

This file contains documents relevant to the MPCA rulemaking for Water Quality Standards - Use Classifications 2 and 7.

Included are:

- Hearing requests received during the comment period for the Dual Notice of Intent to Adopt Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations

✓ Ann C. O'Reilly, Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings
600 Robert St.
P.O. Box 64620
St. Paul, MN 55164-0620

10/7/2019

Ms. Mary H. Lynn
Mn Pollution Control Agency
520 Lafayette Road North
St. Paul, MN 55155-4194
mary.lynn@state.mn.us

RCUD OAH '19 OCT 8

Dear Ms. O'Reilly and Ms. Lynn:

I am submitting this comment letter both as a public comment letter to be included in the public record and as a request for a public hearing for the reasons contained below. Minnesota Rules, Chapter 7050 are Minnesota's water quality standards [WQS]. I have included portions of Chapter 7050.0140, Chapter 7050.0150, and Chapter 7050.0222 at the end of this letter for reference.

In those portions at the end of this letter, I have bolded and underlined specific phrases for emphasis and attention. In both .0140 and .0222, there is very clear and explicit intent that both actual and potential protection of the state's waters must be protected. Phrases including "is or may be" and "actually or potentially" are very clear and unequivocal.

The following language directly below from the MPCA Amendments to Aquatic Life document clearly demonstrates that "potential designated uses" are clearly ignored by the use of the phrase "**must reflect an existing beneficial use**".

June 2019 MPCA Amendments to Aquatic Life (Class 2) Use Designations [page 11]:

7050.0420 COLD WATER HABITAT TROUT WATERS.

A. ~~Trout lakes identified in part 6264.0050, subpart 2, as amended through June 14, 2004, are classified as trout waters and~~ Cold water habitats are listed under part 7050.0470. ~~Trout streams and their tributaries within the sections specified that are identified in part 6264.0050, subpart 4, as amended through June 14, 2004, are classified as trout waters. Trout streams are listed in part 7050.0470. Other lakes that are classified as trout waters are listed in part 7050.0470.~~

B. Cold water habitat waters identified as class 2A, 2Ae, or 2Ag in part 7050.0470 **must reflect an existing beneficial use** that permits the propagation and maintenance of a healthy community of cold water aquatic biota and their habitats.

This “potential” protection language is also clearly not being met in Subpart 6 of 7050.0150, below. In the paragraph after section E., the biological components [A, B, and C] are specified, but the habitat component, the “potential” component, is specifically omitted. Thus, while Subpart 6 may be scientifically sound, it is inadequate and incomplete by itself to meet the requirements specified in .0140 and .0222.

The serious implications of this become clear when looking at the draft recommendations in the MPCA public notice. On **page 411** of the 23 September 2019 Minnesota State Register, in 7050.0470, Subpart 1, (25) Cedar Lake [69-0431-00] is proposed to be downgraded from a Class 2A cold water habitat [a trout lake] to a Class 2Bd cool water habitat [a non-trout lake]. Based on .0150, Subpart 6, this determination is based on non-habitat [i.e. non-potential] factors. How else could a trout lake become a non-trout lake? The habitat [the “potential”] hasn’t changed.

Below are two descriptions of Cedar Lake [bolding added for emphasis]:

MnDNR LakeFinder for Cedar Lake [69-0431-00]: Fish Species: black crappie, bluegill, **brown trout**, hybrid sunfish, largemouth bass, northern pike, pumpkinseed, **rainbow trout**, yellow perch, white sucker, brook stickleback, central mudminnow, creek chub, fathead minnow, golden shiner, northern redbelly dace

June 2019 MPCA Amendments to Aquatic Life (Class 2) Use Designations [page 29]:

Cedar Lake (69-0431-00): Cedar Lake is proposed to be designated as a cool and warm water aquatic life and habitat also protected as a source of drinking water (Class 2Bd). The DNR delisted Cedar Lake as a trout lake in 2018 (State of Minnesota 2018) **because this lake is no longer managed for trout** due to the presence of species of fish (bluegills and northern pike) that compete or prey upon trout. Repeated lake treatments to remove non-trout species have been ineffective and the DNR ceased trout stocking on 2007. Considering this information, it is reasonable to remove the Class 2A classification assigned to cold water aquatic life and habitat and replace it with the use assigned to cool and warm waters also protected as a source of drinking water (Class 2Bd). The MPCA will propose to make this change in Minn. R. 7050.0470, subp. 1, Item B to acknowledge the cool or warm water aquatic life and habitat use for this lake.

While Cedar Lake may not presently be hospitable to trout populations, MnDNR Lakefinder’s description of both brown and rainbow trout being present demonstrates the potential that at some future time Cedar Lake could again attain a healthy trout population with a different restoration approach or, perhaps, a budget greater than is being spent. This more than adequately demonstrates that the Cedar Lakes use assignment should not be reduced from a cold water resource use to a cool water resource use. This seems to be a management issue and not a use issue.

The loss or diminution of fish or aquatic invertebrate populations or communities because of modified aquatic management practices or pollution should never be the cause of a designated use weakening. Absent extreme river or lake modification [severe habitat loss], all waterbodies designated as trout waters have the **potential** to recover at some future time.

Please note that this inappropriate ignoring of the "potential" provision should be applied throughout this draft and any future proposed rule revisions wherever applicable.

I request that both that this letter be included in the public record available for review by both the Administrative Law Judge and the U.S. EPA, Region 5 and that this letter serve as a public hearing request to establish why the MPCA is not following the requirements of 7050.0140 and 7050.0222, both for their proposed rule language modification that disregards "potential designated uses" and for reducing the use protection for Cedar Lake.

Sincerely,



Howard D. Markus, Ph.D., P.E. [retired]
9175 Pinehurst Road,
Woodbury, MN 55125

7050.0140 USE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR WATERS OF THE STATE.

Subp. 2. Class 1 waters, domestic consumption.

Domestic consumption includes all waters of the state that are or may be used as a source of supply for drinking, culinary or food processing use, or other domestic purposes and for which quality control is or may be necessary to protect the public health, safety, or welfare.

Subp. 3. Class 2 waters, aquatic life and recreation.

Aquatic life and recreation includes all waters of the state that support or may support aquatic biota, bathing, boating, or other recreational purposes and for which quality control is or may be necessary to protect aquatic or terrestrial life or their habitats or the public health, safety, or welfare. [Et cetera through Class 6].

