonia-consuming state, it appears to have no in-state ammonia production facilities: nearly all ammonia fertilizer used in Minnesota is produced outside the State and transported long distances, often from the Gulf Coast	1289-57	117

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
At minimum, the EAW should identify the baseline fertilizer products used on the relevant fields, the likely production region and fuel mix for those products, and the amount of synthetic fertilizer that would actually be displaced before treating ammonia replacement as a fixed emissions reduction.	1289-58	117
The EAW's modeling also assumes that the emissions factor for electricity generation will remain constant throughout the Expansion Project's lifespan. A more accurate model would take into account likely future emissions intensity reductions for the Haber-Bosch process to produce ammonia. Along with many states within the MROW region, Minnesota has reduced emissions from electricity generation over recent decades and has adopted climate goals to further reduce those emissions. For example, Minnesota reduced its GHG emissions from electricity generation by 50% from 2005 to 2022, and the "Minnesota Legislature adopted a new Clean Electricity Standard that requires electric utilities to provide net-zero, or 100% carbon-free, electricity by 2040." More accurate modeling would reduce the scale of the mitigation from the Expansion Project's area ammonia replacement.	1289-59	117
Other mitigation methods proposed in the EAW lack quantified emissions reductions, are theoretically flawed, and/or lack adequate supporting evidence.	1289-60	114
The EAW fails to provide any research on potential emissions reductions from the crossbred Holstein-Jersey cows that will be used in the Expansion Project.	1289-61	118
The EAW also claims that the Expansion Project will employ efficient feed practices, "including research and use of feed additives such as Rumensin, to reduce GHG emissions by up to 4,365 tons CO_2e per year." Yet the EAW provides zero citations or research on potential emissions reductions from efficient feed practices or feed additives, making it unclear why the EAW mentions Rumensin specifically and how Riverview calculated the alleged reduction of 4,365 tons CO_2e.	1289-62	25
Most importantly, this line of reasoning is legally and analytically irrelevant to MPCA's obligations. The argument assumes that denying or conditioning this Expansion Project would result in increased production elsewhere, rather than reduced demand, substitution, or shifts in consumption. Such leakage-style arguments rest on speculative and unsupported assumptions about global market responses. The EAW provides no basis for making these assumptions.	1289-63	25
The Minnesota Supreme Court held in Citizens Advocating Responsible Development v. Kandiyohi County Board of Commissioners that an RGU may not rely on vague or unsupported mitigation concepts. Riverview is making a generalized claim that the Expansion Project is preferable to an imagined alternative production scenario somewhere else in the global dairy market. This argument does not reduce the Expansion Project's actual emissions. It does not impose any enforceable operational requirement. It does not identify a specific avoided source. And it does not provide substantial evidence that any claimed global emissions reduction will occur. At most, it is a policy argument about the relative efficiency of North American dairy production. It cannot be treated as mitigation, cannot offset the Expansion Project's quantified GHG emissions, and cannot support a negative EIS determination. Accepting such reasoning would effectively allow any high-emitting project to evade scrutiny by asserting that emissions might be higher elsewhere, undermining the purpose of environmental review entirely.	1289-64	25

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The EAW does not consider scenarios that improve manure management. Approaches such as these have been shown to reduce GHG emissions from animal agriculture	1289-65	115
The EAW does not consider scenarios that build out renewable energy. Approaches such as these have been shown to reduce GHG emissions from animal agriculture	1289-66	115
The EAW does not consider scenarios that improve livestock conditions. Approaches such as these have been shown to reduce GHG emissions from animal agriculture	1289-67	115
Despite the Expansion Project's significant and continuous energy demands and emissions, the EAW does not quantify potential emissions reductions from these readily available and increasingly cost-effective strategies	1289-68	115
Despite the Expansion Project's significant and continuous energy demands and emissions, the EAW does not evaluate their feasibility or effectiveness.	1289-69	115
Without that information, MPCA and the public cannot determine whether feasible mitigation measures could materially reduce the Expansion Project's emissions; whether the EAW's proposed mitigation is adequate, durable, or enforceable; or whether the Expansion Project's GHG impacts can be reduced below the level of significance.	1289-70	115
The Expansion Project will use clay-lined basins with impermeable covers to collect and store manure and wastewater, with liquid manure subsequently land applied as fertilizer on cropland. As such, the Expansion Project's manure management system will be a major and persistent source of methane and nitrous oxide emissions.	1289-71	103
The EAW entirely fails to discuss alternatives, such as dry or composting systems, that can significantly reduce methane emissions.	1289-72	115
the scale of the proposed operation—generating over 200 million gallons of manure and wastewater annually—means that even marginal per-unit emission rates will translate into substantial absolute emissions increases over time.	1289-73	101
Although manure can displace some synthetic fertilizer use, its application—particularly at the volumes contemplated here—increases the risk of nitrous oxide emissions from soils, especially under conditions of excess nitrogen,.	1289-74	119
Although manure can displace some synthetic fertilizer use, its application—particularly at the volumes contemplated here—increases the risk of nitrous oxide emissions from soils, especially under conditions of variable weather.	1289-75	119
Although manure can displace some synthetic fertilizer use, its application—particularly at the volumes contemplated here—increases the risk of nitrous oxide emissions from soils, especially under conditions of saturated soils.	1289-76	119
nutrient runoff associated with over-application or extreme precipitation events contributes to downstream water quality degradation, which in turn can drive secondary GHG emissions, including nitrous oxide from aquatic systems.	1289-77	102
The EAW fails to adequately evaluate whether the surrounding cropland can consistently and safely absorb the Expansion Project's manure supply.	1289-78	313
At the same time, the EAW does not provide a field-by-field nutrient balance, distance-weighted transport analysis, or average and maximum manure movement distances.	1289-79	328
Nor does it quantify the emissions associated with pumping, transferring, hauling, or otherwise moving manure to those fields.	1289-80	127

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
the EAW does not demonstrate that the Expansion Project's manure can be applied at agronomic rates each year without increasing nitrous oxide or transport-related emissions, and runoff risk and other pollution.	1289-81	154
Renewable energy buildout is another concrete mitigation pathway the EAW should have evaluated, rather than treating renewable electricity as a contingent, market-dependent offset.	1289-82	115
The Expansion Project will create substantial ongoing electricity and fuel demand for cross-ventilated barns, milking and milk-cooling operations, ventilation systems, pumps, lighting, manure handling, and related equipment; yet the EAW does not model whether those loads could be reduced through on-site solar arrays, dedicated wind procurement or development, electrification of diesel-powered machinery and other farm equipment, or battery storage and demand-response measures to manage peak loads and maximize on-site renewable use	1289-83	402
The EAW fails to evaluate alternative livestock management approaches.	1289-84	30
This omission is significant because different production systems—such as pasture-based or hybrid models, reduced stocking densities, distributed smaller-scale operations, or alternative manure handling systems—can materially alter both the magnitude and intensity of GHG emissions,.	1289-85	115
This omission is significant because different production systems—such as pasture-based or hybrid models, reduced stocking densities, distributed smaller-scale operations, or alternative manure handling systems—can materially alter the associated environmental.	1289-86	162
This omission is significant because different production systems—such as pasture-based or hybrid models, reduced stocking densities, distributed smaller-scale operations, or alternative manure handling systems—can materially alter public health impacts.	1289-87	395
An adequate environmental review would assess whether feasible alternatives could achieve similar production objectives with lower emissions and reduced risk.	1289-88	30
the EAW fails to identify any ways in which the Expansion Project would be subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority or any other mitigation measures that could reasonably be expected to effectively mitigate the significant increase in GHG emissions from the Expansion Project. This factor weighs in favor of requiring an EIS.	1289-89	5
The Expansion Project's GHG emissions must be considered in the context of its cumulative potential effects.	1289-90	98
Although the EAW quantifies the Expansion Project's operational GHG emissions at 72,210 tons CO_2e/year, the actual cumulative potential effects analysis in Item 21 does not discuss climate impacts at all	1289-91	98
Item 21 defines the "Environmentally Relevant Area" as the Expansion Project site, the dedicated manure application acreage for the Expansion Project and existing facility, and a one-mile radius around the off-site well, then limits the cumulative discussion to overlapping manure application and groundwater extraction. That is not a cumulative climate analysis.	1289-92	24
It does not evaluate whether the Expansion Project's substantial annual GHG emissions will combine with existing and reasonably foreseeable emissions from other animal agriculture operations to affect the same climate resource.	1289-93	98
As a result, the Expansion Project's emissions will cause irreversible environmental harm that cannot be fully mitigated after the fact.	1289-94	81

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
By adding tens of thousands of tons of CO_2-equivalent emissions annually over the Expansion Project's lifetime, the Expansion Project will contribute meaningfully to climate change.	1289-95	103
Thus, the Expansion Project's GHG emissions will aggravate the consequences of climate change in Minnesota.	1289-96	103
The Expansion Project's emissions will contribute to increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events, including heavy rainfall. These impacts are particularly relevant in Minnesota, where recent trends show increasing precipitation intensity and temperature.	1289-97	100
The Expansion Project's emissions will contribute to increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events, including flooding. These impacts are particularly relevant in Minnesota, where recent trends show increasing precipitation intensity and temperature.	1289-98	100
The Expansion Project's emissions will contribute to increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events, including heat waves. These impacts are particularly relevant in Minnesota, where recent trends show increasing precipitation intensity and temperature.	1289-99	100
The Expansion Project's emissions will contribute to increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events, including drought. These impacts are particularly relevant in Minnesota, where recent trends show increasing precipitation intensity and temperature.	1289-100	100
The EAW does not quantify economic climate damages, such as by providing a social cost of carbon, and does not compare the Expansion Project's emissions to state-sector reduction needs.	1289-101	398
These challenges and deficiencies underscore the urgent need for MPCA to require an EIS that fully evaluates GHG emissions from the proposed feedlot.	1289-102	5
The EAW, both on its face and in what it failed to disclose, demonstrates that the Expansion Project has the potential for significant environmental effects from its contribution to increasing levels of GHG emissions.	1289-103	103
Emissions from the Expansion Project are not effectively mitigated or offset; and they are contrary to Minnesota law and policy directing steep reductions in emissions.	1289-104	120
Because the Expansion Project has the potential for significant environmental effects, the MPCA must order an EIS.	1289-105	1
DNR has not conducted any independent or separate environmental review to justify a water appropriation permit for the proposed Expansion Project and is instead relying on this draft EAW. No analysis is provided in the EAW to justify the water appropriation other than the 2007 Aquifer Report.	1289-106	190
The EAW claims that environmental impacts from this plan have been considered and mitigated. But this claim rests upon an outdated aquifer report that considers old information that tells an incomplete story about the environmental impacts of Riverview's water allocation plan.	1289-107	191
Because the potential for significant environmental effects from Riverview's water appropriation is high, MPCA must prepare an EIS.	1289-108	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
These pumping restrictions are to remain in place for Riverview, and the EAW leans on the 2007 Aquifer Report to explain away environmental concerns associated with the proposed water allocation. However, for multiple reasons the accuracy of the 2007 Report has faded with time, resulting in the potential for significant environmental effects not considered and resolved by the 2007 Aquifer Report.	1289-109	192
There are many reasons to doubt the continued utility of the 2007 Aquifer Report. First, the 2007 Aquifer Report uses pre-2007 data and conditions to reach conclusions about protecting the river and natural resources. For example, the report helps justify permit conditions curtailing withdrawals to protect the Pomme de Terre River when flow drops to 31 cubic feet per second ("CFS"), the rate determined in 2007 to be when adverse impacts occur.	1289-110	191
Second, since 2007, new wells have been dug into the same surficial aquifer that Riverview seeks to access. Well data from the Minnesota Department of Health shows new wells drilled in 2023 and 2013 that are close in proximity to the Off-Site Well. These are active irrigation wells that permitted to access the same water source years after the 2007 Aquifer Test was completed. Because the wells did not exist when the study was completed, the 2007 Aquifer Test's conclusion that the well pump rate will not cause interference drawdown in existing wells or impacts to nearby wetlands is no longer trustworthy.	1289-111	222
Third, the quality of the data is low.	1289-112	192
Concerns about well interference, but not groundwater sustainability, motivated the search for a different source of water. Presently, however, DNR recognizes that there are "potential sustainability concerns" in the surficial aquifer, and that the buried aquifer system in this region of the state "is likely over-allocated	1289-113	190
These recent findings undermine the credibility of the 2007 Aquifer Report, which did not cite groundwater sustainability as a risk from the appropriation.	1289-114	191
There are also multiple reasons why the Expansion Project's proposed water allocation has the potential for significant environmental effects despite the 2007 Aquifer Report	1289-115	3
First, the 2007 Aquifer Report does not address the potential water quality impacts from withdrawing 226 MGY from an aquifer hydrologically connected to the Pomme de Terre River.	1289-116	190
Second, the appropriation demand on the surficial aquifer has not been adequately reviewed	1289-117	190
The EAW does not discuss these new wells, pointing instead to the 2007 Aquifer Report as proof that the requested appropriation is sustainable.	1289-118	192
Last, the EAW does not address the impact altered hydrology has on river flow and thus whether the flow-based permit conditions will protect natural resources.	1289-119	216
An updated aquifer test is needed to properly evaluate potential negative impacts to groundwater quantity and quality resulting from the Expansion Project, and MPCA should analyze the results of that test within an EIS.	1289-120	3
This is a mistake. As DNR pointed out in its own comments on the EAW, the two aquifers are part of one connected system, and "water availability from these aquifers is limited." Failing to fully describe the water appropriation from the on-site wells is a significant flaw in the EAW, and makes it more difficult to determine what the impacts of the Off-Site Well's water withdrawals will be on local groundwater resources.	1289-122	191

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The 2008 water appropriation permit for the Off-Site Well contains restrictions on pumping under certain flow conditions in the Pomme de Terre River, and these would be expected to also be incorporated into the new permit. If pumping needs to be restricted, Riverview's plan is to use two water storage basins as a contingency measure, which would be filled from both the Off-Site Well and from stormwater collection. This plan is not sufficient, and creates a serious risk that Riverview could overdraw from the Off-Site Well even when flow conditions are poor.	1289-123	436
An additional reason for caution is that Riverview has a history of causing groundwater depletion.	1289-124	195
The EAW fails to accurately capture and mitigate the risks the Expansion Project has on water quality. Because of the potential for significant environmental effects on water quality	1289-125	193
MPCA should require the Expansion Project to complete an EIS.	1289-126	1
the EAW covering the proposed Expansion Project does not consider impacts from any pollutants other than nutrients.	1289-127	352
The potential for adverse water quality impacts from other pollutants must be weighed in an EIS, especially because waters adjacent to the Expansion Project area are already impaired by E. coli and other pollutants associated with mega-dairy operations.	1289-128	2
Riverview's plan to store manure and process wastewater from the proposed expansion in clay-lined basins is likely to cause significant environmental impacts that warrant consideration in an EIS.	1289-129	9
the EAW does not contemplate that Riverview will conduct any monitoring to detect whether its clay liners are continually performing as designed. Clay lines, without monitoring, provide no assurance that Riverview's lagoons will not contaminate groundwater, and clay liners absent monitoring is an insufficient mitigation	1289-130	355
Failure to impose discharge monitoring requirements is particularly concerning at the Expansion Project site because groundwater within the vicinity of the dairy is hydraulically connected to the Pomme de Terre River.	1289-131	190
Even if Riverview is able to maintain compliance with the permeability limit, the proposed lagoons are so large that they will leach substantial amounts of pollution over the lifetime of the Expansion Project.	1289-132	354
Pollution that leaches to the subsurface is liable to contaminate not only soil and groundwater surrounding the basins, but also the Pomme de Terre River via subsurface hydrological discharges. MPCA must require that Riverview install synthetic liners with leak detection—as it has agreed to do for its Abercrombie Dairy in North Dakota —to protect against subsurface discharges and the environmental hazards caused by such discharges	1289-133	244
MPCA must further investigate the interconnection between the basin sites and surface waters in the Pomme de Terre River basin before making a decision on the proposed Expansion Project.	1289-134	252
If Riverview is permitted to store its waste in basins that are designed to—and will—leach pollutants to the subsurface, then its stormwater storage plans are seriously flawed.	1289-135	252
Of note, Commenters are limited in their ability to assess impacts that would result from Riverview's stormwater management because the facility's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan was not included in materials made available for public comment.	1289-136	288

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
at least one problem is evident from the EAW materials that were made available. Riverview plans to install a drain tile system to "control seasonal subsurface saturation" near the 35.2 acres of liquid manure storage basins where Riverview proposes to store nearly 150 million gallons of additional liquid manure. This subsurface water will be diverted to one of the on-site storage basins and then released directly into the environment via a series of drainage ditches that ultimately flow to the Pomme de Terre River.	1289-137	275
Riverview's repeated claims that this stormwater is "clean" are belied by their plan to construct the manure basins out of permeable (i.e. leaky) clay. Water that seeps into the ground surrounding the basins will be exposed to pollutants—including nitrates, dangerous pathogens, and pharmaceuticals that breed antibiotic resistant bacteria—that inevitably leach from the basins.	1289-138	287
Though the EAW makes vague references to "treatment" of this stormwater (an unnecessary step if the water were truly clean, as Riverview claims), but provides no details that allow Commenters or any other members of the public to evaluate the effectiveness of such treatment. This alone provides a sufficient justification for a harder look at the environmental impacts of the proposed expansion in an EIS.	1289-139	287
The EAW does not consider how leaks from the hoses it uses to pump waste to these fields could impact water quality, nor are there monitoring requirements to ensure any such leaks are discovered and stopped in a timely manner	1289-140	344
The additional runoff caused by the expansion combined with subsurface leaching from the manure storage basins is likely to significantly increase cumulative impacts on the watershed	1289-141	255
These impacts need to be fully assessed and disclosed to the public in an EIS before MPCA makes a decision about Riverview's expansion application.	1289-142	1
The EAW is also incomplete because, in violation of the Minnesota Rules, it fails to analyze the Expansion's cumulative potential effects on water quality from manure application	1289-143	331
To comply with MEPA, MPCA cannot simply proclaim that the Expansion Project will have no cumulative effects on water quality—it must take a hard look at the potential for significant environmental effects. Thus far, it has not done so.	1289-144	409
This region of the Pomme de Terre River Watershed has the most stretches of impaired waters and the highest nutrient concentrations and turbidity levels.	1289-145	266
The EAW merely suggests that farmers who receive manure to be spread in areas near surface water with already phosphorus-polluted waters will follow the Feedlot Permit rules for land application, with testing every 4 years. But even if all recipients do follow the permit rules, those rules do not attempt to eliminate all water pollution from land application of manure. Some pollution will certainly occur, and there is no consideration in the EAW for the downstream effects on the already polluted water.	1289-146	289
The EAW ignores the cumulative and compounding increases in nitrate and phosphorus pollution, that an Expansion Project would contribute.	1289-147	256
The EAW overlooks the broader context of intensive regional agricultural activity	1289-148	400
The EAW and minimizes the significant additional pollution that an Expansion Project would contribute.	1289-149	146

