

## Spreadsheet of Rebuttal Comments: Water Legacy

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1406	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please reject the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed rules to deregulate salts and ion pollution. These rules would protect polluters, not people or natural resources; they go against the mission of the MPCA.	The Agency has provided justification for all proposed rule changes in the SONAR.
1407	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	MPCA's proposed rules to eliminate and weaken water quality standards would harm fish, wild rice, wildlife habitats, tribal Treaty resources, state species of concern, recreation, sustainable farms, businesses that depend on clean water, human health, and environmental justice.	These comments were addressed in multiple sections of the MPCA initial Response memo.
1408	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments about mining	MPCA's proposed rules would deregulate mining pollution from taconite mines and proposed copper-nickel mines. MPCA's rules would contaminate high quality and sensitive waters in the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior watersheds. Nearly every part of these rules must be rejected.	The Class 3 and Class 4 standards continue to apply to all waterbodies. The proposed rules do not change regulations for any specific category of permitted sources. See Response Memo Section II.B (Assumptions about protection and effluent limits); Section III.A.2 (Narrative Standards Enforcement and Effluent Limits).
1409	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments suggesting that the proposed rules would weaken WQS	Disapprove all removal or weakening of any class 3 & 4 numeric water quality standards. These changes would kill aquatic life, harm people, and remove existing uses of water bodies.	The comments were addressed in the initial Response Memo, Section III.B.1 (Beneficial Uses and Criteria/Standards), Section III.B.2 (Need to Protect Aquatic Life), and Section III.B.4 (Designated and Existing Uses)
1410	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Disapprove MPCA's radical idea that water quality violations only matter where water is taken by a high volume appropriator. Water belongs to all of us, and limits on discharge must be set to protect all waters, not specific private interests.	The comments were addressed in the initial Response Memo, Section II.B; Section III.A.1 (Application of the Standards)
1411	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments about wildlife	Disapprove changes to wildlife uses that protect wildlife for "watering," as if they were livestock and fail to support wildlife use of wetlands. Respect ecological science.	The comments were addressed in the initial Response Memo Section III.A.4 (Wildlife or Wildlife Watering)
1412	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments about wild rice	Direct that MPCA protect wild rice by placing narrative and numeric standards for wild rice with aquatic life protection where they belong, not with agricultural irrigation.	The comments were addressed in the initial Response Memo Section III.B.3 (Wild Rice)
1413	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments suggesting that the proposed rules would weaken WQS	Instead of trying to remove limits on pollution, the MPCA should be setting more stringent limits to protect clean water, fish, and health based on modern science.	The comments were addressed in the initial Response Memo, Section III.B.1 (Beneficial Uses and Criteria/Standards) and Section III.B.2 (Need to Protect Aquatic Life)

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1414	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Steven Bauer, MD, Duluth, MN	Comments about sulfate and mercury	<p>I am a child and adolescent psychiatrist and medical director at CCBHC (Certified Community Behavioral Health Center) for most of NE MN. My colleague Dr. Saracino has written a brief but detailed review of how we under the impact of exposure to heavy metals on a child's developing brain and functional impairments associated with this toxicity. I am writing to focus on the difference between prevention and treatment. Medical providers are taught to advocate for public health. I would again focus on the reality that increasing "allowable" levels of these toxins in both our surface and groundwater supplies will inevitably lead to more children, families, and communities being impacted with difficult, life-long, neurological, learning, and emotional problems. Please do not allow short-term financial gain to outweigh the health and safety of our future population.</p>	<p>These commenters endorsed the comment letter submitted by Wavery Reibel on behalf of WaterLegacy. MPCA's responses to those comments are provided on a different spreadsheet. Some commenters simply endorsed the overall letter, while others provided generally short additional comments. The additional comments are included here. The comments generally 1) express support for the importance of clean water and 2) express concern about the proposed rule amendments. The MPCA takes seriously our goal to protect clean water. The MPCA's initial Response Memo and the Rebuttal Response Memo address the concerns expressed, as they relate to the specifics of the proposed rule.</p>
1415	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber, Duluth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	<p>Advocate for the rejection of the MPCA's proposed rules to deregulate toxic chemicals and minerals, salts and iron pollution, and its proposal to eliminate numerical regulations. The MPCA's proposed deregulation of water quality standards is inimical to the mission of the MPCA. It protects the polluters, not the people. Planet is experiencing growing scarcity of drinking water, Lake Superior's life-giving water must be protected for millions of inhabitants relying throughout the Great Lakes region. Threats are PFA "forever chemicals" pollution from burst(s) of Line 3, future contamination by proposed copper/nickel sulfide mines. Lengthy on-going and costly effort to clean up the superfund site at the St. Louis Estuary. We heard how the hazardous chemicals threaten the entire chain of life from the tiniest fungus to fish (mercury levels). Yet our government agencies granted no health studies in PolyMet's permitting process. Is that the agency attitude of "What you don't know know, won't hurt you?" We can't manage what we don't measure. Again, please reject the MPCA's proposed regulations to eliminate numerical standards.</p>	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1416	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jane E. Townsend, Rochester, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	It's hard to believe that the MPCA would want to deregulate anything that protects our quality of water. Born and raised in Michigan's Upper Peninsula, which has experienced discharges/releases from former paper mill and lumber mill operations. Once a water source is degraded, it does not come back easily, or quickly, or even ever; I'm a lover of all the Great Lakes and the pristine beauty of the Boundary Waters. We are running out of time to repair what we have already done, let alone future regrets, This is where I believe the MPCA's proposed pollution deregulation rules will lead us.	
1417	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Karen Johnson, Columbia Heights, MN, World Citizen Board	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I am a concerned citizen writing to you about the MPCA's new proposal to deregulate salts and ions pollution. These proposals would have very adverse effect on the state of MN, especially the BWCAW. The MPCA is designed to help protect our state's environment by controlling pollution. If that is their mission, I do not understand how this will help their mission and duty to our state. Deregulating the class 3&4 to weaken water quality standards would harm not only fish, wild rice, and animal habitat, but also recreation areas, farms, and anyone who depends on clean water. The proposed rules would also deregulate mining regulations causing more pollution, not less. Not only taconite mines that are not meeting current standards, but the copper-nickel mines that are presently being sued for improper pollution practices would benefit. Please have the MPCA protect wild rice, leave the current standards where they belong and direct the MPCA not to include Wild Rice with agricultural irrigation. Wild Rice is not a regular agricultural crop. PROTECT the air, water, land, animals, and people. Make the MPCA accountable.	
1418	Waverly Reibel on behalf of John Ek, Hermantown, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I implore you to take positive action now to protect the BWCAW water of NE Minnesota and the Lake Superior watershed! See form letter.	
1419	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Carol Jagiello, Bloomingdale, NJ	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	This is The MPCA making these clearly dangerous regulatory proposals - History of MPCA. The Minnesota Legislature gave authority to the MPCA to begin controlling pollution problems in the state three years before the first Earth Day and the creation of the US EPA. MPCA is a national leader in delivering services that support healthy people and ecosystems, and a thriving economy. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1420	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Shodo Spring, Faribaulte, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Officially MPCA monitors environmental quality, offers technical and financial assistance, and enforces environmental regulations. Practically, this seems to imply that MPCA should act to protect the environment, not to harm it. A rule that reduces standards is a rule opposed to the mission of the MPCA and should not happen. See form letter.	
1421	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Dan Nelson, Crystal, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Our waters are more threatened than ever so it is discouraging to see the MPCA taking actions such as this. See form letter.	
1422	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Catherine Chayka, New Brighton, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Is not the MPCA charged with protecting Minnesota from polluters? They cannot be permitted to shirk their duties and obligations to keep our waters clean. See form letter.	
1423	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Janet Hatch, Waconia, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	The job of the MPCA is to protect Its' constituents from the further descration of wildlife, clean wter and air, and ever increasing pollutants, NOT continue to break their own rules, and make it even easier for corporations to increase these activities. I am so disappointed and disillusioned with this organization. Please think what is best for future generations, not short terms gains. See form letter.	
1424	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Peter Leschak, Side Lake, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a natural resources professional, I urge you to reject. Instead of trying to remove limits on pollution, the MPCA should be setting more stringent limits to protect clean water, fish, and health based on modern science. See form letter.	
1425	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Megan Holm, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I am a lifetime MN resident who eats fish and rice from our lakes, and drinks water directly from the boundary waters. Water, and all of the life it supports, is critical to our survival, and our well being. We cannot live without water, and there is so much emerging research now about how water, particularly that which has not been treated that comes from lakes and springes is healing. The MPCA's rules would protect polluters, not people or natural resources; they go against the mission of the MPCA. See form letter.	
1426	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Grant Thral, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Our water standards must be STRICTER, not weaker! See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1427	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Tiffany Larson, Prior Lake, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Minnesota's lakes, rivers and streams are an interconnected lifeline for our state. Loosening restrictions on pollution would have huge negative impacts to tourism, the health and safety of our food, and the overall wellbeing of all Minnesota residents. Please do not allow mining considerations to poison our water and our future. See form letter.	
1428	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Merikay Garret, Mahtowa, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Minnesotans thrive on fresh, clean waters around them. Reducing protections for these watersheds which support so much of the wildlife ecosystems will harm us in ways known and in ways not yet fully understood. Please do not permit pollution rich industries to pollute even more. See form letter.	