[my bolding and underlining for emphasis]

7050.0222 SPECIFIC WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS 2 WATERS OF THE STATE; AQUATIC LIFE AND RECREATION.

Subpart 1. General.

The numeric and narrative water quality standards in this part prescribe the qualities or properties of the waters of the state that are necessary for the aquatic life and recreation designated public uses and benefits. If the standards in this part are exceeded in waters of the state that have the class 2 designation, it is considered indicative of a polluted condition which is actually or potentially deleterious, harmful, detrimental, or injurious with respect to the designated uses.

[my bolding and underlining for emphasis]

7050.0150 DETERMINATION OF WATER QUALITY, BIOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL CONDITIONS, AND COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS.

Subp. 6. Impairment of biological community and aquatic habitat.

In evaluating whether the narrative standards in subpart 3, which prohibit serious impairment of the normal aquatic biota and the use thereof, material alteration of the species composition, material degradation of stream beds, and the prevention or hindrance of the propagation and migration of aquatic biota normally present, are being met, the commissioner will consider all readily available and reliable data and information for the following factors of use impairment:

A. an index of biological integrity calculated from measurements of attributes of the resident fish community, including measurements of:

- (1)species diversity and composition;
- (2)feeding and reproduction characteristics; and
- (3)fish abundance and condition;

B. an index of biological integrity calculated from measurements of attributes of the resident aquatic invertebrate community, including measurements of:

- (1)species diversity and composition;
- (2)feeding characteristics; and
- (3)species abundance and condition;

C. an index of biological integrity calculated from measurements of attributes of the resident aquatic plant community, including measurements of:

- (1)species diversity and composition, including algae; and
- (2)species abundance and condition;

D. a quantitative or qualitative assessment of habitat quality, determined by an assessment of:

- (1)stream morphological features that provide spawning, nursery, and refuge areas for fish and invertebrates;
- (2)bottom substrate size and variety;
- (3)variations in water depth;

- (4) sinuosity of the stream course;
- (5) physical or hydrological alterations of the stream bed including excessive sedimentation;
- (6) types of land use in the watershed; and
- (7) other scientifically accepted and valid factors of habitat quality; and

E. any other scientifically objective, credible, and supportable factors.

A finding of an impaired condition must be supported by data for the factors listed in at least one of items A to C. The biological quality of any given surface water body will be assessed by comparison to the biological conditions determined by the commissioner using a biological condition gradient model or a set of reference water bodies which best represents the most natural condition for that surface water body type within a geographic region.

[my bolding and underlining for emphasis]

7050.0222 SPECIFIC WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS 2 WATERS OF THE STATE;
AQUATIC LIFE AND RECREATION.

Subpart 1. General.

The numeric and narrative water quality standards in this part prescribe the qualities or properties of the waters of the state that are necessary for the aquatic life and recreation designated public uses and benefits. If the standards in this part are exceeded in waters of the state that have the class 2 designation, it is considered indicative of a polluted condition which is **actually or potentially deleterious, harmful, detrimental, or injurious with respect to the designated uses.**

[my bolding and underlining for emphasis]

Lynn, Mary (MPCA)

From: Monta Hayner <montah@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, November 4, 2019 7:53 AM
To: Lynn, Mary (MPCA)
Subject: Request for public hearing

I am requesting a public hearing for the Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050

I object to the proposal to change Designated Trout streams to cold water streams. I am a trout angler and guide. The designation “Trout Stream” is two fold. In a scientific sense it includes temperature and lack of pollution for trout and the aquatic insects they eat to survive and reproduce. In a public image sense, Minnesota has some of the best trout streams in the world. Many livelihoods rely on the trout stream designation because of outdoor recreation and tourism. Please hold a public hearing on the proposed amendment.

The proposed rule amendments would effect how reports of pollution are investigated. I reported a farmer plowing manure into a stream last year. This stream is a primary reproductive stream for native brook trout. We could not locate any trout below where the manure was graded into the stream.

Please notify me of the public hearing when you determine the date.

Monta Hayner
63 Arthur Ave SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414

Sent from my iPad



John P. Lenczewski, Executive Director
Minnesota Trout Unlimited
PO Box 845
Chanhassen, MN 55317
612.670.1629
jlenczewski@comcast.net

November 7, 2019

Mary H. Lynn
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
520 Lafayette Road, North
St. Paul, MN, 55155-4194
Email: mary.lynn@state.mn.us

Via email

Re: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality
Standards—Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations,
Minnesota Rules Chapter 7050
Revisor's ID Number R-4561

Dear Ms. Lynn:

I am writing on behalf of Minnesota Trout Unlimited to request that the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency hold a public hearing on the proposed rules referenced above.

Minnesota Trout Unlimited's mission is to protect, restore, reconnect and sustain coldwater fisheries and their watersheds. We applaud the MPCA's steps to change the use designation of 34 stream segments to Class 2A (Class 2Ag and Class 2Ae), thereby increasing protections for these coldwater systems. However, the MPCA also proposes to reclassify many stream segments from 2A to 2B (2Bg, 2Be or 2Bm). But the MPCA has failed to demonstrate that at all times since November 28, 1975 there never has been an existing coldwater (2A) use in these 31 stream segment it proposes to reclassify from 2A to 2B (2Bg, 2Be or 2Bm).

Consequently, we object to the following portions of the proposed rules:

1. The proposed changes to Minnesota Rules 7050.0420;
2. Those portions of Minnesota Rules 7050.0470 which propose to change the current beneficial use designations for a stream segment from its current use designation of 2A or 2Ag to a use designation of 2Bd or 2Bdg.

We believe the proposed changes to Minnesota Rules 7050.0420 are either not necessary or are overly broad and create new criteria. We believe that in those instances where MPCA proposes to downgrade a stream segment from Class 2A that the agency has not met its burden of demonstrating that in fact a

coldwater use never exiting at any time since November 28, 1975. We will be submitting further comments on these issues and offering testimony at the hearing.

