

Surface Water	Comment: What are you noticing? Likes? Dislikes? What might be missing?	Updated
<p>Concern #1: Surface water rate and flow, quantity, flooding</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> Altered hydrology has modified flow rate and volume and water storage causing flooding, streambank erosion, and low base flow. This risk may be compounded due to the effects of climate change.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Water rate and volume have not increased on average.</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Infiltration and storage will increase proportionate to land use and climate change.</li> <li>2. Protect non-contributing (hydrologically landlocked) areas so they continue to not discharge.</li> <li>3. No increase in rate and volume from new development.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to control water volume. (Chris Lawson)</li> <li>• Is altered hydrology man “made” or natural – is most land affected private? → is there incentive to reverse the issues with the altered hydrology (Sierra)</li> <li>• This is not ideal for farmers that wish to drain tiled fields → addition of drain tile = faster water flow into ditches (Reggie Matter)</li> <li>• New Development – no increase in rate and volume indicates new regulations. Minnesota is already overburdened with regulation, dampening development opportunities in rural MN (Mike Wimmer)</li> <li>• Infiltration and storage? Where will this land come from?</li> <li>• Would infiltration and storage reduce the nutrients in the river?</li> <li>• Deal properly with ditching, tilling and other practices that increase flow. (Greg Brink)</li> </ul>	<p>Concern #1: Surface water rate and flow, quantity, flooding</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> Human-caused changes to the landscape have modified flow rate and volume and water storage causing flooding, streambank erosion, and low base flow. This risk may be compounded due to the effects of climate change.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Water rate and volume have not increased on average.</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Infiltration and storage will increase proportionate to land use and climate change.</li> <li>5. Protect non-contributing (hydrologically landlocked) areas so they continue to not discharge.</li> <li>6. No increase in rate and volume from new development.</li> </ol>
<p>Concern #2: Surface water quality.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> The lakes and streams are threatened or impaired due to excess pollution including E.coli, nutrients, and sediment. These excess pollutants can cause low oxygen and eutrophication, impact aquatic life and recreational use opportunities, and degrade downstream resources.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Lakes and streams are meeting water quality standards (except mercury.)</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ___# (to be determined later, or reference wraps, etc.) of currently impaired lakes and streams meet water quality standards.</li> <li>2. 5% nutrient reduction to the Rum River (Rum River currently near impairment, but not impaired, 5% is a margin of safety).</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water Quality – who set standards. (Chris Lawson)</li> <li>• 10-year plan – not knowing the impairment makes it challenging to forecast improvement (Chris Lawson)</li> <li>• I think we need to strive for a target of nutrient reduction well below the “impaired” to maintain the biological integrity of Rum River (Tom Anderson)</li> <li>• Why are we leaving out mercury? Where are the nutrients coming from? Does this need to be a policy change? (Sierra)</li> <li>• Lakes and streams ARE threatened. Proof of this. (Larry Backlund)</li> <li>• Clean sediment via how? When Rum River watershed hasn’t been cleaned/dredged ever. Currently trees over 210’ tall (Reggie Matter)</li> <li>• How confident are the sampling results of the river over the years? (Chris Klinghagen)</li> <li>• What level of nutrient level is necessary to support a healthy food chain and maximum wild life populations? (Greg Brink)</li> <li>• Nutrient excess: municipal feedlots (Ag) contributors considered?</li> </ul>	<p>Concern #2: Surface water quality.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> The lakes and streams are threatened or impaired due to excess pollution including E.coli, nutrients, and sediment. These excess pollutants can cause low oxygen and eutrophication, impact aquatic life and recreational use opportunities, and degrade downstream resources.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Lakes and streams are meeting water quality standards “or better” (except mercury.)</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. ___# (to be determined later, or reference wraps, etc.) of currently impaired lakes and streams meet water quality standards.</li> <li>4. ___% nutrient reduction at the outlet of the Rum River (Rum River currently near impairment, but not impaired, 5% is a margin of safety).</li> </ol>

