

Table of Contents/Executive Summary - 60-Day Review				
Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
1	ii	Acronyms and Abbreviations: "CFR" is only used once, is it necessary	MH	Typically, with statute language, the acronyms are not spelled out within the body text and therefore not defined in the document unless included in an acronym list. Therefore, this acronym (as well as USC) was included for reference. No change was made.
2	ii	Acronyms and Abbreviations: "EQUIP" should be "EQIP	MH	Change was made.
3	ii	Acronyms and Abbreviations: "MSCA" is not used in the plan that I could see. Remove?	MH	This was in reference to a portion of Section 5 that has since been removed. The acronym was removed from the list.
4	ii	Acronyms and Abbreviations: "USACE" is not used consistently in the plan, sometimes it is USACOE.	MH	Per the agency website, USACE is the accepted acronym. The document was searched and 3 instances of USACOE were changed to USACE (all located in action tables).
5	ES-3	In order to increase readability of the plan and to present a better picture of plan priorities, we recommend that the issues table be organized in the A-B-C priority order. That is group all the A's and B's together within each resource concern.	CS	The PWG discussed this comment. In the Executive summary, the priority issues table was reordered to show A priorities first (within the resource concerns) followed by B priorities (within the resource concerns).
6	ES-5	Bases for the measurable goals include: (Bullet points - include the years for each of the studies or items referenced	MH	The years of the study documents were added to the end of the listing. Additionally, the Lake of the Woods Excess Nutrients TMDL Study and the Warroad AIG study were added to the list (used in TP and in-channel measurable goals, respectively).
7	ES-8	3rd bullet point, add an "(s)" after the word "region"	MH	This appeared to not need this change. Perhaps comment was made based on previous version of the document. No change was needed.
8	ES-8	Second to last sentence: "Zonation is a value-based model that uses a combination of geographic information and user-input weighting to prioritize places on the landscape for conservation and restoration that addresses multiple resource values." Should the word "conservation" be "protection"?	MH	"Conservation" was changed to "protection," to keep consistency throughout terminology used in the plan overall.
9	ES-14	Highlighted in yellow text: The Policy Committee and respective boards have drafted a Joint Powers Agreement	MH	The text was adjusted to include the JPA. The acronym was added to the acronym list. Text was removed about the name of the entity (undecided by PWG).
10	General	Executive Summary: The executive summary should be a summary of what is in the plan. As currently constructed, the	CS	The PWG discussed this comment. The PWG likes the existing ES, as it serves as a "roadmap" for the

Table of Contents/Executive Summary - 60-Day Review				
Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
		executive summary describes in detail the terminology of the plan (issues, measurable goals, background of the planning area and partnership, etc.) with some examples of the planning areas and references to more detailed information in the plan but does not summarize the overall objectives and direction of the plan. There is also a placeholder for the implementation structure the partners are discussing but that decision should be made apparent in order to ensure a smooth transition from planning to implementation.		plan content. After further discussion, the PWG decided to modify the existing ES with the following changes:- add some text in the introductory paragraph describing the overall objectives and direction of the plan;- reorder the priority issues table, so that higher priority issues (A) come before lower priority issues (B), within each resource concern category;- replace the example MG factsheet with a summary table of the list of MGs;- remove the example sheets related to Section 4 and briefly summarize what is in the section; and- remove the responsibility table related to Section 5 and briefly summarize Section 5. These changes were made.

1 - Introduction - 60-Day Review				
Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
1	1-2	In the sentence: "The watershed is in the Rainy River Basin and encompasses parts of Roseau (20%) and Lake of the Woods (80%) Counties (including Lake of the Woods and the Northwest Angle (NWA))." maybe separate the 2 thoughts: 1. The watershed is in the Rainy River Basin. 2. The watershed encompasses parts of Roseau (20%) and Lake of the Woods (80%) Counties (including Lake of the Woods and the Northwest Angle (NWA)). Combining them changes the meaning or makes it less clear if you are referring to the Rainy Basin the LOW Watershed.	MH	The sentences were separated.
2	1-4	Sentence: "Five predominant watercourses flow into Lake of the Woods along the south shore: the Warroad River, Willow Creek, West Branch Zippel Creek, South Branch Zippel Creek, and Bostic Creek." Should this just be FOUR and remove the branches for Zippel, and just leave it as Zippel Creek? Not sure why Zippel is separated but Warroad is not?	MH	The sentence was modified to include the four watercourses.