Thank you for your consideration of our request for a hearing on these matters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "John P. Lenczewski". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

John P. Lenczewski

From: Andrew Slade
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 12:21:54 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Andrew Slade
1026 South Lake Ave.
Duluth, MN 55802

From: Jacob Crawford
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 10:12:11 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Jacob Crawford
2125 E River Ter
Minneapolis, MN 55414

From: Matt Ringquist
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:01:04 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Matt Ringquist
402 Valley View Dr.
Redwood Falls, MN 56283

From: T Nygard
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:03:35 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

T Nygard
Randall, MN 56475

From: Sandra Hartmann
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:04:16 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Sandra Hartmann
4515 lyndale ave so
Minneapolis, MN 55419

From: T Mo
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:05:52 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

T Mo
3310 69th st e
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55075

From: John Ek
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:05:52 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

This proposal is not good for Minnesota!

Sincerely,
John Ek
4000 W 9th St
Duluth, MN 55807

From: John Margerum
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:07:28 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

John Margerum
3232 W Penn St
Philadelphia, PA 19129

From: Steven George
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:08:48 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Steven George
PO Box 535
Finland, MN 55603

From: Candace Dow
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:09:49 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Candace Dow
1425 W 28th St, Apt 315
Minneapolis, MN 55408

From: Thomas Sullivan
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:10:35 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Thomas Sullivan
4061 209TH LN NW
OAK GROVE, MN 55303

From: Erin Enger
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:11:54 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Erin Enger
5941 Wisconsin Cir
New Hope, MN 55428

From: Lisa Fitzpatrick
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:11:55 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am very concerned about keeping Minnesota's waters clean and pristine. I enjoy recreational activities on lakes and streams.

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Lisa Fitzpatrick
5229 Peabody St
Duluth, MN 55804

From: Luann Kleppe
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:12:45 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Luann Kleppe
Minneapolis, MN 55406

From: Tahera Mamdani
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:13:15 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Tahera Mamdani
Fridley, MN 55432

From: AMY GRACE
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:13:50 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

AMY GRACE
722 Everett St S
Stillwater, MN 55082

From: Cindy Jackson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:17:23 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Cindy Jackson
3749 Glenhurst Ave S
St Louis Park, MN 55416

From: Lois Seaburg
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:17:52 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Lois Seaburg
New Ulm, MN 56073

From: dean peter
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:18:13 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

dean peter
pob 156
prior lake, MN 55372

From: Sonja Miedtke
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:20:24 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Sonja Miedtke
71977 200 Ave
Hayfield, MN 55940

From: Bryan Hansel
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:21:21 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Bryan Hansel
PO Box 149, 140 County Road 44
Grand Marais, MN 55604

From: Erik Roth
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:22:14 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Erik Roth
225 W. 15th St. #412
Minneapolis, MN 55403

From: Kevin Heaslip
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:22:56 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule. Water is our most important resource. As stewards of the environment the MPCA is obligated to protect.

Sincerely,
Kevin Heaslip
2511 W 13th St
Duluth, MN 55806

From: Jan Ackerman
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:25:40 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Jan Ackerman
15781 Hayes Trl
Saint Paul, MN 55124

From: Paula Savage
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:26:37 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Paula Savage
4727 South Lake Sarah Drive
Maple Plain, MN 55359

From: richard taylor
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:28:11 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

richard taylor
1619 e 6th st
duluth, MN 55812

From: Timothy Mullen
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:29:04 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Timothy Mullen
Saint Charles, MN 55972

From: Jim Marsden
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:29:48 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Jim Marsden
1872 Howard St. N.
Malewood, MN 55109

From: Stephen Christopher
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:31:07 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Stephen Christopher
5117 43rd Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55417

From: Zoe Bird
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:31:09 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Zoe Bird
4918 37th Ave So
Minneapolis, MN 55417

From: Charles Benzie
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:35:37 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Charles Benzie
14466 Viking Ave. N.
Rogers, MN 55374

From: Lynne Bly
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:37:14 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Lynne Bly
30726 Ivywood Trail
Stacy, MN 55079

From: Heidi Windmiller
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:38:57 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Heidi Windmiller
Wayzata, MN 55391

From: Peggy Knapp
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:38:57 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I realize you will recognize the language below as being provided by Water Legacy. But, I understand and support every single word. As the agency charged with protecting water quality in Minnesota, do your job. Protect drinking water. Now more than ever.

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule

Sincerely,
Peggy Knapp
3228 22nd Ave. S.
Minneapolis, MN 55407

From: Lynda Pauling
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:39:16 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Lynda Pauling
5812 Olene Ave N
Oak Park Heights, MN 55082

From: kathy dunn
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:40:05 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

kathy dunn
8657 maplebrook
brooklyn park, MN 55445

From: Brandan Fiedler
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:42:31 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Brandan Fiedler
100 Central Ave NE Apt 206
Chisholm, MN 55719

From: Jerry Giefer
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:43:43 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Jerry Giefer
1252 2nd Ave. N
Windom, MN 56101

From: Scott Russell
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:44:10 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Scott Russell
3124 44th Ave. S.
Minneapolis, MN 55406

From: Scott Anderson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:45:28 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Scott Anderson
1150 N Elm Ave
Owatonna, MN 55060

From: John Carson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:45:37 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

John Carson
326 Arizona Street Se
Lonsdale, MN 55046

From: Amelia Kroeger
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:46:35 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Amelia Kroeger
1404 Gettysburg Ave N
Golden Valley, MN 55427

From: John Almlie
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:48:42 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Do your job. You need to be protecting our water more now, not less. Our water does not belong to the greedy

corporations!

Sincerely,
John Almli
1813 Park Ridge Cir
Chaska, MN 55318

From: Amelia Kroeger
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:46:35 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Amelia Kroeger
1404 Gettysburg Ave N
Golden Valley, MN 55427

From: Rebecca Shedd
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:55:02 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Shedd
Minneapolis, MN 55419

From: Elizabeth Merz
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:53:44 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Merz
Fergus Falls, MN 56537

From: Lynn C. Lang
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:52:52 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Lynn C. Lang
1721 Polaris Ct
Saint Cloud, MN 56303

From: Rich Bachman
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:48:49 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Rich Bachman
13000 Sylvan Ave
Lindstrom, MN 55045

From: Christopher Boldt
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:48:48 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Christopher Boldt
1235 Hartford Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55116

From: Barb Powell
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:01:27 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Barb Powell
Rochester, MN 55904

From: Kathleen Hutchins
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:00:54 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Hutchins
537 17th Ave NW
Saint Paul, MN 55112