<p>Concern #3: Surface water protection.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> There are many high-quality water resources in the Rum River watershed that are threatened by changing land use, altered hydrology, and pollution. Protecting these resources, including cisco lakes, wild rice lakes, the Wild and Scenic Rum River, and others from the threat of degradation is of primary concern.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Conditions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Water quality is the same or better in waters that do meet state standards.</li> <li>2. The Rum River is a safe drinking water source.</li> </ol> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No increase in treatment needed for drinking water.</li> <li>2. Maintain or enhance watershed-based ecosystems to maintain water quality (metrics TBD).</li> <li>3. No previously assessed water bodies exceed water quality standards (conventional pollutants: lakes - TP, streams - E. Coli, TP, TSS).</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I like all parts of the desired condition and 10 year goals. This seems like a concern that the general public could “get behind” to support. (Sierra)</li> <li>• Is DFC 2 realistic? Given uses that will take place. (Tom Burk)</li> <li>• What is a cisco lake? Named after ciscos – cold <b>dear</b> water (Larry Backlund)</li> <li>• E Coli standard is 125 organisms/100mL (Larry Backlund)</li> <li>• You’ll have a hard time increasing buffer zones on farmers to control drain till run off (Reggie Matter)</li> <li>• What would actually need to change in order to “maintain or enhance watershed-based ecosystems to maintain water quality?”</li> <li>• Add chlorides (road salt) (Greg Brink)</li> <li>• How is water quality going to respond to more pleasure seekers</li> <li>• Add to goal: reduction of solids released from erosion (George Kraynick)</li> <li>• Understand that the Rum River discharge directly impacts the drinking water quality for the residents of Minneapolis and St. Paul (George Kraynick)</li> <li>• Consider addressing wastewater discharges with regards to contaminants of emerging concern. Current discharge permits do not address these contaminants which can have significant impacts on the ecosystem (George Kraynick)</li> <li>• Phosphorous levels addressed</li> </ul>	<p>Concern #3: Surface water protection.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> There are many high-quality water resources in the Rum River watershed that are threatened by changing land use, changes to the landscape that impact runoff and the ability for water to soak into the ground, and pollution. Protecting these high-quality resources from the threat of degradation is of primary concern.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Conditions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Water quality is the same or better in waters that do meet state standards.</li> <li>4. The Rum River is swimmable, drinkable, fishable.</li> </ol> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. No increase in treatment needed for drinking water.</li> <li>5. Maintain or enhance watershed-based ecosystems to maintain water quality (metrics TBD).</li> <li>6. No previously assessed water bodies exceed water quality standards</li> </ol>
<p>General Surface Water Category Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What data back up the issue statement details? Important to sell plan to possibly “doubting public.” And need to ID what extent of watershed gives rise to the issue. (Tom Burk, Page Township)</li> </ul>	<p>General Surface Water Category Comments</p>

Groundwater	Comment: What are you noticing? Likes? Dislikes? What might be missing?	Updated
<p>Concern #1: Groundwater and drinking water quality.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> Groundwater and drinking water quality are negatively impacted by human actions, including manure and nitrogen fertilizer application, use of chlorides, land management, non-compliant septic systems, pesticides, and contaminants of public health concern.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Drinking water is free of contamination</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase decision makers and tech staff and citizen knowledge of where drinking water contaminants exist.</li> <li>2. Decrease nitrates in vulnerable areas by ____.</li> <li>3. Decrease non-compliant septic systems by ____.</li> <li>4. Protect vulnerable areas not developed or without land use that negatively impacts GW.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Free of contamination – does it include minerals? (Chris Lawson)</li> <li>• Goal #3 – 95% compliance, goal would be 100% (Chris Lawson)</li> <li>• Public health can help with this goal but has lack of direction/instruction – lack of available resources + data to get action taken (Sierra)</li> <li>• Goal #4 – Protect <u>vulnerable</u> areas not developed. Does this preclude development? (Larry Backlund)</li> <li>• Septic. Why are septic systems non-compliant? What is causing non-compliance? Determining that reason will help guide an affective goal. (Mike Wimmer)</li> <li>• Most interested in the “how”</li> <li>• Should talk about wetlands and their use in cleaning and slowing water flow</li> <li>• Groundwater testing! Arsenic, nitrogen, coliform, mercury, E Coli</li> <li>• Chlorides – any tests for road salt? How it impacts? Water softeners? (Chris Klinghagen)</li> <li>• More emphasis on home water softeners contributing to increased chloride levels (George Kraynick)</li> </ul>	<p>Concern #1: Groundwater and drinking water quality.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> Groundwater and drinking water quality are negatively impacted by human actions, including manure and nitrogen fertilizer application, use of chlorides from salt, land management, non-compliant septic systems, pesticides, and contaminants of public health concern.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Groundwater is safe to drink.</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Increase decision makers and tech staff and citizen knowledge of where drinking water contaminants exist.</li> <li>6. Decrease nitrates in vulnerable areas by ____.</li> <li>7. Decrease non-compliant septic systems by ____.</li> <li>8. Locally understand and protect vulnerable areas not developed or without land use that negatively impacts GW.</li> </ol>