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This omission understates the true environmental harm and risks, allowing further degradation of already vulnerable water resources.	1289-150	416
B. The EAW Does Not Adequately Address The Cumulative Effects Of Manure From All Feedlots In The Region	1289-151	331
The EAW, however, contains only a superficial and incomplete cumulative effects analysis regarding manure application in an already impaired watershed.	1289-152	331
The concern about manure over-application, however, is waived away entirely by pointing to the number of acres local producers have made available to receive the Expansion Project's manure.	1289-153	371
This is an entirely insufficient analysis.	1289-154	26
it wholly ignores on-the-ground data from this region of the state that reveals 73% of fields received an over-supply of manure,	1289-155	371
Riverview will not be able to guarantee that farmers follow best management practices or apply at agronomic rates.	1289-156	371
Manure runoff is well known to contaminate surface waters with nitrate, phosphorus, ammonia, and fecal coliform bacteria (like E.coli), which can make water undrinkable, harm fish, cause algal blooms, and destroy aquatic habitats.	1289-157	272
The EAW also makes no attempt to examine how the combination of manure from the Expansion Project and manure from the approximately 96,300 animal units in the Pomme de Terre River Watershed will affect water quality	1289-158	256
The draft EAW itself fails to analyze many of the cumulative impacts, but publicly available information in the form of many agency studies over many years demonstrates the potential for significant environmental impacts on water quality from the addition of an enormous industrial feedlot in an already heavily impacted watershed. This must be studied in a detailed EIS that seriously considers alternatives before MPCA can permit the proposed project.	1289-159	2
VI. MPCA MUST CONSIDER THE IMPACT THE EXPANSION PROJECT WILL HAVE ON THE DAIRY MARKET AND NEARBY ECONOMIES	1289-160	398
Consolidation impacts pricing and the ability for smaller dairies to access markets.	1289-161	398
Consolidation in industrial farming and agribusiness presents very significant economic and social repercussions for rural families and communities.	1289-162	397
A mistake was made by scheduling the public informational meeting in too small of a venue. I was an hour early and there were less than 10 scattered seats available.	1290-1	22
Ground water is a finate resource and there are already other large water usage industries in Steven's County.	1290-2	195
More and more farm land is being tiled which quickly drains rain water off the field so it is no longer seeping into the ground to replenish the ground water.	1290-3	245
Extreme weather events are becoming more common due to climate change. Was there any reported manure over flow from the pit when Morris was hit with 16" of rain?	1290-4	124
This expansion will put to much stress on the water table and other environmental impacts that will not be good.	1291-1	195
Water is not a renewable resource. It is the new gold for our lifetime and for our children and grandchildren. It affects much more than Riverview.	1292-1	231
Ease at the very least require an Environmental Impact Assessment Study.	1292-2	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
My name is Jamalea Martelle, and I am writing in support of requiring the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to conduct a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Riverview LLP's proposed West River Dairy Expansion.	1293-1	1
I have had the privilege of experiencing this landscape through time spent with my husband and his family along the Pomme de Terre watershed and surrounding lands. Through waterfowl hunting, whitetail deer hunting, and time spent outdoors in this region, I have created lasting memories and developed a deep appreciation for the ecological value of this watershed and the wildlife it supports.	1293-2	403
These experiences have also allowed me to witness the growing pressures placed on these landscapes over time. The Pomme de Terre watershed and nearby wetlands are vital habitat for migratory birds, deer, and countless other species that rely on these increasingly fragmented areas for survival.	1293-3	173
Protecting these lands and waters matters not only for conservation, but for the future generations who deserve the opportunity to experience and connect with these places the same way we have.	1293-4	403
Given the unprecedented size of this proposed CAFO I believe a full Environmental Impact Statement is necessary.	1293-5	1
Given the enormous water demand I believe a full Environmental Impact Statement is necessary.	1293-6	1
Given the proximity to already impaired waterways I believe a full Environmental Impact Statement is necessary.	1293-7	1
Given the proximity protected wildlife areas, I believe a full Environmental Impact Statement is necessary.	1293-8	1
Minnesotans deserve a transparent and comprehensive review of the potential impacts to groundwater before any decisions are made.	1293-9	191
Minnesotans deserve a transparent and comprehensive review of the potential impacts to surface water before any decisions are made.	1293-10	289
Minnesotans deserve a transparent and comprehensive review of the potential impacts to wildlife habitat before any decisions are made.	1293-11	76
An EIS is a reasonable request for a project of this magnitude. It is a responsible step toward ensuring long-term protection of Minnesota's land, water, wildlife, and rural communities.	1293-14	1
An Environmental Assessment Worksheet for a Confined Animal Feedlot Operation of this size is insufficient and an Environmental Impact Statement must be ordered.	1294-1	15
The EAW is largely prepared with information provided by the petitioner and their contractors and is only focused on the CAFO in question. This casts the permitted activity in the best possible light and glosses over any negative impacts.	1294-2	432
An in independent assessment that includes this CAFO, the other CAFOs in the area and the impaired waterways in the affected watershed must be performed.	1294-3	18
The amount of water that is requested alone should trigger an EIS.	1294-4	3
The amount nitrogen rich manure that will be applied through the watershed should trigger an EIS.	1294-5	2
The manure is applied largely in the fall when it has the greatest potential to leach nitrates into surrounding wells and waterways before it can be utilized by crops 6 months later in the summer.	1294-6	340

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
No one is against progress, but when industrial agriculture progresses to this size then it needs to be regulated just like any other industry.	1294-7	434
I urge acceptance of the EAW as published, without requiring preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.	1295-1	20
We are residents of western Minnesota, eastern North Dakota, and eastern South Dakota, representing generations of farmers, business owners, and communities writing to share our strong support for Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion	1296-1	431
We respectfully encourage you to rely on the extensive environmental review already underway and the strong record of stewardship demonstrated by Riverview.	1296-2	20
Based on the proven track record of Riverview and the safeguards provided through the EAW process; this expansion does not warrant a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	1297-1	20
I respectfully encourage the MPCA to consider their outstanding environmental record and support the proposed West River Dairy expansion.	1297-2	431
Minnesota Has Never Seen Anything Like This. That Is Precisely the Point.	1298-1	434
Minnesota dairy farming is woven into the identity of this state. On a typical Minnesota dairy in 2025, a family averages fewer than the average 280 cows. They know their herd. They know their neighbors. They know the watershed. They have made generations of careful decisions about how much to take from the land and how much to give back.	1298-2	434
What Riverview, LLP is proposing is not a larger version of that farm. It is not a bigger barn or an extra milking parlor. What Riverview is proposing is a facility that would house 18,855 dairy cattle, totaling 26,397 animal units, in a single location. That is nearly double the size of the next largest livestock operation in the entire state of Minnesota. It is more than 60 times the size of the average Minnesota dairy. It would be, from the day it opens, the largest livestock facility Minnesota has ever seen.	1298-3	434
This is not a farm expansion. This is the industrialization of Minnesota agriculture at a scale this state has never confronted and is entirely unprepared to regulate without a comprehensive Environmental Impact Study.	1298-4	15
And here is what we know with certainty, backed by decades of peer-reviewed science: at this scale, in this concentration, the environmental consequences of a dairy operation are categorically different from what an average family operation of the average 280 cows produces. The water impacts are different.	1298-5	133
And here is what we know with certainty, backed by decades of peer-reviewed science: at this scale, in this concentration, the environmental consequences of a dairy operation are categorically different from what an average family operation of the average 280 cows produces. The air quality impacts are different.	1298-6	81
And here is what we know with certainty, backed by decades of peer-reviewed science: at this scale, in this concentration, the environmental consequences of a dairy operation are categorically different from what an average family operation of the average 280 cows produces. The public health risks are different.	1298-7	395

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
And here is what we know with certainty, backed by decades of peer-reviewed science: at this scale, in this concentration, the environmental consequences of a dairy operation are categorically different from what an average family operation of the average 280 cows produces. The threat to neighboring farms is different.	1298-8	400
And here is what we know with certainty, backed by decades of peer-reviewed science: at this scale, in this concentration, the environmental consequences of a dairy operation are categorically different from what an average family operation of the average 280 cows produces. The threat to rural communities is different.	1298-9	397
Minnesota's families, farmers, rural residents, schoolchildren, and people who draw their water from the aquifers and streams of the affected watershed deserve to know what those differences are before the facility is built. Not after. Not once have the wells been drawn down, and the manure lagoons have been constructed, and the 26,000 animal units are in place, and the consequences have become irreversible.	1298-10	32
The demand before you today is the most modest, reasonable, legally grounded request that can be made in the face of a proposal this large: conduct a full Environmental Impact Study before a single shovel breaks ground.	1298-11	15
The evidence in this matter is not drawn from a single study, a fringe journal, or an advocacy organization. It represents the convergent findings of dozens of independent, peer-reviewed scientific studies conducted across the United States, Europe, Asia, New Zealand, and Latin America. Wherever researchers have examined what happens when dairy operations reach mega-scale, they have found the same patterns. What follows is the story that evidence tells, about water, health, the land, and the communities that depend on all three.	1298-12	432
To understand why 26,397 animal units in one place is qualitatively different from the average 280 cows on a family farm, consider the arithmetic of waste. A single dairy cow produces approximately 120 pounds of manure per day. Riverview's proposed facility, with 18,855 dairy cattle, would generate on the order of over one million pounds of manure every single day, waste that must be stored in lagoons, applied to fields, and managed in a watershed that has never absorbed anything remotely close to that volume.	1298-13	391
The science of nutrient loading is precise on this point. As dairy intensity expands in a watershed, phosphorus loads, the primary driver of toxic algal blooms, have been shown to increase by as much as 91%.[Waller et al., 2021] Now multiply those impacts by the difference between an average 280- cow farm and an 18,855-cow facility.	1298-14	272
Studies measuring stream water quality downstream of dairy CAFOs found dissolved nitrogen concentrations eight times higher downstream than upstream during manure application periods. [Sousan et al., 2021] Now multiply those impacts by the difference between an average 280- cow farm and an 18,855-cow facility.	1298-15	272
Manure lagoons, which a facility of this size would require at a massive scale, have been documented contributing between 6% and 12.6% of a region's total groundwater nitrogen load while occupying just 0.8% of the land surface. [Baram et al., 2014] Now multiply those impacts by the difference between an average 280- cow farm and an 18,855-cow facility.	1298-16	354
Minnesota's rural communities depend on groundwater. The families, farms, and small towns near the proposed facility draw their drinking water from wells. Those wells tap the same aquifer system that a facility of this scale would draw upon and potentially contaminate.	1298-17	193

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The science is unambiguous about what mega dairies do to groundwater. Nitrate concentrations beneath dairy operations have been measured at an average of approximately 64 mg/L, nearly three times the EPA's maximum contaminant level of 10 mg/L for drinking water. [Harter et al., 2002]	1298-18	193
The science is unambiguous about what mega dairies do to groundwater. In California's Central Valley, a region with significant experience with large dairy operations, dairies are identified as major contributors to domestic well contamination. [van der Schans et al., 2009]	1298-19	193
And contamination is not limited to nitrates. Groundwater near dairy operations has been found to contain antibiotic-resistant bacteria and genes [Meyer et al., 2024]. These are not isolated findings. They are a consistent pattern that repeats wherever mega dairy operations and aquifers intersect, and Minnesota's aquifers would be no exception.	1298-20	193
And contamination is not limited to nitrates. Groundwater near dairy operations has been found to contain antibiotic-resistant bacteria and genes [Meyer et al., 2024]. These are not isolated findings. They are a consistent pattern that repeats wherever mega dairy operations and aquifers intersect, and Minnesota's aquifers would be no exception.	1298-21	193
And contamination is not limited to nitrates. Groundwater near dairy operations has been found to contain antibiotic-resistant bacteria and genes [Meyer et al., 2024]. These are not isolated findings. They are a consistent pattern that repeats wherever mega dairy operations and aquifers intersect, and Minnesota's aquifers would be no exception.	1298-22	193
And contamination is not limited to nitrates. Groundwater near dairy operations has been found to contain PFAS, the "forever chemicals". [Wang et al., 2025] These are not isolated findings. They are a consistent pattern that repeats wherever mega dairy operations and aquifers intersect, and Minnesota's aquifers would be no exception.	1298-23	234
Critically, the research documents that groundwater contamination from intensive livestock farming can have legacy effects with lag times exceeding 20 years.[Kim et al., 2021] The full consequences of today's permitting decisions may not fully appear in Minnesota's water supply for two decades. By the time the harm is visible, the facility will be entrenched, the contamination will be established, and the opportunity to prevent it will be gone.	1298-24	205
Minnesota's lakes, rivers, and streams are not just ecological assets; they are cultural and economic ones. The state's identity, its tourism economy, its fishing heritage, and its agricultural water supply all depend on the quality of surface water in its watersheds.	1298-25	265
The nutrient loads from a facility of 26,397 animal units, the manure would enter Minnesota's watershed through multiple pathways.	1298-26	290
The nutrient loads from a facility of 26,397 animal units, the effluent from milking operations would enter Minnesota's watershed through multiple pathways. The science documents what happens when those loads arrive.	1298-27	272
The nutrient loads from a facility of 26,397 animal units, the effluent from milking operations would enter Minnesota's watershed through multiple pathways. The science documents what happens when those loads arrive.	1298-28	272
The science documents what happens when those loads arrive. Phosphorus and nitrogen fuel eutrophication: the systematic suffocation of aquatic ecosystems by algae that strip oxygen from the water, killing fish, generating toxic blooms, fouling drinking water sources, and degrading the ecological function of lakes and rivers for generations.	1298-29	272

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Pathogens follow the same runoff pathways. E. coli O157:H7, Cryptosporidium, Giardia, and fecal coliforms enter waterways through manure runoff and field applications [Mohammed et al., 2023; Mausbach et al., 2025], creating direct risks for downstream communities. Minnesota's fishing culture and recreational water economy have no margin for this.	1298-30	265
Pharmaceutical residues, such as estrogens, NSAIDs, and antibiotic compounds, are routinely detected in surface water runoff from manure-amended fields at concentrations sufficient to cause endocrine disruption in aquatic organisms. [Havens et al., 2020; Hill et al., 2021] Minnesota's fishing culture and recreational water economy have no margin for this.	1298-31	265
The people who would live within one to two miles of this proposed facility farm families, rural residents, schoolchildren, elderly neighbors face documented health risks that accumulate with proximity and time.	1298-32	395
Air quality monitoring at homes within a quarter mile of industrial dairy operations found ammonia concentrations eight times higher and cow allergen concentrations sixty times higher than at homes three miles away. [Williams et al., 2011]	1298-33	394
Children with asthma demonstrate measurable declines in lung function on the day after elevated CAFO emissions events. [Loftus et al., 2020]	1298-34	394
Adults with COPD experience acute lung function drops exceeding 20% following ammonia spikes from nearby operations. [van Kersen et al., 2020]	1298-35	394
Residents within 1.5 miles show significantly higher rates of asthma, allergies, and persistent lung function decline. [Schultz et al., 2019]	1298-36	394
In regions with high livestock density, physicians document higher rates of pneumonia and other infectious diseases among nearby residents. [Hooiveld et al., 2016] A facility producing at the scale proposed here would be a significant driver of that threat in Minnesota's environment.	1298-37	395
A 2026 study across three U.S. states found higher cancer incidence in counties with greater CAFO density. [Son et al., 2026] A facility producing at the scale proposed here would be a significant driver of that threat in Minnesota's environment.	1298-38	395
And the antibiotic resistance threat driven by the documented presence of up to 21 classes of veterinary antibiotics in dairy-associated watersheds [Lee et al., 2020] represents one of the most serious emerging public health threats of our time. A facility producing at the scale proposed here would be a significant driver of that threat in Minnesota's environment.	1298-39	395

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
We do not need to speculate about how Riverview, LLP behaves when its operations reach a scale that strains the surrounding environment. We have a documented case study. In Arizona. On December 31, 2025, just months ago, Riverview, LLP entered into a formal Settlement and Release Agreement with Arizona Attorney General Kristin Mayes. The Attorney General had invoked her authority under Arizona's public nuisance statute based on expressed concerns that Riverview's existing groundwater pumping in the Sulphur Springs Valley of Cochise County constituted a public nuisance. The settlement's own recitals acknowledge that groundwater levels in the Valley "continue to decline" and that Valley residents' domestic wells "no longer reach the aquifer." Arizona's own water resources agency found conditions serious enough to designate the affected basins as Active Management Areas, a designation reserved for regions facing critical groundwater depletion. The result: before Riverview could proceed, the state of Arizona extracted $11 million in remediation commitments, $5.5 million to an independent charitable fund for residents and schools affected by groundwater decline, and $5.5 million administered directly for those closest to Riverview's irrigation wells. Five Valley schools were specifically identified as needing emergency water access assistance. Riverview also committed to removing 2,000 acres of irrigated farmland from production over 15 years. Riverview paid $11 million in Arizona to address what its existing operations already did to that state's groundwater — before adding a single animal. Minnesota is now being asked to permit a facility nearly double the size of anything that state has ever seen, with no comparable assessment of what it will do here. To be precise: Riverview denies liability in the Arizona matter. The settlement is not a legal admission. But the Attorney General of the State of Arizona with the full resources of her office found the evidence of groundwater harm serious enough to pursue formal legal action under the state's public nuisance statute That is not a fringe claim. That is the considered legal judgment of a state's top law enforcement officer about Riverview's existing operations. And now Riverview is asking Minnesota to permit a facility that, by its own application, would be the largest livestock operation this state has ever seen.	1298-40	194
Some harms can be remediated. You can clean a spill, relocate a facility, adjust a management practice. Aquifer depletion is not that kind of harm.	1298-41	190
Some harms can be remediated. You can clean a spill, relocate a facility, adjust a management practice. Watershed contamination is not that kind of harm.	1298-42	290
Some harms can be remediated. You can clean a spill, relocate a facility, adjust a management practice. The destruction of rural communities is not that kind of harm.	1298-43	397
When an aquifer is drawn down beyond recovery within a human lifetime, the water does not return. Wells that took families years to install become useless. The agricultural economy of a region, built across generations, can be permanently compromised.	1298-44	398
Nitrate contamination once established in a groundwater system can persist for decades, affecting the neurological development of infants, the health of elderly residents, and the viability of neighboring farm operations.	1298-45	193