From: Kaare Melby
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:00:53 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Kaare Melby
5782 Little Marais Rd
Finland, MN 55603

From: Carl Dawson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:55:59 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Carl Dawson
40 Judith Dr
Chaska, MN 55318

From: Richard Bjorum
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:55:55 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Richard Bjorum
2038 Town Road 492
International Falls, MN 56649

From: Mark Vesley
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:15:32 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Mark Vesley
1598 Edmund Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104

From: JL Charrier
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:15:31 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

JL Charrier
1910 Heritage Dr
Wayzata, MN 55391

From: Michelle McClung
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:12:24 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Michelle McClung
Eagan, MN 55122

From: Kathryn Mosher
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:10:52 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Mosher
4316B Clemson Circle
Eagan, MN 55122

From: Donna Olsen
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:03:46 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Donna Olsen
1706 Continental Dr, Apt 109
Grand Forks, ND 58201

From: Shannon Darsow
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:24:50 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Shannon Darsow
13376 carrach way
rosemount, MN 55068

From: Barbara Brockway
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:24:29 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Barbara Brockway
233 Nichols Ct
Saint Paul, MN 55126

From: Jaci Christenson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:21:37 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Jaci Christenson
12309 Fiona Ave N
White Bear Lake, MN 55110

From: Robert Wohlberg
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:20:51 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Robert Wohlberg
6739 11th ave s
Richfield, MN 55423

From: Libby Bent
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:17:49 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Libby Bent
2423 E 2nd St
Duluth, MN 55812

From: Lorie Marsh
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:39:45 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Lorie Marsh
1437 Hartford Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55116

From: susan berscheid
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:32:08 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

susan berscheid
1722 s franklin st
new ulm, MN 56073

From: Amelia Hummel
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:29:35 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency in the MPCA's description of these rules in its Notice. For example, it states "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." That is worse than misleading: Changing classifications would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply, most importantly the vitally important drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, as it is mandated to do to protect the health of Minnesotans and our state's unique and priceless environment, but also that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters." This term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes would deprive Minnesotans of an easily-available list that shows which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist those waters -- and allow more industrial pollution. This goes against the MPCA's reason for existence.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. In terms of river miles, however, it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is a threat to clean water, trout, and the health of Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw these proposed amendments

Sincerely,
Amelia Hummel

4368 France Ave N
Robbinsdale, MN 55422

From: Kate Crowley
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:28:41 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Kate Crowley
82119 Bennett Rd
Willow River, MN 55795

From: Sue Halligan
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:25:04 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Sue Halligan
1190 Schooner Way
Woodbury, MN 55125

From: Elizabeth Neuvar
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:47:12 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Neuvar
Minneapolis, MN 55414

From: Juliann Rule
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:43:41 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Juliann Rule
35002 115th Ave.
Avon, MN 56310

From: Pat Shea
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:43:33 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Pat Shea
Edina, MN 55436

From: Tom Koors
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:40:27 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Tom Koors
833 20th Ave. S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55414

From: Tina Krauz
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:39:55 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Tina Krauz
701 W 5th St Apt 212
Grand Marais, MN 55604

From: Terry McCarthy
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:58:03 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

ALL WATERS ARE CONNECTED.CORPORATE GREED AND IGNORANCE ARE POISONING THE LIFE

BLOOD OF THE PLANET. PROTECT ALL WATERS. PERIOD

Sincerely,
Terry McCarthy
Duluth, MN 55803

From: Carolyn Bartholomew
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:51:55 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Bartholomew
3 E Atlantic Ave
Oceanside, NY 11572

From: Catherine Lundoff
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:51:28 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Catherine Lundoff
3816 13th Ave. So.
Minneapolis, MN 55407

From: Philip Rampi
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:50:56 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Philip Rampi
2150 Jefferson Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105

From: Thomas Childs
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 2:48:45 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Thomas Childs
Babbitt, MN 55706

From: Nancy Pickering
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:09:41 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Nancy Pickering
201 Westminster Ave. NW
Watertown, MN 55388

From: Reed Heff
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:09:08 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Reed Heff
Minneapolis, MN 55424

From: William Fischer
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:05:58 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

William Fischer
1070 11th Ave SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414

From: DeeAnn Stenlund
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:03:19 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

DeeAnn Stenlund
2687 Matilda St.
Roseville, MN 55113

From: Betsey Porter
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:01:39 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Betsey Porter
10040 Penn Ave S Apt 11
Bloomington, MN 55431

From: Marie Nickell
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:26:00 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am a member of Water Legacy asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Marie Nickell
10526 County 113
Mabel, MN 55954

From: Jack Hennes
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:23:04 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Jack Hennes
10571 Colorado Blvd #J304
Thornton, CO 80233

From: Taran Green
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:23:00 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Taran Green
1364 Pheasant Run
New Richmond, WI 54017

From: kathleen spencer
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:17:20 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

kathleen spencer
315 N Lake Ave Apt 229
Duluth, MN 55806

From: Barbara Janssen
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:13:38 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Barbara Janssen
7356 Quantico Ln N
Maple Grove, MN 55311

From: Leslie McDonald
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:31:55 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Leslie McDonald
15824 Park Terrace Dr
Eden Prairie, MN 55346

From: Elinor Ogden
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:28:18 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Elinor Ogden
1505 Xanthus Ln N
Minneapolis, MN 55447

From: Jen Pearson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:28:13 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Jen Pearson
4532 London Rd
Duluth, MN 55804

From: Meghan Wannebo
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:27:47 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Meghan Wannebo
234 West 40th st.
Minneapolis, MN 55409

From: Mark Johnson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:26:25 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Mark Johnson
9013 East Superior St.
Dulut, MN 55804

From: Marian Severt
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:41:02 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Marian Severt
11465 Easy Street
Brained, MN 56401

From: Richard Mammel
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:38:46 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Richard Mammel
1209 Birch Hill Drive
Albert Lea, MN 56007

From: Lauren Young
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:38:33 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Lauren Young
14507 183rd Av NW
Elk River, MN 55330

From: Greg Rupert
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:35:41 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Greg Rupert
Duluth, MN 55803

From: Alex Spitzer
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:34:18 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Alex Spitzer
12352 Angel Food Ln
Fort Worth, TX 76244