<p>Concern #2: Groundwater availability and quantity.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> There is a significant increasing groundwater withdrawal trend resulting from expanding communities, agricultural irrigation, and non-crop irrigation. In addition to this increased demand on drinking water sources, there is also concern about the loss of recharge areas and water retention.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Withdrawals = recharge (sustainable rate) in all aquifers.</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop a sustainable groundwater budget by quantifying the amount of water being consumed in the watershed and determine how much water is available for consumption.</li> <li>2. Increase to ## the number of aquifer monitoring wells to ensure any negative long-term trends are noticed.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10-year plan – hard to estimate monitoring well when we don’t know current (Chris Lawson)</li> <li>• Need to figure out how to accurately ascertain the water use to water recharge (Tom Anderson)</li> <li>• Why isn’t there a goal to educate the public to reduce overall usage? And for responsible usage – less than 1% of drinking water is actually used for drinking (Sierra)</li> <li>• Withdrawals = recharge... for what time frame? Monitoring this is critical (Tom Burk)</li> <li>• Will water consumption levels be controlled? How enforced? Wasn’t there a statement made that groundwater levels were stable? (Larry Backlund)</li> <li>• Stormwater – Rain gardens in cities = help recharge and reduce stormwater runoff instead of tar or cement (Chris Klinghagen)</li> </ul>	<p>Concern #2: Groundwater availability and quantity.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> There is an increasing groundwater withdrawal trend resulting from expanding communities, agricultural irrigation, and non-crop irrigation. In addition to this increased demand on drinking water sources, there is also concern about the loss of recharge areas and water retention. These two trends may threaten the future groundwater balance.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Withdrawals = recharge (sustainable rate) in all aquifers.</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Develop a sustainable groundwater budget by quantifying the amount of water being consumed in the watershed and determine how much water is available for consumption.</li> <li>4. Increase to ## the number of aquifer monitoring wells to ensure any negative long-term trends are noticed.</li> </ol>

<p>Concern #3: Knowledge and data regarding groundwater.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> There is not enough awareness or understanding of groundwater-surface water interaction and the extent to which land management decisions impact groundwater quality and quantity. More information is needed to identify and target vulnerable areas in protecting groundwater resources from pollution.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Every citizen understands their impact on groundwater.</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase decision-makers and technical staff knowledge of vulnerabilities of groundwater-surface water interaction (define spectrum of vulnerabilities).</li> <li>2. Support the completion of the Mille Lacs County Geologic Atlas.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I mentioned this before, lack of resources/data to enable local government to take action (Sierra)</li> <li>• Public health is a huge resource for public education (Sierra)</li> <li>• MNDoT in Minneapolis/St. Paul toxifies water (run-off) from winter salt greater than any farmers nitrates and drain tile to ditch via buffer strip into rivers. *this needs to be addressed* (Reggie Matter)</li> <li>• Assist on development testing plans for private wells. Expand beyond just nitrates (Greg Brink)</li> <li>• Try and target the citizens that are in higher impact areas</li> <li>• DFC language – every citizen, business, city, farmers, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>Concern #3: Knowledge and data regarding groundwater.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> There is not enough awareness or understanding of groundwater-surface water interaction and the extent to which land management decisions impact groundwater quality and quantity. More information is needed to identify and target vulnerable areas in protecting groundwater resources from pollution, and enable local governments and communities to take action.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> People understand their impact on groundwater. Every local government has a clear understanding of their local groundwater picture and what is needed to protect groundwater.</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Increase decision-makers and technical staff knowledge of vulnerabilities of groundwater-surface water interaction (define spectrum of vulnerabilities).</li> <li>4. Develop science-based policies to protect groundwater.</li> <li>5. Support the completion of the Mille Lacs County Geologic Atlas.</li> </ol>