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Studies document legacy contamination effects with lag times exceeding 20 years. [Kim et al., 2021] By the time the full damage is visible, the facility will be entrenched, the permits will be issued, and the opportunity to prevent harm will be a memory.	1298-46	205
The economic consequences for Minnesota's rural communities would be profound. A 26,397- animal-unit facility doesn't just compete with family dairies for water it competes with them for land.	1298-47	397
The economic consequences for Minnesota's rural communities would be profound. A 26,397- animal-unit facility doesn't just compete with family dairies for water it competes with them for local labor.	1298-48	397
The economic consequences for Minnesota's rural communities would be profound. A 26,397- animal-unit facility doesn't just compete with family dairies for water it competes with them for community identity.	1298-49	397
The research is clear that mega dairy operations tend to reduce total employment per unit of output relative to smaller farms, concentrate land ownership, weaken local supply chains, and generate community tension that undermines the social fabric rural areas depend upon. The average 280-cow farm that has sustained Minnesota's dairy heritage for generations cannot compete on the same terms as a facility that is 60 times its size and externalizes its environmental costs onto the surrounding community.	1298-50	397
And the threat is not merely to this one watershed, or this one community, or this one permitting decision. This is the first proposed livestock facility of its kind in Minnesota. If it is permitted without a rigorous Environmental Impact Study, if the precedent is established that a 26,000-animal-unit facility can be sited and built without a comprehensive, independent, public assessment of its consequences, then every future applicant for a comparable facility will point to this decision as the standard. The precedent set here will shape Minnesota's agricultural and environmental landscape for a generation. An Environmental Impact Study is not a weapon against agriculture. It is the mechanism a responsible state uses to ensure that its most consequential decisions are made with eyes open — not discovered in hindsight.	1298-51	19
If the Science Is Wrong, Why Won't They Let Us Check? Riverview and its advocates will argue that the science is overstated. That their operation is well-managed. That they use the best available technology. That an Environmental Impact Study is unnecessary, burdensome, and punitive. That this is just opposition to progress dressed up as environmental concern. Consider that argument carefully because embedded within it is a question they have not answered and do not want you to ask: If this facility poses no significant environmental risk to Minnesota's water, air,land, and communities a rigorous, independent Environmental Impact Study willprove it. So why fight one?	1298-52	31
The Environmental Impact Study process is not a presumption of guilt. It is a neutral scientific and regulatory assessment. It requires independent experts, not the company's consultants, not the company's attorneys, not the company's hired engineers, to evaluate the projected impacts on groundwater, surface water, air quality, public health, and community welfare. If Riverview's facility truly poses no significant harm, the Environmental Impact Study will say so. The permit will be granted with public confidence and legal protection.	1298-53	32

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The only reason to oppose an Environmental Impact Study is if you fear what it will find.	1298-54	31
The Efficiency Argument Is Incomplete Riverview will point to its conservation practices, and some of them are genuinely meaningful. The 2025 Arizona settlement documents center-pivot systems, low-energy precision application, and variable-frequency drive pumps. These are real technologies with real water efficiency benefits. But there is a critical distinction that efficiency arguments consistently obscure: per-unit efficiency gains do not offset the aggregate impact of scale.[Rotz et al., 2024; Han et al., 2024] A facility that uses 15% less water per cow but concentrates 18,855 cows in a single location draws dramatically more water from the aquifer system than any collection of smaller farms that those cows would otherwise replace.	1298-55	194
The manure volume is not reduced by efficiency technology, it is concentrated.	1298-56	326
The ammonia emissions are not eliminated; they are concentrated.	1298-57	86
The pathogen load in runoff is not neutralized it is concentrated.	1298-58	395
Concentration is the variable that an Environmental Impact Study must evaluate. It is also the variable Riverview does not want evaluated.	1298-59	31
The Regulatory Gap Problem The research literature on CAFO oversight is striking in its consistency across states and decades. Federal databases on the number and location of CAFOs are incomplete.[Chugg et al., 2021]	1298-60	65
Permitting rates are low even for large operations.	1298-61	65
Inspection rates have declined sharply since 2011. Most compliance monitoring relies on operator self-reporting the very operator with a financial interest in favorable findings. [Glibert, 2020; Moran, 2022]	1298-62	65
State preemption laws in many jurisdictions block local governments from imposing stricter standards than the state minimum, creating what researchers call "regulatory vacuums" that leave communities with no meaningful recourse. [Moran, 2022]	1298-63	66
Minnesota has never permitted a facility of this scale. It has no track record with a livestock operation of 26,397 animal units, no established monitoring infrastructure calibrated to impacts of this magnitude, no regulatory precedent for enforcing against a facility that dwarfs anything that has come before. The Environmental Impact Study is not just about understanding the facility's environmental impacts it is about determining whether Minnesota's regulatory framework is even equipped to manage them, and what additional protections would be required before a permit could be responsibly granted.	1298-64	67

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The Arizona Track Record Cannot Be Dismissed Riverview will argue that Arizona is a different state, a different climate, a different hydrogeology. And that is true as far as it goes. Arizona's desert aquifers face different pressures than Minnesota's. But the Arizona settlement does not prove a specific quantity of harm in Minnesota. What it proves is something more fundamental: that at the scale Riverview operates, the company's activities can deplete groundwater to the point where a state Attorney General pursues formal public nuisance litigation, where domestic wells go dry, where schools require emergency water assistance, and where $11 million in remediation is required before anyone agrees to stop investigating. That is a pattern of conduct. It occurred with Riverview's existing operations not with a proposed expansion. Minnesota is now being asked to permit a facility the applicant itself describes as nearly double the size of the next largest livestock operation in the state. The Arizona experience is not a disqualifier. It is, precisely, the reason an Environmental Impact Study is necessary.	1298-65	194
The Environmental Justice Dimension The communities that bear the greatest burden from mega dairy operations are consistently documented to be rural, lower-income, and in many cases, communities of color or Indigenous communities with the least political capacity to demand accountability. [Driscoll & Theis, 2020; Hudlet-Vazquez, 2025; Tulbure et al., 2024]	1298-66	399
Rural Minnesota families are not corporations. They cannot hire hydrogeologists, retain legal teams, or absorb the cost of a failed well while litigation proceeds. They depend on the regulatory process on the Environmental Impact Study to ensure their government is looking out for them before the damage is done, not after.	1298-67	32
When we ask why Riverview opposes a full Environmental Impact Study, part of the honest answer is this: the people who bear the cost of getting this wrong are not the people deciding to build. That asymmetry between who profits and who pays is precisely the asymmetry that environmental review processes were designed to address.	1298-68	435
The Demand Is Reasonable. The Stakes Are Not. We are not here to end dairy farming in Minnesota. Agriculture is the backbone of this state's economy and identity. Minnesota's dairy farmers, the real ones, the average 280-cow operations that have sustained rural communities for generations, deserve a future. And that future is not served by permitting a single corporate facility that is 60 times their size to externalize its environmental costs onto the land, water, and communities those farmers share.	1298-69	400
What we are asking for is not extraordinary. It is not punitive. It is not a backdoor attempt to block development. We are asking for what the law provides, what the science demands, and what any reasonable observer looking at a proposed 26,397-animal-unit facility that would be the first and largest of its kind in Minnesota would recognize as the minimum due diligence owed to the people of this state.	1298-70	32
Is it so much to ask for a full Environmental Impact Study conducted independently, reviewed publicly, and completed before a single permit is issued and a single shovel breaks ground?	1298-71	18

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Minnesota's environmental and community interests. The Legal and Moral Standard Environmental review processes exist because Minnesota and the federal government made a foundational decision: when an action is large enough to cause significant environmental consequences, the public has the right to know what those consequences will be before the decision is made, not after.	1298-72	32
A facility of 26,397 animal units, the first of its kind in Minnesota, nearly double the next largest operation in the state, 60 times the average dairy	1298-73	434
proposed by a company that is already paying $11 million in remediation for groundwater impacts in another state, is precisely the kind of action this standard was designed to address.	1298-74	194
The burden in this proceeding does not fall on Minnesota's farmers and families to prove that this facility will cause harm. The burden falls on the applicant to demonstrate, through a rigorous and independent process, that it will not. Minnesota has never faced a livestock facility of this scale. It will never get a second chance to make this decision correctly. Require the Environmental Impact Study. We are asking you to require what the law contemplates, what the science demands, and what Minnesota's rural communities deserve: a full Environmental Impact Study before the largest livestock facility in this state's history is permitted to become a permanent feature of Minnesota's landscape. The family farmers whose livelihoods border this proposed site, the parents whose children will breathe the air within two miles of 26,000 animal units, the neighbors whose wells draw from the same aquifer those Minnesotans cannot afford for you to get this wrong. Require the Environmental Impact Study. Demand the full picture. Do not let the largest environmental decision Minnesota's agricultural communities have ever faced be made in the absence of the information they are owed.	1298-75	1
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1299-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	1299-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	1299-3	430
Thorough review is absolutely essential before any project! We have a gold standard, stick to it! No shortcuts!	1300-1	29
I am writing in support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1301-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	1301-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	1301-3	430

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
My name is Sandra Fernow. I am a current resident of Morris, and have been for the past 10 years. I have two kids, age 8 and 5, who were born at the local hospital, and now our family has come to call this place home. I may not be a farmer, but I do have a career in housekeeping, so I care about ensuring the community has a clean, safe environment to thrive in. I waited until after I had attended the MPCA public comment meeting at Old No One Southside on April 28th to submit my comment. I have to inform you that I was one of the last to enter the room before the doors were closed for the extent of the public comment meeting, and I had arrived about 15 minutes early. I was guided to standing-room-only, from where I had a vantage point of the main entry door. There were waves upon waves of concerned citizens who attempted to come to the meeting to be better informed, and/or to make their concerns, questions, or whatever else be heard, and their entry to the venue was denied due to the Southside being at capacity. I watched some friends, some community members, and more I didn't recognize, have their whole body demeanor sink as they heard the news that they were not allowed to enter the "public" comment session. I won't forget their faces. This experience left me frustrated, and I believe it revoked some of the voice of the community and other farmers, and effectively silenced their concerns or potential opposition to the proposed expansion.	1302-1	22
Even now, amongst the public comment period board, there are many submissions stating "No EIS needed, I support West River expansion" type of a generic comment; it makes it feel like that same moment, of filling the space in a similar manner so it's harder to see the worries people may have surrounding this.	1302-2	435
An old college acquaintance of mine first messaged me in September of 2025, directing me to a video on some of the less-than-ideal impacts that Riverview had done to the community in Arizona; this video was put together by Perfect Union, and posted April 25, 2025 on their Instagram. The first example in the video, an Arizona resident, had their well run dry due to Riverview's over-usage of groundwater there, so the resident had no running water in their home for 6 months. This person had hoped to pass their house down, a stability for generations, but feared they could no longer do so due to the manner in which their land was impacted. I saw an article from January of this year, that Riverview reached an agreement to reduce groundwater usage and pay $11 million to affected residents in AZ over 20 years; but is money enough to repair damage to our natural world?	1302-3	194
Does money paid after-the-fact undo damages which dictate how we leave the land for our children?	1302-4	403
At what point are we crossing the line here, away from being farmers and into something more reminiscent of resource miners, extracting the land and exchanging it for the all-mighty dollar?	1302-5	403
Are there things which could be done unto our local land out here, thanks to decisions made by investors, which could be irreversible?	1302-6	403
These sort of questions is why I think we need an Environmental Impact Statement.	1302-7	1
I'm concerned about Water Quality, as a recent story from Minnesota Public Radio described in their headline, "Nitrate is quietly polluting rural drinking wells. How researchers are working to help." I may live in town, but have daydreamed about buying property somewhere out of town for more room to garden and enjoy nature's bounty, so I'm concerned about rural groundwater quality. Groundwater pollution is especially difficult to filter, needing expensive equipment a lot of people probably can't afford.	1302-8	388

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I worry that surface water could be polluted as well, impacting local hunters and outdoors-people who want to enjoy what western MN has to offer. The manure runoff from factory farms can have a big impact on putting nitrates in water. I think the community should be able to achieve a sense of security, in having detailed and clear answers to the many questions they may have. CAFOs (or Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations) are notorious for contaminating water with nitrates, and I have real concern that a massive operation such as this could potentially pollute our area in a way that impacts our precious resources for years, and generations, to come.	1302-9	265
Ground water and surface water contamination is a greater risk with factory farm style projects of this size, and I'm concerned about our water resources being negatively impacted with such a massive expansion.	1302-10	193
The types of pollutants associated with potential spills concern me, because of their environmental impact to wildlife in the form of algae blooms.	1302-11	294
The types of pollutants associated with potential spills concern me, because of the increased risk of cancer rates associated with nitrates.	1302-12	396
I know fisherman friends who have shared Snapchat videos to their story while out at the lake and along the Pomme de Terre watershed near here, and possibly north of town, which depicted algae of an unnatural color along the shore line.	1302-13	294
Another concern I have for stability of the land is for future generations out here, because Blue Baby Syndrome is caused by drinking from nitrate-contaminated water wells.	1302-14	193
I worry, also, as a "townie" here, about how well our own municipal water facility is capable of filtering out harmful pollutants. We do have a reverse osmosis system in our home, but the option we chose has monthly payments, and not everyone can afford luxuries like water filtration systems within their home.	1302-15	230
Many in our town are also renters, who may not find it feasible to have their own RO system, or are limited to the water fill up station at places like Willie's grocery store, which is dependent on the local water supply as well.	1302-16	230
I'm ultimately concerned about the future of this community, if we are allowing a major expansion at this scale, and the implications it could have for the people who are connected to the aquafer below this massive expansion.	1302-18	195
Even in application of the manure to fields, which in a way is just a bunch of micro-spills, I am concerned about potential for water to run off of the fields, and contaminate area waterways of both surface and groundwater.	1302-20	289
I have also heard from one of the smaller time farmers, that Riverview had a manure spill near Pennock, MN, and this was supposedly not reported for a full week. Supposedly there was no environmental contamination indicated from that 2025 spill, but I remain concerned that there could be things unreported, or issues to be had in not having a baseline to compare data to if a spill occurs, or things could be cleaned up before a spill was fully reported, so the scale of a spill could potentially be underreported.	1302-21	385

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This contamination would be difficult to undo or remedy, once it occurs. As I said, I have already heard from friends who fish in the area along the Pomme de Terre water shed, that there were noxious algae blooms in area waterways in the last several years. I am concerned that a project of this size may go up, before we even have baselines of data to compare anything to, to monitor the effects of the expansion over time. I believe we need more accurate data than is currently the standard, in order to protect the environment from the people who are "farming" on it and straining the land for what they view it is worth.	1302-22	251
The effect this expansion could have on small family farms is potentially irreversible. I just today saw a news article from MPR news titled, "Agriculture is changing. To protect farmers from stress, mental health support has to change, too," which was written by Tadeo Ruiz Sandoval and Molly Castle Work. This article described the immense stress that small farms have in the face of the current turbulent economy. With the proposed expansion of Riverview's operations in Morris, I fear for the small-time farmers who may "go under" because the influence of flooding the market with this many cows may be "the straw that broke the camel's back" and negatively impact those who gave their testimony at the MPCA public comment meeting at Old No One Southside on April 28th. Riverview wanting to expand from 7,885 to 18,885 cows has small family farms worried about what the future holds for their farm.	1302-24	400
With Riverview having so much capital, I wonder also how they have been influencing the housing market in town in Morris. I have seen recently a home was for sale, then swooped quickly off the market, where now a truck with "Riverview" on the side is parked. This could be a good thing on the surface, or could be a more complicated thing at the heart of it. If Riverview is able to purchase properties, they could then rent them to employees, setting terms for rent and making even more profit as an entity. By purchasing homes right when they enter the market, I fear that other people and families in this town may struggle to then become homeowners themselves, due to not being able to put as big of a downpayment on a potential home purchase in comparison to those associated with Riverview. Morris has an abundance of renters, and I wonder how much their ease of access to evolving to the level of homeownership is impacted through this potential pattern in rapid property buy-ups.	1302-25	397
And while Riverview may not own all the land which they interact with, I fear they still have the "air of a monopoly" due to the amount of influence they have upon farmland which they contract with; they may not own all the acres, but in a way they do, by having the ultimate say on what cover crop is planted and what is used to fertilize via their cow-barn liquid excrement. I heard that this liquid manure is tested once a year? Well, I don't think testing this liquid manure once a year is enough, because I imagine there could be some variations over the course of the year which could impact testing results.	1302-26	366
One of my acquaintances, her husband works for Riverview tending the cows. They are from Mexico. She said they treat the cows better than their workers at times. They are very strict with timing of operations. My acquaintance is fearful that if the company might have something go wrong, that potentially people will blame the low-level workers, before they find any fault in the owners and investors of the company.	1302-27	403