2 - Priority Resources and Issues - 60-Day Review				
Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
1	2-3	In the Description for 2.2 Lakes: "Environment Canada" should be "Environment and Climate Change Canada"	MH	The change was made.
2	2-4	In the Description for 2.2 Lakes: "Lake of the Woods Watershed Board" should be "Rainy Lake of the Woods Watershed Board"	MH	The change was made.
3	2-7	Reword: "By using the "dot method," people were given a set number of stickers and asked to use them to indicate which issues are the most important to them by voting by placing their stickers on the issues." to "By using the "dot method," people were given a set number of stickers and were asked to vote on which issues are the most important to them by placing their stickers on those issues." or something similar	MH	The sentence was reworded to: "By using the "dot method," people were given a set number of stickers and asked to vote on which issues are the most important to them, by placing their stickers on those issues."
4	2-13	Second Paragraph last sentence: "For example, land use impacts to drinking water (Issue 1.1.5, C level) may benefit from addressing land use regarding stream and river impacts (issue 2.1.6, A level)." Consistency with capitalization of "issue"	MH	The capitalization change was made.
5	2-14, 2-16, 2-19, 2-20,	MPCA Assessment of waters happened in 2015 and not 2016. This affects multiple sections and especially multiple maps that call out assessment when the waters were assessed.	CH	The PWG discussed this comment. Any streams/ivers listed as "Assessed" were tagged with 2015 (the formal assessment year).
6	2-14, 2-16	Impaired listings for this watershed occurred in 2018	CH	The PWG discussed this comment. Any streams/ivers listed as "Impaired" were tagged with 2018 (the most recent impairment listing year).
7	2-16	Lake of the Woods (lake) was impaired on the 2008 impaired waters list. This affects multiple sections and especially multiple maps that call out assessment what year these waters were added to the impaired waters list.	CH	The PWG discussed this comment. Any reference to Lake of the Woods "Impairment" was tagged with 2008 (the impairment year).
8	General	MDH comments on the draft plan concern the health of private well owners who consume unsafe levels of arsenic. The Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) of arsenic the U.S. EPA allows in community water systems is 10 parts per billion (ppb). However, consuming water with arsenic at levels lower than the MCL over many years can still increase the risk of cancer. As a result, the EPA has set a goal of 0 ppb of arsenic in drinking water.	CP	The PWG discussed this comment. MDH information related to arsenic levels in private wells was provided to the PWG in April 2018, 6 months after the issue prioritization for the plan was completed. Additionally, no arsenic issue concerns were explicitly identified in the initial agency review letter from the MDH. The combination of these factors led the PWG and PC to consider arsenic in drinking water to be a low priority issue (Level C) during the prioritization that occurred in October

2 - Priority Resources and Issues - 60-Day Review

Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
		Issue 1.1.3 (page 2-3) documents the concern for “Elevated concentrations of contaminants (notably arsenic, iron, and sulfate) in cretaceous, surficial, and buried sand and gravel aquifers”. Unlike arsenic, iron and sulfates are not identified as Primary Drinking Water Contaminants by the EPA. MDH provided information during the planning process that identified elevated concentrations of arsenic above the established MCL in private wells for four of the six HUC10 sub-watersheds. In contrast, documented nitrate levels in private wells for the entire watershed were all less than 3 parts per million (ppm), where the MCL is 10 ppm. According to the plan consultant, the “goals and actions in the plan were developed to focus on protection of drinking water, from nitrates and bacteria”. Protection makes sense for these two potential contaminants. MDH’s mission is to protect, maintain, and improve the health of all Minnesotans, and MDH would like the plan to address the unsafe levels of arsenic in private wells by providing technical and financial assistance to private well owners. Protecting the health of the watershed’s residents from unsafe levels of arsenic should be as high a priority as for nitrate and bacteria.		2017. However, while Level C issues are not explicitly prioritized in the plan (i.e. they do not have measurable goals nor do they have direct actions), they often receive attention through the actions associated with Level A and B priority issues. The draft plan does include mechanisms for providing technical and financial assistance to private well owners via proposed baseline actions. Examples actions include:- Seal abandoned and unused wells, particularly those wells that may impact drinking water supplies; and - Host a well testing clinic or provide resources to well users to have their water tested. Additionally, proposed moderate funding increases include funding for the follow action:- Collect additional ground water quality data on bacteria, nitrate, and arsenic using well testing clinics to collect data for private water supply wells. These actions will ultimately work towards protection the health of watershed residents from unsafe levels of arsenic in drinking water. No additional changes were made to the plan based on this comment.