<p>General Groundwater Category Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overpopulation?! (Sierra)</li> </ul>	<p>General Groundwater Category Comments</p>

Natural Resources	Comment: What are you noticing? Likes? Dislikes? What might be missing?	Updated
<p>Concern #1: Degraded fish habitat.</p> <p><u>Issue Statements:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Aquatic habitats are threatened by poor water quality resulting from increasing runoff, pollutant loads, and sedimentation.</li> <li>2. Riparian areas lack vegetation and habitat features. There are barriers to fish passage.</li> </ol> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Watershed lakes, streams and wetlands hold connected and quality habitats</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify, protect, and restore critical spawning areas.</li> <li>2. Increase connectivity for native aquatic organisms and fish species within the Rum River watershed.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical spawning areas (Larry Backlund)</li> <li>• Maintain appropriate nutrient level for food chain to thrive (Greg Brink)</li> <li>• Not sure how goals for #1 address the concerns in the issue statement (George Kraynick)</li> </ul>	<p>Concern #1: Degraded aquatic habitat.</p> <p><u>Issue Statements:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Aquatic habitats are threatened by increasing runoff, pollutant loads, and sedimentation.</li> <li>4. Shoreland areas lack vegetation and habitat features. There are barriers to fish passage.</li> </ol> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Watershed lakes, streams and wetlands hold connected and quality habitats</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Identify, protect, and restore critical aquatic and shoreland, habitat areas.</li> <li>4. Increase connectivity for native aquatic organisms and fish species.</li> </ol>

<p>Concern #2: Invasive species.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> Invasive species threaten the health and quality of upland, wetland, riparian, and aquatic ecosystems and need to be prevented and controlled and their impacts mitigated.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Minimize by x% OR no new infestations.</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduction of current invasive species populations.</li> <li>2. Prevent new infestations of invasive species.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have to tie it to how it's spread/transmitted from water body to water body – humans, boats (Chris Lawson)</li> <li>• Very broad – might have to narrow down quite a bit (Sierra)</li> <li>• Which are the most important IS to focus on? Needs more specificity. (Tom Burk)</li> <li>• Importance of ALL entities to fund control of invasive species (Larry Backlund)</li> <li>• Is elimination of any invasive practical? (Larry Backlund)</li> <li>• How will this be done? I don't see current efforts being hyper-impactful (Mike Wimmer)</li> <li>• What are you going to do about expanding species?</li> <li>• Increased public awareness not part of the solution (George Kraynick)</li> <li>• Educate public? (Chris Klinghagen)</li> <li>• How do we minimize? Who minimize?</li> </ul>	<p>Concern #2: Invasive species.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> Invasive species threaten the health and quality of upland, wetland, riparian, and aquatic ecosystems and need to be prevented and controlled and their impacts mitigated.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Minimize by x% OR no new infestations.</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Reduction of current invasive species populations.</li> <li>4. Prevent new infestations of invasive species.</li> <li>5. Increase public involvement in reducing the spread of invasive species through understanding and behavior change.</li> </ol>
<p>Concern #3: Habitat fragmentation and quality.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> Habitat is critical for wildlife, water quality and quality of life. Existing habitat areas have been, or are at risk of being, reduced in size and quality due to fragmentation, pollution, invasive species and lack of management. Habitats with high ecological value, particularly those that provide habitat for rare and endangered species, should be protected.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Conditions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All current sites of high ecological value are maintained or expanded.</li> <li>2. No net loss of upland and wetland habitat.</li> <li>3. Create and protect interconnected hubs and corridors of habitat, particularly where water quality will also benefit.</li> </ol> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Define, identify, rank, and protect high value areas.</li> <li>2. Increase habitat acreage, quality, connectivity and resiliency to climate change.</li> <li>3. Restore degraded habitats (wetlands, uplands, forests, etc.) by X.</li> <li>4. Increase the use of conservation development that consolidates housing and infrastructure and creates or maintains habitat corridors and complexes.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C3 &amp; C4 seem to be a bit "heavier" than C1 &amp; C2? – C2 might even be part of C3? (Sierra)</li> <li>• 10 year goal – What has been done to identify rare and endangered species habitats? How do you deal with bears, cougars and residential areas? (Larry Backlund)</li> <li>• Define housing consolidation. High-density development and rural MN don't always mix. (Mike Wimmer)</li> <li>• Where does the increased habitat acreage come from?