

Forest Classification
and
Forest Road and Trail Designations
for the
West Central Forests – Mississippi Headwaters Unit
Public Comments



Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

DNR West Central Forests Road/Trail Designation Team

Colleen Adam.....	Enforcement
Mary Broten, Co-Chair.....	Trails & Waterways
Rob Naplin.....	Fish & Wildlife
Michael North.....	Ecological Services
Keith Simar, Co-Chair.....	Forestry
Shelly Sentyrz.....	Geographic Information Systems
Kent Wolf.....	Geographic Information Systems
Bill Johnson.....	Planner

Acknowledgements

The DNR West Central Forests Road & Trail Team gratefully acknowledges the contributions of the following individuals to the forest classification and road/trail designation process.

Bruce Cox.....	Clearwater County Land Department
Alfred Fox.....	White Earth Natural Resources
Chip Lohmeier.....	Becker County Land Department
Bob Milne.....	Beltrami County Land Department
Katherine Warren.....	White Earth Natural Resources

© 2008, State of Minnesota, Department of Natural Resources



Equal opportunity to participate in and benefit from programs of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources is available to all individuals regardless of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, marital status, status with regard to public assistance, age, sexual orientation, or disability. Discrimination inquiries should be sent to MN DNR, 500 Lafayette Road, St. Paul, MN 55155-4031; or the Equal Opportunity Office, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC 20240.

Introduction

On November 13, 2008 the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) published a notice in the *State Register* (32 SR 878) of proposed motor vehicle use classifications and road/trail designations for State Forest Lands in the West Central Forests – Mississippi Headwaters Unit. The planning area includes: 1) forest lands within the statutory boundaries of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest, and 2) scattered forest lands in Southwest Beltrami County. The proposal was described in statewide news releases dated November 13, 2007 and December 21, 2007. One public informational open house on the proposed classifications and road/trail designations was held on January 16, 2008 in Detroit Lakes, to explain the proposal and to receive comments. The public comment period ended on January 23, 2008.

The DNR received comment forms, letters, and e-mails from individuals and organizations. The agency appreciates the time and effort of everyone who commented on the proposals. The draft proposals were improved and clarified as a result of the public review process.

This document is a compilation of the documents received and the DNR's response to the issues raised about the proposed motor vehicle use classifications and road/trail designations. The DNR's motor vehicle use classification and road and trail use designation decisions for State Forest lands in the planning area will be based on the draft proposal and response to comments. The classification and road and trail designations will be implemented by publication of written orders of the Commissioner of Natural Resources published in the *State Register*.

Comments were arranged alphabetically by author and individual responses were developed.

Project Scope & Limitations

The final Forest Classification and Route Designation Plan contains vehicular use guidance for all State Forest lands in the West Central Forests – Mississippi Headwaters Unit planning area. In total, more than 11,000 acres of state land and about 38 miles of inventoried routes were evaluated with respect to motor vehicle use.

The plan addresses only EXISTING inventoried routes located on state-administered forest lands; designation orders will be made only on existing routes. Approximately 0.5 miles of new hunter walking trail is proposed for future construction; if pursued this will be evaluated under a separate planning process. No grant-in-aid trail designations are proposed; existing and potential future routes were considered during the classification review and road/trail designation process. Trail designations are not subject to the Environmental Quality Board (EQB) rules for recreational trail projects.

The plan does not address OHV use in public road ditches or road rights-of-way (ROW), or the use of private lands, trails, or roadways. Nothing in this plan is intended to endorse nor discourage any potential future State Trail, unit trail, or Grant In Aid trail development proposals.

Route evaluations were based upon current use and existing conditions. Existing state forest roads and designated trails were presumed sustainable, with the current *managed* classification serving as the starting point. The Planning Team systematically evaluated each route proposed for designation in terms of need, physical suitability, and environmental factors.

All inventoried state land routes are depicted on planning maps. Informal, local-use route on private lands, were not inventoried and are not depicted on the DNR draft or final maps.

Every effort was made to maintain existing vehicular access, subject to the proposed forest classification, environmental constraints, and land ownership considerations. The Planning Team sought to connect vehicular routes where possible, and carefully weighed all options and alternatives. Team members also attempted to physically separate potentially conflicting recreational uses (motor versus non-motor) wherever possible. This was accomplished by recommending designation of non-motorized trails and Areas with Limitations on Off-trail and Non-designated Trail Use where appropriate. This plan presumes that forest users (motorized or non-motorized) are, for the most part, law-abiding and respectful of trail rules, regulations, and sign postings.