3 - Measurable Goals - 60-Day Review

Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
1	3-6, 3-14, 3-16	MG-4: Previous comments have suggested that Warroad should stay in the restoration because the second bullet of the restoration definition, puts the harbor in restoration. If this is the case, then either to be consistent the Bostic should also be added, or we could put Warroad into the Protection category.	MH	The PWG discussed this comment. The biological impairment for East Branch Warroad River does list sediment as a stressor, so this would categorize it for restoration. Additionally, the PWG would like the three planning regions with sedimentation problems in their outlet bays (Warroad, Bostic, and Zippel) to reflect a TSS restoration goal because of this sediment infilling. The PWG decided to move Bostic to the restoration category (MG-4) and modify the bullet points that define restoration. The second restoration bullet was

3 - Measurable Goals - 60-Day Review

Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
				modified to: "Is a component of the landscape present in a limited amount and is providing an amount of essential ecosystem function and services below the needed amount at the landscape scale, and is therefore degraded (e.g., sedimentation infilling of bays or habitat fragmentation)," specifically calling out sedimentation of bays in the example. Additionally, the language in the MG-4 Factsheet was modified to reflect this and to clarify the basis for TSS goals in planning regions.
2	3-13	The sentence: "Currently, there is one MnDNR Observation Well (#39000) located in southern Lake of the Woods County, near Roosevelt." remove the work southern, or consider just saying that there is one Ob well within the Plan area?	MH	The word "southern" was removed.
3	3-20	Picture caption: Shoreline erosion on Lake of the Woods	MH	The caption was added.
4	3-21	Reword this paragraph (clean up "ands"): "Changes in the landscape including increases in the amount of impervious area, loss of wetlands and amount of field residue, which can cause an increase in the volume of runoff, peak discharges, and water levels, causing flooding and flood damages to agricultural land, transportation systems, and building and structures, and problems within artificial and natural conveyance systems (2.3.1, A Level)"	MH	The paragraph was revised to: "Changes in the landscape including increases in the amount of impervious area, loss of wetlands, and changes in the amount of field residue can cause an increase in runoff volume, peak discharges, and water levels. This can lead to flooding and damages to agricultural land, transportation systems, building and structures, and problems within artificial and natural conveyance systems (2.3.1, A Level);"
5	3-23	Language: "Channelized segments are not good for moving sediment," I believe that channelized segments are good for moving sediment. Consider clarifying.	MH	The sentence was changed to read: "Channelized systems are not good at redepositing sediment that has been suspended and transported, a function healthy streams do well in a meandered system."
6	3-26	Picture caption: AIS Inspector at Wheelers Point Public Access	MH	The caption was added.
7	3-30	Picture Caption: AIS Inspector at Zippel Bay State Park Public Access	MH	The caption was added.

4 - Targeted Implementation Schedule - 60-Day Review

Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
1	4-3	Baseline funding bullet: I'm not sure it is accurate to say that the baseline actions are the highest priority for plan implementation since. Consider language change.	CS	The PWG discussed this comment. The baseline funding actions are a combination of mandated actions (regulatory), high priority based on cost-efficiency data such as PTMApp, and high priority based on status quo work the group intends on continuing. PWG decided to reflect this in the sentence modification. The sentence was changed to: "Actions identified as baseline are a combination of mandated actions (i.e. regulatory), high-priority based on current, ongoing actions within the plan area, or high-priority based on analysis developed during the planning process (i.e. cost-effectiveness)."
2	4-13	Pg. 4-13: Table 4-6 the Funding Source Program column has the dollar value listed for Plan Administration instead of the funding source	MD	The errant dollar amount was removed and replaced with the correct cell, "Existing Budget."
3	4-16	Impaired listings for this watershed occurred in 2018	CH	The impaired listing was changed from "2016" to "2018."
4	4-18, 4-23, 4-25, 4-32, 4-35, 4-37, 4-42, 4-43, 4-45, 4-50	MPCA Assessment of waters happened in 2015 and not 2016. This affects multiple sections and especially multiple maps that call out assessment when the waters were assessed.	CH	See Section 2.0 Comments 5-7.
5	Action Tables	Need to add Action regarding Septic System upgrades directly addressing MG-17. I think it would be best to put under structural practices under each Planning Region. Currently the counties have been applying for this funding and getting it so I think it would fall under baseline funding, however I am not sure if it shows up in our funding table that was used to develop the baseline funding level. Action table language: Assist landowners in upgrading noncompliant SSTS. Funding: \$20K/county/year for a total of \$80K/biennium Timelines: Every biennium Lead J: LOCAL Lead Entity: County	MH, JS	The PWG discussed this comment. The action was added to all of the planning region structural actions tables as a moderate level funding action and given the details provided in the comment (i.e. Description, Lead, Partners, etc.).

