

## Responses to Written Comments

### **Mike Tauber:**

**On page 14 - the potential to protect the Stony Creek Watershed there are some parcels listed as forested that have been converted to field. There are also some that are no longer county, and some that are 2c that are listed only as private forest. These are just the discrepancies I can see in my immediate vicinity. I also would like to again point out that my comments regarding problems created by industrial ag in our watershed are largely ignored and/or struck from the record and that the engineering firms that coordinate watershed planning may have a conflict of interest due to employment by industrial ag corporations simultaneously.**

### **Response:**

*Thank you for your comment. The Watershed Parcel land use and ownership classification data was last updated in 2021, so we are using the best data available that we have. Updating the dataset for this plan could be costly and time consuming; data gathered this way also changes rapidly as parcels transfer between owners and uses. We decided that it was not a worthwhile endeavor to update the dataset at this juncture.*

*Industrial agriculture is not a large concern for this particular watershed at this time. Only 5% of land in the Pine River Watershed is used as crop or pasture land (Page 15 of the full plan).*

**Steve Henry:**

**The revision of the Surface Water 'Declining Lakes' goal from the original 5% phosphorus loading reduction to the proposed 5 lb phosphorus loading reduction equates to an on average 94% reduction in the Goal. This seems like an extreme reduction in a goal and strangely the new goal matches the accomplishments to date raising the question "Is this a Resource driven goal change or a Reporting driven goal change"? Is this goal revision driven by new modeling and changes in the Resource if so then it is appropriate and I would support it. If the change in this goal is not associated with the needs of the Resources or new data and modeling then I strongly oppose the change. Goals should be based on the needs of the Resource and not constructed so that the Reporting will look nice.**

**Response:**

*Thank you for your input. The reduction in goals is solely for the 10 year period that this plan covers. Long-term goals remain unchanged. The Pine River Watershed was one of the first One Watershed, One Plans written after the initial pilot program, because of this it was difficult to estimate how far the dollars and staff time would stretch. The updates in 10 year goals reflect what we have learned during the first 5 years of implementation.*