By any measure, implementation of this plan represents a net reduction in legal motor routes available for vehicular travel on state lands in the planning area, especially during the non-hunting summer season. All existing and newly designated travel routes will be mapped and signed appropriately. These routes, and these forests, will also be the focus of stepped-up enforcement during the implementation period as forest users adjust to changed motor vehicle use regulations. Finally, should assumptions prove incorrect or use conditions change substantially, forest classifications can be re-evaluated, and road/trail designations revisited, at any time.

Compilation of Comments

Written comments, in the form of emails, comment forms, or written correspondence, were received from 364 persons or groups between November 13, 2007 and January 23, 2008. The list includes:

1. Arrestad, Phil
2. Ackerson, Peter
3. Adams, Mary
4. Adamson, Joel
5. Adamson, Joel & Carolyn
6. Albert, Diane
7. Allen, Ben
8. Amey, Jeanne
9. Anderson, Gary
10. Anderson, Leroy
11. Anderson, Gail
12. Anonymous
13. Axelson, June & Dick
14. Babcock, Barry
15. Babcock, Linda
16. Bachman, Corey
17. Bachmann, Diane
18. Bachmann, Shane
19. Bair, Linda
20. Baland, Gene
21. Balbach, James & Jeannette
22. Barcikowski, Tanya
23. Barthel, George
24. Barton, William
25. Baso, Monica
26. Bell, Karl-Edwin
27. Bennett, Stephen
28. Bergquist, Ruth
29. Bertrand, Linda

30. Berman, Cathy
31. Birnstengel, Bob
32. Blake-Bradley, Niki (2)
33. Blakesley, Douglas
34. Blau, Jim
35. Bogen, Iver
36. Bogolub, Larry
37. Borkenhagen, Chip
38. Bower, John
39. Boyer, Matt
40. Branch, Marty
41. Braud, Jim & Kathy
42. Braun, Lois
43. Bridges, Craig
44. Brinkman, Randy
45. Brumfield, Richard
46. Bullis, Robert
47. Bunkers, Eric
48. Buscho, Arden E.
49. Cann, Matt
50. Cannon, John
51. Cardinal, Ken & Mary Kaye
52. Carlson, Greg
53. Carter, Clark
54. Casson, John
55. Chadwick, Amy
56. Champlin, Charlie
57. Cherwin, Bill
58. Christofferson, Karen
59. Cichon, Mike
60. Cierna, Suzannah
61. Connell, Chuck
62. Cotant, Harold
63. Cousins, Woodie, Kim, Matt & Sam
64. Crandell, Eugene & Deb
65. Crocker, Kyle
66. Crosby, Stewart
67. Dalen, Dean
68. Dan & Leany (2)
69. Davis, Joshua
70. Davis, Matthew
71. Delong, Colleen & Herman
72. Delong, Margaret
73. Derby, Maryellen & Ted
74. DeVries, Wallace J.
75. Dietl, Martin
76. Doeblar, Gary
77. Doering, Sheila
78. Donaldson-Evans, Mary (Prudhomme)
79. D'Orazio, Ronald E.
80. Downing, Mary Theresa

81. Draper, Charles
82. Drentlaw, David
83. Dunn, John
84. Dunnette, Joel
85. Dvorak, Tom & Judy
86. Eichorn, Marlene
87. Elmer, Michelle
88. Elwell, Adele S. (Laddie)
89. Emery, Frank
90. Erickson, Christina
91. Erzar, Bill
92. Fahning, Mr. & Mrs. John (2)
93. Fanfulik, Paula
94. Fettes, Donald
95. Fier, Bob
96. Fischer, Vincent Sr.
97. Flatt, Dwight & Anita
98. Forst, Kenny
99. Franzen, Linda & Edward
100. Freund, TheresaGarland, John
101. George, Terry
102. Giese, Mark M.
103. Goeb, Dave
104. Goetz, Robert J.
105. Green, Todd & Cindy
106. Grignon, Kay
107. Gruetzmacher, Sybil
108. Grussing, Ann B.
109. Haarman, Janet
110. Haefner, Rick
111. Hageman, Brandt
112. Hartwell, William
113. Hedeem, Carter
114. Hedeem, Florence
115. Hedin, Ross
116. Helgesen, Lisa
117. Hennen, Kevin & Wanda
118. Hering, Kent M.
119. Hogensen, Sharon
120. Hoirriis, Judith
121. Holbrook, John
122. Holinshead, Mathews
123. Homa, Lara (2)
124. Hoops, Bill
125. Hopp, Mary K.
126. Houdek, Joshua
127. Hulett, Sharon
128. Husted, Rachel
129. Ilstrup, Sam (2)
130. Irish, Ken
131. Iwaarden, Ellen Van