1429	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jan Stern, Duluth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	WHY would we Minnesotans want poisoned water in our 10,000 lakes, our rivers, streams & creeks? What we NEED are stricter guidelines for those corporations who would destroy our land and water for their profit! See form letter.	
1430	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Laura Schauland, Isabella, MN	Comments about mining	I have lived in the Superior National Forest for over 40 years. I have sacrificed many economic opportunities in order to live in a clean natural environment and now you think it's appropriate to allow multinational corporations to come in and destroy the clean water and air for the sake of their rape and plunder profits! Nope, not good! See form letter.	
1431	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Thomas Probst, Grant, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	What are you up to here? Have you forgotten your essential mission, to protect Minnesota and Minnesotans from pollution? Or are you deliberately undermining it? See form letter.	
1432	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Lisa Fitzpatrick, Duluth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a citizen of Duluth, I am very concerned about water quality, in the rivers and tributaries leading to L. Superior. The MPCA needs to Control Pollution, not allow more. Commenter also supports content of form letter.	
1433	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Joan Huges, St. Louis Park, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	... based on modern science. Our future, kid's future, and grandchildren's futures depend on it. See form letter.	
1434	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Ellen Hinchcliffe, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I have a six year old daughter. Her future and the future of her grandchildren must be considered and given more weight than short term profits. Water is life, is not a slogan but words we must literally all live by. See form letter.	
1435	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Derek Smith	Comments about mining	I am a native Minnesotan and I don't want mining or anything potentially environmentally damaging ruining Minnesota's landscape. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1436	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Kathryn Stodola, Duluth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I urge you to reject... See form letter.	
1437	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Frederick Campbell, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	These proposed changes by the MPCA are inconsistent with MPCA's mission to protect human health and the environment. Because I worked as a hydrologist for the MPCA for 29 years, I have a good perspective on the MPCA's mission. As one MPCA Commissioner recently put it, it is much easier to prevent pollution, than it is to clean up pollution. Please ensure that pollution by these parameters is prevented. See form letter.	
1438	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Catherine Lundoff, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	See form letter.	
1439	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Lynn Anderson, Tamarack, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a property owner in Minnesota who lives near one of the proposed sulfate mines I urgently implore you to reject... Minnesota is the most water-rich state in America. Her clean water assets must be protected, especially in the era of increasing global warming and climate change. See form letter.	
1440	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Nell Ubbelohde	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	We, and the future generations of Minnesotans depend on the MPCA doing its job and protection us, and our environment. See form letter.	
1441	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Donna Seabloom, Elk River, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Clean water is one of our state's greatest resources and it is important that we do all we can to protect these waters for future generations. See form letter.	
1442	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Michael Scribner-O'Pray, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Clean water is one of our state's greatest resources and it is important that we do all we can to protect these waters for future generations. See form letter.	
1443	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Margit Berman, St. Paul, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	This is not Minnesota. This is not what we want for our beautiful sky blue waters. Please stop this terrible rule change. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1444	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Elizabeth Choma, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a newer resident of Minnesota, I have been underimpressed with the environmental acts in place to protect precious areas like the BWCA and Lake Superior, which are the gems of the state and draw not only nature lovers locally but also out of state and contribute to the economy in the areas. I want to see these lands preserved for future generations as I plan on making Minnesota my home. See form letter.	
1445	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Anna Jeide-Detweiler, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I am gravely concerned about the environmental impacts for generations to come. See form letter.	
1446	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Melvin Thoresen, Deer River, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Clean Water = LIFE See form letter.	
1447	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jo-Ann Sramek, Duluth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	We have one of the most beautiful treasurers in the world right here in Minnesota. A few jobs which may or may not come to frustration are not worth even thinking about tampering with a pristine area that would be ruined forever. Our earth is on the brink of disaster. Permits for corporations to pollute our sacred resources aren't going to mean doodles when the planet is uninhabitable. See form letter.	
1448	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Sandy and Tom Ahlstrom, Excelsior, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	We have lived in MN all of our 79 yrs. and are extremely concerned with the lack of scientific support for the decisions that the MPCA is proposing! The results of these rules and removals of standards for waters, soils and air are proven inhibitors for the health of our environment, our animal population and our human conditions. Please take into consideration our concerns as you make your decision. See form letter.	
1449	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Garrie Huisenga, Chaska, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I enjoy going to the BWCAW several times a year with family, friends and by myself. When I've gone with friends from other countries or met people there from other countries, they are amazed at the wilderness area. Several times in have heard "there is no other place like this in the world!" I am a grandfather and I look forward to sharing these wilderness experience with my grandchildren. See form letter.	
1450	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Garrie Huisenga, Chaska, MN	Comments about mining	I am concerned with the potential changes in MPCA rules. I don't understand why the rules should be changed to allow mining in the BWCAW watershed. This natural area should be preserved. The risk of any pollution from mining is too high!	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1451	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Laurel Browne, Saint Paul, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please, your Honor, please reject ... See form letter.	
1452	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Marysa Storm, Mankato, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please keep our waters safe. Please protect our people and our natural resources. See form letter.	
1453	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jackie Smolen, Hopkins, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I am the chair of our church's climate justice group (Unitarian Universalist Church of Minnetonka) and am writing to express my deep concern for the welfare of our water, plantlike, animals and humans. We are all one interdependent web of life and what we do to the earth we do to ourselves. We must act to get the MPCA to start protecting the earth instead of helping the polluters. See form letter.	
1454	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Fred Mayer, Minneapolis, MN	Comments about mining	I was dumbfounded to learn that MPCA wants to get rid of water quality standards for major ions and deregulate mining pollution just as copper-nickel mining is being proposed. See form letter.	
1455	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jody Wurl, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I care about future generations. I care about the health of my community. I care about the land and the plants and animals that rely on it. See form letter.	
1456	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Kathryn Null, Waconia, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	The limits that are currently in place are there to protect us from these harmful chemicals that will destroy tourism, recreation, fishing, and the health of people living near water. It will also destroy farmlands, aquatic life and wildlife. We cannot continue to destroy our water and lands and expect to survive in this destruction - maybe it won't kill you or me, but what about our children and grandchildren? See form letter.	
1457	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Richard Mammel, Albert Lea, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	See form letter.	
1458	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Kristine Osbakken, Duluth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I am deeply affected by MPCA's consideration of deregulating pollution to assist metal extraction. It feels as if I am personally assaulted by an agency of my own government. Such deregulation would certainly be an assault on the wetlands of northern Minnesota, on the vibrant life these lands sustain, on the wild rice native people rely on. Colonizers have years ago taken the lives and made impossible the livelihoods of our native peoples. How can the MPCA even think to propose such damage? See form letter.	



Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1459	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Denise Tennen, St. Louis Park, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Thank you for considering my comment. The cleanliness and safety of our waters is of utmost importance to me as a resident of this state. See form letter.	
1460	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Patricia Ward, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	One thing we're learning from the pandemic is that the outdoors offers us solace from our isolation. We need to treasure and preserve our natural resources. We need clean air and water to protect our immune systems. See form letter.	
1461	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Maureen Hackett, Hopkins, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Minnesota is gifted and fortunate to have fresh water that is still clean and pure. It is a major asset and going forward will continue to be highly coveted. Once water is polluted especially with salts, it cannot be undone except maybe with large reverse osmosis filters that have their own source of energy needs and pollution waste. We need to keep this highly valuable resource for now and the future! See form letter.	
1462	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Tania Malven, Tucson, AZ	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	... and environmental justice. HELL NO!!!!!!! PROTECT OUR CLEAN AIR AND WATER FROM GREEDY CORPORATIONS!!!!!!!!!! See form letter.	
1463	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Ruth Lindh, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Water is truly a most precious resource and becoming more so every day..... protect it. See form letter.	
1464	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Vicki Kelley, St. Petoskey, MI	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	It is not in the best interest of our future, the future of our grandchildren to continue practices of the past. We are to learn from the past, not duplicate it. See form letter.	
1465	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Elisabeth Peterson, Wayzata, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	If we can't protect our water, we have no reason for any laws regarding pollution! See form letter.	
1466	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Laura Eustice, Hibbing, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I've lived in Hibbing most of my life and I'm tired of the mining industry trampling on everyone's rights. It is especially egregious that the MPCA is, once again, proposing rule changes antithetical to their stated mission to "protect and improve the environment and human health" in order to serve an extractive industry. See form letter.	
1467	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Joel Weisberg, Northfield, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1468	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Terry McCarthy, Duluth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Having high water quality standards with enforceable regulations is imperative. Clean water is our future. We can create sustainable jobs that won't desecrate the planet's life blood. It can be pretty difficult to create clean water after it's been poisoned by industry, agriculture, ignorance & greed. See form letter.	
1469	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Scott Mills, Ely, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	...environmental justice. The economy in Northeastern Minnesota is dependent at the very least by 50% on a healthy, often pristine, environment. The MPCA is not regarding their responsibility to protect all Minnesotan's economic stake. See form letter.	
1470	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Daniel LeClaire, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please: we all hold water in common. It is ancient wisdom, and it is common sense. Scientific and spiritual. everywhere the water is troubled. Please: act on our behalf now in this most important time. See form letter.	
1471	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Bry Osmonson, Seattle, WA	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Minnesota's fresh water supply must be protected at all costs. I urge you to look toward the future and make policies that reflect a healthy future for everyone. See form letter.	
1472	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Cynthia Goss, Bloomington, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please STOP protecting polluters! See form letter.	
1473	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Elizabeth Songalia, St. Paul, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Don't allow further pollution to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area! See form letter.	