From: Janet Green
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 3:41:50 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Janet Green
4004 London Rd. apt CC27
Duluth, MN 55804

From: Amy Cordry
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 4:52:09 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Amy Cordry
26006 County Road 9
Winona, MN 55987

From: Hugh Curtler III
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 4:46:09 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Hugh Curtler III
Brooklyn Park, MN 55443

From: Lynn and Tom Anderson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 4:44:55 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Lynn and Tom Anderson
15621 Goshawk Road
Tamarack, MN 55787

From: Patricia Loverink
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 4:43:42 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Patricia Loverink
403 19th St NE
Austin, MN 55912

From: Amy Freeman
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 4:41:36 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Amy Freeman
Grand Marais, MN 55604

From: Michelle Lang
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 5:02:32 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Michelle Lang
5128 Wentworth Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55419

From: David Zimney
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 4:58:15 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

David Zimney
7110 Excelsior Way
Saint Louis Park, MN 55426

From: Emma Schurink
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 4:57:25 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Emma Schurink
Stillwater, MN 55082

From: John Schlichting
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 4:54:44 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

John Schlichting
1020 10th St SE
Saint Cloud, MN 56304

From: Linda Dean
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 4:54:30 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Linda Dean
Duluth, MN 55810

From: Barton Sutter
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 4:53:24 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Barton Sutter
1321 East 8th Street
Duluth, MN 55805

From: Jenni Zickert
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 4:53:04 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. This is not the time in our shared history to roll back any environmental protections for our waters. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Jenni Zickert
1715 Marshall St. NE
Minneapolis, MN 55413

From: RICK MUELLER
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 5:25:38 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

RICK MUELLER
5631 136th Street Court
Saint Paul, MN 55124

From: KAREN HULSTRAND
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 5:23:11 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

KAREN HULSTRAND
1204 Everett St. S.
Stillwater, MN 55082

From: Jody Goldstein
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 5:16:44 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Jody Goldstein
2124 Schmidt Ct SE
Rochester, MN 55904

From: Pamela Martin
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 5:16:25 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Pamela Martin
7144 10th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55423

From: Alva Pingel
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 5:14:14 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Alva Pingel
13894 Birchwood Ave
Rosemount, MN 55068

From: Don Hon
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 5:12:51 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Don Hon
3135 Arthur St. NE
Minneapolis, MN 55418

From: Dean Borgeson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 5:08:35 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Dean Borgeson
36030 Bonnie Lakes Rd
Crosslake, MN 56442

From: Mary Creighton
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 6:22:46 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Mary Creighton
501 6th St. S.
Virginia, MN 55792

From: Maxene Linehan
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 6:18:28 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

As a science teacher and UMN Extension master gardener, I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be favorable for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for OUR clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Maxene Linehan
P.O.B. 278
Hovland, MN 55606

From: Cecelia Newton
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 5:58:32 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

Sincerely,
Cecelia Newton

5516 Irving Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419

From: Adaline Shinkle
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 5:57:44 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Adaline Shinkle
Minnetonka, MN 55345

From: James Conway
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 5:32:16 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

James Conway
Rochester, MN 55901

From: AL LARSON
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 5:25:51 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

AL LARSON
3408 BEAUTY LAKE RD SW
PILLAGER, MN 56473

From: Scott Doblar
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 5:25:38 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Scott Doblar
712 East King
Winona, MN 55987

From: Lilah Gilyard
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 7:31:39 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Lilah Gilyard
10657 Hollywood Blvd NW
Minneapolis, MN 55433

From: Robert Bullis
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 7:30:06 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Robert Bullis
19088 Dodge St NW
ELK RIVER, MN 55330

From: Nicole Everling
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 7:12:28 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I'm asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public, and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Nicole Everling
1639 Sherwood Way
Eagan, MN 55122

From: Kurt Kimber
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 7:09:33 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Kurt Kimber
4811 35th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55417

From: Larry Bogolub
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 7:03:11 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Larry Bogolub
1424 Lincoln Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55105

From: Darcy Bergh
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 6:55:15 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Darcy Bergh
1121 Hallam Ave N,, no paper mail please
St. Paul, MN 55115

From: Matthew Schaut
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 6:51:09 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Matthew Schaut
Minneapolis, MN 55406

From: carol jagiello
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 6:50:31 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

This is simply de regulation and obfuscation and must not proceed.

Sincerely,
carol jagiello
91 wood pl
bloomingdale, NJ 07403

From: Jason Husby
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 6:43:47 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Jason Husby
3531 3
minneapolis, MN 55412

From: William Dustin
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 6:24:57 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

William Dustin
4654 LINDEN TRL N
LAKE ELMO, MN 55042

From: Connie Grundhofer
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 10:35:08 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Connie Grundhofer
235 Linda St
Circle Pines, MN 55014

From: frank florin
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 10:33:55 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

frank florin
n12902 273rd st
boyceville, WI 54725

From: Julia Kloehn
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 10:23:41 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Julia Kloehn
5879 Nikolai Rd
Finland, MN 55603

From: Steve Tuckner
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 10:11:39 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Steve Tuckner
St Paul, MN 55117

From: Karen Rom-Kormann
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 10:01:07 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Karen Rom-Kormann
1717 van buren ave
st paul, MN 55104

From: Dylan Koltz-Hale
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 9:59:38 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. As someone who regularly recreates in and cares for the aforementioned areas I strongly urge the MPCA withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Dylan Koltz-Hale
788 Idaho Ave W
Saint Paul, MN 55117

From: Lynn Shoemaker
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 9:59:13 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Lynn Shoemaker
172 N Esterly Ave, Address 2
Whitewater, WI 53190

From: John Munter
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 7:59:04 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

John Munter
14860 Bruce Creek Rd
Warba, MN 55793

From: Sara LaValley
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 7:48:09 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Sara LaValley
Superior, WI 54880

From: Wayne Burville
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 7:37:19 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Wayne Burville
1118 Madison St S
Shakopee, MN 55379

From: Eric Bong
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 3:03:48 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Eric Bong
Duluth, MN 55805

From: Diane Brown
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 2:26:15 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Diane Brown
1718 McKnight
Maplewood, MN 55109

From: Christine Popowski
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 2:25:46 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Christine Popowski
2630 Pleasant Ave #101
Minneapolis, MN 55408

From: PAULA RUSTERHOLZ
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 12:40:56 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