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Situations like the overly-packed MPCA meeting are problematic; there were community members who were born and raised in Morris area, who were unable to attend the meeting due to capacity constraints. From comments I have read on local Facebook posts online, people became very frustrated that Hispanic/people of color (who potentially may not be proficient in English or may not have attended the meeting to make a public comment) were there "in their stead", and thus occupying seats where other genuine concerns could have been sitting. Moments like this impact the resiliency of our community, because I believe there could be an increase in racial prejudice and racial stereotyping or profiling, due to someone reporting that they had attempted to speak with the Hispanic members of the audience, and were apparently greeted with "No English". This issue has me feeling frustrated, because my Mexican acquaintance whose husband works for Riverview, said she had wanted to attend the meeting to maybe see more people in the community, and to learn more about the scope of the project and impact it could have; she wants to maybe have a baby of her own, and needs to know if she should invest in a water filter for her home to protect her family, and she voiced concern about how the community may view her, and welcome her (or not) depending on the way this proposed expansion situation unfolds.	1302-28	399
This sort of social impact is something that could be better understood, if an EIS were to be conducted. An EAW is small potatoes, compared to the in-depth analysis that this community deserves before this project is pushed through.	1302-29	14
There is also the major recent concern, of having so many animals housed in a relatively small areas; given the recent hantavirus sensationalism in the news, I am now worried about what it means for the community in Morris to have so many animals in close quarters. Would an increase in capacity at the facility put the surrounding area at an increased risk of pathogens to spread or mutate in close quarters?	1302-30	72
What measures are in place to prevent and plan for this biological aspect of the project? Is there adequate confidence that a sufficient plan is in place if something were to go wrong, to prevent us from being a new "Ground Zero"?	1302-31	72
I am not voicing that I am for or against this project, but I do have legitimate concerns regarding a project at this scale. It's great if it works, but I worry about what happens if or when it doesn't go according to plan. This is the only home my kids have ever known, and I would appreciate getting a sense of potential impact on the community and our area at large, and maybe even beyond, if this project proposal were to be granted.	1302-32	434
If this project pollutes the water,that is an issue I need to be addressed.	1302-33	388
If this project pollutes the air, that is an issue I need to be addressed.	1302-34	81
If this project wrecks roads in the area, that is an issue I need to be addressed.	1302-35	308
How can we mitigate these potential impacts, and what sort of plan is in place, if these impacts are realized in our community, or by those who are downstream?	1302-36	397
I don't want to focus on potential jobs created by this expansion, or impact on taxes (although my worry for an increased burden on tax-payers is also real), I care most about our fundamental rights to have access to clean water and to retain our freedoms to accessible clean water.	1302-37	403
I don't want to focus on potential jobs created by this expansion, or impact on taxes (although my worry for an increased burden on tax-payers is also real), I care most about ethical land management which considers the community at large.	1302-38	403

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I don't want to focus on potential jobs created by this expansion, or impact on taxes (although my worry for an increased burden on tax-payers is also real), I care most about wildlife who doesn't have a voice to defend itself.	1302-39	403
I don't want to focus on potential jobs created by this expansion, or impact on taxes (although my worry for an increased burden on tax-payers is also real), I care most about the state of Minnesota as a whole.	1302-40	403
I'm concerned about how much manure waste a facility of this size would have, which could in turn impact local families, due to the precedent this facility will set.	1302-41	433
I'm concerned about what land this waste would be applied to, which could in turn impact local families, due to the precedent this facility will set.	1302-42	433
I'm concerned about how much of a risk there is for runoff to pollute our precious water ways, which could in turn impact local families, due to the precedent this facility will set.	1302-43	433
I'm concerned about how much manure waste a facility of this size would have, which could in turn impactlocal wildlife, due to the precedent this facility will set.	1302-44	433
I'm concerned about what land this waste would be applied to, which could in turn impact local wildlife, due to the precedent this facility will set.	1302-45	433
I'm concerned about how much of a risk there is for runoff to pollute our precious water ways, which could in turn impact, local wildlife, due to the precedent this facility will set.	1302-46	433
I'm concerned about how much manure waste a facility of this size would have, which could in turn impact the future of the land in west central MN and beyond, due to the precedent this facility will set.	1302-47	433
I'm concerned about what land this waste would be applied to, which could in turn impact the future of the land in west central MN and beyond, due to the precedent this facility will set.	1302-48	433
I'm concerned about how much of a risk there is for runoff to pollute our precious water ways, which could in turn impact the future of the land in west central MN and beyond, due to the precedent this facility will set.	1302-49	433
We need a thorough Environmental Impact Statement. The risks to the ecology of the area are too great to not conduct an EIS. How would this sort of precedent established by the project impact the way that other future operations are scaled up?	1302-50	1
The only people who were advocating for a "more streamlined, faster" process of these proposals and project fulfillment, were the ones who stood to profit from it. What's to come of the people, who are stuck in the area which they call home, after this area becomes altered in ways they struggle to voice, due to a project which was pushed through too hastily?	1302-51	403
I request that an Environmental Impact Statement be completed, to ensure all necessary factors are considered, and controls in place to mitigate the potential risks of this project. I need to be assured that I have an answer that I can depend on, through scientific data and rigorous analysis of all facets of the proposal.	1302-52	1
Riverview has brought so much growth and opportunity into our community and we are grateful for that.	1303-1	431

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
My name is Joe Stroman and I operate my family farm which is located 2 miles from the existing West River Facility. I am the 6th generation to live and work here, and 2026 marks 150 years of family ownership of our farm since it was homesteaded in 1876. I am very familiar with Riverview's operation. I have family members who work for them. I have toured both their main barn and the West River barn. I've sold silage to them in the past and I've also worked on one of their silage harvesting crews. What people say is true: Their barns are clean and professionally run, and their employees all seem happy to work there.	1304-1	431
After reviewing the Environmental Assessment Worksheet, I believe there are some issues that need to be addressed.	1304-2	435
My first issue of concern is wind erosion due to numerous consecutive corn silage crops. While documentation shows that runoff erosion is minimal, It seems that wind erosion is not being monitored. In fact, wind erosion isn't mentioned once in the entire EAW document. We have many days throughout the fall, winter and spring where the wind exceeds 30 mph and large amounts of topsoil can be observed blowing off of Riverview's silage fields while adjacent fields remain intact. Corn silage harvest removes at least 90% of above ground biomass, and even if the maximum rate of manure solids are applied afterwards and a cover crop is planted, it doesn't come close to replacing what was removed.	1304-3	186
Riverview usually grows silage corn for a number of years, followed by a perennial alfalfa crop as a resting period. This is described numerous times in the EAW as a "crop rotation". This is not a crop rotation, it is a decade-long alternation of two cash crops and a cover crop that never exceeds vegetative state. The continuous removal of biomass, followed by intensive tillage, plus a lack of biodiversity from consecutive corn crops results in a loss of soil structure and rapid degradation of the A-horizon. When topsoil blows off of fields it typically collects in road and drainage ditches. Numerous studies have been conducted where blown topsoil has been shown to have very high concentrations of nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium. Wind erosion potential of continuous silage ground and mitigation practices thereof is something that should be required in an Environmental Assessment Worksheet. If not, an Environmental Impact Statement should be required to determine the potential impacts of these practices.	1304-4	186
Another concern that I have is the socioeconomic impact of an operation this size, which is not covered in the EAW, and is often ignored in public discourse. While Riverview does provide opportunities to other farmers in the form of buying silage and selling manure, many smaller farm operators within the West River Dairy footprint are of the opinion that Riverview's competitive presence in the local land market has caused a false inflation of land values.	1304-5	398
If Riverview is interested in a piece of farmland, they will pay top dollar, and landowners are aware of this fact. Most farmland tenants can't compete with Riverview's offers or bids if and when their rented ground comes up for sale, which decreases their acres of production, leading to a loss of opportunity for future generations to step into their family business.	1304-6	400
This has become very evident in the small communities surrounding Morris, who must work diligently to keep businesses and schools open in spite of a declining population. I am aware that the consolidation of agriculture in this area isn't solely caused by Riverview. However, observing many other rural communities where Riverview doesn't have a presence may lead one to believe that they are a catalyst.	1304-7	400

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
An argument could be made that the West River Expansion already has a sufficient land base to operate with, and has no need to buy more land. That very well could be true, under the assumption that there will be no further expansions. Anyone who possesses the gift of hindsight can see how that plays out. In 2003, Riverview held a public meeting to discuss the proposed construction of the original West River Dairy facility, their second barn at the time. My father, Keith Stroman, stood up and asked why they were more than doubling the size of their dairy enterprise with the simple question: "Why are you doing it?" One of the owners responded, "It's for our kids." This was a good enough answer for Keith, as he was structuring his own farm operation so that I could someday step in. Fast forward 23 years, and they've built a dozen more barns just in the state of Minnesota alone. I'm not convinced that this is a one and done project, and I'm also not convinced that this is being done to safeguard job security for someone's kids.	1304-8	400
I believe that Riverview has every right to do business in Stevens County, but when the industrial scale of their expansion has the potential to impact an entire community, there needs to be industrial scale accountability.	1304-9	400
I've deliberated making this comment since the opening of the comment period, because I feel like it will put a target on my back. I know many other people who won't be making a comment or voicing their opinion because they fear social or professional repercussions. This ties back to the socioeconomic effects that I mentioned above.	1304-10	398
In closing, I don't believe the Environmental Assessment Worksheet addresses all of the potential impacts of the proposed expansion, environmental or otherwise. Riverview has the personnel, resources and most of all, ambition to do their due diligence and complete an Environmental Impact Study.	1304-11	1
no specific gap has been identified that would require an EIS to fill.	1305-1	20
I respectfully ask the MPCA to issue this permit.	1305-2	430
It concerns me that when we concentrate this many animal units in a single area that there is the potential for issues.	1306-1	435
While I understand their ability to handle these farms, It's important to remember that when we concentrate the farms, we lose small farms.	1306-2	400
While I understand their ability to handle these farms, It's important to remember that when we concentrate the farms, when we lose small farms we lose communities.	1306-3	397
If this project is allowed to move forward, I believe it will affect our rural areas in a way that will not be seen for years. Therefore, it is important to fully understand the effects on the loss of other dairy's in the state that this project would be replacing.	1306-4	403
I believe when we look at all the facts and exam the options there are other ways that the good of all people can be achieved. Understanding that we need to consider the water and the waste issues, it is important to study it in more depth. Thank you for considering this and requiring a more in depth study.	1306-5	29
I am writing in strong support of the proposed West River Dairy Expansion in Synnes Township, Stevens County,	1307-1	431
respectfully urge the MPCA Commissioner to issue a negative declaration on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement.	1307-2	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Living my entire life in the dairy industry i have seen tremendous growth in farm size and we are getting to the point of industrialization not farming. At the proposed size of this dairy I believe there are many things that could result in a disaster along the line of the large dairy in Texas suffering a fire on killed the majority of the cows and had a effect on the national milk supply.	1308-1	435
There is many possibilities of biosecurity going wrong with the scope of an operation this size and causing a disruption of the short shelf life of diary products.	1308-2	395
Concentrating this size of operation in one location i believe is not good for the people of Minnesota. A strong viable dairy industry is i believe very important to this state.	1308-3	434
As the industry farm operations increase to industrial size maybe the state legislature has to consider in spending public dollars on research and promotion a worth while invastment	1308-4	434
I support the West River Dairy expansion.	1309-1	431
No EIS is needed as Riverview has already provided information required to move forward with an expansion.	1309-2	20
There is more than just the environment at issue here. The dairy cattle live heart-breaking lives in these factory farms. If MN can save beagles from a neighboring state, I think we can try to help the cattle here	1310-1	74
If MN can save beagles from a neighboring state, I think we can try to help with our environment.	1310-2	435
We know that weather and ethical issues often cross state lines and impact lives at great distances from our State.	1310-3	435
Thank you for requesting we pause and give more thought to all of the issues involved.	1310-4	435
You are correct, our water, is counting on us.	1310-5	388
You are correct, our climate is counting on us.	1310-6	107
You are correct, our communities are counting on us.	1310-7	435
You are correct, the animals with whom we share our lives on a daily basis are counting on us.	1310-8	435
What world do we want our children inherit from us?	1310-9	435
What care and concern and compassion are we modeling for them?	1310-10	74
Based on the history of past Riverview projects and confined animal feeding operations (CAFOs) in general, our review of the draft EAW for this exceedingly large expansion and the applicable criteria we have concluded that an environmental impact statement (EIS) is warranted.	1311-1	1
We find the draft EAW itself deficient in a lot of ways, but we do not call for its revision. Instead, the information we do find in the draft EAW is more than sufficient justification for moving forward into a full EIS.	1311-2	1
EAW vastly under sizes the environmentally relevant area (ERA)	1311-3	24
The EAW claims the area impacted by the project can be limited to the exact area of the feedlot site, the areas where manure will be spread and a one-mile radius around the off-site wells. This claim cannot be supported	1311-4	24
the impacts of this exceeding large feedlot project on this larger more realistic and environmentally relevant scale are potentially significant and justify an EIS.	1311-5	1
EAW fails to acknowledge that polluted groundwater may not be reversible	1311-6	193

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Agronomic application rates are not designed to prevent excess nutrients or other farm chemicals from reaching groundwater, instead they are designed to maximize production with the least amount of application.	1311-7	362
Effects on ground and surface water quantities and flows don't add up; [commenting on backup basins]	1311-8	208
No calculations are supplied in the EAW to assure the backup will suffice during extended drought periods lasting several months if not years.	1311-9	208
An EIS will be required to estimate the probability and frequency at which the project operators may request emergency exemption from well pumping limits to keep their livestock alive.	1311-10	3
Such an exemption places other well users and the river at risk for serious water shortages. This alone is a potential for significant impact warranting an EIS to evaluate available alternatives including the no-action alternative.	1311-11	195
Potential ground water contamination by leachate from manure pits and basins is not quantified	1311-12	353
At the public meeting in Morris on April 28th of this year, MPCA officials admitted that manure pit leakage, even at the reduced rates afforded by thicker clay liners, would likely reach groundwater. The MPCA dismissed these impacts as not being significant because "receptors" of this contamination (understood to be private or public wells) were far enough away.	1311-13	353
The basis for these estimates and the factors contributing to estimate uncertainties should be presented in an EIS and thus subjected to third party scrutiny.	1311-14	18
Contamination by manure seepage to perimeter tile draining shallow groundwater from under manure pits delivered to storm water basin is unaccounted for	1311-15	374
The EAW form fails to address the need for wastewater treatment in section 12.B.1. C as follows: "12.B.1.c. If the wastewater discharge is to surface water, identify the wastewater treatment methods and identify discharge points and proposed effluent limitations to mitigate impacts. Discuss any effects to surface or groundwater from wastewater discharges, taking into consideration how current Minnesota climate trends and anticipated climate change in the general location of the project may influence the effects."	1311-16	254
An EIS would need to resolve this contradiction/omission and either describe total containment of contaminated manure pit leachate which would seem impractical or the proposed treatment of this wastewater, possibly by land irrigation or other means.	1311-17	9
A report in EAW minimizes future low flow probability in Pomme de Terre River and is misleading and inconsistent with climate trends stated elsewhere	1311-18	269
In the climate impacts section of the EAW, river flows are predicted to continue decreasing as average temperatures increase. These inconsistencies are confusing to the public and should be clarified in an EIS.	1311-19	5
Crop land used for manure spreading may need containment to avoid runoff reaching surface waters	1311-20	330
If 3,000 acres of prospective manure application fields have known drainage issues that will not be identified and remedied until after some future rain events this should be a red flag.	1311-21	341
Simply eliminating these areas [with drainage issues] from future manure application after the drainage problem has been experienced will not prevent this pollution.	1311-22	381

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
the EAW can serve its true function and trigger an EIS that can explore this issue more thoroughly and evaluate alternatives that would avoid predictable pollution.	1311-23	1
The EAW fails to identify potential increases in antibiotic resistance and/or the potential zoonotic infections effects of large CAFOs.	1311-24	72
Because these issues are highly complex, were not addressed at all in the EAW and because research has shown the overuse of antibiotics and failure to employ proper and consistent biological safeguards in feedlots can present significant threats to human health that may not be reversable, an EIS is warranted to fully inform the public and inform the permitting of an industrial scale livestock facilities like the one proposed.	1311-25	72
The project is not proposed for a pristine, isolated island, it will be situated in an already degraded environment, part of which is caused by the existing feedlot that is being expanded. And degradation by the landscape having been converted to agriculture is evidence of past effects. If the air and water in the vicinity are not clean and the native ecosystems are not fully functioning, this project's impacts must be added to these "past and present" actions and then added to the impacts of reasonably foreseeable actions.	1311-26	128
These cumulative effects should be more honestly and accurately assessed by preparing an EIS.	1311-27	11
Deliberate under sizing the environmentally relevant area cannot be used to avoid impact overlap and claim impacts are not cumulative	1311-28	24
EAW does not properly characterize past, present and future environmental conditions of the environmentally relevant area	1311-29	156
A fair determination of the cumulative effects of this project requires the effects of all past, present and future projects be accurately characterized so this project's impacts can be added to them.	1311-30	136
An EIS is the appropriate tool for correcting this oversight in the EAW and informing the MPCA and the public as to whether a permit can be issued.	1311-31	1
EAW fails to account for impacts of feedlots in the impacted areas whether owned or operated by proposer or not.	1311-32	136
Quantifying and accounting for the collective impacts of these existing livestock operations is usually beyond the scope and purpose a of an EAW.	1311-33	136
The EAW must identify and locate these feedlots but does not need to quantify their impacts. This is an appropriate function of an EIS.	1311-34	11
EAW minimizes or ignores proposed project incremental contribution to cumulative potential effects	1311-35	136
By declaring the environmentally affected area of the project so narrowly, as described above, the proposer attempts to side-step the need to acknowledge the incremental addition of the project to the effects of its own operations and those like it in the vicinity. This error should be corrected and the incremental impacts quantified in an EIS.	1311-36	24
EAW describes purposeful avoidance of potential mitigation offered by "green infrastructure" as part of intentional project design	1311-37	142

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Landscaping with trees, shrubs, pollinator friendly plants near constructed ponds could provide aesthetic mitigation for the adverse effects of the enormous built infrastructure proposed in this project while providing a modicum of natural habitat for birds, insects and many other forms of important wildlife. As described above, this entire region has had its wildlife populations of all kinds, decimated by loss of these types of habitats.	1311-38	138
While this biosecurity practice may be recommended by the USDA, alternatives to these environmentally harmful biosecurity measures should be evaluated with an EIS.	1311-39	72
EAW fails to identify impaired waters as evidence of past and present projects	1311-40	266
The project, as presently designed, does not specify any special designs or alternative measures intended to effectively avoid these impacts. This is an appropriate function of the EIS and underscores the need for that higher level of review that we support.	1311-41	30
While buffers are shown around manure application fields near wetlands and water courses no analysis is provided to assure these buffers are sufficient to avoid or minimize the effects the DNR is concerned about. An EIS should be prepared to answer the question the DNR poses in order to inform the Department whether a takings permit will be needed. The EAW did not and likely could not provide this level of analysis.	1311-42	7
The proposed project can be predicted to exacerbate these impairments given the EPA's finding that the state's feedlot rules are ineffective for protecting water quality (see item 3-A below). These impairments are, as evidenced by the TMDL plans prepared for them, significant and in need of reduced loading primarily from improper handling of livestock wastes in their respective watersheds. An EIS is necessary to explore alternative methods for land application of livestock wastes from this facility as part of the remedial actions called for in the TMDLs	1311-43	429
The EPA has found MPCA's existing feedlot rules and permits to be inadequate	1311-44	39
The EPA instructed the MPCA to revise or amend their rules and write more effective permits. While the MPCA is in the process of making these improvements, the proposed project is subject to the very same existing rules the EPA found inadequate.	1311-45	39
There is no more compelling argument for ordering an EIS on this and any other large feedlot proposed in Minnesota than this finding by the highest environmental authority in the nation, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.	1311-46	1
MPCA will not have strengthened feedlot rules in time to control this project	1311-47	39
the MPCA's rules and permit requirements for feedlots are in the process of being improved to satisfy the EPA and the public that they will adequately protect water quality. However, those improvements have not yet been made. Yet the MPCA has proceeded to draft an EAW and a prospective permit for this project under these decidedly inadequate rules.	1311-48	39
The Proposer has agreements with landowners for manure application covering over 16,500 acres. Depth to groundwater will vary throughout these acres. There are no rules prohibiting manure application onto high water table soils. The Proposer uses and exceeds BMPs for manure application and follows all state rules and local ordinances. (bolding added for emphasis) This declaration (in bold) by the project proposer demonstrates how feedlot operators can take advantage of the agency's overly lax feedlot rules to apply manure where shallow water tables are vulnerable.	1311-49	382