</li> <li>• Are you talking about lot size to build a home on and if so what size – zoning? (Greg Brink)</li> <li>• Hard to do with climate change</li> <li>• \$\$\$ - where to get funds to help repair? (Chris Klinghagen)</li> <li>• Goal #2: resiliency to climate change – dislike</li> <li>• 10-year plan goal: "consolidates housing" – what does that mean here (Tom Burk)</li> </ul>	<p>Concern #3: Habitat fragmentation and quality.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> Habitat is critical for wildlife, water quality and quality of life. Existing habitat areas have been, or are at risk of being, reduced in size and quality due to fragmentation, pollution, invasive species and lack of management. Habitats with high ecological value, particularly those that provide habitat for rare and endangered species, should be protected.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Conditions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. All current sites of high ecological value are maintained or expanded.</li> <li>5. No net loss of upland and wetland habitat.</li> <li>6. Create and protect interconnected hubs and corridors of habitat, particularly where water quality will also benefit.</li> </ol> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Define, identify, rank, and protect high value areas.</li> <li>6. Increase habitat acreage, quality, and connectivity, as well as resiliency to changing precipitation and climate patterns.</li> <li>7. Restore degraded habitats (wetlands, uplands, forests, etc.) by X.</li> <li>8. Increase the use of development strategies which create or maintain habitat corridors and complexes.</li> </ol>

<p>Concern #4: Land use impacts to habitat.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> Changes to upland habitats through intensifying land use and resulting pollution from urban, agricultural, and industrial uses negatively impact water quality and habitat. Wetlands, forests, and other ecosystems that can protect water quality should be managed, enhanced, and restored.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Conditions:</u> No net loss. Ideally a net increase of upland and wetland habitat.</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Restore degraded habitats (wetlands, uplands, forests, etc.) by X.</li> <li>2. Increase the use of thoughtful smart development tools throughout the watershed.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C3 &amp; C4 seem to be a bit “heavier” than C1 &amp; C2? – C2 might even be part of C3? (Sierra)</li> <li>• Do changes <u>necessarily</u> negatively impact? Is “pollution” inevitable? (Larry Backlund)</li> <li>• What is “smart” development? (Mike Wimmer)</li> <li>• How will degraded habitats be restored? (Mike Wimmer)</li> <li>• I dislike the prospect of more wildlife to eat cropland. Would better habitat prevent the problem?</li> <li>• Land acquisitions to add to existing WMA’s or create new ones (Greg Brink)</li> <li>• Instead of trying to maintain these habitats is there something we should change it to</li> <li>• Add to 10-year goal maintaining existing wetlands and possibly add new wetlands (George Kraynick)</li> <li>• Excellent and critical with greater human population (Tom Anderson)</li> </ul>	<p>Concern #4: Land use impacts to habitat.</p> <p><u>Issue Statement:</u> Changes to upland habitats through intensifying land use and resulting pollution from urban, agricultural, and industrial uses negatively impact water quality and habitat. Wetlands, forests, and other ecosystems that can protect water quality should be managed, enhanced, and restored.</p> <p><u>Desired Future Conditions:</u> No net loss. Ideally a net increase of upland and wetland habitat.</p> <p><u>10-year plan goals:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Restore degraded habitats (wetlands, uplands, forests, etc.) by X.</li> <li>4. Increase the use of thoughtful smart development tools throughout the watershed.</li> <li>5. Create wetland banks through wetland restoration to offset their loss within the watershed.</li> </ol>
<p>General Natural Resource Category Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since the Rum River is one long north-south watershed/corridor it’s critical to provide connectivity, particularly with climate change and greater urbanization in southern <b>third</b> of watershed (Tom Anderson)</li> <li>• Let’s not forget about tillable acres → people need to eat. You restrict or take away tillable acres and you’re shrinking the food supply for human beings (top of food chain) (Reggie Matter)</li> <li>• How do you protect the ecosystems stewardship plan – SFA easements reduce development areas</li> </ul>	
<p><b>General Overall Comments</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lot of statements are vague or ambiguous, so it’s hard to recommend changes – need further understanding of each issue (Chris Lawson)</li> <li>• Supporting data – Too broad. Hard to focus. (Chris Lawson)</li> <li>• Overall need for more specificity if going to move forward. (Tom Burk)</li> <li>• Habitat concerns are important and drive many of the others. (Tom Burk)</li> <li>• Transparency and communication is <u>key</u> (Reggie Matter)</li> <li>• Desired future conditions/10 year plan goals (when completed are realistic and obtainable</li> </ul>	<p>-</p>