1474	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Kenneth Kaseforth, Bloomington, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	It's title purpose is to CONTROL pollution, not enable it. Relaxing pollution restrictions would serve the short-term interests of international mining conglomerates. However, these industrial endeavors will contribute only a couple of decades of economic activity while contaminating the region for hundreds if not thousands of years. The ultimate negative impacts on environment and habitability will offset the economic gains from mining many, many times over. And that's not even taking into account the immediate deleterious effects of mining on contemporaneous economic activity such as recreation and sight-seeing. See form letter.	
1475	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Earle Tonra, Minneapolis, MN	Comments about mining	Once the damage from unregulated/under regulated mining has polluted and destroyed habitat and water supplies-THERE IS NO GOING BACK. Let our collective legacy be that we put the health of the plant first-we only have just the one shared home. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1476	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Nan Corlis, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	This is the time to protect and preserve our natural resources and to make sure they are in a healthy state and remain so for a sustainable environment. In the end nothing else will matter if we pollute the earth to death-nothing will matter because everything that matters will be sick or dead-the water, the air the animals and insects, the earth. Is this what we want to leave for thos who come after us? I do not think so. See form letter.	
1477	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jan Stern, Duluth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	WHY would anyone want polluted lakes & rivers and let the rich get away with running Minnesota? See form letter.	
1478	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Johnna Hyde, Ely, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Let's think about future generations! Clean water is increasingly rare on this planet, population is increasing. Minnesota's fresh water is a precious resource. Please protect it!! See form letter.	
1479	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Larry Risser, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I have lost confidence in the MPCA. Clearly their mission has moved from protecting the environment and human health to enabling exploitation of the environment and enhancing corporate profits. Health, lives, and a sustainable environment are at stake, but there is no long-term view at the MPCA, only shore-term expediency. See form letter.	
1480	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Robin Raplinger, Virginia, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I grew up in Lakeville, MN and moved to and have lived in Virginia for over 20 years. Virginia MN is the heart of the Iron Range. I moved to enjoy the wonderful clean lakes and public lands, including the BWCA. See form letter.	
1481	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Donna Seabloom, Elk River, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I write to discourage deregulation of salts and iron pollution. I am wholly opposed to deregulation which reduces or potentially reduces our water quality. See form letter.	
1482	Waverly Reibel on behalf of John Kantar, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	The pollution caused by this mining could damage ground water for hundreds of years. Not a reasonable trade off for a generation of jobs. No water, no life. See form letter.	
1483	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Kent Simon, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1484	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Marian Severt, Brainerd, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	MPCA's proposed rules to eliminate and weaken water quality standards is definitely harmful to all creatures including humans who depend upon clean water for health and well being. See form letter.	
1485	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Cristina Czaia, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Minnesota's waterways are a precious resource not only for our state but for the country. If we do not continue to fight to protect our bodies of water, and the pure waters of northern Minnesota's Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, we will lose a precious gem of natural history and it will be a devastating loss to all those who love coming to this place to restore a sense of peace, health and well-being. If we cease to seek understanding from the natural environment as it is, we will lose both the land, which may never heal from the damage we inflict, as well as our humanity, by permanently clouding the waters that nurture and restore our hearts and minds. See form letter.	
1486	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Catherine Zimmer, St. Paul, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a citizen, taxpayer and small business owner, I am very concerned about the MPCA's proposed rules to deregulate salts and ion pollution. These rules would protect polluters, not people or natural resources and they are contrary to the mission of the MPCA. See form letter.	
1487	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Anne Reich, Marine on St. Croix, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please PROTECT CLEAN WATER, which we all need for survival, by rejecting the MPCA proposed rules to deregulate salts and ion pollution. These rules would protect polluters, not people or natural resources; they go against the mission of the MPCA. See form letter.	
1488	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Dave Crawford, St. Paul, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I object to yielding to pressure from private interests and to blatant disregard of responsibility. The MPCA is charged with regulating private interests for the continuing good of the people of Minnesota. See form letter.	
1489	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Tim Wallace, Zim, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	My wife and I live in the St. Louis River watershed and own property on the river. All of our land drains directly to the river. We care greatly for the river and its water quality because we value fish and wildlife that are affected by pollution. See form letter.	
1490	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Robin Nicholson, White Bear Lake, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I think it is imperative that Minnesota continue to numerically regulate the water quality in our state. This is one of our greatest assets. We need to protect it vigorously! See form letter.	
1491	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Dagmar Romano, St. Paul, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please be one of those who care about doing the right thing during this very difficult time! See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1492	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Tim Ryan, Preston, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	We ALL KNOW that after we pollute all of our water, we can just make some more, right? See form letter.	
1493	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Tracy Kugler, St. Paul, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a born-and-raised Minnesotan, I have always been proud to that my home recognizes that lakes, rivers, streams, trees, and wildlife have value far beyond their utility as "resources" for human consumption. Lately, however, we seem to have forgotten that truth. The MPCA's proposed rules to deregulate salts and ion pollution are a particularly egregious example of treating nature as something to be exploited. I hope that you will hold to the values that have kept Minnesota a special place to call home and reject the proposed rules. See form letter.	
1494	Waverly Reibel on behalf of David Carlson, Fort Ripley, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Who's running you guys these days, industry or the people of Minnesota? An awful lof of BS from the MPCA lately. See form letter.	
1495	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Anne Calderwood, Murphys, CA	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Clean water and areas like the BWCA are precious both to Minnesota and all those of us from around the country who come to vacation in Minnesota. See form letter.	
1496	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Robert Kosuth, Duluth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	At the very time when ever stronger environmental protections are needed, the MPCA just continues to given into industrial lobbying. I frankly don't know what to say. These requests are just examples of the deeper changes in attitude that the MPCA needs to embrace. See form letter.	
1497	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Lynn Glesne, Miltona, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	We need regulation not deregulation Protect the people! See form letter.	
1498	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Delores Dufner, Saint Joseph, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	It is urgent that we protect our water supply. Preventing water pollution is much easier much less expensive than trying to get rid of pollution in water. See form letter.	
1499	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Shodo Spring, Faribault, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	One might think the purpose of MPCA is to control pollution, meaning to limit pollution. But they seem to be limiting their role to simply enforcing the law, and they are trying to weaken those laws in a way that would harm lands, waters, and human beings for the benefit of mining businesses. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1500	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Mary Cullen, Minneapolis, MN	Comments about mining	Bottom line is that these polluters are coporations in it for one thing, their own profits. Historically they have gone in, raped and pillaged the land and then left their ugly messes for others to fclean up. They create only short term jobs then leave "ghost towns" in their wake. See form letter.	
1501	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Sarah Reed, Berkely, CA	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As an environmental scientist, I am appalled ast MPCA's proposed rules. As an agency whose mission is to "protect and improve the environment and human health", their proposed rules threatens to do just the opposite. See form letter.	
1502	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Robert Douglas, St. Paul, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	The MPCA willingness to trade jobs for a minority with the sacrifice of centuries of clean water and natural beauty is an ugly dance for temporary economic profit-pipers. To destroy an area that cannot be un-destroyed after defiling this water treasure connected to even larger water lands takes away a precious rare asset not just from our present native peoples but also from unborn generations of human and animal life. It is a very short-sighted immoral theft from our future. It is an uneven exchange, in my opinion, an obscene action. See form letter.	
1503	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Rebecca Perry, Spring Lake Park, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Thank you for taking the time to read this. I don't understand the benefits of deregulation, when the risks are so high. Our health, and the health of so many aquatic and land species, is too vital. I hope you will make the right decision and not let polluters get away with their rampant destruction. They need to be held accountable! See form letter.	
1504	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Susan Rengstorf, Shoreview, MN	Comments about mining	This mining will ruin our State forever, Please stop it. See form letter.	
1505	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Nan Corliss, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	It is time to protect and preserve not destroy the lands which are so important to the health of our planet. It is time to protect and preserve the waters which feed our land and our bodies. It is time to protect the air which we breathe and which sustains life. If we do not, there will be life in the future, the future of this state, this earth. Everything we do now to protet and preserve will matter in the future, Everything we do. See form letter.	
1506	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jackie Smolen, Minnetonka, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	In order to be called the pollution control agency one would suppose you would want to stop pollution and make our air and water cleaner. One would hope you put people's health and safety above corporate profit. We can no longer do business as usual if we are going to keep our planet safe for human and plant and animal habitation. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1507	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Karin Winegar, St. Paul, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Nothing is more precious than clean fresh water, nothing is more essential for life and nothing is more jeopardized by mining practices worldwide and here in Minnesota. See form letter.	
1508	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Meg Kearns, Duluth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	MPCA must live up to its name and not only control pollution but do more to prevent it entirely. See form letter.	
1509	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Merikay Garrett, Mahtowa, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please do not make it easier for mining to pollute our waters simply because it's easier to regulate eased rules. The ion levels increasing are harmful to people, fish, wildlife and aquatic flora. Mining companies can comply with strict effluent rules. MPCA can work to protect Minnesotans and water heritage. See form letter.	
1510	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jerry Jensen, Brainerd, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	MPCA is abandoning MN citizens and not following their mission. See form letter.	