PAULA RUSTERHOLZ
2787 Marion St
Roseville, MN 55113

From: Richard Fish
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 11:50:43 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Richard Fish
5345 37th Ave So
Minneapolis, MN 55417

From: Anne Franklin
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 11:44:42 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Anne Franklin
9914 Penn Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55431

From: Nancy Hauer
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 11:13:01 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Nancy Hauer
1990 Ridgewood Ave.
White Bear Lake, MN 55110

From: COURT STOREY
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 11:08:53 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

COURT STOREY
1033 Indian Trail Path S
AFTON, MN 55001

From: Scott vizecky
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 11:03:01 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Scott vizecky
3194 co hwy 4
Hendricks, MN 56136

From: Dennis Schaef
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 11:00:09 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Dennis Schaef
715 Limber Road
Meadville, PA 16335

From: Michael Murray
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 9:45:22 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Michael Murray
104 Coleman St
Ghent, MN 56239

From: Donna Anderson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 9:17:43 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Donna Anderson
10211 Cedar Lk Rd
Mtka, MN 55305

From: Duncan Storlie
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 8:55:58 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Duncan Storlie
5375 Eureka Rd.
Excelsior, MN 55331

From: Scott Mills
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 8:51:09 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

The MPCA has demonstrated that oversight is required of its operations.

The MPCA operations must be open to the public.

Sincerely,
Scott Mills
9 N Yukon Dr
Ely, MN 55731

From: Ramona Kopnick
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 8:50:59 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Ramona Kopnick
Ap't Rpad
Sandstpmeeee, MN 55072

From: David Gagne
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 8:26:13 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule. These changes will threaten the cold waters/trout waters inheritance for our children and grandchildren.

Sincerely,
David Gagne
3517 East 26th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55406

From: jim Reilly
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 7:37:55 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
jim Reilly
Minneapolis, MN 55406

From: A Bonvouloir
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 7:36:47 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

A Bonvuloir
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

From: MICHAEL BROUILLETTE
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 7:30:30 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL BROUILLETTE
7420 CEDAR AVE SO, APT 5
Richfield, MN 55423

From: Sandra Swanson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 7:27:19 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Sandra Swanson
2872 96th St E
Inver Grove Hts, MN 55077

From: Madeline Pilon
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 9:28:25 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Madeline Pilon
Falcon Heights, MN 55113

From: Earle Tonra
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 9:24:35 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Earle Tonra
3911 Girard Ave N
Mpls, MN 55412

From: Mike Hoyt
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 8:54:50 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

As a lifelong MN resident, an avid trout fisherman, and as someone whom is raising two daughters to grow up spending significant time responsibly recreating in MN streams and lakes, I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed amendment.

Sincerely,

Mike Hoyt
3301 Oakland Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55407

From: Julie Hukriede
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 8:28:36 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Julie Hukriede
2312 10th St
Two Harbors, MN 55616

From: Michael Alexander
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 11:29:49 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Michael Alexander
78. 10th. Street east
Saint Paul, MN 55101

From: Mary Arps Thompson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 11:27:31 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Mary Arps Thompson
1370 White Lake Dr
Duluth, MN 55803

From: Mary Dosch
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 10:38:11 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Mary Dosch
ON540 MA Center Drive, #3
Elburn, IL 60119

From: Dan Schlatter
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 10:36:52 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Dan Schlatter
61 St Albans St S, Apt C
Saint Paul, MN 55105

From: Mark Lehigh
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 9:48:47 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Mark Lehigh
904 Mesaba Avenue
Duluth, MN 55805

From: Ryan Sabol
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 9:47:25 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Ryan Sabol
2910 Wyoming Ave S
St Louis Park, MN 55426

From: Christopher Loch
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 11:32:11 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Christopher Loch
2410 Garfield Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55405

From: Jennifer Hengelfelt
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 11:29:21 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hengelfelt
29 Dwinnell Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55110

From: Candyce Westfield
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 11:21:55 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Candyce Westfield
P.O. Box 460
Walker, MN 56484

From: Carl Haensel
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 11:10:54 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Carl Haensel
2067 E Pioneer Rd
DULUTH, MN 55804

From: Mary Cullen
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 10:56:32 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Mary Cullen
2421 Bloomington Ave. South
Minneapolis, MN 55404

From: Emily Brown
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 10:24:28 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Emily Brown
Ely, MN 55731

From: Kendall Kramer
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 10:12:08 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Kendall Kramer
Hopkins, MN 55305

From: Mary Lu Kavanagh-Beltman
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 10:04:01 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Mary Lu Kavanagh-Beltman
584 Snelling ave S
Saint Paul, MN 55116

From: Debra Masters
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 9:46:26 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Debra Masters
395 Bucher Ave
Shoreview, MN 55126

From: Mary Smith
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 9:37:52 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Mary Smith
13998 165th St
Little Falls, MN 56345

From: Mary Pouliot
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 3, 2019 5:26:02 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Mary Pouliot
2157 Overlook Dr.
Bloomington, MN 55431

From: Timothy Alvar
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 3, 2019 4:36:05 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Timothy Alvar
2849 Lakewood Jct Road
Duluth, MN 55804

From: Kenneth Matysik
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 3, 2019 4:24:34 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

And furthermore, as a member of Trout Unlimited, I think the proposed rule

will undermine the DNR's management of trout waters

Sincerely,
Kenneth Matysik
4819 Thomas Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55410

From: Sarah M
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 3, 2019 4:23:33 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Sarah M
Mpls, MN 55407

From: Carol Stiteler
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 3, 2019 4:18:30 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Carol Stiteler
114 Greeley St N
Stillwater, MN 55082

From: Dian Lopez
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 3, 2019 4:16:00 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Dian Lopez
5770 Burkeys LN NW
Alexanria, MN 56308

From: Clara Ueland
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 3, 2019 3:06:54 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Clara Ueland
Long Lake, MN 55356

From: Mary Johannsen
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 3, 2019 2:28:40 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Mary Johanssen
2418 Aldrich Ave No.
Minneapolis, MN 55411

From: Cathy Curtis
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 3, 2019 2:20:22 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Cathy Curtis
Buffalo, MN 55313

From: Janet Draper
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, October 4, 2019 6:22:27 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Janet Draper
1825 Dunedin Ave.
Duluth, MN 55803