4 - Targeted Implementation Schedule - 60-Day Review

Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
		Partners: MPCA, BWSR, MG: MG-17 and ??? MAYBE: MG-2, MG-5,		
6	Action Tables	The implementation table generically identifies the budget for implementation as a Moderate (2X) or High (3X) increase above current baseline funding levels. The scale of program activities or number of BMPs is presented, but the budgetary priorities for the increase in funding anticipated through Watershed Based Funding are not identified. The Plan content requirements for the targeted implementation include: A brief description of the action, Location targeting where this will occur, Identification of partner roles, An estimate of the cost and potential sources of funding, An estimate of when the action will occur and How the outcomes will be measured. Within the plan these elements, with the exception of the estimated cost have been identified.	CS	The PWG discussed this comment. The PWG decided to: - add PTMApp moderate and high funding amounts to each of the treatment groups in the action tables under the Allocated Budget column; - add additional tables to the additional funding sections (4.3.1 and 4.3.2) that show the funding apportionment amongst the incentive program project basis and PTMApp treatment groups; and - Modify the Allocated Budget/Measurable Output/Metric merged cells for moderate and high incentive program actions to reference the apportionment tables.
7	Action Tables	As part of the organizational structure and targeted implementation programs and actions evaluation, we recommend that you review the workload required for the scale and number of practices identified and adjust the implementation table as necessary to balance workload with the anticipated outcomes.	CS	The PWG discussed this comment. The PWG acknowledged that they reviewed the actions/timelines/and workloads and adjusted them properly based on anticipated outcomes. No changes to the plan were made based on this comment.
8	4-20	Make action BC S-04 start on 2019-2020	MH	The change was made.
9	PR: example 4-20 and 21 and all others	FUNDING AMOUNTS IN THE ACTION TABLES: Put in the funding amounts for Moderate and High for the PTM App practices in the Baseline practices. Put a footnote for the Moderate Level PTM App practices to say that this will have to be broken out. -or explain it and put To Be Determined Put the funding amounts for the Moderate Level In channel and other practices in the funding table. Put the funding amounts for the High Level In channel and other practices in the funding table.	MH	The PWG discussed this comment. See comment #6.
10	4-21	Managing beaver activity is listed as an action that moves us toward the goals of impacting lake shore development (MG-11), and habitat protection (MG-13) (Drop these goals from this action)	AD	These measurable goals were removed from this action.
11	4-21	BC M-07 is about habitat protection and forest stewardship, not public education (Drop MG-18)	AD	This measurable goal was removed from the action (and actions in other planning regions).