1511	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Samantha Muldoon, Long Lake, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	<p>It's in the name: Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. It's not "Minnesota Enabling Agency." It's not "Minnesota Economic Protection Agency." It's not "Minnesota is OK Sometimes Agency." The Agency exists to CONTROL POLLUTION in MINNESOTA. Other agencies and lobbyists will try and push deregulation, to ease the standards for Pollution Control. The MPCA should not do their work for them! Our legal system exists with two opposing sides, arguing their case. The MPCA is the defense representative for the state-this is like removing the defense attorney from a trial. To quote the MPCA: "Chloride is a serious threat to Minnesota's freshwater, says Brooke Asleson, water pollution prevention coordinator at the MPCA. Because it does not break down or settle out of water, she says, the agency wants people to know that prevention is the only solution. "We need to take action quickly to reduce future costs" Asleson says. "Chloride is permanent. You can't get it out."</p> <p>(<a href="http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/mcvmagazine/issues/2020/jan-feb/chloride.html">www.dnr.state.mn.us/mcvmagazine/issues/2020/jan-feb/chloride.html</a>).</p> <p>Direct that MPCA protect wild rice by placing narrative and numeric standards for wild rice with aquatic life protection where they belong, not with agricultural irrigation. See form letter.</p>	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1512	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Brad Snyder, Maple Grove, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a Science Teacher/Environmental Educator, Engineering/STEM Professional, and an Environmental/Human Health/Natural World Advocate, I wholeheartedly encourage you to reject the MPCA rules. This JUST NOT be allowed!! The MPCA MUST do its job and protect the environment AND human health!! See form letter.	
1513	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Michael Maleska, Hibbing, MN	Comments about mining	Existing mining companies currently have available technology to detect and ameliorate changes in pollutants escaping their operations. Thank labor unions for protecting workers from retaliation when reporting spills, faulty record-keeping, and other activities mining companies find cumbersome. With respect to developing sulfide mines in this water-rich environment, there is no recovery possible from damage that would occur from that type of mining. There is no benefit to humanity in changing current environmental regulations to satisfy new mining companies and their exploitation of air and water quality. See form letter.	
1514	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber, Duluth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	MPCA's proposed rules would deregulate mining pollution from taconite mines and proposed copper-nickel mines. MPCA's rules would contaminate high quality and sensitive waters in the BWCA and Lake Superior watersheds as well as watersheds potentially polluted by the high sulfide ores from mining expected with the Tamarack, MN area where mining exploration is ongoing. Mining there would risk polluting the drinking water for people in the watersheds of the St. Croix River and the Mississippi. How many people's drinking water should be offered up forever to develop mining? Deregulating water quality standards would be tantamount to Flint, Michigan on steroids. Not merely unsafe but, minus numeric standards, UNKNOWN levels of lead, arsenic, cobalt and other toxins/carcinogens would be released from proposed and planned copper/nickel mines in Duluth Complex and around the Tamarack area. Such would not serve the public interest. The profiteers would extract, take their filthy lucre and flee leaving the state and our communities with irretrievably toxic water. See form letter.	
1515	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jo Wood, Grand Marais, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	All life needs clean, unpolluted water to live and thrive. The standards must be higher to protect life of our home EARTH. See form letter.	



Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1516	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jessica Norby, Minneapolis, MN	Comments about mining	The BWCA generates more revenue as a protected waterway, than mining ever will. Not to mention, if mining is allowed, the waterways will be destroyed for people and wildlife. Mining should be banned in this pristine wetland. Mining in no way benefits Minnesotans, it does not create jobs and destroys land that is enjoyed by everyone.	
1517	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jan Karon, Duluth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Even those of us who are not scientists has a terrific responsibility to help be good stewards of this planet. Weakening MPCA rules is not in the best interests of the planet. See form letter.	
1518	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Steve Doyle, New Brighton, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	The MPCA exists to protect the Commons, not for private profit. This is not a balancing act, since mining WILL destroy water and wilderness and jobs tat depend on thos basic amenities. It's plain to see that MPCA's attempts to weaken water standards are a sop to industry and a few hundred jobs, all to be subsidized years down the road when the corporations have pulled out with their gains and the clean up - probably futile-is left to the taxpayer. See portions of form letter.	
1519	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Karen Graham, Plymouth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I believe the MPCA has forgotten their purpose. Seriously, with the MPCA's new proposal of deregulation. their initials are MUPA (Minnesota's Uncontrolled Pollution Agency). See form letter.	
1520	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Yvette Schultenover, Grand Rapids, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	It would be unconscionable to reduce standards! What does science have to do to prove more than already proven that this toxic waste HARMS PEOPLE. See form letter.	
1521	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Cynthia Goss	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please don't weaken Minnesota's water quality standards any further, hold polluters accountable. Don't sell out our state for foreign profiteers. See form letter.	
1522	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Ian Hedberg, St. Paul, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Minnesota calls itself the land of 10,000 lakes for a reason: our waters are our most precious resource. The BWCA, Lake Superior, the Mississippi River... these are all the engines of our economy. See form letter.	
1523	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Elizabeth Choma	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a new resident of Minnesota, I expect more of environmental agencies of the state given the great biodiversity of the area and the population's passion for outdoor adventure. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1524	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Rachel Youens	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Industries should not be allowed to pollute waters and land that are needed for all of us. Regulation, nit deregulation is key to protect our future. Please reject the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed rules to deregulate salts and ion pollution. These rules would protect polluters, not people or natural resources; they go against the mission of the MPCA. See form letter.	
1525	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Pamela Strom	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Truly, this should be an easy decision. We are killing ourselves and our future generations, for stuff. The greatest gift given was this beautiful earth and it is our obligation to safe guard it, not rape it for money. See form letter.	
1526	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Kate Dougherty	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Has Satan taken over MPCA? It sure sounds like it. See form letter.	
1527	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Samuel Engel	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please reject the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed rules to deregulate salts and ion pollution. These rules would protect polluters, not people or natural resources; they go against the mission of the MPCA.	
1528	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Samuel Engel	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	It seems to me that these changes are intended to benefit a small but powerful part of the MPCA's "community partners" and takes a step away from science and objectivity towards "special" interests and subjectivity.	
1529	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Samuel Engel	Comments about the rulemaking process	MPCA states in receives thousands of comments, but never metions how they are utilized.	
1530	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Samuel Engel	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	The rule changes talk about basing decisions on science, yet they propose getting rid of numerical thresholds.	
1531	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Mark Anderson	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a gourmet Chef, a wild rice lover and a Northwoods camper, the commenter asks that the rules be rejected. See form letter.	
1532	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Susan Wehrenberg	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a lifelong Minnesota resident, I ask that you please reject the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed rules to deregulate salts and ion pollution. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1533	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Paula Fischer	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a grandmother concerned about generations to come and a lover of the waterways and aquifers, the commenter asks that the proposed rule be rejected. See form letter.	
1534	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Lynn Levine	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	When I first moved to Minnesota in 1969 there was a battle to protect the Boundary Waters, and the success of these protections made me proud to be in Minnesotan. I was young and didn't understand that one victory only meant more assaults were on the way. The Boundary Waters is one of Minnesota's greatest gifts. See form letter.	
1535	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Tom Beltt	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Water is our most precious resource and we must do everything possible to protect its quality and quantity. See form letter.	
1536	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Mary Arps	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	The job of the MPCA is to CONTROL pollution, not ignore it. See form letter.	
1537	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Joy Reid	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Concerned with algal blooms in City of Minneapolis lakes due to salt in the roads. See form letter.	
1538	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Clara Ueland	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please ensure that Minnesota's waters remain as clear and unpolluted as possible. Once polluted in this way, there is no going back. See form letter.	
1539	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jan Stern	Comments about mining	The commenter has sulfide mining concerns anywhere near the Boundary Waters. See form letter.	
1540	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Karen Locke	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a Minnesotan, I hold our water as one of our most valuable resources. I find it hard to believe that you would endanger our water in this way. See form letter.	
1541	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Paula Tomkins	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a grandmother concerned about my grandchildren's future in this increasingly uncertain world, I ask you to please reject the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed rules to deregulate salts and ion pollution. See form letter.	
1542	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Daniel Iverson	Comments about mining	Mining-related concerns regarding environmental protection. Distrust of foreign mining companies . See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1543	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Diane Tessari	Comments about mining	Water is Life! We must protect this planet upon which the lives of our children and their children will depend. To compromise water quality so that mining companies can profit from mines the people don't want or need is unconscionable. See form letter.	
1544	Waverly Reibel on behalf of David Reisenweber	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Clean water still exists in most of NE Mn, don't screw it up. It is Duluth's and surrounding areas most important resource. Don't give it away. See form letter.	
1545	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Denise Tennen	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Our Boundary Waters and Lake Superior are treasures for our state, our nation and the world. Please do every thing you can to protect them, our environmental protections need to be strengthened, not weakened. See form letter.	
1546	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Terry McCarthy	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Polluters will be the beneficiaries of this proposal. Water is our life blood. Regulatory agencies and lawmakers should be advocating for stronger protections for our water that sustains life for all living things. Big industry profits over clean water, health of our children and more is not acceptable. Please act as if your grandchildren's well being took precedent over industry profits. See form letter.	
1547	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Diane Hiniker	Comments suggesting that the proposed rules would weaken WQS	As a resident of Cook County, and one who treasures our clean water and beloved BWCAW, and wants it preserved for future generations, please reject the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed rules to deregulate salts and ion pollution. See form letter.	
1548	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Louis Asher	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please STOP the madness of such pollution! See form letter.	
1549	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jackie Holmbeck	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Now, more than ever, we need to be careful stewards of the environment that can protect our health and the health of other living creatures. See form letter.	