From: Michelle Gobely
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, October 4, 2019 8:40:44 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Michelle Gobely
1581 Wheelock Ln Apt 202
Saint Paul, MN 55117

From: Theresa Lastovich
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, October 4, 2019 8:31:19 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Theresa Lastovich
206 6th St NE
Chisholm, MN 55719

From: James Reents
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, October 4, 2019 3:27:44 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth. Too often, proof of damage or even need for protection falls on the public without the resources of the corporate applicant.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
James Reents
4561 Alder Ln NW
HACKENSACK, MN 56452

From: Robert Kosuth
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, October 4, 2019 12:31:23 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Robert Kosuth
1224 E 11th St
Duluth, MN 55805

From: Jonathan Early
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 3, 2019 10:28:52 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Early
8032 Hidden Bay Trail
Lake Elmo, MN 55042

From: Paula Gustafson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Saturday, October 5, 2019 10:36:20 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Paula Gustafson
562 deer ridge lane s
Maplewood, MN 55119

From: Mary Miller
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Saturday, October 5, 2019 9:05:16 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Mary Miller
3804 Cedar Lake Place
Minneapolis, MN 55416

From: April Narcisse
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Saturday, October 5, 2019 8:59:24 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

April Narcisse
8140 Rhode Island Cir
Minneapolis, MN 55438

From: Joseph Wenzel
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Saturday, October 5, 2019 3:24:04 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Joseph Wenzel
Lake Elmo, MN 55042

From: Sarah Harper
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, October 4, 2019 10:14:02 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Sarah Harper
3407 Harriet Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55408

From: Michael Shoop
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, October 4, 2019 7:33:44 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Michael Shoop
2318 Parkwoods Rd
Minneapolis, MN 55416

From: Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Monday, October 7, 2019 9:14:36 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Doretta (Dorie) Reisenweber
101 West Kent Road
Duluth, MN 55812

From: River Gordon
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, October 6, 2019 4:59:43 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

River Gordon
Saint Paul, MN 55114

From: Kevin Stueven
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, October 6, 2019 1:48:56 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Kevin Stueven
11 McKinley place north
St. Cloud, MN 56303

From: Bill Mears
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Saturday, October 5, 2019 10:39:20 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Bill Mears
2429 30th Ave so.
Minneapolis, MN 55406

From: Diane Tessari
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Saturday, October 5, 2019 8:14:26 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Diane Tessari
5375 Eureka Rd
Excelsior, MN 55331

From: Michael Poisson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Monday, October 7, 2019 6:30:51 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

Aside from the pre-made letter below let me just say that I find even the slightest infringement on current standards as wrong. We should be increasing water standards to protect water quality for future generations when increased populations will need that water.

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

Sincerely,
Michael Poisson
9273 HAMLINE AVE
CIRCLE PINES, MN 55014

From: Nancy Lawroski
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 8, 2019 11:50:20 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Nancy Lawroski
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

From: Daniel Iverson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, October 8, 2019 8:35:50 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Daniel Iverson
4640 North Arm Drive
Mound, MN 55364

From: sue Morem
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Monday, October 7, 2019 10:21:01 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

sue Morem
4620 Vinewood
Plymouth, MN 55442

From: Dennis Good
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, October 11, 2019 2:30:45 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Dennis Good
7140 N. Dark Lake Rd.
Britt, MN 55710

From: Rex Lucien Martin
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, October 11, 2019 10:26:16 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Rex Lucien Martin
1112 North Second Street
Stillwater, MN 55082

From: Diane Tessari
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, October 11, 2019 8:45:50 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Diane Tessari
5375 Eureka Rd
Excelsior, MN 55331

From: NANCY Giguere
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 10, 2019 1:58:13 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

NANCY Giguere
1471 Edmund Ave
St Paul, MN 55104

From: Ralph Karsten
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 17, 2019 10:46:16 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is misleading. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule is dangerous! MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Ralph Karsten

1646 Hartford
SAINT PAUL, MN 55116

From: Andrew St. Croix
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 17, 2019 9:04:34 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Andrew St. Croix
5412 Avondale St.
Duluth, MN 55804

From: S.Rose Anthony Krebs
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, October 18, 2019 2:39:34 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

S.Rose Anthony Krebs
170 Good Counsel Drive
Mankato, MN 56001

From: Moira Kuehn
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, October 18, 2019 1:39:32 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Maira Kuehn
Minneapolis, MN 55429

From: Jami Gaither
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 17, 2019 12:07:11 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Thank you for your consideration. More Minnesotans each day are becoming activated to help save the planet. Help

us to that.

Sincerely,
Jami Gaither
25288 County 2
Shevlin, MN 56676

From: Judy Grant
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Thursday, October 17, 2019 11:31:45 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Judy Grant
1455 Breda Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55108

From: Lynn Anderson
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Saturday, October 19, 2019 12:34:10 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans like my husband and myself. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Lynn Anderson
15621 Goshawk Road
Tamarack, MN 55787

From: Lynn Levine
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, October 18, 2019 11:30:31 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

Lynn Levine
2301 Westridge Lane
Minneapolis, MN 55416

From: [Kevin Dahm](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Saturday, November 2, 2019 4:15:32 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Kevin Dahm
1022 Orchard Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55103

From: [Evangeline Moen](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Saturday, November 2, 2019 2:51:44 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Evangeline Moen
42902 Vista Road, Isle, MN 56342
Isle, MN 56342

From: [Dean Borgeson](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Saturday, November 2, 2019 8:13:24 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Dean Borgeson
36030 Bonnie Lakes Rd
Crosslake, MN 56442

From: [Joseph Wenzel](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Saturday, November 2, 2019 7:40:04 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Joseph Wenzel
93 Midwest Ave N
Lake Elmo, MN 55042

From: [Bonny Bellville](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Friday, November 1, 2019 6:57:59 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Bonny Bellville
739 forest hills dr sw
Rochester, MN 55902

From: [Candyce Westfield](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, November 3, 2019 9:39:33 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Candyce Westfield
PO Box 460
Walker, MN 56484

From: [Audie Miller](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, November 3, 2019 8:06:28 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Audie Miller
10548 Chowen Ave. South
Bloomington, MN 55431

From: [Terry McCarthy](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, November 3, 2019 7:30:40 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Protect our water, not corporate profits for polluters. Keep the regulations that protect ground & surface water strong.