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The MPCA's moving this project forward to this point may be required by laws intended to streamline the permitting process. But by ordering an EIS on this and any other feedlot seeking a permit in the interim, the MPCA has the choice of forestalling inadequately designed feedlots from being constructed and operated until more adequate rules are in place.	1311-50	1
EIS can serve as an effective guide in crafting rules and permit conditions that meet the EPA's requirements and fulfil the goals of the Clean Water Act.	1311-51	1
We request the MPCA respond to this proposition by exploring their own and possibly the Environmental Quality Board's statutes and rules to assure the Agency has the authority and willingness to temporarily hold permits in abeyance for this purpose.	1311-52	38
Local ordinances and county feedlot officers are ineffective	1311-53	432
we apply this criterion to demonstrate the lack of regulatory authority at the local county or township level to mitigate identified environmental effects not otherwise addressed by state or federal rules.	1311-54	432
Federal Clean Water Act authority remains delegated to the state MPCA	1311-55	435
While the EPA did find the MPCA feedlot rules inadequate the federal agency has not revoked the state's authority to continue issuing permits under the existing rules while the state's feedlot rules are undergoing amendments. Thus, citizens cannot depend on the federal government to prevent feedlot pollution.	1311-56	432
MPCA may be in violation of MEPA which prohibits permitting polluting activity when less polluting alternatives exist	1311-57	432
Given that the EPA has officially notified the MPCA, the petitioners and the public (including Riverview Farms that the agency's feedlot rules are inadequate to protect water quality it is likely that if the agency does proceed to issue a permit for the project it will, in this federal agency's opinion, cause the pollution, impairment or destruction expressly prohibited by this section of MEPA when and if the project is constructed and operated as planned.	1311-58	432
We agree with the EPA and also believe that this project will cause or is likely to cause pollution, impairment, or destruction of the air located within the state and that feasible and prudent alternatives to the issuance of this permitting action by the state exist including the no action (no permit) alternative.	1311-59	432
We agree with the EPA and also believe that this project will cause or is likely to cause pollution, impairment, or destruction of the water located within the state and that feasible and prudent alternatives to the issuance of this permitting action by the state exist including the no action (no permit) alternative.	1311-60	129
We agree with the EPA and also believe that this project will cause or is likely to cause pollution, impairment, or destruction of the land located within the state and that feasible and prudent alternatives to the issuance of this permitting action by the state exist including the no action (no permit) alternative.	1311-61	129
We agree with the EPA and also believe that this project will cause or is likely to cause pollution, impairment, or destruction of other natural resources located within the state and that feasible and prudent alternatives to the issuance of this permitting action by the state exist including the no action (no permit) alternative.	1311-62	129
MPCA fails to extend its authority over pollution caused by manure delivered to other farmers and landowners.	1311-63	389

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
MPCA feedlot permit writers and enforcement staff admit they have not attempted to extend permit conditions for land application of manure to secondary users. This means these secondary users have been knowingly allowed complete immune from compliance with the permittees manure management plan. This is an obvious failing of the MPCA's current feedlot rules and permits or the agency's enforcement policy.	1311-64	432
The MPCA should not issue feedlot permits or approve manure management plans that allow this loophole that has significant potential for adverse effects on water quality. An EIS may be useful for exploring the jurisdictional options and authority the MPCA has or may need to close this loophole.	1311-65	2
MPCA has failed to adopt nitrate standards for surface and groundwaters.	1311-66	379
The Minnesota legislature granted the MPCA the authority and resources to develop nitrate standards to protect aquatic life uses for the state's surface waters and regulate non-fertilizer sources of nitrates (primarily manure) from large feedlots decades ago but the agency has not completed the necessary rulemaking to implement this authority.	1311-67	379
An EIS for this project that calculates nitrate loading to area surface waters (and groundwater) from the project may help underscore the urgency for the agency and the Minnesota Department of Agriculture to complete the rulemaking in effective way to control manure borne nitrates from polluting both surface and groundwaters.	1311-68	2
No other EIS has been prepared on a feedlot of this size in the project area or similar setting	1311-69	16
This is an important fact and should be considered support for preparing an EIS for this project. The food industry in general has avoided formal environmental scrutiny by local, state or federal governments. Scientific studies of this industry's impacts are widely available in literature, and the impacts are myriad and widespread.	1311-70	1
The MPCA would be well justified in selecting this, the largest ever proposed CAFO in the state for the very first EIS.	1311-71	15
Compliance with TMDL goals for areas surface waters are not acknowledged	1311-72	293
Other studies have found large feedlots degrade local economies and community health	1311-73	397
"Workshop Recommendations Priority research needs. Community health studies. Although sufficient research supports actions to protect rural residents from the negative impacts of CAFOs on community health, additional research could be conducted to further delineate mechanisms of effects and impacts on susceptible subgroups. These areas include psychophysiologic impacts of malodor; impacts of malodor on mental health and quality of life; and respiratory impacts of bioaerosol mixtures, especially among asthmatics, children, and the elderly. Wider and more effective application of community-based participatory research will be important to advance research in these areas.	1311-74	397
Sustainability of livestock production. Federal funding for agricultural research should be reoriented to promote innovation in sustainable livestock production.	1311-75	73

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Translation of science to policy. Requirements for issuing permits for CAFOs should include increased protections for health and the environment including the following: •CAFOs should be sited and issued permits on the basis of total animal density allowed in a given watershed as determined by the carrying capacity. •Environmental impact statements should be mandated for all new CAFOs. These should include environmental health, social justice, and socioeconomic issues. •Decisions to issue permits for CAFOs should be considered in public meeting and decided at the local level. •CAFOs should be regulated using standards applied to general industry based on the level of emissions and type of waste handling. •Permits for manure storage basins should require bonding for performance and remediation. •The current state of knowledge of community impacts of CAFOs warrants support for the American Public Health Association recommendation for a moratorium on all new CAFO construction."	1311-76	157
Economic impacts are not included in EAWs but can be addressed in an EIS	1311-77	14
The worksheets used to make preliminary determination on the potential significance of a project's environmental effects have evolved to be so focused on categorical details as to miss the big picture.	1311-78	432
The public who reads these lengthy EAWs gets lost in minute details and is never informed of the devastating, incrementally small but cumulatively significant destructions of nature that humans have committed.	1311-79	432
The ecological setting for this massive, multifaceted food (milk) industry enterprise is one that has, over many decades, been incrementally degraded to such an impoverished level that the beneficial functions (services) original ecosystems once provided have been all but obliterated. These are the very services nature delivers for free that are essential for all life forms including humans. Pure clear air, clean and plentiful water, fish and wildlife once abounded here. Remnants of the tall grass prairie and wetland complex ecosystems that existed prior to its near total conversion to agriculture (dotted by small human communities) remain only in small insignificant patches here and there. This EAW hints at what the area used to be and in subtle ways justifies the projects contribution to the ecological destruction by explaining that the land is now only used for agriculture and therefore there is little measurable impact on the parts which remain in their "natural" state.	1311-80	184
If the setting, the natural backdrop of this project was to be fairly described, it would have to disclose the plummeting populations of insects, birds, fish, reptiles, amphibians, fish and macroinvertebrates. It would have to describe soils that are no longer thriving ecosystems teeming with microscopic life forms important to healthy crops or native prairie. This is known science but this and other EAWs avoid mention of it. Thus, the public largely remains unaware of the apocalyptic declines and a projects likely role in continued declines.	1311-81	184
There is no requirement to acknowledge mass declines on most all other wildlife and plant populations that are rapidly nearing extinction.	1311-82	184

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
When mere vestiges of nature are pronounced a threat to a human enterprise and sanctioned in a government document such an EAW, there is something seriously wrong with the process. It no longer serves the serves the spirit or intent of Minnesota's Environmental Policy Act that authorizes the document.	1311-83	184
This is a substantive comment on all EAWs in general, but also on this one in particular. So, we request that the MPCA respond to it in its record of decision.	1311-84	432
It is eminently and very possibly existentially regrettable that even our state agencies who accept and even produce flawed environmental assessments "do not want to be told otherwise".	1311-85	432
Hello, my name is Ethan Bruer, I'm a life long resident and 5th generation farmer of Stevens county. Our family farm which started in 1884 is west of west river dairy 4 miles. I've been reading most of these comments made and I also attended the public meeting in Morris. I'd like to point out a few things from an observation of mine. RiverView had people standing outside the Old No. 1 at 4:45pm for a meeting that was supposed to start at 6pm. Talk about stacking the deck. Lots of people in this community knew this was going to be a large meeting, yet the planned event space was exceptionally small for the masses that wanted to come and voice their views. Unfortunately many people were denied entry due to space. I'd suggest having a second meeting at a larger venue.	1312-1	435
That being said, from what I've gathered are, if you're tied to Riverview in any way, employee, shareholder, family or any financial ties you're in favor of the expansion. Which stands to reason. But you need to look beyond on that and think what's good for the environment.	1312-2	432
Those who weren't, seemed to have genuine questions or concerns about the project. Almost each person who was in favor wrote a sermon on how great RiverView was followed by a softball lob of a question to the MPCA panel to tie it in at the end. Are we playing to emotion or are we going to look at facts, data and research?	1312-3	432
Data such as wind erosion aspect that impacts the environment and those around it.	1312-4	186
Are we playing to emotion or are we going to look at facts, data and research? Data such as water that impacts the environment and those around it.	1312-5	413
Data such as manure aspect that impacts the environment and those around it.	1312-6	167
Data such as nitrate runoff aspect that impacts the environment and those around it.	1312-7	272
With that said, I will say Riverview does a nice job keeping their facilities clean and well maintained.	1312-8	430
I've debated writing a comment on this as I feel it puts a target on my back being a smaller farm in the area who cannot compete on such a scale as Riverview. We all know smaller farms are going away as years go by. But when that happens you don't have a community anymore.	1312-9	397
The more people and farms you have in a community the better it thrives. Not less when the "competition" is driven out.	1312-10	397
As a fifth generation farmer I want to pass this legacy and way of life down to my children. I just hope the resources, (land and water) are here for them and their kids. But with large a scale operation like Riverview it's hard to compete and be optimistic.	1312-11	397

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I'd suggest there needs to be an EIS done on this project. Something of this scale needs to have every component looked at. Whether it passes or not. There needs to be a standard or precedent for such large projects.	1312-12	15
The current EAW process is sufficient and thorough. There is no need for further EIS review.	1313-1	20
I am in strong support of the West River Dairy Expansion.	1314-1	431
The EAW is sufficient and there is no reason for an EIS.	1314-2	20
I would request that you require an EIS. These Riverview sites are not farm scale, but industrial scale. They need to regulated at the highest possible level to protect our shared environment and water resources.	1315-1	1
The amount of water pulled from the ground is very concerning for anyone on the same aquifer.	1315-2	195
The size that they are if something goes wrong with manure application it would be disastrous.	1315-3	385
The size that they are if something goes wrong with manure storage it would be disastrous.	1315-4	385
I implore you to require an EIS for this project. This appears to be an unprecedented size of operation in our region. We don’t know what the impacts can be or how far-reaching they may be.	1316-1	15
Bringing jobs to the area is not a bad thing at all.	1316-2	432
My concern lays more in how our groundwater will be impacted.	1316-3	195
My concern lays more in how our farmland will be impacted.	1316-4	168
Our agricultural output is staggering in the area. It could be tragic if that is impacted.	1316-5	400
should be approved for the follow reasons:	1317-1	431
I’m in support of what Riverview is planning to build, and I don’t think there should be any more restrictions for them to build what they already have built across the country.	1318-1	431
Riverview should be granted the permit for expansion.	1319-1	431
We are living with global warming which is rapidly making weather events more extreme and more frequent. There will be an increasing number of extreme storm events. We're seeing them already, year round.	1320-1	100
It is no longer possible to swim in most MN waterways due to blue-green algae caused by feces runoff from MN land.	1320-2	294
It just takes a few flooding events per year to spread feces into waterways.	1320-3	262
How will they keep the water table around the 19,000 cow feedlot free of nitrogen from manure?	1320-4	193
How will they keep the air clean and fresh for the neighbors?	1320-5	82
How will they dispose of the manure on an ongoing daily basis that won't burden the county with fecal waste?	1320-6	346
Can they disperse it beyond the county?	1320-7	329
Right now more than 5 tons of animal waste is generated for every man, woman and child in the U.S. per Dr. Michael Greger. You don't want that concentrated in one county.	1320-8	310
And even though the MPCA's only concern is pollution, the State has a strong health interest in avoiding another pandemic. This is a comment site for the MPCA, so you'll see it as irrelevant that epidemiologists like Dr. Michael Osterholm believe we're due within a few years for a pandemic that could originate in industrial feedlots that could kill 1/3 of mankind.	1320-9	395

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Pathogens swiftly become maximally lethal where animals are packed together skin to skin, according to nutritionist (originally epidemiologist) Dr. Michael Greger.	1320-10	395
Globally, corporations have copied our megafarm model, so the next pandemic is just as likely to originate overseas as in Minnesota. Wet markets, uber feedlots, endanger mankind to save a few pennies.	1320-11	395
And cow milk isn't even that healthy, due to the pregnancy hormones in it. A huge Swedish nutritional study of tens of thousands of people over decades found that people who drank a cup of milk per day die at a higher rate than those who don't.	1320-12	395
I've studied comparative religion 63 years, and it turns out 2 Messengers from God arose in Iran 200 years ago, Muslims, who fulfill the prophecies/requirements of the 9 major world religions for the ones who will bring world peace at "the end of time". The prophecies about pandemics that will kill 1/3 of mankind are yet to be fulfilled, even if Christ returned in Iran as a Muslim 200 years ago. MPCA can't prevent the raging pandemics that are coming, but at least you could stop them from starting here.	1320-13	395
Maybe we can make the burying of our children in the next, about 7 times worse than covid, pandemic cheaper by digging mass graves and omitting coffins and just tossing people in.	1320-15	395
I submitted this comment on 3/20/26 and you deleted it. I'm resubmitting it. The MPCA deleted the comment I made on Tuesday, 3/17/26, so, outraged, I followed up with more comments on 3/18 & 3/19.	1321-1	435
But what I have to say shouldn't be muzzled because it applies to the dangers to Minnesotans of animal/poultry factory farm practices. They have a direct bearing on this expansion request. And the MPCA is the government bureau with the oversight to regulate animal and poultry factory farms. So take my comment. And act to protect Minnesotans.	1321-2	16
I note that the head of the MPCA when the MN public was just discovering 3M's PFAs pollution came to the MPCA from 3M. So perhaps the current leadership at MPCA is from the corporate animal factory farm sector, and they're in a position to try to hide from us the dangers they actually pose to us.	1321-3	228
NYT best-selling nutrition expert, Dr. Michael Greger, started out as an epidemiologist. One of the world's leading epidemiologists is Dr. Michael Osterholm, at the University of Minnesota.	1321-4	435
In 2020, Dr. Michael Greger published, "How to Survive a Pandemic," about the next pandemic, possibly as soon as within 5 years, that might be a bird flu pandemic, that he predicted would probably be generated in an animal/poultry factory farm. He went in detail in the book about why viruses and bacteria become extremely lethal when generated in a system where the hosts are packed body to body, in dark, airless enclosures. Yes, dark, airless enclosures, packed body to body, causes weight to be put on fastest for poultry, cutting meat production time in half.	1321-5	72
Greger told us calves are weaned on cow blood, which is protein nutritious, rather than on milk, which farmers can sell.	1321-6	73
Cattle (beef and dairy?) are fed chicken manure, which doesn't affect the taste of the meat of the cattle butchered for meat.	1321-7	73
Cattle are fed highly subsidized corn and soybeans which causes e coli to be produced in their stomachs, and the e coli endangers the consumer when he eats hamburger.	1321-8	395

