

Comment #	Author	Comment	Category	Citation	Response	Edit Planned?
1	BWSR	With the updated costs in the implementation section, how does this relate to the current Plan's baseline funding?	Comment	Cover Letter	As stated in the executive summary, the purpose of this plan amendment is to provide clarity on implementation goals and actions, make clerical revisions regarding roles and to improve plan usability for future funding requirements. Not all plan elements have been addressed by this amendment process. Future plan amendments may review updated model estimates, costs for services, and usefulness of the funding methodology provided in the current plan.	No
2	BWSR	Clarify how the proposed pollutant reductions will be reported. For example, at the catchment scale versus the priority resource point.	Tracking, Evaluation, Reporting	Cover Letter	The current plan states that field practices are reported at the planning region scale within the plan (Section 2.4.2.8, Page 2-40). This plan amendment does not address methods for tracking, evaluating or reporting. BWSR released guidance for assessing implementation of the CWMPs in October 2021. The Technical Advisory Committee is currently reviewing the current plan and guidance documents and developing procedures, tools and methods for plan tracking.	No
3	BWSR	Amendment (Consistent with 1W1P operating procedures, this needs to be retitled as a plan amendment throughout the document)	Grammatical	Full Document	Comment Noted. The updated language will be reflected in the final document.	Yes
4	BWSR	NFCRWPP is what is used in the Plan. Need to be consistent across Plan and amendment. This occurs numerous times throughout this document.	Grammatical	Full Document	Comment Noted. The updated language will be reflected in the final document.	Yes
5	BWSR	Narrative correction to "updated"	Grammatical	Page 1	Comment Noted. The updated language will be reflected in the final document.	Yes
6	BWSR	The partnership should still track any progress led by others as projects and programs are implemented.	Comment	Page 1	This plan amendment does not address methods for tracking, evaluating or reporting. BWSR released guidance for assessing implementation of the CWMPs in October 2021. The Technical Advisory Committee is currently reviewing the current plan and guidance documents and developing procedures, tools and methods for plan tracking.	No
7	BWSR	How well do the goals align with the new Top 250? Is there a significant change in pollutant reduction?	Comment	Page 2	This is addressed in the revision to table ES-2. More priority regions will meet the reduction goals with the new top 250.	No
8	BWSR	Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (first occurrence should be written out)	Grammatical	Page 2	Comment Noted. The updated language will be reflected in the final document.	Yes
9	BWSR	Crow River Organization of Water	Grammatical	Page 3	Comment Noted. The updated language will be reflected in the final document.	Yes
10	BWSR	Why are local priorities tied to capacity? I understand that the number of priorities may be impacted by an LGUs ability to address them, but factors such as pollutant loading, recreational opportunities, etc. should be the determining aspects.	Comment	Page 6	Comment noted. Language updated in final document.	Yes
11	BWSR	This is a commendable and useful addition	Comment	Page 6	Comment noted.	No

12	BWSR	Plan only runs through 2028	Comment	Full Document / Implementation Tables	Comment noted.	No
13	BWSR	Provide estimate	Information Needed	Page 10	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
14	BWSR	How will this be addressed? Are subwatershed assessments/analyses planned?	Comment	Page 14	Measurable outputs revised in table.	Yes
15	BWSR	Estimated costs are needed. I suggest assuming one stabilization every 1-2 years and using an average cost for past projects.	Information Needed	Page 14	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
16	BWSR	Estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 14	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
17	BWSR	Costs need to be associated with this work	Information Needed	Page 14	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
18	BWSR	Estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 14	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
19	BWSR	This is great proactive work to identify projects for future implementation	Comment	Page 14	Comment noted.	No
20	BWSR	Estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 18	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
21	BWSR	Estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 18	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
22	BWSR	Estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 18	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
23	BWSR	Costs need to be associated with this work	Information Needed	Page 18	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
24	BWSR	Estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 19	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
25	BWSR	Estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 22	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
26	BWSR	Estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 26	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
27	BWSR	Estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 26	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
28	BWSR	Costs need to be associated with this work	Information Needed	Page 26	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
29	BWSR	Costs need to be associated with this work	Information Needed	Page 27	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
30	BWSR	Estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 27	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
31	BWSR	Cost estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 30	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
32	BWSR	Provide estimate	Information Needed	Page 30	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
33	BWSR	Costs need to be associated with this work	Information Needed	Page 30	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
34	BWSR	Costs need to be associated with this work	Information Needed	Page 30	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
35	BWSR	Estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 31	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
36	BWSR	Estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 31	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
37	BWSR	Estimates are needed	Information Needed	Page 31	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
38	BWSR	Costs should be associated with this work	Information Needed	Page 35	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
39	BWSR	Costs should be associated with this work	Information Needed	Page 35	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
40	BWSR	Costs should be associated with this work	Information Needed	Page 35	Estimate provided in revised table.	Yes
41	BWSR	Measurable	Grammatical	Page 50	Grammatical error corrected.	Yes
42	City of Otsego	I don't have a lot of history with this particular plan and I was confused if this document is the overall plan or a separate amendment document. Reading further, I understand there is a larger plan. Perhaps clarifying that and providing a link to the overarching plan?	Comment	Title Page	Clarifying statements have been added to Section 2 of the plan amendment.	Yes
43	City of Otsego	City of Otsego is an MS4 and the largest city in Wright County according to the 2020 census. Also one of fastest growing in the state (top 5 depending on source).	Comment	Page 32	Comment noted.	Yes
44	City of Otsego	Otsego has one in this watershed	Comment	Page 32	Otsego SE was added to the Priority Issues and Resources table for the Crow River planning region.	Yes