1550	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Bryan Wyberg	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Shocked! That is how I feel having just read that the MPCA is contemplating the complete evisceration of our state's water protections. See form letter.	
1551	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Dean Borgeson	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	The MPCA is charged with protecting the public now and into the future, not to run interference for monied interests. Please execute your mission and don't reduce environmental protections. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1552	Waverly Reibel on behalf of John Elward	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	We need more protection for our water not less. For beer, for coffee, for swimming, for life. See form letter.	
1553	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Michael Overend	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I am a Minnesota Citizen and I live and work in the Northeast portion of Minnesota. Your actions affect my health, quality of life, livelihood, that of my children and of my community. We all depend on your staff and leadership at the MPCA to exercise your responsibility to protect our environment and our health as your single most important priority. See form letter.	
1554	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Mary Theresa Downing	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Reject the MPCA proposal . See form letter.	
1555	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Emerys S	Comments about treaty rights and full consideration of tribal lands	This will destroy the most important resources in our state and is a violation of treaty law that guarantee usufructory rights. See form letter.	
1556	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Jessica Carlson	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	My heart hurts for humans who have become so bold to believe our kind is above the rest. Wildlife does not have a voice or an option. We do. See form letter.	
1557	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Rebecca Perry	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Deregulation is simply not an option, for the potential, if not inevitable, consequences are too grave. See form letter.	
1558	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Kathryn Menard	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I grew up in Minnesota's Northwoods, and I cherish that connection to the land that was nurtured there. Although I no longer call it my home, I return as often as I can. See form letter.	
1559	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Susan Elvira Foran-Bernier	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Instead of trying to remove limits on pollution, the MPCA should be setting more stringent limits to protect clean water, fish, and health based on facts and modern science. See form letter.	
1560	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Elaine Gaston	Comments about mining	MPCA's proposed rules would deregulate mining pollution from taconite mines and proposed copper-nickel mines. Studies have shown this for years. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1561	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Elaine Gaston	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	These rules would protect polluters, not people or the natural world; they go against the mission of the MPCA. ..to be wise decision-makers looking out for the health and safety of all Minnesota residents and the land on which we live. See form letter.	
1562	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Steven Lindstrom	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Water is life. See form letter.	
1563	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Brian Carlson	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please protect our waters and environment! See form letter.	
1564	Waverly Reibel on behalf of David Brockway	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	WE NEED TO DRAW A LINE IN THE SAND TO MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE OUR MINNESOTA WATER! OUR ENVIRONMENT IS BEING NICKED AND DIMED TO DEATH. COMPANIES SHOULD DISCHARGE WATER AT LEAST AS "PURE" AS THEY FOUND IT. See form letter.	
1565	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Kay Drache	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As stewards for future generations we need to look beyond the moment to preserving our environment. See form letter.	
1566	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Richard Staffon	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	It appears to me that the MPCA is capitulating to corporate capture to make it easier to get permits for the big polluters. See form letter.	
1567	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Richard Staffon	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	It seems incongruous to me that we are proposing to weaken our water quality rules when if fact they need to be strengthend and enforced.	
1568	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Richard Staffon	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	MPCA does not seem to able to adequately protect our resources. See form letter.	
1569	Waverly Reibel on behalf of John Peck, Jr.	Comments about environmental justice	Proposed rule violates treaty rights.	
1570	Waverly Reibel on behalf of John Peck, Jr.	Comments suggesting that the proposed rules would weaken WQS	5) Given the serious problems with toxins in fish, this rule should strengthen - not weaken - overall water quality standard.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1571	Waverly Reibel on behalf of John Peck, Jr.	Comments about wild rice	4) Wild rice is wild - and should be broadly protected as aquatic flora - and not relegated to "agricultural irrigation."	
1572	Waverly Reibel on behalf of John Peck, Jr.	Comments about wildlife	3) Wildlife requires clean water in all forms for survival - so wetlands should be included along with all other water bodies.	
1573	Waverly Reibel on behalf of John Peck, Jr.	Comments about application of the standards and/or effluent limits	2) Set clear limits on all pollution discharges - size of the discharge should not matter for effective enforcement.	
1574	Waverly Reibel on behalf of John Peck, Jr.	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	1) No changes to class 3 and 4 water quality standards - these need to be maintained for public health and habitat integrity.	
1575	Waverly Reibel on behalf of John Peck, Jr.	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	This effort to weaken water quality standards would have an adverse impact on many of the natural resources of our state, as well as adversely impact family farms that depend upon clean water for their ability to provide safe healthy local food.	
1576	Waverly Reibel on behalf of John Peck, Jr.	Comments about mining	The MPCA proposal is clearly meant to pave the way for further pollution from mining in northern MN.	
1577	Waverly Reibel on behalf of John Peck, Jr.	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Reject the MPCA's proposed deregulation of pollution limits on ion and salt.	
1578	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Angela Anderson	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	My experience with MPCA has been that the organization does not work for the people but for the minority of business interests. I thought this State Agency was put in place to assure the wellbeing of everyone to the greatest extent possible. Please scrutinize their proposals in the interest of all living organisms. Clean water is the lifeblood of our nation. See form letter.	
1579	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Meg Kearns	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	There are no guarantees that accidents will not cause damage to the natural environment or that mining companies will pay for any damage that might occur. They should not be allowed to avoid financial responsibility at the expense of MN taxpayers. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1580	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Kathryn McKenzie	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Approximately 1/2 billion has been used to clean the water in Lake Superior. Why place these waters in more danger if a dam breaks? See form letter.	
1581	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	In these times of increasing, global water scarcity Minnesota must protect our life-sustaining water. Please reject the MPCA's proposed water quality deregulation rules.	
1582	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Agencies, entities and industries must be held accountable through measureable numerical standards to ensure that our natural resources are protected and safe for the people.	
1583	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Without numerical standards the regulations would be handing polluters a blank check. Minnesota needs stricter standards, scientifically-determined numerical limits and stronger enforcement.	
1584	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber	Comments about narrative standards	Reliance on narrative without numbers does not assure an accurate measurement of toxins, salts or conductivity. To apply narrative-only regulations would allow the evasion of accountability. Words can be spun toward a particular outcome. Figures don't lie.	
1585	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	To hold businesses accountable, it is necessary to set numerical limits or standards and then to monitor those standards with scientific regularity to measure whether those standards are being met.	
1586	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	The proposed deregulation of water quality standards is inimical to the mission of the MPCA.	
1587	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	The proposed rules would protect the polluting industry, not the people and natural resources---certainly they would not protect life-sustaining water.	
1588	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please reject the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed water quality regulations which would deregulate toxins, hard rock minerals, salts and ion pollution.	



Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1589	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Erik Storlie	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Strongly agrees with the content of the form letter, especially the first two points. See form letter.	
1590	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Martha Baxter	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	In addition, please remember, clean water is always most important. More essential than jobs and profits! See form letter.	
1591	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Nathan Acker	Comments about mining	When the ore is gone and the jobs with it, when once pristine lakes and streams are poisoned for centuries or more, we'll all have the MPCA to thank for opening the door to mining corporations that have never and will never give a damn about Minnesota, who will come through to exploit, pollute, and move on. See form letter.	
1592	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Beth Tamminen	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	MPCA's proposed rules would harm many aspects of our legacy: fish, wild rice, wildlife habitats, tribal treaty resources, state species of concern. It would damage our livelihoods based on recreation, sustainable farming, and businesses such as breweries and fishing charters that depend on clean water. There are also concerning implications for human health. See form letter.	
1593	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Gary Noren	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	MPCA's job is to regulate, NOT de-regulate! They need to get busy with their job of protecting our water, land and air.	
1594	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Judy Chucker	Comments about wildlife	Commenter notes overall decline in insects and birds. MPCA's proposed rules to eliminate and weaken water quality standards would only exacerbate the catastrophic losses already documented by legitimate scientific studies. See form letter.	
1595	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Janis Hollenbeck	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Clean water is essential to man's survival and will, very likely, in the future be the object and subject of conflict, even war, just has been the case with oil. We ought to be making water protection an absolute priority in the interests of our own and future generation's survival. See form letter.	
1596	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Steven Smith	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Lake Superior contains one fifth of the world's fresh water, an invaluable resource for the nation, North America and the world. I believe the job the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) was created for was to protect people from polluters and not the other way around. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1597	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Tina Krauz	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	it is time to recognize the con game of saving jobs is a lie and nothing is more important than profits for mining companies and the graft. Taking down the real economy for a barren one. See form letter.	
1598	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Chel Anderson	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	As a longtime resident of the Lake Superior watershed, retired NE MN ecologist and co-author of North Shore: A Natural History of MN's Superior Coast I am acutely aware of the what is at stake biologically, ecologically and culturally if water quality standards are weakened. In fact, the existing rules need to be strengthened and consistently enforced, not weakened as proposed by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA).	
1599	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Chel Anderson	Comments about wild rice	My own and others harvest of wild rice has NO connection or relationship to any common or legal definition of "agricultural irrigation". See form letter.	
1600	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Stephanie Johnson	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	We have come to a crossroads as to what we want to leave future generations, as in 1972 when the ESA was made policy. This time our policies encompass wildlife, people, wilderness all together. It is time to strengthen our policies against pollution, we need to think "environmental justice" before it is too late. It is much harder to restore than to conserve and protect. See form letter.	