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The reason this is relevant to MPCA, pollution control, is that you are the government bureau that can green light or limit animal and poultry factory farms.	1321-9	73
Stink, smell and shit aren't the only things you should be paying attention to. The likelihood of animal factory farms generating pandemics is in your wheelhouse, too, within your responsibity.	1321-10	72
Dr. Michael Osterholm published a book in December 2025 called, "The Big One," about the upcoming pandemic which might take 1/3 of mankind's lives. I couldn't bear to finish Dr. Greger's book or to get past a few chapters of Dr. Osterholm's book. I advise you to talk with Dr. Michael Greger and to Dr. Michael Osterholm about how animal/poultry factory farms can be modified to minimize their generation of pandemics.	1321-11	72
As a consumer of dairy products, I urge the MPCA to deny this permit.	1322-1	432
The proposed size of the project is simply too large, and will have profoundly negative effects on the area's groundwater.	1322-2	195
The proposed size of the project is simply too large, and will have profoundly negative effects on the area's air.	1322-3	81
The proposed size of the project is simply too large, and will have profoundly negative effects on the neighbors.	1322-4	434
The proposed size of the project is simply too large, and will have profoundly negative effects on the animals themselves.	1322-5	74
As such, approving it would make a mockery of the stated mission of the MPCA.	1322-6	432
This is a terrible proposal.	1323-1	432
We need more small farms, family farms, not factory farms.	1323-2	432
As a consumer of dairy products, I urge the MPCA to deny this permit.	1323-3	432
The proposed size of the project is simply too large, and will have profoundly negative effects on the area's groundwater.	1323-4	434
The proposed size of the project is simply too large, and will have profoundly negative effects on the area's air.	1323-5	81
The proposed size of the project is simply too large, and will have profoundly negative effects on the neighbors.	1323-6	397
The proposed size of the project is simply too large, and will have profoundly negative effects on the animals themselves.	1323-7	74
As such, approving it would make a mockery of the stated mission of the MPCA.	1323-8	435
I had no idea that this type of factory farm is being proposed in the Morris MN area until I read the StarTribune article in the April 2nd edition.	1324-1	435
Having grown up on a farm in northeast South Dakota, I know the damage that these "farms" inflict on our communities. There are so many environmental downsides to this proposal.	1324-2	148
Having grown up on a farm in northeast South Dakota, I know the damage that these "farms" inflict on our communities. There are so many ethical downsides to this proposal.	1324-3	403
Having grown up on a farm in northeast South Dakota, I know the damage that these "farms" inflict on our communities. There are so many economic downsides to this proposal.	1324-4	398
26000 cows in a confined area is simply wrong.	1324-5	434
This is about big ag damaging the prospects for smaller farms all across Minnesota.	1324-6	400
It's wrong on so many levels.	1324-7	432
This needs to be reviewed at the very least, with the possible damage scrutinized at every turn.	1324-8	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Stopping it is the very best outcome, and is your responsibility as the MPCA. Please live up to your name.	1324-9	432
I would not be in favor of granting this proposal.	1325-1	432
I think the potential for negative impact on the environment is huge with disposal of concentrated manure.	1325-2	167
I also think the cows deserve more of a real life then being held in a factory farm.	1325-3	74
I am asking that there be a full environmental impact statement for this project.	1326-1	1
The size/number of cattle will inhibit and hurt smaller, family-owned operations.	1326-2	400
The water for environment and humans would be impacted.	1326-3	387
Plus - can't we put risk to people above the profit motive?	1326-4	403
I am writing on behalf of many neighbors, friends, and family that live in Minnesota that strongly oppose factory farming in our state, particularly the expansion of factory farming.	1327-1	403
I oppose this because it has been shown to have a negative effect on the environment.	1327-2	432
I oppose this because it has been shown to have a negative effect on the water.	1327-3	432
I oppose this because it has been shown to have a negative effect on the soil etc.	1327-4	432
I oppose this because it has been shown to have a negative effect on the air etc.	1327-5	81
It puts neighboring Minnesotans at risk for disease and health issues related to the environmental impact.	1327-6	395
It also is not ethical to put animals in cramped, unsanitary conditions such as those in factory farms.	1327-7	74
Theres is also a global oversupply of milk right now.	1327-8	435
Out state doesn't need more factory farm milk, we need small organic farms that care deeply about the land.	1327-9	162
Out state doesn't need more factory farm milk, we need small organic farms that care deeply about the relationship with the ecosystem.	1327-10	162
Out state doesn't need more factory farm milk, we need small organic farms that care deeply about the neighbors.	1327-11	400
Our state doesn't need more factory farm milk, we need small organic farms that care deeply about the animals.	1327-12	73
Out state doesn't need more factory farm milk, we need small organic farms that care deeply about the role in the community.	1327-13	400
I'm concerned about the overall scale and that it's unprecedented in the state.	1328-1	434
How can we be confident about how the consequences of failure scale with volume at these new levels?	1328-2	434
I'm also concerned about the words "except in an extreme storm event" and how different that will look with these huge volumes compared to what might happen at a small family farm.	1328-3	100
I see that some commenters are very confident this particular business will do everything right. The permit can say certain things are required but why should we feel confident the operators can really meet those requirements when it's so far beyond what's be done so far?	1328-4	61
Weren't we just hearing about some insane number of chickens left to starve when a large chicken outfit went out of business?	1328-5	435
They were probably fulfilling some permitting requirements right up until they weren't around to be held accountable anymore.	1328-6	435

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Their business was probably an economic boon to some farmers and communities right up until it wasn't.	1328-7	398
I see that the chickens (1.6 million!) were not actually all in one location. Well, thank goodness for that!	1328-8	435
This kind of concentration means all the local environmental consequence eggs are in one basket.	1328-9	434
I see the words "permanent stockpiles" above there too... uh, there was nothing permanent about the chicken business and presumably these will be the largest ever permanent manure stockpiles in the state?	1328-10	434
My understanding is the decision being made currently is just about whether there should be a more detailed environmental assessment. Yes, yes there should.	1328-11	29
What would merit such a review if not a huge increase in scale like this?	1328-12	19
If this kind of increased concentration is actually a good idea, it will pass such a review.	1328-13	31
This is insane. As a former feedlot inspector for Renville Co. I find this a major threat to our water supply: surface water.	1329-1	289
This is insane. As a former feedlot inspector for Renville Co. I find this a major threat to our water supply: groundwater.	1329-2	218
Our surface water in the agricultural regions of the state are already badly degraded by the Ag industry.	1329-3	266
Our groundwater in the agricultural regions of the state are already badly degraded by the Ag industry.	1329-4	193
To add yet another threat is MPCA not doing their job to protect the citizens.	1329-5	435
All the water in this region is already degraded/impaired due to lack of regulation and influence by big Ag.	1329-6	19
For once due your job and defend the citizens and not corporate agricultural.	1329-7	435
So if we do not allow some new facilities to be built to replace the dairy farmers that are retiring around the US we will eventually have a problem with food security.	1330-1	431
I urge MPCA to move forward expeditiously.	1331-1	431
This business cares for the community and as industry and revenue to the state.	1332-1	431
Confining close to 19,000 cows in one site is incomprehensible to me.	1333-1	434
Sprawling industrial facilities like this jeopardize our natural resources.	1333-2	180
Sprawling industrial facilities like this jeopardize our animal welfare.	1333-3	74
Sprawling industrial facilities like this jeopardize our public health.	1333-4	395
Facilities like this keep their cows pregnant for six years and then slaughter them when they've become no longer useful.	1333-5	74
This is just another way of destroying small dairies that lovingly take care of their animals and strive to proudly produce dairy products that are healthy and unique.	1333-6	400
Please conduct the essential Environmental Impact Study that clearly should be done for a project of this magnitude.	1334-1	1
As a citizen of Stevens County I am deeply concerned about potential further depletion and pollution of our regional water resources.	1334-2	387
I oppose the project in general and believe that the EIS will show that this is not a sustainable or viable project.	1334-3	432
As the wife of someone who has worked in the farm fields of this region I find it alarming to see the degradation of the land here by family corporations that put profit before environmental protection.	1334-4	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
We already know that Riverview Dairy's operations in other parts of the country have caused serious problems for people in the communities that surround their dairies.	1334-5	432
Please require Riverview to prove that they can protect the people and environment of this region.	1334-6	432
Thank you for doing the job of protecting the residents of Minnesota!	1334-7	435
The environmental review is thorough.	1335-1	20
This project deserves to move forward so that our industry can continue to grow in the Upper Midwest — responsibly, sustainably, and in a way that benefits producers, processors, communities, and the environment alike.	1335-2	431
This feedlot proposal is too large.	1336-1	434
I have no faith any corporate farm will abide by current regulations.	1336-2	432
I have no faith any corporate farm will care for the animals.	1336-3	74
This type of gigantic farm is bad for family farms.	1336-4	400
This type of gigantic farm is bad for our environment.	1336-5	167
Our history of family farms is too important to ignore and allow big business have their way.	1336-6	400
A project of this nature absolutely requires an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	1337-1	1
Not requiring one makes a mockery of all that has been done previously to protect our land and water resources from degradation.	1337-2	58
I am writing to you at the MPCA as a concerned Minnesotan, born and raised in the land of 10,000 lakes, and proud of our environmental advocacy. I love our state and I am certain that you do, too. My public comment to all of you at the MPCA is this: As the Minnesota POLLUTION CONTROL Agency, caps added by me, if you don't outright deny Riverview LLP's expansion proposal, which I truly believe is the only environmentally responsible decision to make for our state.	1338-1	432
then the only alternate and responsible environmental decision left for you to make is for you to request an Environmental Impact Statement	1338-2	432
Please, and I know I speak for countless thousands of your fellow Minnesotans, do the job that you are all there to do.	1338-3	432
This potential dairy feedlot expansion permit request is horrific for our state in so many ways, including for our lands.	1338-4	176
This potential dairy feedlot expansion permit request is horrific for our state in so many ways, including for our waters.	1338-5	387
This potential dairy feedlot expansion permit request is horrific for our state in so many ways, including for our air.	1338-6	81
This potential dairy feedlot expansion permit request is horrific for our state in so many ways, including for oour public health.	1338-7	395
Requiring an EIS would require Riverview LLP to justify and to prove to you and to all Minnesotans that increasing their feedlot capacity to a maximum total of 26,397 AU, ANIMAL UNITS (read living, breathing, suffering, milk-producing cows kept in close proximity in total confinement barns) while inconceivable to me, is environmentally sound.	1338-8	1

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Requiring an EIS would require Riverview LLP to justify and to prove to you and to all Minnesotans that increasing their feedlot capacity to a maximum total of 26,397 AU, ANIMAL UNITS (read living, breathing, suffering, milk-producing cows kept in close proximity in total confinement barns) while inconceivable to me, that spreading an unimaginable volume of manure onto our lands isn't a dire contamination threat to our lands.	1338-9	6
Requiring an EIS would require Riverview LLP to justify and to prove to you and to all Minnesotans that increasing their feedlot capacity to a maximum total of 26,397 AU, ANIMAL UNITS (read living, breathing, suffering, milk-producing cows kept in close proximity in total confinement barns) while inconceivable to me, that spreading an unimaginable volume of manure onto our lands isn't a dire contamination threat to our waters.	1338-10	2
Requiring an EIS would require Riverview LLP to justify and to prove to you and to all Minnesotans that increasing their feedlot capacity to a maximum total of 26,397 AU, ANIMAL UNITS (read living, breathing, suffering, milk-producing cows kept in close proximity in total confinement barns) while inconceivable to me, that spreading an unimaginable volume of manure onto our lands isn't a dire contamination threat to our wildlife.	1338-11	7
Requiring an EIS would require Riverview LLP to justify and to prove to you and to all Minnesotans that increasing their feedlot capacity to a maximum total of 26,397 AU, ANIMAL UNITS (read living, breathing, suffering, milk-producing cows kept in close proximity in total confinement barns) while inconceivable to me, that spreading an unimaginable volume of manure onto our lands isn't a dire contamination threat to our air quality.	1338-12	4
Requiring an EIS would require Riverview LLP to justify and to prove to you and to all Minnesotans that increasing their feedlot capacity to a maximum total of 26,397 AU, ANIMAL UNITS (read living, breathing, suffering, milk-producing cows kept in close proximity in total confinement barns) while inconceivable to me, that spreading an unimaginable volume of manure onto our lands isn't a dire contamination threat to our public health.	1338-13	10
Requiring an EIS would require Riverview LLP to justify and to prove to you and to all Minnesotans that increasing their feedlot capacity to a maximum total of 26,397 AU, ANIMAL UNITS (read living, breathing, suffering, milk-producing cows kept in close proximity in total confinement barns) while inconceivable to me, that closely confining many thousands of animals for the entirety of their lives presents no risks of illness and disease to be spread amongst them or to their caregivers.	1338-14	72
Requiring an EIS would require Riverview LLP to justify and to prove to you and to all Minnesotans that increasing their feedlot capacity to a maximum total of 26,397 AU, ANIMAL UNITS (read living, breathing, suffering, milk-producing cows kept in close proximity in total confinement barns) while inconceivable to me, that a mass casualty event such as mass illness requiring euthanasia has been contemplated, planned for and mitigated;	1338-15	72
Requiring an EIS would require Riverview LLP to justify and to prove to you and to all Minnesotans that increasing their feedlot capacity to a maximum total of 26,397 AU, ANIMAL UNITS (read living, breathing, suffering, milk-producing cows kept in close proximity in total confinement barns) while inconceivable to me, that the environmental disaster implied by the ominous words "except in an extreme storm event" has also been planned for and mitigated;	1338-16	5

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
...and I wish I knew the other environmental risks there are that I would cite today if I knew them. Instead, I must trust that you at MPCA know what these additional environmental risks are and that, with an EIS, you will hold Riverview LLP accountable to the highest standards of environmental protection that our state and we Minnesotans expect and deserve.	1338-17	1
We Minnesotans and our beautiful state are worth protecting.	1338-18	403
I hope that the MPCA recognizes Riverview's long history of doing right by the communities it's established in.	1339-1	431
I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed expansion of the Riverview dairy operation in Morris, Minnesota.	1340-1	432
As a concerned citizen who worked for over 40 years as a Registered Professional Engineer, I believe this project—which would become the largest livestock farm in state history—poses unacceptable risks to our local environment.	1340-2	167
As a concerned citizen who worked for over 40 years as a Registered Professional Engineer, I believe this project—which would become the largest livestock farm in state history—poses unacceptable risks to our groundwater.	1340-3	246
As a concerned citizen who worked for over 40 years as a Registered Professional Engineer, I believe this project—which would become the largest livestock farm in state history—poses unacceptable risks to the health of our community.	1340-4	395
My primary concerns include: Water Depletion: The facility is permitted to pump up to 226 million gallons of water per year. This massive appropriation rivals the consumption of the entire City of Morris (permitted for 300 million gallons) and threatens to deplete local groundwater and impact the Pomme de Terre River.	1340-5	195
My primary concerns include: Nitrate Pollution: The collection and application of manure from such a massive number of animals significantly increases the risk of nitrates leaking into groundwater.	1340-6	193
My primary concerns include: Nitrate Pollution: Given Riverview's history of manure spills in western Minnesota, I am deeply concerned about the long-term safety of our drinking water, and the impact that will have on the cancer rates of those living in the area.	1340-7	373
My primary concerns include: Inadequate Environmental Review: I join organizations like the Land Stewardship Project in calling for a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The current Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) is insufficient to address the unprecedented scale of this facility and its cumulative impacts on the region's land and water.	1340-8	15
I urge the MPCA to deny the current permit and require a more rigorous environmental review to protect the health and resources of Stevens County residents.	1340-9	33
The impact of these large scale corporate farms and livestock enclosures on the health of our groundwater aquifers needs to be of concern to ALL Minnesotans!	1340-10	218
I have lived with in 5 miles of the proposed expansion for most of my life. I am not concerned about Riverview as a company itself. I think that they a great asset to our community.	1342-1	397
However, I am concerned about is the true environmental impact of the proposed expansion.	1342-2	167
I believe that a full Environmental Impact Statement should be done prior to the expansion.	1342-3	1
Also, I have noticed that our water quality has gone down in past 15 years.	1342-4	411
What happens when our well goes dry? Who will pay for that?	1342-5	224

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am writing to formally request that the MPCA mandate a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed West River Dairy expansion.	1343-1	1
As the largest livestock operation in Minnesota's history, the cumulative environmental risks—specifically regarding Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs)—far exceed the scope of the current Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW). The Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) and the MPCA classify hormones as CECs. MDH data indicates that these substances already affect 90% of tested Minnesota lakes, and a U.S. Geological Survey study found the Mississippi River in Minnesota has the highest rate of "feminized" fish--male fish that develop female characteristics, such as eggs in their testes. The cause is attributed to endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs) that act as estrogens, causing sexual disruption.	1343-2	432
The scale of the West River Dairy expansion poses the following significant risks: - Hormone Output: Pregnant and lactating cows produce large amounts of estrogen and related hormones. An 18,000-cow herd produces approximately 15 pounds of estrogen daily. Hormones are potent in very small concentrations. In addition, large dairies routinely use synthetic hormones to maximize lactation and control the cows' reproductive cycles, which further increases this biological load.	1343-3	434
The scale of the West River Dairy expansion poses the following significant risks: - Environmental Persistence: Estrogens in dairy wastewater are notably persistent and often fail to biodegrade under the anaerobic conditions found in manure storage lagoons.	1343-4	412
The scale of the West River Dairy expansion poses the following significant risks: - Public Health Implications: These hormones bioaccumulate in the food chain. Human exposure through contaminated drinking water is linked to impaired fertility, developmental malformations, and hormone-sensitive cancers.	1343-5	395
The scale of the West River Dairy expansion poses the following significant risks: - Private Wells: Rural residents relying on private wells are particularly vulnerable. No one monitors our wells for safety, so the full financial and health burden of testing and harm falls directly on us.	1343-6	396
Most municipal systems are incapable of filtering out these contaminants, so well owners are particularly disadvantaged by lack of regulatory oversight to keep our water safe. We deserve better.	1343-7	396
Our state prides itself on its water, pure water at that. If our water is no longer drinkable because others have profited from making it so, regulation and justice must prevail.	1343-8	396
Having grown up along Shakopee Creek in the adjacent watershed to the proposed expansion, I have witnessed the degradation of local watersheds firsthand; the Shakopee is now a designated critical nutrient hotspot.	1343-9	435
Nearby is Dublin Dairy, one of Riverview LLP's 8000 cow dairies. Do we have CEC [Contaminants of Emerging Concern] data for Shakopee Creek?	1343-10	404
A blueprint for protecting our water may become apparent if we choose to look. Perhaps we have hardly begun to accurately assess the environmental impact of dairies of this size, placing them ahead of CEC data collection and the safety of our drinking water.	1343-11	396

