

Comment	Rule Part	Comment Topic	Summary of comment (note: comments that are paraphrased are indicated with *)	EQB Response	Discussed on SONAR	Affiliation Name/Address	Comment Time
443			*My qualifications for making these comments are exceptional and should be given appropriate weight;	Exhibit R.	N/A	Willis Mattison 42516 State Highway #34, Osage Minnesota	Post-hearing comment period
444			*The public hearing process was necessary to hold the EQB accountable for compliance with applicable law through means of an objective third party	Exhibit R.	N/A	Willis Mattison 42516 State Highway #34, Osage Minnesota	Post-hearing comment period
445			*Minnesota and the entire globe are in existential environmental climate, ecosystem and human health crises;	Exhibit R.	N/A	Willis Mattison 42516 State Highway #34, Osage Minnesota	Post-hearing comment period
446			*The EQB's proposed rule changes are wholly oblivious too and entirely inadequate to adequately address these looming crises	Exhibit R.	N/A	Willis Mattison 42516 State Highway #34, Osage Minnesota	Post-hearing comment period
447			*The proposed rule changes are not compliant with the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) and the Minnesota Administrative Procedures Act (MAPA);	Exhibit R.	N/A	Willis Mattison 42516 State Highway #34, Osage Minnesota	Post-hearing comment period
448			*The EQB has not properly exercised its authority and legal obligation to utilize unbiased advisory panels to assess the effectiveness of environmental review and make recommendations for changes;	Exhibit R.	N/A	Willis Mattison 42516 State Highway #34, Osage Minnesota	Post-hearing comment period
449			*The Administrative Law Judge has available basis in record and legal options for remanding the proposed set of rule changes to the EQB with instructions for revisions demonstrating compliance with certain requirements MEPA and MEPA and to empanelling unbiased advisory panels of qualified experts to make recommendations that would be both MEPA and MAPA compliant.	Exhibit R.	N/A	Willis Mattison 42516 State Highway #34, Osage Minnesota	Post-hearing comment period
450	4410.4300, subpart 37	Recreational Trails Mandatory Category	"It is the executive branch, which is the Environmental Quality Board (EQB) under the Governor and the Courts, that are responsible for holding the Legislature in check and assuring that execution of laws are not in conflict with legislation that has passed, including here, the longstanding requirements of the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA). As I will detail in the following testimony, the proposed rule changes for mandatory review for Motorized Recreational Trails, Items A. and B. are, I believe, in direct conflict with the EQB's responsibility under MEPA 116D.01 "to promote efforts that will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of human beings." The Legislature directs agencies, including the EQB, to follow all of MEPA when it states in MEPA 116D.03 subdivision 1: Requirement The legislature authorizes and directs that, to the fullest extent practicable the policies, rules and public laws of the state shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in sections 116D.01-116D.06."	Exhibit R.	pages 47-48	Susan Perrin Schubert susanpschubert@gmail.com 319 Pine Mountain Road Grand Marais, Mn. 55604	Post-hearing comment period
451	4410.4300, subpart 38	Recreational Trails Mandatory Category	"Items A. and B. are in direct conflict with the intent of Environmental Review to prevent environmental degradation by wise and informed decisions and with the stated purpose of the MEPA. 116D. 01 (b), which all state agencies, including the EQB are to follow. The rule changes proposed in items A. and B. are also in conflict with the EQB's responsibilities to carry out MEPA and act as a trustee of the environment for succeeding generations under 116 D.02 Subdivision 2, 1."	Exhibit R.	pages 47-48	Susan Perrin Schubert susanpschubert@gmail.com 319 Pine Mountain Road Grand Marais, Mn. 55605	Post-hearing comment period

Comment	Rule Part	Comment Topic	Summary of comment (note: comments that are paraphrased are indicated with *)	EQB Response	Discussed on SONAR	Affiliation Name/Address	Comment Time
452	4410.4300, subpart 39	Recreational Trails Mandatory Category	"I believe it is the EQB's responsibility, as dictated by the legislature, in MEPA 116D.03, to maintain the threshold at 10 miles as it is in the best interest of the environment to prevent degradation, as supported by the 1982 Sonar statement that the degree of environmental impact is a function of length, and it is in the best interest of succeeding generations for whom the EQB is the environmental trustee, as stated in 116D.02 under Subdivision 1. Policy and Subdivision 2. State Responsibilities."	Exhibit R.	pages 47-48	Susan Perrin Schubert susanpschubert@gmail.com 319 Pine Mountain Road Grand Marais, Mn. 55606	Post-hearing comment period
453	4410.4300, subpart 40	Recreational Trails Mandatory Category	<p>"The language in this proposed rule change of Item B. remains impermissibly vague in my view and so indefinite one must guess at its meaning.</p> <p>It does not establish a reasonably clear policy or standard to control and guide administrative officers so that the rule is carried out by virtue of its own terms and not according to the whim or caprice of the officer.</p> <p>What is the definition of " an existing corridor in current legal use by motor vehicles?" This description is not specific enough. It could include public roads and highways, to the detriment of the general public's physical safety and well being and jeopardize the physical integrity of needed public transportation infrastructure. It could also include pipeline corridors and power line corridors that ATVS can legally ride along in some areas. It could also include seldom used, primitive logging roads that are not closed and can pose significant environmental impact issues of sedimentation and invasive species spread, if designated for motorized recreational use.</p> <p>The language is unclear to the user and to the enforcer regarding the specific parameters for a route to be designated for a new motorized recreational use. Could, for example, a mudder truck go down a pipeline or powerline corridor which is legally used by ATVS in some areas? How does the enforcer know? How does the user know?"</p>	Exhibit R.	pages 47-48	Susan Perrin Schubert susanpschubert@gmail.com 319 Pine Mountain Road Grand Marais, Mn. 55607	Post-hearing comment period