1601	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Deborah Huskins	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	To protect Minnesota's environment, we need the tools to prevent damaging substances from polluting the waters and soils of our state-- which include standards that industry must meet in order to operate. Deleting the standards as proposed by the MPCA would weaken the regulatory tools needed. It also means that those monitoring release of such substances (private citizens and others can monitor, as can regulatory agencies) would not have the tools to enforce the standards and protect the environment. See form letter.	
1602	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Robert Kosuth	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I have lived in northern Minnesota for 40 years and I know well from canoeing and camping and hiking now delicate the environment up here is. If anything, existing statutes should be strengthened. See form letter.	
1603	Waverly Reibel on behalf of David Reisenweber	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	The future of N.E. Mn is best served by our abundant mostly clean water that needs more protection, not less. State agencies' job is to serve people not lying multinational corporations who write most of the thousands of pages in the EISs. It is sad when our taxes pay for govt. that does not work for us. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1604	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Ken Kaseforth	Comments about mining	The long-term consequences of these proposed changes will far outweigh any short- term advantages they'd provide to extractor industries.	
1605	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Ken Kaseforth	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please reject the Minnesota POLLUTION CONTROL Agency's (MPCA) proposed rules to deregulate salts and ion pollution. As these changes would protect polluters rather than people and the environment, they go against the mission of the Agency. See form letter.	
1606	Waverly Reibel on behalf of James Mickelson	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	MPCA should use the 7th generation principle in its decisions. See form letter.	
1607	Waverly Reibel on behalf of James Mickelson	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Believes MPCA is proposing the rule to enhance corporate profits, and the proposed rule should be rejected. See form letter.	
1608	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Claire Mutch	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please, disapprove all removal or weakening of any class 3 & 4 numeric water quality standards to protect the world that future generations will inherit. See form letter.	
1609	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Claire Mutch	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I am perplexed as to why an agency that is intended to protect public resources, like water, is instead looking to weaken protections except for large downstream appropriators of water. See form letter.	
1610	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Emrys S	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Clean water is a human right. See form letter.	
1611	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Emrys S	Comments about environmental justice	It is genocide and a war crime to destroy a people's food and water resources, the history and cumulative impacts of multiple extractive projects in the region and climate change must be taken into account.	
1612	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Emrys S	Comments about wild rice	Wild rice is threatened by this rule change as well as other species tribes depend on and hold sacred in addition to water.	
1613	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Andrea B. Crouse	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Millions have been spent restoring the habitat and wildlife in the Twin Ports region, and they are seeing the successful return of sturgeon and wild rice in certain areas. See form letter.	
1614	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Donald Wedll	Comments about the Clean Water Act	Proposed rule is an attempt to not regulate pollutions and allow the degradation of waters, which is in direct violation of the CWA agreed to by the MPCA and should not be allowed. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1615	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Richard Bachman	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I am so tired of giving my hard earned money and my time to protect something that's already supposed to be protected!!!!!! See form letter.	
1616	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Julie Allen	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	My family and I are small farmers of fruits and vegetables, harvesters of native wild rice, and avid users of the Boundary Waters Wilderness. Ask rule be rejected. See form letter.	
1617	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Norman Herron	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Reject proposed rules. They do not protect people or natural resources from dangerous pollution. The proposed rules only protect industry.	
1618	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Norman Herron	Comments about sulfate and mercury	Increased algal blooms due to increase in sulfate, which means more mercury.	
1619	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Norman Herron	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Aquatic insects, fish, and amphibians are in jeopardy	
1620	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Norman Herron	Comments about narrative standards	Proposed rule would result in unenforcable standards	
1621	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Norman Herron	Comments about narrative standards	Shifting standards from numeric to narrative seems to be a change in the data driven decisions the MPCA has been pursuing.	
1622	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Norman Herron	Comments about the Clean Water Act	Deregulation proposal does not meet CWA.	
1623	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Norman Herron	Other	Comments on how the agency's image is now tarnished as a result of Polymet mine and EPA comment submittal. Now, when MPCA proposes to deregulate certain standards, the public wishes to know the origin of these proposals and whether powerful entities have come to unduly influence outcomes.	
1624	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Joanne Sieck	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Are you all asleep at the wheel? Or are you benefiting from greedy corporate kickbacks? Where is the common sense in any of this? You are beholden to PROTECT our environment, not sell out to the highest bidder. See form letter.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1625	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Joanne Sieck	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Concerns on disappearing insect, animal and fish species, decreasing clean drinking water supply, and air quality particulate pollution.	
1626	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Benjamin Tsai	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	MPCA's rules would contaminate high quality and sensitive waters in the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior watersheds. The economic and health impacts to from this contamination would have longterm, deleterious effects on Minnesota. Nearly every part of these rules must be rejected. See form letter	
1627	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Mary Ellen Frame	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	We need to clean up our water, protect wetlands, wildlife, conservation agriculture, and the future of life on this earth. We do not need to give free rein to already too- powerful corporations to insure profitability to those who are already rich. See form letter.	
1628	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Angela Tillges	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please reject the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed rules to deregulate salts and ion pollution. See form letter.	
1629	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Angela Tillges	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Establish priorities that align with water health first and industry second.	
1630	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Angela Tillges	Comments about climate change	Changing climate and progressive clean energy and climate forward policies Minnesota has adopted require redefining relationship between people and the natural world.	
1631	Waverly Reibel on behalf of Angela Tillges	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Proposed Deregulation Rules not in line with agency mission	
1632	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Please reject the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed rules to deregulate salts and ion pollution. These rules would protect polluters, not people or natural resources; they go against the mission of the MPCA.	
1633	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	MPCA's proposed rules to eliminate and weaken water quality standards would harm fish, wild rice, wildlife habitats, tribal Treaty resources, state species of concern, recreation, sustainable farms, businesses that depend on clean water, human health, and environmental justice.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1634	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments about mining	MPCA's proposed rules would deregulate mining pollution from taconite mines and proposed copper-nickel mines. MPCA's rules would contaminate high quality and sensitive waters in the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior watersheds. Nearly every part of these rules must be rejected.	
1635	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments suggesting that the proposed rules would weaken WQS	Disapprove all removal or weakening of any class 3 & 4 numeric water quality standards. These changes would kill aquatic life, harm people, and remove existing uses of water bodies.	
1636	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Disapprove MPCA's radical idea that water quality violations only matter where water is taken by a high volume appropriator. Water belongs to all of us, and limits on discharge must be set to protect all waters, not specific private interests.	
1637	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments about wildlife	Disapprove changes to wildlife uses that protect wildlife for "watering," as if they were livestock and fail to support wildlife use of wetlands. Respect ecological science.	
1638	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments about wild rice	Direct that MPCA protect wild rice by placing narrative and numeric standards for wild rice with aquatic life protection where they belong, not with agricultural irrigation.	
1639	Waverly Reibel on behalf of 585 form letter commenters	Comments suggesting that the proposed rules would weaken WQS	Instead of trying to remove limits on pollution, the MPCA should be setting more stringent limits to protect clean water, fish, and health based on modern science.	