4 - Targeted Implementation Schedule - 60-Day Review

Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
12	PR: example 4-22	On the Table change the title so that it is clearly "PTM App Practices" for the baseline funding	MH	The table titles were changed to "Baseline Funding - PTMApp Practices"
13	PR: example 4-22	On the cost efficiency curve graphs change the title so that it is clearly "PTM App Practices"	MH	The graph titles were changed to "PTMApp Practices - Sediment/Total Phosphorus Cost-Benefit"
14	PR: example 4-22	Make it clear in the Baseline Funding Level Summary narrative: First Paragraph: State at the end of this paragraph that in channel and other practices are not PTM App practices, however these practices will help to attain the goals for these watersheds but they are not reflected in the Table Below or the Cost Efficiency curves to the right. or something to make this clear at the beginning of the narrative.	MH	The PWG discussed this comment. Based on some additional language added via the document edits (See General Comment #10), this is now clarified in the text. No additional changes were made.
15	4-23	In-channel progress toward measurable goals. There seems to be a disconnect here between what was set as short-term goal (Bostic Creek 0.9 miles) and this particular action. Exceeding the short-term goal by 1,044% Maybe says we don't have this set right?	AD	The PWG discussed this comment. The PWG agreed that this is a bit confusing, but it is correct. If the LTG is to restore/do in-channel work on 100% of the length identified, then completing all of that work is >100% of the STG. The STG is 1/10th of the LTG, so if you achieve the LTG, you achieve 10x the STG (i.e. 1000%). The PWG decided to leave these percentages in the plan.
16	4-37	Pg. 4-37: The very last sentence under Current Conditions has 'ass' instead of 'as'	MD	The change was made.
17	4-38, 4-46, 4-26	Below each set of PTMApp Maps the following wording is presented: <i>There are many more practices shown here than can realistically be implemented within the 10-year lifespan of this plan. The number and type of practices that can be implemented is largely influenced by the amount of funding available and by what practices are the most locally accepted by the community, for voluntary implementation.</i> This is where priority areas could be highlighted based on some of the priorities given in the "Planning Region Priorities" Box. We recognize that this can be addressed with annual plans, and perhaps that is the direction the committee is considering.	AD	The PWG discussed this comment. The initial PTMApp implementation sheets show all of the potential PTMApp practices, while the baseline sheets provide priority areas based on 1) most cost-effective practices, and 2) multiple benefits based on zonation. The PWG decided that this information was adequate for highlighting priority implementation areas in the plan itself and that further specific implementation priority will be determined during the annual planning.
18	4-45	The listing of activities in each planning region appear to be a laundry list of what could be done. An example of this is Zippel Creek - in the Planning Region Priorities (p.4-45) the "Baseline funding will prioritize" is verbatim the same as the "Additional	AD	The PWG discussed this comment. The consultant reviewed the text and determined that this section got modified in between the draft and Committee reviews. There was no comment

4 - Targeted Implementation Schedule - 60-Day Review

Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
		funding opportunities will prioritize". Again, if everything is a priority, nothing is a priority. Adding wording that addresses how priorities will be set may be one way to address this concern,		indicating a change at this time and the consultant tracked it back through the revision. The repeating of the same priorities under both the Baseline and Additional Funding headings was likely an editing error during the plan production. The original text provided by the consultant was:Additional funding opportunities will prioritize:- implementation of additional overland structural and management practices to reduce sediment loading;- implementation of recommendations from the Bostic and Zippel Watershed Assessment that prioritized projects and data gaps for the planning region;- implementation of in-channel restoration projects; completion of a hydrologic and hydraulic study of the planning region;- completion of a needs assessment and feasibility study for restoration/dredging of Zippel Bay; and- completion of a feasibility study for the installation of community sewer systems for developed areas of Zippel Bay and Graceton Beach.The PWG reviewed this text and agreed to add this text back, thus correcting the original production error.
19	4-51	Pg. 4-51: The last sentence of the first paragraph uses 'large increased funding' instead of 'high funding' – wording inconsistency	MD	The wording was changed to be consistent with the use of "high funding" throughout the plan.
20	4-62	Table 4-9: Consider defining treatment groups earlier in Section 4 prior to the planning region sections. I might make it easier to understand the PTM practices in those sections.	CS	The PWG discussed this comment. The PWG decided to move the table back to Section 4.1.1 and back reference it in Section 4.6.
21	General	On the introductory pages to the planning region profiles, the % (private and agricultural) is confusing. They are independent percentages.	JM	The PWG discussed this comment. The introductory sheets were clarified by adding "XX% of the Planning Region is private/agricultural..." The percentages were also separated to show independence of the percentages.