45	City of Otsego	Two WMAs are located in this area, identified by the red arrows. Both could benefit from additional surrounding protections, including wetland restorations. Possible opportunities with the DNR.	Comment	Page 33	Comment noted.	No
46	City of Otsego	This area is all Otsego (MS4) and could benefit from local priorities designation. The blue public waters shown all drain in succession down Rice the Foster Lake. This area has a lot of drain tile and drained wetlands.	Comment	Page 33	Comment noted.	No
47	City of Otsego	Otsego	Comment	Page 33	City of Otsego added to narrative.	Yes
48	City of Otsego	Inspection and maintenance is a requirement of the MS4 permit.	Comment	Page 34	Comment noted and language added to table.	Yes
49	City of Otsego	Otsego would support this effort as there is at least one area that was developed prior to stormwater regulations.	Comment	Page 34	Comment noted and language added to table.	Yes
50	City of Otsego	Otsego	Comment	Page 34	Comment noted and language added to table.	Yes
51	City of Otsego	The city has identified several areas along the banks of the Crow that could use bank stabilization practices.	Comment	Page 34	Comment noted as an opportunity for future implementation.	No
52	City of Otsego	There is at least 1 feed lot in this area of Otsego	Comment	Page 34	Comment noted as an opportunity for future implementation.	No
53	Met Council	We believe this amendment has the potential to further strengthen and tie work being done for downstream drinking water users but would like the team to consider listing additional partners on Action #55 on page 42, such as the Upper Mississippi River Source Water Protection Project (UMRSWPP).	Comment	Cover Letter	Comment noted. UMRSWPP added as a partner to listed activity.	Yes
54	Met Council	Additionally, please add clarity on what that downstream impact evaluation would be from an action standpoint. For example, engage with UMRSWPP representatives annually or biennially at the TAC to understand what current challenges are being observed downstream and what types of areas across the watershed could be targeted and prioritized to leverage those downstream benefits on top of meeting local needs.	Comment	Cover Letter	Comment noted. The Technical Advisory Committee is currently developing methods to evaluate plan progress, including evaluation of progress towards goals, which may be included in a future plan amendment.	No
55	Met Council	Furthermore, Groundwater is listed as the Resource Category for Action Item #55. We suggest changing this to Surface Water to more accurately reflect the drinking water resource being impacted by this action.	Comment	Cover Letter	Change to resource category reflected in draft.	Yes
56	Met Council	Our 2016 letter also urged the inclusion of North Fork Crow River monitoring data to evaluate metrics of success over the long-term. This remains an improvement we would like to suggest in this amendment.	Comment	Cover Letter	Request noted. This plan amendment did not evaluate overall metrics of success over the long-term. This will be done in a future plan amendment.	No
57	Met Council	In addition to the existing goals for Streams and Rivers Protection (pg. 54) that emphasize goals based on PTMApp estimates for load reductions, we suggest including a field verified and outcome-based success metric. This metric could include long-term water quality trends and pollutant load improvements from the North Fork Crow River near Rockford monitoring station operated by the MPCA. If the planning region and watershed-wide goals are met as outlined in the plan, a reduction in pollutant loading and concentrations observed at that station would be a way to measure and confirm the successful outcome of the plan.	Comment	Cover Letter	Request noted. This plan amendment did not evaluate overall metrics of success over the long-term. This will be done in a future plan amendment.	No
58	Met Council	In multiple planning region sections, it was referenced that part of the prioritization process for targeting areas and setting planning region specific goals was an acknowledgement of limited technical and financial capacity for that region and how that varies across the watershed. We suggest highlighting the areas where local watershed priorities and goals were reduced or excluded from the plan due to these limitations and what types of targeted technical or financial resources could assist in offsetting current local resource limitations to best meet the needs of the watershed and specific planning regions.	Comment	Cover Letter	Comment noted. No plan priorities or goals have been limited or excluded from the original plan. Additional clarification has been provided in these sections.	No

59	Met Council	We suggest highlighting the impact that irrigation management programs can have on nitrate leaching and the dual benefits those programs offer on protecting the groundwater supply as well as mitigating drawdown and potential for increased rates of nitrate leaching.	Comment	Cover Letter	The plan amendment contains actions related to irrigation management. Additional discussion of irrigation programs can be considered during a future plan amendment.	No
60	Met Council	Irrigation management programs were not identified in planning regions outside of the Bonanza Valley Groundwater Management Area (BVGMA) but should be considered as a tool for all planning regions to help protect groundwater drinking water quality which was consistently a Level A priority.	Comment	Cover Letter	The plan amendment contains actions related to irrigation management. Additional discussion of irrigation programs can be considered during a future plan amendment.	No
61	Met Council	Furthermore, in the planning regions that fall within the BVGMA the “Regional Priority Issue” level was only a “B” despite being referred to on page 12 as a “major factor in groundwater quantity available for agricultural production and drinking water”. In these two planning regions we suggest more emphasis on managing those groundwater and surface water interactions and irrigation management benefits.	Comment	Cover Letter	Comment noted.	No