1640	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Claire Shirley, Owner/Operator of Sawbill Canoe Outfitters - BWCA area	Comments about sulfate and mercury	As a physician, I am concerned that MPCA's proposal to remove and weaken these water quality standards will result in significantly more sulfates being released from sediments into water, and thus more methyl mercury forming in the aquatic community and posing human health risks. There is a link between environment and human health. Toxins released into the environment will eventually make their way into the air, water, soil, fish, wildlife and eventually humans. References two studies: 2011 MDH findings of mercury in the blood of new born babies in the western	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1641	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Dr. Jen Pearson, MD in Duluth, MN	Comments about sulfate and mercury	<p>As a physician, I am concerned that MPCA's proposal to remove and weaken these water quality standards will result in significantly more sulfates being released from sediments into water, and thus more methyl mercury forming in the aquatic community and posing human health risks.</p> <p>There is a link between environment and human health. Toxins released into the environment will eventually make their way into the air, water, soil, fish, wildlife and eventually humans.</p> <p>References two studies: 2011 MDH findings of mercury in the blood of new born babies in the Lake Superior Basin. Concludes that mercury is already a problem in this region.</p> <p>2014 Alancett (sp) British Medical Journal released a study showing that industrial chemicals, include methyl mercury, that injure the developing brain, are among the known cause for rise in known mental disabilities, i.e., autism, attention deficiet hyperactivity and dyslexia.</p> <p>Reject MPCA's proposed changes to weaken current water quality standards for salts and other major ionic pollutants in water discharges.</p>	
1642	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Bill Hansen, Grand Marias, MN resident, (previously owned/operated Sawbill Canoe Outfitters)	Comments about mining	<p>Address social and economic side. This rule change appears to be organized by industry in order to take short term advantage of our precious and valuable fresh water resources in northeastern MN. The rule changes would allow them to pollute to the detriment of our overall economic development. Especially mining projects.</p> <p>Mining and timber is not the primary economy of this area. Services and hospitality indutries are more prevelant for quality of life.</p> <p>Do not weaken our water rules for very wealthy people.</p>	
1643	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments:Dr. Jesse Coenen, MD, Duluth, MN	Comments about sulfate and mercury	<p>Speaking on behalf of the risks to our children in NE MN, those born and those not yet born. Obvious there are increase in nerologic developmental issues. 2011 MDH study showed 10% of new borns in this area had elevated levels of blood mercury.Proposal would lead to inheritently leave even higher levels of mercury with higher Increased neuropsychiatric problems. Lower IQ, speech disorders, slurs, etc., already no resources to treat existing. Would be huge step in wrong direction. No dollar amount high enough to sell health of our children. The effects of methylmercury on humans are permanent. Please don't condemn our children to a lifetime of higher incidences of these health problems. Please let's deny the proposed rule changes.</p>	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1644	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Allen Richardson, Palcade, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	<p>Near Tamarac, potential sulfide mine. Been tracking for a number of years. Seems MPCA is the victim of corporate capture and allowing industry to write their regulations at the expense of Minnesotans and Minnesota water quality. Proposed changes would remove Minnesota's numeric standards, limiting typical mining pollutants and weaken water quality standards.</p> <p>They are crushing the science and making it easier for the mining industry to get away with polluting into MN waters. That is 100% the wrong way to go about this sort of thing. Weakening standards is 100% foolish. No need to allow the mining industry to exert this much influence.</p> <p>We're spending quite a bit of time and money to clean up the St. Louis River and there is an increasing knowledge of the seriousness of mercury and the role of sulfate in that equation. Appreciates having a senator in Duluth that takes the wild rice sulfate standard seriously. These changes should not go through. MPCA should not be deregulating mining pollution. All designed to establish copper/nickel mining in MN. They have yet to prove that it has been anywhere without serious consequences to water quality.</p>	
1645	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Svea Frantzich, 13, MN	Other	<p>So important the water of Grand Marais, Lutsen and shore of Lake Superior stay clean and we really need to protect it. As a young person in MN, it should really not be up to the adults of the world to be making these very important decisions for many generations that will come after them. It's definitely up to us to protect our land and waters for our children and our children's children, rather than for ourselves. Thank you for listening.</p>	



Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1646	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Robert Hale, St. Paul, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	<p>Retired data analyst. Now my main job is hiking and fishing the rivers and waters of NE MN. I'm 71 years old and have enjoyed this region my entire life. I'm here to speak against the proposed rule change.</p> <p>I've read the documentation on the MPCA website and has been to several hearings regarding permits. There must be a lot of finance make data. We need to use numeric data to make the rules and then in turn make the rules enforceable.</p> <p>Discuss biomagnification - the story of how toxic discharges of sulfate and mercury can do to our food chains. Poison our plants and animals. new borns in NE MN are born with mercury.</p> <p>Allowing greater levels of contaminants such as self proposed for our class 3 &amp; 4 waters gives discharges no incentive to clean up their water. We don't get a second chance with waters, once they're in there, they're in there forever.</p> <p>I'm asking you to please reject these proposed rule changes. Thank you.</p>	
1647	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Jaci Christenson	Comments on Line 3	<p>Honorable Judge Lipman and MPCA staff, please take responsibility for the impacts of your decisions. There are thousands of people putting their lives on the line to stop the impacts from the Line 3 debacle where the MPCA issued permits to pollute our water with toxic tarsands.</p> <p>Before you move forward with these rule changes, take a trip north along the Line 3 route of destruction to witness how your decisions impact these people and the places you're charged to protect.</p> <p>On the rule changes, it is obvious that there are numerous concerns. You're removing and weakening our protections. But most importantly, you are violating treaties and not upholding Executive Order 1924, which affirms government to government relationship between the State of Minnesota and Minnesota Tribal Nations.</p> <p>These rule changes unreasonable and are not supported and should not go forward. Thank you.</p>	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1648	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments:Margot Monson, Entomolgist, St. Paul, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	<p>Judge Lipman, why should we be regulating the contamination from mining that will be great on Minnesota waterways? You must be aware of the critical importance of healthy aquatic ecosystems and what is necessary for these habitats to be functional. The animals must have healthy water to survive. The waste and effluent from mining operations have already degraded some of our northern Minnesota environments. Why would we risk further damage to our waters. As an aquatic biologist I am losing faith that the MPCA will ever live up to its name and step up in the face of these mining proposals to control pollution. It might be possible to capture some of the surface water, but I can tell you will not be able to clean up water that is moving underground. We should not weaken water quality standards to permit sulfide discharge. We should be protecting our natural stands of wild rice. We should not allow discharges to impact waters downstream, rather we need limits to prevent this. It's unconscionable that in this land of 10,000 lakes or more, many are already designated as unhealthy for recreation and fishing due to agricultural runoff. By removing the numeric standards that limit mining pollutants and weakening water quality standards that prevent excessive sulfates, the impact is going to be felt by our Native American Tribes by limiting their rights to hunt, fish, and gather from waters that are full of life. In addition, all water pollution affects our tourism and sustainable farming economy. Please do the right thing by our environment and make the MPCA live up to its name to control pollution in this state. I urge you to reject the proposed Class 3 &amp; 4 proposed rule changes. Thank you.</p>	
1649	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Dianne Polasik, with 3 grandchildren, Stillwater, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	<p>We believe the judge should reject the MPCA's proposed rules. I'm a retired school nurse and I spent much of my career helping children stay healthy. We all need a healthy environment, clean air, clean water, or all the nursing in the world won't matter much.</p> <p>We are asking MPCA to please keep your current standards limiting mining pollutants. Protect clean water for wildlife. Protect clean water for kids. More sulfate = more mercury in our fish. More sulfide leads to algae blooms. Protect the quality water in the Boundary &amp; Lake Superior watersheds. Water is like our family... something we love and care for and protect. Thank you.</p>	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1650	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Timothy Frantzich	Comments about mining	As a child I went to the boundary waters. We want to protect them. Our body is 70% water, and we are the food we eat and the water we drink. If we start to forget that we are actually made of the earth, then we start to get sick ourselves because the earth gets sick. Stay vigilant with these laws in the watersheds up in the boundary waters and the watersheds the flow into Lake Superior. These mines can have a catastrophic accident and destroy thousands and thousands of acres which would affect Lake Superior. Increase the laws that protect the waters because the waters protect us. Thank you.	
1651	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Nancy Giguere, St. Paul, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	Citizen scientists and other experts have already explained how the deregulation of water pollution would destroy everything Minnesotans love about the arrowhead region, including fishing, recreation and tourism. Small sustainable farms that produce organic crops would be devastated. Clean water would become a scarce commodity in many communities. And wild rice and food that is both sacred and nourishing would become killed off.  I am not a scientist, but I speak as a mother and grandmother. What will happen to their futures? Will they have fresh water or have to rely on bottled water? Already 10% of children have mercury in their blood. Mercury causes learning and language disabilities. I worry many children will suffer these preventable conditions. Existing water quality standards must be enforced and water pollution regulated. The proposed new rules will remove these standards. I urge you to reject the MPCA's proposed rules. These rules would promote polluters and goes against the job of the MPCA and they are not in the best interest of future generations of Minnesotans.	
1652	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Wendy Ward, Marine on St. Croix, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I am confused and alarmed at these potential changes. I think the best way is to refer to the mission This is a generalized comment. It does not address the proposed rule. of our MPCA, "to protect and improve the environment and human health. And also in their vision it states that they will deliver services that support healthy people and eco systems." With the proposed changes, that is not possible. That mission is completely compromised.  As a Minnesotan, I would ask that you comprehensively reject these proposed changes. Thank you very much.	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1653	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments:Julie Cox, Minneapolis, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	I strongly oppose these changes to the MN water quality standards by the MPCA. If enacted, the new MPCA rules would weaken our water quality in several ways. For me the most damaging results of these changes would be #1: The threat to survival of many species of concern, i.e. lake sturgeon and cricket frog, etc. from exposure to more salts and other pollutants. #2 the rise in contamination of mercury in fish from increased sulfate, which could further damage the brains of infant children.MN has so much that makes our state so rich. So please do not take away the richness or the beautifulness that makes MN a great place to live. Thank you.	