132. Jacob, John
133. Jacobson, Christina
134. Jacobson, Robert & Diane
135. Jeffrey, Susu
136. Jenison, Kate
137. Johansen, Matt
138. Johnson, Deanna
139. Johnson, Ira
140. Johnson, Judy
141. Johnson, Richard
142. Johnson, Larry
143. Johnson, Larry & Sharolyn
144. Johnston, Bond
145. Kalina, Charles
146. Kalina, Matt
147. Kania, Laurie
148. Kannegeiter, Becky
149. Karon, Jan
150. Kelzenberg, Dennis
151. Keough, Janet R.
152. Kilmer, Kathy
153. King, Gregory
154. Kleymeyer, Charles D.
155. Knaeble, Alan
156. Knafla, Cheryl
157. Knisley, John
158. Kollenberg, Jon
159. Kottke, Laura
160. Krogstad, Blanchard O.
161. Kruse, John
162. Lais, Dan
163. Langsdorf, Pauline
164. LaPray, John & Jamie
165. Larimore, Gene
166. Larsen, Kristin
167. Larson, Bette
168. Larson, Bette
169. Larson, Bill
170. Larson, Connie
171. Larson, W. M.
172. Laumer, Jim
173. Lawrence, Peggy
174. Leach, Elaine
175. LeBlanc, Colleen
176. Lee, Ed
177. Lee, Mary Jane & Gordon
178. Lee, Vern
179. Lehrer, Mark
180. Lenarz, Jeff
181. Lenk, Brendon
182. Libbey, Wesley

183. Lien, David A.
184. Lies, Diedra
185. Liehou, Leslie
186. Lindquist, Brian
187. Long, Edith (Mimi) & Edward
188. Lonquist, Jane
189. Louisiana, Duane
190. Luckrow, Theodore
191. Lutz, Sandra
192. Lyman, Robert
193. Maertens, Jerry
194. Maertens, Shirlee
195. Magnuson, Gina
196. Mahler, Andy & Linda Lee
197. Maki, Greg
198. Manning, Barbara
199. Martin, Chris
200. Mastro, Mark
201. Mattison, Willis
202. Mattson, Jeri Lu
203. May, Mary
204. McCarthy, Terry
205. McCarthy, Thomas
206. McConnell, Shirley
207. McKeown, Anthony
208. McLaren, Deborah
209. McNamara, Curt
210. McReady, Doug & Nancy
211. McReady, Nancy
212. Medion, Francois
213. Metzger, Bob
214. Meyer, Keith
215. Myers, Mason & Gwen
216. Meyers, Marilee
217. Mielke, Paul & Dawn
218. Mikkelson, Greg
219. Milburn, Scott
220. Miller, Sherry
221. Moe, Tony
222. Morgan, Cheryl
223. Moriarty, Mary
224. Mork, Ellen E.
225. Morrow, Jean
226. Moryc, David
227. Moyer, William L.
228. Myers, Mason
229. Myking, Larry
230. Naylor, William
231. Nelles, Richard D.
232. Nelsen, Deborah
233. Nelson, Jack T.