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
A blueprint forpreventing contamination may become apparent if we choose to look. Perhaps we have hardly begun to accurately assess the environmental impact of dairies of this size, placing them ahead of CEC data collection and the safety of our drinking water.	1343-12	396
If this expansion is green-lighted, hormones and endocrine disruptors will enter our water system at an unprecedented scale, affecting us all.	1343-13	395
Along with raising already elevated levels of nitrogen, phosphorus, and E. coli, the West River Dairy expansion represents a permanent threat to regional water security.	1343-14	387
I urge the MPCA to require a comprehensive EIS to study these cumulative impacts.	1343-15	1
We have the following concerns regarding Riverview's proposed expansion -an Environmental Impact review of industrial measures must be done	1344-1	1
-impact of local water supply—future water supply, safety of water available, especially long term (we are aware of the issues created by Riverview in AZ)	1344-2	194
expansion will likely be a boost to the local economy, but consider how many small dairy farms have been/will be forced to sell out having a negative impact on the local economy	1344-3	400
I would encourage a decision by the agencies involved to approve the West River Dairy expansion.	1345-1	430
With the rigorous safeguards for environmental security well documented in this EAW, the request for an EIS would be considered overreach.	1345-2	20
I am against this for reasons including concern about groundwater contamination.	1346-1	193
I am against this for reasons including concern about sustainability of the Pomme de Terre aquifer to provide watwer to not only this endeavor.	1346-2	276
I am against this for reasons including concern to continue to have water available for other businesses, residents and farmers in our community.	1346-3	195
Based on the performance of the Sulphur Valley, AZ operation, I have serious doubts about the trustworthiness of this project here in Morris.	1346-4	194
We here at Meixel Farms, and Meixel Truck sales support the west river dairy expansion.	1347-1	431
I think allowing Riverview LLP to expand their operations in Morris would be a big mistake.	1348-1	33
knowing of their previous manure spills in the state.	1348-2	373
I am writing in full support of their proposed West River Dairy expansion in Stevens County.	1349-1	431
No EIS is needed as the state environmental review process is rigorous and very sufficient.	1349-2	20
I respectfully encourage your support and approval of this important project.	1349-3	431
The environmental impact to the community will be devastating.	1350-1	397
Air quality will be affected in a very bad way!	1350-2	81
water quality will be affected in a very bad way!	1350-3	388
Living close to the dairy, I am concerned about the water input this dairy will require.	1351-1	195

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I am also concerned with water quality. I have a family and livestock living off well water. Loosing that resource would be catastrophic.	1351-2	193
I have concern regarding local traffic.	1351-3	435
I have concern regarding wildlife impact.	1351-4	173
Many times trucks running to the dairy disregard traffic laws and don't share road space safely when we are working in ditches.	1351-5	435
Lastly with the need for land and the ability for them to pay large prices, it affects local families being able to afford land as prices are driven up.	1351-6	400
I can't believe this is being considered.	1352-1	403
The increase to this facility will cause well water contamination that down the road could in put local water tables at stake.	1352-2	193
The increase to this facility will cause well water contamination that down the road could in put personal wells at stake.	1352-3	193
The other side of this debate is manure storage. This may sound good but it all has to be disposed of and that much manure will have to impact the water supply in the future. What will be the options then?	1352-4	350
I grew up in Hancock 9 miles from Morris and some days the smell was bad, I can only imagine by increasing the dairy to this extremely large size will make living in the surrounding area unbearable.	1352-5	83
However, I take comfort in knowing that an operation like Riverview has already done more than their share of due diligence on a project of this nature, including the necessary research in the background, permitting, etc. to make sure that this is done in the correct way. This type of operation already operates under strict regulatory oversight, & the systems are in place to meet MPCA requirements.	1353-1	431
This expansion is very troubling. concerns with the amount of manure.	1354-1	391
This expansion is very troubling. concerns with the amount of water.	1354-2	195
Very concerning what this expansion will have on the sites dairy farmers who already have been under extreme pressure.	1354-3	400
Why cn be done with the manure, can it really be used for fertilizer without increasing Athene risk of nitrate pollution?	1354-4	367
Requiring a full environmental impact assessment in this case should be required.	1355-1	1
A large CFO that degrades soil should not be allowed in a State that says it stands for a healthy environment.	1355-2	183
A large CFO that degrades water should not be allowed in a State that says it stands for a healthy environment.	1355-3	33
A large CFO that degrades air should not be allowed in a State that says it stands for a healthy environment.	1355-4	81
I support West River Dairy Expansion and Feedlot Permit	1356-1	431
No EIS required. Have a great day	1356-2	20
I support West river expansión	1357-1	431
no EIS required	1357-2	20
This is a revised comment from my previous one. I attended the MPCA meeting April 28. After seeing so many in the crowd who are a part of Riverview dairy, I have come to the conclusion that the dairy itself stacked the meeting and dominated the discussion, to the detriment of those who also wanted to participate- space was limited and many were turned away.	1358-1	435

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I still have very valid concerns regarding the proximity of this operation to the Pomme de Terre River, which is already stressed out due to farm fertilizer runoff.	1358-2	266
I am concerned about the contaminants already in that river that, although they meet EPA guidelines, as was mentioned last night, those guidelines are out of date in regards to the current health concerns this river poses.	1358-3	259
The potential for an accidental leak at Riverview makes this a very tenous situation.	1358-4	385
To make a leap from 8,000 to 20,000 animals without regard for potential hazards is foolish at best.	1358-5	434
Riverview has already experienced a manure leak at its Murdock facility, why is this risk being allowed here in Morris?	1358-6	373
I urge you all to fully consider the repercussions of this and make a decision that will benefit ALL residents of Stevens County and Morris, not JUST those who will benfit financially.	1358-7	403
Having worked with Riverview LLC for many years, I would support this project.	1359-1	431
I fully support the project and appreciate the work Riverview has done to ensure the safety of the community and stewardship of the animals.	1360-1	431
I attended the recent public hearing on the West River expansion permit and would like to submit the following public comment. At the outset, I should note that many of the comments at the hearing, although perhaps scripted, seem to accurately reflect the fact that Riverview is very generous and appears to be a good neighbor. While these are laudable attributes, it appears that they may not be very relevant to the environmental review that your permitting process contemplates.	1361-1	403
It is my understanding that the proposed expansion would result in an approximate 200% increase in animal units at this one location. I may not be reading it correctly but it appears that there might be an allowable increase of up to 26000 animal units, which would be over a 300% increase. In either case, it would result in the largest feedlot in one location in Minnesota if not the country. It appears as if the proposal, from an environmental standpoint, is going where no man has gone before.	1361-2	433
The thrust of my comment is that there needs to be a focus on the cumulative environmental effect of this proposal upon the entire geographic area. Although the proposed expansion is the largest feedlot in the geographic area, it is not the only feedlot in the area. Whether these are dairy, pig or cattle feedlots, they all have a potential environmental effect upon the air.	1361-3	80
The thrust of my comment is that there needs to be a focus on the cumulative environmental effect of this proposal upon the entire geographic area. Although the proposed expansion is the largest feedlot in the geographic area, it is not the only feedlot in the area. Whether these are dairy, pig or cattle feedlots, they all have a potential environmental effect upon the soil.	1361-4	136
The thrust of my comment is that there needs to be a focus on the cumulative environmental effect of this proposal upon the entire geographic area. Although the proposed expansion is the largest feedlot in the geographic area, it is not the only feedlot in the area. Whether these are dairy, pig or cattle feedlots, they all have a potential environmental effect upon the water.	1361-5	136

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Additionally, these feedlots are not the only users of these resources. Area farms not associated with West River also apply either manure or fertilizer to virtually every field that is farmed in the area.	1361-6	314
Although this is anecdotal and not necessarily accurate, it appears that irrigation of cropland in the area has increased, placing a further strain on water resources.	1361-7	221
It seems incongruous that the cumulative effect of the largest feedlot expansion in the state, if not the nation, should not be more fully explored through utilization of an EIS or conditions on the permit approval mandating graduated expansion with follow up mandatory environmental assessment of the whole area.	1361-8	2
I am fully aware that additional delay could have some economic impact upon Riverview. So would an environmental disaster. From the presentation at the public meeting, I am aware that the proposed application includes certain provisions designed to mitigate negative environmental impacts of the feedlot. I am not knowledgeable as to whether the mitigation efforts are state of the art, but I am assuming they probably are.	1361-9	364
However, state of the art does not equate to absolute certainty. Mistakes or failures still happen. Once a negative impact happens, you cannot put the toothpaste back in the tube or the poop back in the cows.	1361-10	385
I can't believe that the policy of the state of Minnesota is going to permit the largest feedlot expansion in a single geographic area without more fully exploring the already existing environmental condition of the area.	1361-11	57
I am not sufficiently knowledgeable whether it is more environmentally friendly to concentrate large feedlots in a single geographic area or to spread them out through the state, but I assume that MPCA staff has such requisite knowledge.	1361-12	435
I fully support the expansion of this facility.	1362-1	431
I think it is an opportunity for more jobs.	1363-1	431
The proposed Riverview expansion in Stevens County poses significant environmental harm to the county.	1364-1	167
The proposed Riverview expansion in Stevens County poses significant economic harm to the county.	1364-2	398
The proposed Riverview expansion in Stevens County poses significant environmental harm to it's water supply.	1364-3	387
The proposed Riverview expansion in Stevens County poses significant economic harm to it's water supply.	1364-4	398
The proposed Riverview expansion in Stevens County poses significant environmental harm to it's environment.	1364-5	167
The proposed Riverview expansion in Stevens County poses significant economic harm to it's environment.	1364-6	398
The proposed Riverview expansion in Stevens County poses significant environmental harm to it's economy.	1364-7	398
The proposed Riverview expansion in Stevens County poses significant economic harm to it's economy.	1364-8	398
The proposed Riverview expansion in Stevens County poses significant environmental harm to it's citizens.	1364-9	397
The proposed Riverview expansion in Stevens County poses significant economic harm to it's citizens.	1364-10	398
In addition, small family farms and county residents face economic threats from mega corporate farm operations.	1364-12	398
In addition, small family farms and county residents face economic threats from negative impacts on water critical to remaining in business and loss of future viability.	1364-13	398
In addition, small family farms and county residents face economic threats from negative impacts on land critical to remaining in business and loss of future viability.	1364-14	398

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
In addition, small family farms and county residents face economic threats from negative impacts on environmental resources critical to remaining in business and loss of future viability.	1364-15	398
In addition, small family farms and county residents face economic threats from negative impacts on economic resources critical to remaining in business and loss of future viability.	1364-16	398
At the very least, we urge MPCA to require an extensive Environmental Impact Study prior to any consideration of an expansion request of this magnitude.	1364-17	1
The water sources are fragile already, and this unprecedented expansion threatens the short and long term sustainability of these systems.	1364-11a	387
The related ecosystems are fragile already, and this unprecedented expansion threatens the short and long term sustainability of these systems.	1364-11b	165
As a resident of Morris and a person who loves to utilize outdoor public spaces for recreation activities, I am concerned by the amount of waste this change would produce.	1365-1	391
The nutrient load from manure on the lands surrounding the facility will likely be disproportionate, with closer locations receiving more inputs than locations farther away, as a function of transport cost and equipment abilities.	1365-2	323
I am concerned that public water bodies will be impacted, affecting fishing opportunities in the vicinity.	1365-3	265
I am concerned that public water bodies will be impacted, affecting boating opportunities in the vicinity.	1365-4	265
I am concerned that public water bodies will be impacted, affecting wildlife observation opportunities in the vicinity.	1365-5	76
Many of the lakes in the area are already known to be relatively shallow, and green algae (cyanobacteria) blooms are often encountered in the summer months. These blooms are detrimental to fish health.	1365-6	75
Many of the lakes in the area are already known to be relatively shallow, and green algae (cyanobacteria) blooms are often encountered in the summer months. These blooms are detrimental to the health of birds that use these lakes for breeding and migration sites.	1365-7	75
The health of humans and pets can also be affected by these blooms, if severe enough.	1365-8	396
Adding more nutrients to the landscape with increased manure supplies under this proposal will negatively affect the surrounding waterways and the wildlife that utilize them for survival and leisure.	1365-9	173
Adding more nutrients to the landscape with increased manure supplies under this proposal will negatively affect the surrounding waterways and the people that utilize them for survival and leisure.	1365-10	272
I support completely this project	1366-1	431
I would really like to see a full environmental impact assessment on this plan.	1368-1	1
I appreciate the growth and diversity Riverview has brought to the Morris community but am concerned that an operation of this size may negatively impact our local water quality and believe that caution is merited.	1368-2	434
I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed expansion of the West River Dairy facility near Morris, MN.	1369-1	432

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This project, which seeks to increase capacity from 7,855 cows to 18,855 (totaling over 26,000 animal units), is unprecedented in the state of Minnesota. Given the massive scale and the history of this specific site, I urge the MPCA to deny the permit or, at minimum, require a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) before further consideration.	1369-2	15
Massive Groundwater Depletion: Riverview LLP has requested to pump 226 million gallons of water annually. Concentrated pumping of this magnitude threatens the domestic wells of neighbors and the long-term viability of the aquifer for the broader community.	1369-5	195
Public Health: The emission of hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, and nitrous oxide (N2O) from a facility of nearly 19,000 cows is a significant public health hazard. Respiratory Impact: Neighbors are subjected to particulate matter and noxious gases that are linked to asthma, bronchitis, and other chronic respiratory conditions.	1369-6	394
Public Health: The emission of hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, and nitrous oxide (N2O) from a facility of nearly 19,000 cows is a significant public health hazard. Climate Change: N2O is a greenhouse gas roughly 300 times more potent than CO2. Permitting a single facility to emit such a concentrated volume contradicts Minnesota's stated climate goals.	1369-07	120
Social Justice and Economic Disparity: The expansion of "Mega-Dairies" is not a neutral economic development; it is a driver of rural inequity. •Consolidation vs. Community: By flooding the market with industrial-scale milk production, Riverview systematically pushes small- and mid-sized family farms out of business. This destroys the fabric of rural Stevens County, replacing independent business owners with a transient, low-wage labor model.	1369-8	398
Social Justice and Economic Disparity: The expansion of "Mega-Dairies" is not a neutral economic development; it is a driver of rural inequity. Environmental Justice: Industrial CAFOs are consistently sited in rural areas where residents have fewer resources to fight protracted legal battles. This places the "negative externalities" of corporate profit—pollution, road damage, and smell directly onto the shoulders of local citizens while the profits are exported.	1369-9	399
Social Justice and Economic Disparity: The expansion of "Mega-Dairies" is not a neutral economic development; it is a driver of rural inequity. Lack of Oversight: In 2014, the MPCA Citizens' Board ordered an EIS for a much smaller version of this project. Since that board was abolished, the lack of a mandatory EIS for a project three times larger represents a failure of democratic oversight and a victory for corporate lobbying over public interest.	1369-10	434
The MPCA must recognize that the "West River Dairy Expansion" is not a standard agricultural project; it is an industrial experiment at a scale Minnesota has never seen. I urge that a full EIS be conducted to study the cumulative impacts on our water.	1369-11	2
The MPCA must recognize that the "West River Dairy Expansion" is not a standard agricultural project; it is an industrial experiment at a scale Minnesota has never seen. I urge that a full EIS be conducted to study the cumulative impacts on our climate.	1369-12	11
The MPCA must recognize that the "West River Dairy Expansion" is not a standard agricultural project; it is an industrial experiment at a scale Minnesota has never seen. I urge that a full EIS be conducted to study the cumulative impacts on our rural social structure.	1369-13	15

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
"This permit requires the facility to be designed, operated, and maintained to prevent discharge to waters, except in an extreme storm event." I have lived in this part of Minnesota for over 50 years. I know West central Minnesota gets extreme weather. This facility, the Riverview LLP West River Dairy, will see extreme storm events and it will cause damages to the surrounding area. Just last summer in two days, July 27 and 28, the City of Morris got over seven inches of rainfall. When the storage ponds at this site over top, the storm water and manure will flow downstream to the east where just across the road is a large county tile drain pipe and draw that flows to the Pomme de Terre River less than four miles away.	1370-1	125
Conversely, I have seen drought when the Pomme de Terre River completely stopped flowing and was reduced to puddles in its channel just downstream from this facility where the well is to be located to supply it.	1370-2	182
An EAW (Environmental Assessment Worksheet) is insufficient for this site. The magnitude of this animal confinement operation, which will be the largest in the state of Minnesota, warrants that an Environmental Impact Statement should be required before a permit for this feedlot expansion can be issued.	1370-3	15
On behalf of H2 Land Stewards, we respectfully submit this letter in support of the Riverview Farms West River Dairy Expansion.	1371-1	431
H2 Land Stewards does not believe a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is justified.	1371-2	20
On behalf of Minnesota Famers Union (MFU) and responding to a vote from our Full Board, I write to request that you require an Economic Impact Statement (EIS) for Riverview LLP's permit to expand their West River Dairy in Stevens County.	1372-1	1
This scale of expansion is unprecedented in our state and we believe strongly that Minnesotans deserve a fuller examination of its environmental.	1372-2	434
This scale of expansion is unprecedented in our state and we believe strongly that Minnesotans deserve a fuller examination of its economic.	1372-3	434
This scale of expansion is unprecedented in our state and we believe strongly that Minnesotans deserve a fuller examination of its social consequences.	1372-4	434
MFU is a grassroots organization that has represented Minnesota's family farmers, ranchers and rural communities since 1918. Our membership and our Full Board include family dairies, including many who are struggling to stay in business while they shoulder prices below their cost of production. This challenge is not new with the number of Minnesota dairies declining by nearly half in the last decade, dropping from 3,470 in 2016 to just 1,600 farms today. And while farms are declining, cows are consolidating into fewer operations. This one company is permitted for nearly a third of Minnesota's dairy herd.	1372-5	397
This consolidation has consequences not just for those families, but also for rural schools that make life possible in rural Minnesota.	1372-6	397
This consolidation has consequences not just for those families, but also for small businesses that make life possible in rural Minnesota.	1372-7	398
This consolidation has consequences not just for those families, but also for veterinary practices that make life possible in rural Minnesota.	1372-8	398

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
This consolidation has consequences not just for those families, but also churches that make life possible in rural Minnesota.	1372-9	397
This consolidation has consequences not just for those families, but also for other institutions that make life possible in rural Minnesota.	1372-10	397
According to an analysis from 2020, the average Minnesota dairy generates $1.6 million in economic activity.[1] A more complete analysis of the economic and social consequences of this project is needed.	1372-11	398
Beyond that, we believe there are important environmental concerns that an EIS would more fully address. Our members understand that livestock projects draw water year-round and we want to ensure that we are stewarding this shared resource and safeguarding sufficient supply for neighboring farms.	1372-12	3
We also understand that consolidating livestock increases the potential consequences of a natural disaster.	1372-13	131
We also understand that consolidating livestock increases the potential consequences of a zoonotic disease.	1372-14	72
We also understand that consolidating livestock increases the potential consequences of a human disease affecting workers.	1372-15	395
To close, this project is different than those that are approved through our existing processes. From my memory of that time, when we established our current regulatory framework for feedlots in the late 1990s no-one contemplated a nearly 19,000 cow dairy operation. That is more than 60 times the average size herd in our state.	1372-16	432
This project is different and deserves distinct consideration and the full public comment afforded by an EIS.	1372-17	1
Riverview is proposing a feedlot expansion that would accommodate an additional 11,000 cows, together with a new 1,304-foot by 692-foot cross-ventilated freestall barn, a new milking parlor, three new liquid manure storage areas, a temporary manure tank, and a solid manure storage building sized for up to a year of storage. Riverview reports that its proposed expansion would produce more than 72,000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions (CO2e) per year, as estimated in the corresponding Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW).	1373-1	103
As drafted, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) cannot issue the permit for this expansion, because the permit does not comply with Minnesota law. Subpart 4 of Minnesota Rule 7020.0505 requires Riverview to submit an Air Emission Plan describing "methods and practices that will be used to minimize air emissions resulting from animal feedlot or manure storage area operations." Methane, nitrous oxide, and carbon dioxide are "air emissions resulting from animal feedlot or manure storage area operations." Yet Riverview's Air Emission Plan contains no greenhouse gas (GHG) emission controls, no monitoring or reporting obligation directed at GHG emissions, and no incorporation of GHG emissions mitigation proposals discussed in the project's EAW. The application and draft permit fail to address GHG emissions at all.	1373-2	63
Because the draft permit incorporates Riverview's application materials—including the deficient Air Emission Plan—as enforceable terms, the noticed permit itself fails to comply with the plain language of Minnesota Rule 7020.0505, subpart 4(B)(1). Before issuing a permit, Riverview must submit an Air Emission Plan that satisfies the requirements of the rule by describing methods and practices that will be used to minimize GHG emissions, and MPCA must re-notice the draft permit for public comment.	1373-3	63