1654	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Kendall Kramer, Hopkins, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	<p>On it's website, the MPCA states that its mission is to protect and improve the environment and human health. However, the MPCA's proposed mining pollution deregulation would allow pollution without regard for people or natural resources. Allowing contamination of high quality waters in the boundary waters and Lake Superior watershed, through taconite and copper/nickle mining pollution is the opposite of improving the environment.</p> <p>Allowing mining runoff to impair the soil and sensitive crops of unsustainable or small farms, is an undoing of efforts towards the sustainability and environmental health.</p> <p>Allowing for the increased mercury contamination in fish resulting from increased sulfate in the water, does the opposite of protecting the health of developing children's brains. Allowing high levels of sulfate he increased sulfate to affect the cultural wild rice production and fishing in the NE will damage treaty rights. It's clear the Chippewa advocate to the government, including the MPCA, for the protection of wild rice from sulfates.</p> <p>The rules in the proposed mining deregulation would 1-remove numeric standards limiting mining pollutants. 2-weaken MN's water quality standards that prevent excess sulfate. 3-provide no limits to discharge in MN waters. 4-narrowing the protection of watering to livestock as opposed to the water needs of live creatures.</p> <p>These rules don't serve the public. Please do not allow the mining pollution deregulation. Thank you.</p>	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1655	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Dan Engelhart	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	<p>Dan Engelhart, Minneapolis MN. Mr. Engelhart comments that the MPCA rule proposal to deregulate the mines and other polluters is a terrible idea. Existing rules are there, and they should be enforced and maintained. Treaties and sovereign rights exist. Wild rice is a way of life for sovereign nations. Fresh clean water is a valuable resource for biodiversity, fishing, swimming, and drinking. It is wild to see water being traded on the stock market.</p> <p>Weakening the rules, deregulation, removing numeric standards on major ions and salts is reckless and dangerous. Weakening water quality standards that prevent excessive sulfate and privatizing the protection of water quality.</p> <p>We have so much water and we need to protect it because it is an essence for human life. MN needs to choose to be a leader. We have so much water in the Great Lakes Region, and we need to protect it. We should keep the rule we have in place and protect our water resources.</p> <p>Mr. Engelhart also offered comments on his concern about efforts to privatize water, which would allow it to be traded in the stock market. He does not believe it is a good idea, which is evident to him based on available case studies, such as Cochabamba, Bolivia.</p>	

1656	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments:Judy Dufficy	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	<p>Judy Dufficy lives in Minneapolis. She opposes MPCA's proposed rule changes that deregulate taconite and sulfide mining, which would harm the areas and ecosystem surrounding the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior watershed. She urges that the proposed rule changes be rejected. She is retired now, but she and her spouse grew up in the area along the Great Lakes. She wishes to testify on the benefit that government regulation has had on Lake Superior, Lake MI, and the surrounding area. She recalls the Great Lakes being full of pollution when she was child during the 50's and early 60's. At that time, swimming in Lake Superior and Lake Michigan meant the acrid lake water hurt the eyes. In the Late 60's, she recalls seeing enormous stacks of dead alewives on Lake Michigan shores stinking up the area for miles. However, in the early 70's, the CWA and CAA changed everything. The federal regulations required industry to manage manufacturing byproducts, and the CWA resulted in lakes no longer being treated as sewers for industrial pollution and mining waste. When she talks to her children about vacationing in the lakes area during her childhood, they can scarcely believe her description of the pollution. She notes that they were not alive during the time that EPA took action against Reserve Mining Corporation in MN, which resulted in the largest settlement in history to clean up Lake Superior. She wants us to know that regulation and ordinances governing the protection of the environment work, especially when enforced – the purpose of good government. She strongly urges the ALJ to keep correct laws and regulations for numeric standards in place, and to reject the MPCA's proposal to deregulate regulations for mining (major ions and salts) in the Lake Superior watershed and the Boundary Waters. She does not believe that the effects of deregulating taconite, copper, and sulfur mining to the ecosystem, human health, and local economies from tourism and recreation could be undone today. If the proposed changes are approved, she believes dangerous consequences will result for northeast MN waters that are currently naturally low in sulfate, chloride, hardness, and conductivity, such waters are especially vulnerable to major ion and sulfate pollution. Harm will result to aquatic fish, insect, and amphibian populations. Growth in algal blooms will also occur as increased sulfates release phosphorus from lake sediment. Every reliable medical study has proven the direct link between brain damage in children and mercury contamination resulting from increased sulfate in the water supply. This will also inflict enormous hardship on the Ojibwe and other nations that depend on land and water for their livelihood harvesting wild rice and fish. The</p>	
------	---	--	--	--

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
			<p>MPCA was created to protect Minnesota. MPCA protects air, land, and the quality our environment. MPCA was not created to do the bidding of corporations that have an insatiable desire for profit. Corporations created the myth that deregulation creates jobs, but that is not the case. The commenter believes that the ALJ has the power to stand up to corporations and protect the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior watershed. The commenter urges the ALJ to protect the water by rejecting the MPCA's proposed rule changes to remove numeric water quality standards that protect us from pollution from mines, ethanol plants, and other polluters.watershed.</p>	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1657	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments:Theresa Lastovich	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	<p>Ms. Lastovich lives in Chisolm, MN. She grew up in Balkan Township. She essentially had the Superior National Forest and Sturgeon River, which the outlet from the Dark River flowed into, in her backyard. Her mother is a breast cancer survivor, pre-menopausal. Ms. Lastovich, the commenter, was also diagnosed at 35 with stage 3C, breast cancer. She is sharing medical information to make sure people understand her views. She has a strong opinion – deregulation cannot be an option. She states that, “You don’t s*** where you eat.” She expresses concerns about letting a certain company that is allegedly known internationally for child labor law human rights violations and environmental disasters leave. Ms. Lastovich shares some of her background in product development design. It is not clear as to whether she holds a PhD, or simply needs to finish a dissertation to obtain her PhD in development design, because of the static in the audio. She holds an international domestic patent with 3M for personal protective equipment, PPE. She is an expert in analyzing hazardous situations and outfitting individuals with the correct PPE. She conducts research from many angles. After researching for this rule, she does not see how deregulation is possible. She believes we should have higher standards because of the Boundary Waters and Lake Superior watersheds. Based on her research and contacts, she is concerned (as are others outside of MN) about water shortages. There is a shortage of clean water in the world, and MN has an abundance of clean water. We should be protecting water because we can’t live without it. She waited to make her video because she was healing. She doesn’t want anyone to go through what she went through medically. She raises concerns about a February 8, 2010 North Met Draft EIS (CQ# 20093687). The draft EIS indicates that no EPA regulations exist that apply to that standard. She is concerned because she has family in the area, as do others, and life is important. Water is important to life. She doesn’t believe that it matters if 300 jobs come to the area, if she is too sick to work. Bringing a company into the area that promises jobs doesn’t matter, if they have no union. No union means jobs can be outsourced. The agency cannot deregulate. She is open to sharing her information and discussing it with anyone that is interested. She opposes everything about deregulation.</p>	



Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1658	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Emily Levang	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	<p>Emily Levang lives in Duluth. She grew up in Duluth on the St. Louis River estuary. She enjoyed kayaking, sailing, and living near the water. Her father was a boat builder, which is how they settled in Duluth. She believes that water and all of the waters in MN are precious. She speaks as someone who has grown up in MN and moved away. She has lived on the West Coast and Colorado. Those experiences taught her about the importance of fresh water. She came from MN and grew up with an abundance of fresh water. In CA, she experienced the anxiety of the scarcity of fresh water. When she lived in California during the drought, it made her question the scarcity of fresh water/clean water. She wanted to start a family, and she chose to move back to MN because water was important. Water is important and it is life. Living elsewhere gave her the perspective that MN has a huge responsibility to protect the water sources that exist here because of drought and climate change around the world. We need to protect water for humans, plants, animals, birds, and fish. Water is becoming increasingly scarce and MN is a land of water. The possibility of deregulating MN water is scary because so much of life depends on water. The surface arguments about the impact on certain species or loss of a few species makes it seem like things can be parceled out. However, we are all interconnected. The loss of the first species is like a canary in the coal mine. The loss of the first species is reflecting the harm affecting the whole ecosystem, including humans. We have a responsibility to object to anything that would cause further pollution. When there is no way to measure, how do we know what the impact is? Neurological disorders in children? What will it take to know we have gone too far? It will be too late. She believes that protecting these waters as they are now is right. We may even want to increase their protection further for all life now and in the future.</p>	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1659	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments:Judith Derauf, Duluth, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	<p>Ms. Derauf lives in Duluth. She opposes the proposed rule change because it does not reflect the agency's mission statement to "protect and improve the environment and human health." The proposed rule changes appear to lower the standard for WQS. The effect is that they deregulate industrial polluters - mining in particular. How does deregulating industry by lowering WQS meets the agency's mission? The proposed rule changes look like the MPCA is trying to avoid enforcing the WQS. The proposed rule changes protect polluters, not the people and resources. Removing the numeric standards takes away an important tool for monitoring. Pollutants that dissolve in water need numeric standards because they aren't visible to the eye. Weakening standards for sulfates seems negligent. Sulfate pollution is of great concern in mining areas. More monitoring is needed where mining is practiced. The commenter is concerned about the well-being of vulnerable populations downstream of the mining operations. The commenter expressed concern for young children that may suffer potential brain damage from mercury contaminated fish. The commenter is also concerned about the impact of polluted groundwater on soil health for small scale farmers. The commenter is also concerned about private citizens having their private wells polluted by unregulated pollutants. The commenter believes that high water quality standards are critical in maintaining the balance in an ecosystem. Strong rules are required to maintain the high-quality water resources in MN, BWCA &amp; Lake Superior. Water is MN's strongest asset, and the commenter wants us to help protect it.</p>	

Number	Name/Affiliation	Comment Topic	Summary of Comment	MPCA Response
1660	Waverly Reibel cover letter video comments: Mary Lastovich, Chisolmn, MN	Comments generally opposing the proposed rule amendments	<p>Ms. Lastovich is from Chisolm, MN. She is not against mining, and she shared that her family worked the mines. She is against copper nickel mining so close to the Boundary Waters. The leaching of arsenic is a concern, because of the potential for dams to burst. She doesn't believe that the loss of an estimated 300 jobs is worth the loss of water north to Canada, or south down the Mississippi.</p> <p>Historically, industries overestimate the number of jobs they potentially create. She doesn't believe the loss of overestimated jobs is worth losing the water supply. Ms. Lastovich prefers that state jobs in the cities be moved to the area, because they are less dangerous.</p> <p>She questions whether people would want to buy a house in Flint, Michigan. Would someone buy her \$250k house or property near Ely, if the dam failed? We should look at the disasters that have occurred in other states, Canada, and worldwide. Who is left to clean up the mess? The company that made the money, is long gone. Lives are lost, the tourist industry In Ely and the surrounds areas suffer. The area can do better, such as recycle, and create new technologies that don't compromise essential water.</p> <p>People can't eat, breathe, or drink a dollar bill. Ms. Lastovich wants people to spend a weekend in the BWCA area, and then make a decision on the WQS Class 3 &amp; 4 Rule. She is definitely opposed to the WQS Class 3 &amp; 4 Rule.</p>	