Sincerely,
Terry McCarthy
127 E Calvary Rd
Duluth, MN 55803

From: [Britta Bloomquist](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, November 3, 2019 7:30:39 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Britta Bloomquist
Duluth, MN 55805

From: [Jeb Taylor](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Saturday, November 2, 2019 11:28:39 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Jeb Taylor
5420 15th St SE
Rochester, MN 55904

From: [Erik Johnsen](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Saturday, November 2, 2019 9:04:24 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Erik Johnsen
505 N 3rd St,
Minneapolis, MN 55401

From: [Ruurd Schoolderman](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, November 3, 2019 12:36:44 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Ruurd Schoolderman
2724 E. 2nd St
Duluth, MN 55812

From: [Linda Meyers](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, November 3, 2019 10:32:23 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Linda Meyers
3 Sparrow Lane
Saint Paul, MN 55127

From: [Sheila Johnston](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, November 3, 2019 10:25:59 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Sheila Johnston
7693 Lost Lake Trail
Lake Shore, MN 56468

From: [W Bryan Winget](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, November 3, 2019 10:01:19 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Again, I am asking for a public hearing in front of an administrative law judge to protect our trout water and all water.

Sincerely,
W Bryan Winget
2385 Buford Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55108

From: [Gary Ellman](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, November 3, 2019 10:00:34 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Gary Ellman
141 Poplar street
So. St. Paul, MN 55075

From: [Randall Mattson](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, November 3, 2019 6:24:54 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Randall Mattson
12230 62nd Ave. N
Maple Grove, MN 55369

From: [CJ Bahan](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, November 3, 2019 4:24:54 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
CJ Bahan
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077

From: [Bill Werner](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, November 3, 2019 4:21:08 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Bill Werner
3204 Bob's drive
Cloquet, MN 55720

From: [John Doe](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Sunday, November 3, 2019 3:10:45 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
John Doe
Pleasant Lane
New York, NY 55555

From: [Bart Erickson](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Monday, November 4, 2019 6:43:36 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Bart Erickson
Mpls, MN 55410

From: [Albert Gustaveson](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Monday, November 4, 2019 10:50:00 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Albert Gustaveson
49949 Horseshoe Lake Road
Marcell, MN 56657

From: [Tracy Chartier](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, November 5, 2019 8:17:42 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Tracy Chartier
Inver grove, MN 55077

From: [Roberta Truman](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Monday, November 4, 2019 9:06:29 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Roberta Truman
town 7th st.
Lake City, MN 55041

From: [Bonita Schwartz](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Monday, November 4, 2019 4:23:01 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Bonita Schwartz
13376 Elaine court
Savage, MN 55378

From: [Lori Williams](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Monday, November 4, 2019 3:24:27 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Lori Williams
246 Dogwood Road
Wyoming, MN 55092

From: [Charles Lininger](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Monday, November 4, 2019 11:36:22 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Charles Lininger
24675 Manning Tr
Scandia, MN 55073

From: [Charles Fullerton](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, November 5, 2019 11:06:20 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Charles Fullerton
3626 East 44th Street. Apt 507
Minneapolis, MN 55406

From: [Genevieve Hipsag](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, November 5, 2019 10:26:19 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Genevieve Hipsag
116 8th St Ne
Little Falls, MN 56345

From: [George Selvestra](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Wednesday, November 6, 2019 12:59:34 AM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
George Selvestra
31208 Eastwood Dr
Pequot Lakes, MN 56472

From: [Colton Heitschmidt](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, November 5, 2019 10:32:21 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Colton Heitschmidt
Zimmerman, MN 55398

From: [Della Johnson](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, November 5, 2019 6:01:27 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Della Johnson
1875 3rd Avenue Northwest
Owatonna, MN 55060

From: [Dale Hadler](#)
To: [Lynn, Mary \(MPCA\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rules Governing Water Quality Standards – Class 2 and Class 7 Use Designations, Minnesota Rules chapter 7050
Date: Tuesday, November 5, 2019 1:45:57 PM

Dear Mary Lynn,

Dear Ms. Lynn,

I am asking for a PUBLIC HEARING IN FRONT OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) proposed amendments of state rules regarding trout waters and limited use waters.

I oppose the proposed rules overall, as well as the lack of transparency to the public and lack of candor in the way MPCA described these rules in its Notice.

MPCA wrote in its Notice, "The proposed rules do not change numeric or narrative water quality standards." But that is a half-truth. Changing classifications under this rule would mean that certain water quality standards won't apply. Especially drinking water standards and the 250 parts per million sulfate standard that mining industry polluters have been fighting, even as they've fought the wild rice sulfate standard.

Minnesotans are not all experts, and we should be able to trust not only that MPCA will protect water quality, but that they will tell us the full truth.

Here are some of the specific changes in the rules that I oppose:

1. Removing the classification of "trout waters" in favor of "cold water habitat." Anglers and other Minnesotans understand "trout waters," and this term reflects our State's interest in preserving high quality waters.
2. Removing the entire section of rules (ch. 6264) where trout waters are specifically listed. This change would remove the simple, transparent way in which all Minnesotans can know which waters are protected as trout waters. In addition, by removing this section, tributaries to trout waters would no longer be protected.
3. Defining "cold water habitat" to mean there has to be proof that waters support a healthy population of trout and other cold water life, even if those waters have been listed as "trout waters" for decades.
4. Requiring that the MPCA remove waters from the "cold water habitat" list whenever it can't be proved the waters support healthy populations of trout and other cold water life.
5. Changing existing Rules so that trout waters are no longer all Class A drinking waters, which all have a sulfate limit even without wild rice present.

These changes mean that people like me won't be able to look at an easily-available list and see which waters are protected as "trout waters." Worse yet, when climate change and industrial pollution, including massive discharge of sulfate from mines, affects or has affected cold water biota, like trout, the MPCA could be required to delist the waters and allow more

industrial pollution.

The specific changes in class designations in the MPCA rule aren't clearly explained. But, in terms of river miles it seems that more than 70 percent of the changes would downgrade classifications.

This proposed rule may be good for coal plants and mines, but it is not good for clean water, trout, or Minnesotans. MPCA should withdraw this proposed rule.

Sincerely,
Dale Hadler
1723 West 6th Street Apt.C
Winons, MN 55987