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Riverview, the fifth largest dairy farming company in the world and the second largest in the United States, has operated the West River Dairy in Stevens County since 2004. West River Dairy houses over 7,800 head of dairy cows and is one of the largest feedlot projects in the state of Minnesota. Riverview now seeks an 11,000-head expansion. The Expansion Project would house thousands of additional cows in a crossventilated, total-confinement, free-stall barn. Clay-lined basins with impermeable covers would be used to collect and store manure and wastewater. The resulting 18,855-head feedlot would be the largest in state history.	1373-4	434
The expansion would significantly increase West River Dairy's GHG emissions. New GHG emission sources include direct emissions from livestock digestion and manure management, alongside indirect emissions from feed production, energy use, and other life-cycle emissions associated with animal agriculture.	1373-5	113
The EAW reports that Riverview's Expansion Project would add at least 72,000 tons of CO2e per year to the existing West River Dairy facility. That estimate excludes GHG emissions associated with upstream feed production, downstream processing, and other life-cycle sources. Even at this lower bound, 72,000 tons of CO2e represents one-sixth of the entire statewide emission reductions achieved by Minnesota's Priority Climate Action Plan cost-share and grants program. Offsetting the reported lifetime GHG emissions from Riverview's Expansion Project would require a decade's worth of carbon sequestration by 32 million trees.	1373-6	113
Minnesota's largest feedlots are subject to state and federal laws that require feedlot owners to obtain permits designed to protect human health and the environment from feedlots' adverse effects. NPDES permits are required for any concentrated animal feeding operation that discharges to waters of the United States. Alongside federal NPDES permits, MPCA issues State Disposal System (SDS) permits that "address program issues which the federal regulations do not cover under an NPDES permit program." If a project would house 1,000 or more animal units, a feedlot applicant may apply for an independent SDS permit, or it may apply for a federal NPDES permit that incorporates Minnesota's SDS permit requirements.	1373-7	71
Riverview's Expansion Project would add 15,400 animal units to the existing West River Dairy, far exceeding the state SDS permit threshold, and the company has elected to apply for a federal NPDES permit that includes Minnesota's SDS permit restrictions.	1373-8	71
Many conditions and restrictions in Riverview's draft NPDES permit are required by Chapter 7020 of the Minnesota Rules (the "Feedlot Rules"). MPCA established the Feedlot Rules in 1971 under the agency's authority to "adopt, amend, and rescind rules and standards having the force of law . . . [for] the prevention, abatement, or control of water, air, and land pollution." The Feedlot Rules address a wide range of environmental impacts. When MPCA proposed changes to the Feedlot Rules in 1999, the agency noted in its Statement of Need and Reasonableness (SONAR) for the rule changes that it "intends to use the SDS permit as it has under the current program to address program issues which the federal regulations do not cover under an NPDES permit." MPCA went on to specify that such issues include feedlot emissions: "The Agency has included provisions for addressing air quality issues in SDS and interim permits under the current program. In addition, the proposed rule requires owners having 1,000 animal units or more to develop and implement an Air Emission Plan (part 7020.0505, subp. 4, item B, subitem 1.)"	1373-9	71

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
The Feedlot Rules contain specific provisions dealing with odor complaints and reference a specific standard for the toxic pollutant hydrogen sulfide. In addition, Minnesota Rule 7020.0505, subpart 4, requires a more general plan to address "air emissions." It states, in relevant part: B. In addition to the requirements of item A, a permit application for an animal feedlot capable of holding 1,000 animal units or more or a manure storage area capable of holding the manure produced by 1,000 animal units or more must contain: (1) an air emission plan that includes: (a) methods and practices that will be used to minimize air emissions resulting from animal feedlot or manure storage area operations including manure storage area start-up practices, loading, and manure removal; . . .	1373-10	434
Regarding GHGs in particular, the Generic EIS highlighted it "is well known that methane emissions from animal agriculture, or any other source, contribute to global warming." The report discussed scholarship identifying "global emission rates of methane at 540 x 109 kilograms per year with 5% of the emissions resulting from the anaerobic decomposition of animal manure and another 15% coming from the gut of ruminant animals." Based on its survey of the literature, the Generic EIS stressed that "methane and other greenhouse gas emissions from animal agriculture have an impact far beyond the immediate location of their source."	1373-11	98
The Office of the Legislative Auditor released its own 1999 report that, among other concerns, flagged environmental risks posed by GHG emissions: The main purpose of feedlot regulation is to protect Minnesota citizens from pollution caused by animal manure. Manure is a valuable resource that can provide beneficial nutrients to the soil and thus help in the production of crops. However—if improperly stored, transported, or disposed—manure may pollute lakes and streams or drinking water sources. Manure can also produce unpleasant and annoying odors and emissions, possibly affecting the health of nearby residents. In addition, emissions from manure may contribute to acid rain and greenhouse gas effects . . . In addition to concerns about water pollution, feedlots with high concentrations of manure may produce unpleasant odors and emit gases such as hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, and various volatile organic compounds that may affect air quality. With the trend to larger feedlots and bigger manure storage facilities, complaints about feedlot odors and concerns about air quality have increased in recent years. Other environmental concerns raised include the health and nuisance impacts of flies, the effects of endotoxins in the air at certain facilities, and the contribution of manure emissions to greenhouse gas effects and acid rain.	1373-12	112

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Riverview's NPDES permit application included an Air Emission Plan describing steps Riverview could take to mitigate odors from the Expansion Project. The Plan lists two sources at the industrial dairy that are "likely to generate significant odors": animal holding areas and manure storage areas. Riverview identifies several steps for mitigating odors from these sources. For animal holding areas, the Air Emission Plan includes proposals to "disperse/mix air with tree plantings," "promptly clean up any spilled feed," and eight other odor mitigation proposals. For manure storage areas, the Plan includes an additional fourteen odor mitigation measures, including proposals to "cover the solid manure stockpile" and to "notify neighbors of manure application and avoid holidays." After listing twenty-four odor mitigation proposals, the plan states that if "continued odor complaints are validated, at least one of the practices identified . . . will be implemented pursuant to MPCA request/approval." The Air Emission Plan does not commit the company to employing any of the identified odor mitigation measures.	1373-13	89
In addition to strategies for odor control, the Air Emission Plan contains measures targeting hydrogen sulfide. The plan notes that MPCA may "request a report" from Riverview in the event that ambient air quality monitoring "indicates an exceedance of the Hydrogen Sulfide Standard." In this report, Riverview would demonstrate that it is deploying at least one of ten hydrogen sulfide emissions controls, including, for example, "chemical additions," "straw cover," or "composting," to manage hydrogen sulfide emissions.	1373-14	90
Despite the Feedlot Rules' broadly-worded directive to describe "methods and practices that will be used to minimize air emissions," Riverview's Air Emission Plan fails to identify any other pollutants that will be emitted from its operation or methods to minimize them. In particular, Riverview's Air Emission Plan contains no analysis of GHG emissions. The plan offers no quantitative or qualitative limit on GHG emissions, no measures specifically targeting GHG mitigation, and no monitoring, recordkeeping, or reporting obligation directed at GHG emissions. The Air Emission Plan does not incorporate, attach, or reference the GHG mitigation measures identified in this project's EAW. As a result, neither Riverview's permit application, nor the resulting draft permit, contains any discussion of "methods and practices that will be used to minimize air emissions" associated with the facility's projected 72,210 tons of annual CO2e emissions.	1373-15	91
THE PERMIT CANNOT BE ISSUED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO ADDRESS GHG EMISSIONS AS REQUIRED BY MINNESOTA LAW Subpart 4 of Minnesota Rule 7020.0505 requires Riverview to submit an Air Emission Plan setting out "methods and practices that will be used to minimize air emissions" from its operations as part of its permit application. (Emphasis added.) The plain meaning of "air emissions" includes GHGs. Riverview's Air Emission Plan nevertheless omits GHG emissions entirely. Without a plan addressing methods and practices Riverview will use to minimize its GHG emissions, MPCA cannot issue Riverview's NPDES permit.	1373-16	63
The Feedlot Rules Plainly Require Feedlot Applicants To Describe Methods And Practices For Minimizing GHG Emissions An applicant for a feedlot or manure storage area capable of holding 1,000 animal units or more must submit an Air Emission Plan. That Plan must include "methods and practices that will be used to minimize air emissions resulting from animal feedlot or manure storage area operations including manure storage area start-up practices, loading, and manure removal."	1373-17	342

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
GHGs are air emissions that must be discussed in Riverview's Air Emission Plan. State law defines GHGs as "emissions." Methane, nitrous oxide, and other GHG emissions are emissions "resulting from animal feedlot or manure storage area operations." Regulatory language is construed according to words' "common and approved usage," and when "clear and free from all ambiguity, the letter of the law shall not be disregarded under the pretext of pursuing the spirit." The rule's plain meaning includes GHG emissions produced by Riverview's feedlot project. Despite this broad and unqualified language, Riverview's Air Emission Plan fails to address GHG emissions at all.	1373-18	63
Several GHG Mitigation Measures Are Available For MPCA To Require In Riverview's Air Emission Plan Riverview itself, along with commenters weighing in on the NPDES permit or the EAW, have identified several GHG mitigation measures that MPCA can make enforceable through Riverview's Air Emission Plan as required by the applicable rule. For instance, the EAW reports that Riverview will "utilize crossbred dairy cows selected for improved production efficiency relative to conventional dairy breeds," producing lower GHG emissions on a per-animal basis. The EAW asserts that Riverview will minimize greenhouse gas emissions by adopting "efficient feed practices, including sourcing the majority of ingredients locally, adjusting rations to maximize production and minimize spoilage, and reducing emissions through implementation of feed additives like Rumensin," and states that manure "will be incorporated into the soil during land application by [Commercial Animal Waste Technicians], thereby reducing emissions." In total, Riverview lists more than a dozen strategies in the EAW for minimizing this project's greenhouse gas emissions. These measures can easily be translated into terms in Riverview's Air Emission Plan and incorporated into the permit.	1373-19	91
Alongside mitigation measures listed in Riverview's Draft EAW, public commenters have advocated that several important measures be added to the Final EAW. The Comments of MCEA et al. on the EAW describe additional ways for Riverview to "minimize air emissions" from its proposal, including practices related to manure management, livestock management, and even energy use and procurement. For details on these measures, please see the attached Comments of MCEA et al. at pages 18–27 and supporting exhibits. Ample GHG management strategies exist to include in a revised permit application and revised public notice.	1373-20	91
To ensure Riverview's EAW mitigation measures translate to real-world reductions, MPCA must adhere to the Feedlot Rules by including an Air Emission Plan in the permit that specifies enforceable measures Riverview will take to minimize its air emissions, including GHG emissions. Because the draft permit incorporates Riverview's application materials as enforceable permit terms, the omission of any GHG mitigations from the Air Emission Plan means the draft permit itself fails to comply with the plain language of Minnesota Rule 7020.0505, subp. 4(B)(1). As noticed, the permit cannot be issued.	1373-21	63
Exempting Riverview From Addressing GHG Emissions Based On MPCA's Air Emission Plan Template Would Reflect Unlawful And Unpromulgated Rulemaking Riverview's Air Emission Plan appears to be generated from an online form made available to applicants through MPCA's website. If MPCA allows feedlot applicants to comply with Minnesota Rule 7020.0505, subp. 4(B)(1) by simply checking the "affirmed" box on the template form, the agency would be enforcing an invalid and unpromulgated rule.	1373-22	64

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Administrative rules include any "agency statement of general applicability and future effect" adopted to implement or make specific the law the agency administers. If a state agency wishes to create an administrative rule, it must engage in a rulemaking process that includes notice published in the State Register, a statement of need and reasonableness, opportunity for written and oral public comment, and frequently independent review by an administrative law judge. State agencies are prohibited from enforcing a "policy, guideline, bulletin, criterion, manual, standard, or similar pronouncement" as though it were a duly adopted rule. To separate lawful guidance documents from unpromulgated rules, Minnesota courts examine whether agency documents offer an "interpretation of a rule [that] corresponds with its plain meaning."	1373-23	45
If MPCA's template form is used to demonstrate compliance with Minnesota Rule 7020.0505, subp. 4(B)(1), the agency would be enforcing an unpromulgated rule. First, the form contradicts the Feedlot Rules' plain meaning by wrongly restricting the Rules' scope. Subpart 4 of Minnesota Rule 7020.0505 requires an Air Emission Plan that addresses "emissions resulting from animal feedlot or manure storage area operations." Those emissions include GHGs. By interpreting the rule to omit GHG emissions, contrary to the rule's plain text, MPCA's form falls outside the bounds of lawful interpretation.	1373-24	92
Second, MPCA's form fails to describe "methods and practices that will be used to minimize air emissions." (emphasis added). Despite the rule's mandatory language, MPCA's form rests on hypotheticals. If continued odor complaints are validated, then the template states "at least one of the practices identified above will be implemented," and if ambient air quality monitoring "indicates an exceedance of the Hydrogen Sulfide Standard," the owner may be required to submit a second, separate air emissions report offering "documentation that one of the following [strategies] will control the emissions."[1] Absent complaints or exceedances, the template form does not require feedlot applicants to commit to any air emission reduction strategies. This approach is inconsistent with the Feedlot Rules' directive to describe emission reduction measures that "will be used."	1373-25	93
Including GHG Emissions In Feedlot Air Emission Plans Is Consistent With Minnesota's Climate Commitments And The Minnesota Environmental Rights Act Failing to address GHG emissions in a feedlot permit proposed by one of the largest industrial dairy producers in the world, for what would become the largest dairy operation in the State, is inconsistent with Minnesota's ambitious climate commitments. The Minnesota Legislature has set climate targets to reduce GHG emissions across every sector of the economy. Beginning with the Next Generation Energy Act in 2007, and continuing through the Next Generation Climate Act of 2023, the Legislature has targeted a fifty-percent reduction relative to 2005 by 2030 and net zero by 2050, and it has directed every state agency, including MPCA, to contribute to achieving these targets. The Legislature confirmed that the goal is "to reduce statewide greenhouse gas emissions across all sectors producing greenhouse gas emissions." Animal agriculture is not exempt.	1373-26	91

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
Despite these requirements, methane emissions from the agricultural sector have increased approximately fifteen percent since 2005, emissions from livestock digestion have increased approximately three percent over the same period, and total GHG emissions from the agricultural sector are rising even as statewide GHG emissions have fallen. Agriculture now accounts for roughly a quarter of Minnesota's net GHG emissions, and animal agriculture is the single largest source of methane in Minnesota. To align with Minnesota's climate targets, MPCA must enforce the Feedlot Rules by requiring feedlot owners to plan for GHG emission reductions from their agribusiness projects, including Riverview's unprecedentedly large expansion proposal.	1373-27	91
Enforcing the Air Emission Plan requirement would also align with the Minnesota Environmental Rights Act (MERA). MERA, one of Minnesota's bedrock environmental laws, was passed in 1971 "to create and maintain within the state conditions under which human beings and nature can exist in productive harmony in order that present and future generations may enjoy clean air and water, productive land, and other natural resources with which this state has been endowed." MERA allows Minnesota residents to bring civil actions "against any person, for the protection of the air, water, land, or other natural resources located within the state, whether publicly or privately owned, from pollution, impairment, or destruction." Minnesota residents may also challenge "any environmental quality standard, limitation, rule, order, license, stipulation agreement, or permit [as] inadequate to protect the air, water, land, or other natural resources located within the state from pollution, impairment, or destruction."	1373-28	40
Given the scale of the climate crisis, and the need to reduce GHG emissions from the agricultural sector, requiring emission reduction efforts from one of the country's largest dairy operators is fully consistent with MERA's protective purpose. Unmitigated GHG emissions from the state's largest industrial feedlot would adversely affect the environment. The Feedlot Rules contain no other GHG regulatory mechanism beyond Minnesota Rule 7020.0505's planning requirement. Allowing Riverview to submit an Air Emission Plan that omits GHGs, a crucial source of "air emissions resulting from animal feedlot or manure storage area operation," would risk the pollution, impairment, or destruction of Minnesota's natural resources.	1373-29	91
For the above reasons, MPCA cannot issue the draft NPDES permit as noticed. MPCA should require Riverview to submit a revised Air Emission Plan that identifies enforceable methods and practices to minimize greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the West River Dairy Expansion Project, incorporate those measures into a revised draft permit, and re-notice the revised permit for public comment.	1373-30	63
We are residents of western Minnesota, eastern North Dakota, and eastern South Dakota, representing generations of farmers, business owners, and communities writing to share our strong support for Riverview's proposed West River Dairy expansion	1374-1	431
We respectfully encourage you to rely on the extensive environmental review already underway and the strong record of stewardship demonstrated by Riverview.	1374-2	20
Based on the proven track record of Riverview and the safeguards provided through the EAW process; this expansion does not warrant a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	1375-1	20

Comment (Response in Appendix B-1)	Comment Number (Appendix A)	Comment Group (Appendix B-1)
I respectfully encourage the MPCA to consider their outstanding environmental record and support the proposed West River Dairy expansion.	1375-2	431
It is like dotting your I's and crossing your t's. It is you that we depend on.	1292-3	435