5 - Implementation Programs - 60-Day Review				
Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
1	5-16	Public Drainage Systems paragraph, bottom of page: Says "Rule Section 5 of the WRWD plan", but I think it should "Section 5 of the WRWD Rules".	CS	The change was made.
2	5-18	Agricultural Soil Erosion (JH had a comment to remove altogether that my need to be followed up on).	MH	The PWG discussed this comment. The counties have not adopted this statute/rule therefore it was removed from the county's columns in Table 5-3. The reference to the WRWD rules remains in the table.
3	5-22	Remove Pheasants Forever. Or if not make the "X"s in small caps "x".	MH	The PWG discussed this comment. The original uppercase "X" was a mistake in the formatting. The PWG decided to remove Pheasants Forever from Table 5-5.
4	5-23	Funding: Local, State and Federal funding paragraphs all say that they "exclude general operating funds obtained from BWSR". Is that correct?	CS	The PWG discussed this comment. The original funding estimates that the PWG filled out (and that the funding is based on) do include general operating funds from BWSR. Therefore, this statement was removed from all three paragraphs.
5	5-23	State Funding paragraph also makes a statement that ends in "for state cost-share regulatory purposes". Why is the term regulatory used here? I believe that term should be removed.	CS	The PWG discussed this comment. Cost-share is not regulatory; therefore, the statement was removed.
6	5-25	Decision Making and Staffing: Paragraph says fiscal and administrative duties will be assigned to a planning entity. May want to consider using a different term since the group will be implementing. Consider "one of the implementation partners"	CS	The PWG discussed this comment. The phrase "to a planning entity" was removed and the sentence now read: "The LOWW 1W1P fiscal and administrative duties will be assigned through a PC decision as outlined in the formal agreement."
7	5-32	Joint Powers Agreement, name is still TBD	MH	The change was made. The reference to "Name" (see TOC_ES Comment #9) was removed.
8	General	There are several places in the plan (section 5.3.6 for example) where placeholders exist for describing the implementation structure, roles and responsibilities moving forward). The planning process should have fleshed out those options and the member Boards participating in the planning area should make their wishes known and have the structure agreed upon prior to submitting the draft to the BWSR for approval. Section 5.3.6 of the plan also mentions a legal name to be determined. Whether there is a need for a legal name and concomitant	CS	See Comment #7

5 - Implementation Programs - 60-Day Review				
Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
		organizational structure depends on the decisions made about organization structure.		
9	General	I didn't see any discussion of the potential need for a Watershed Coordinator. There was discussion during the process about the consideration of the joint position down the road. There may be some value in including this as a possible need in the future. The plan does discuss the potential need for additional technical staff.	CS	The PWG discussed this comment. It was decided that the group would like language that leaves open the possibility of hiring additional staff related to implementation of the plan. The added text to Section 5.3.1 is: "It is also possible that implementation of this plan will require additional staffing needs, such as a Watershed Coordinator. The roles and responsibilities of this position would be established as part of the plan administration and coordination of the plan implementation entity and approved by the PC."

General Comments - 60-Day Review				
Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
1	Various	Grammatical errors or inconsistencies outlined in a marked-up PDF on the google drive site.	CH	The edits in the PDF document were reviewed and changes incorporated into the plan.
2	multiple	The Plan makes several references to the 2016 Impaired Waters List. As the 2016 draft Impaired Waters List was never approved by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, but the 2018 Impaired Waters List was approved on January 28, 2019, the MPCA recommends that the Plan be updated to change all references to the 2018 Impaired Waters List.	CH	See Section 2.0 Comments 5-7.
3	multiple	The Plan makes several references to streams assessed in 2016; however, the assessment process concluded in 2015. The MPCA recommends that the Plan be updated to change the assessment year to 2015 for all streams.	CH	The plan was reviewed in its entirety and any reference to 2016 assessment was revised to 2015 assessment.
4	multiple	The Plan makes several references to the Warroad River being impaired due to high Total Suspended Sediment (TSS), thus placing it in the Restoration Strategies Category. During the 2015 assessment process, the Warroad River was determined to be impaired due to TSS; however, it was later determined that the sampling location was too close to the lake and that the lake's backwater effect skewed the data. The Warroad River's TSS-related impairment was then removed from the impaired	CH	See Section 3, Comment #1

General Comments - 60-Day Review				
Comment #	Page #	Comment	Commenter	Comment Resolution
		waters list. Unless there are reasons, other than TSS-related impairments, to keep the Warroad River in the Restoration Strategies Category, the MPCA recommends moving the Warroad River to the Protection Strategies Category throughout the Plan.		
6	General	We commend the LOW Watershed Partnership for your participation in developing the first protection based comprehensive watershed management plan through the 1W1P program and for your collaborative effort in bringing this plan together.	CS	Thank you. The LOW 1W1P Planning Group appreciates the positive feedback.
7	General	The Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Lake of the Woods Watershed One Watershed One Plan (1W1P) report. The MDA commends the planning committee for the consistent formatting which makes the priority concerns and measurable goals easy for the reader to follow.	RL	Thank you. The LOW 1W1P Planning Group appreciates the positive feedback.
9	Appendix	Appendix, Land & Water Resources Inventory. Link to Garden Island State Park does not work	AD	The link was repaired in the document and the Appendix was updated.
10	Various	Grammatical errors or inconsistencies outlined in a marked-up Word Document on the google drive site.	JL	The edits in the Word document were reviewed and changes incorporated into the plan.