234. Nelson, Ronald L.
235. Neururer, Pete
236. Nicklason, Pete
237. Nietzke, Roger A.
238. Nordstrom, Tracy
239. Norquist, Ben
240. Norton, Helen
241. Norton, Matt
242. Norton, Samantha
243. Odendahl, Jeff
244. Ogden, Elinor K.
245. Ohmdahl, Paulette
246. Olander, Joel J.
247. Olmschenk, Daniel
248. Olson, Allen
249. Ortman, Debby
250. Ostrowski, Mike
251. Ostwald, Brent
252. Pari, Felicia
253. Parker, Rebecca
254. Parson, Charles
255. Paul
256. Pavlish, Art & Donna
257. Peck, Linda
258. Pederson, Alan
259. Peterson, Fern, Todd, Jack & Will
260. Peterson, Lin
261. Pettey, Terry W.
262. Pfennenstein, Joe
263. Place, Darren Lori
264. Plakanis, Vesna
265. Preus, Mary
266. Proescholdt, Kevin
267. Profant, Carmine
268. Quistgard, Gayle
269. Radford, Jeffrey
270. Ramer, Kelly
271. Ranum, Mark
272. Rauchwarter, Brian
273. rbxx1100
274. Reber, Butch
275. Redleaf, Karen, Eric Angell & Christine Frank
276. Reed, Liz
277. Rehmann, Todd D.
278. Reindl, Leslie
279. Reynolds, John
280. Reynolds, Peter
281. Rinsem, Jim
282. Riversmith, Bridget
283. Ryan, Jeanine
284. Rypka, Ken

285. Salminen, Kathy & John
286. Sanborn, Keith
287. Sandford, Shaun
288. Sazama, Colleen
289. Sazama, Ken
290. Schad, Jennifer
291. Schaedig, Terry
292. Schaenzer, Dave
293. Scharlemann, Denise & Robert Cochrane
294. Schik, Karen
295. Schimke, Kathleen
296. Schlatter, Charles E.
297. Schmid, Brad. A
298. Schmit, Les
299. Schoesboe, Ellen
300. Schwartz, Gary M.
301. Schwartz, Richard Stephens
302. Scotland, Lee & Polly
303. Scott, Patricia
304. Scott, Stephan
305. Severinghaus, Tom
306. Shaw, Ed
307. Simcox, John
308. Skersik, Dan
309. Sloane, Jim
310. Smith, Jim (2)
311. Smith, Mitch
312. Sobotta, Gary
313. Solterman, Susan
314. Sorenson, Eric
315. Sorenson, John
316. Spindler, Richard
317. Stanton, Jinjer
318. Stember, Susan Hausman & Larry
319. Stets, Edward
320. Stockey, Tim
321. Stowers, Dale C.
322. Stropes Family
323. Sturm, Tim
324. Swift, Andy
325. Tam, Joan
326. Tanner, Scott
327. Tegland, Harlan Dean & Rita Marie
328. Telfer, John & Patricia
329. Thorndahl, Nancy
330. Thorson, Marty
331. Thorson, Thore
332. Tjader, Frannie
333. Toomey, Kathy & Dick
334. Trepka, Judy
335. Trout, Jerry J.

336. Trudeau, Franco
337. Tuomala, Scott
338. Ulrich, Linda
339. Umphress, Karen
340. Updegraff, Gwen
341. Van Oss, Tom
342. Vanderbeek, Fred T.
343. Vassar, Hubert
344. Velie, John
345. Vetter, Mary Ellen
346. Vlasek, Ray
347. Voight, Mary C.
348. Waage, Donn L.
349. Waalen, Lnnny
350. Wallwork, Deb
351. Walsh, James
352. Ward, Bill
353. Waters, Thomas F.
354. Weber, John
355. Wellner, Michael G.
356. Wenthold, Tami J.
357. Wilson, Walter
358. Wolter, Doug
359. Yahn, Stephan
360. Young, Cheryl
361. Zentner, David
362. Zicus, Michael C.
363. Zimmerman, Allan & Carol
364. Zimmerman, Mark

DNR also received two types of “form-email” comments that were identical, or essentially identical, to each other. One set of responses is provided for each. These are listed in the comments document as Serial Email No. 1 (354 comments submitted) and Serial Email No. 2 (960 comments submitted).

Public comments were sorted and distributed to members of DNR’s West Central Forests planning team for their evaluation and response. Copies of the comments were also shared with cooperating partners where relevant.

Both oral and written comments were provided to the Department and counties at the public meeting held on January 16, 2008. Individuals wishing to speak were asked to record a summary of their comments in order to speak. 34 persons exercised this option for the planning record. The comments that were offered are reflected in the written comments formally submitted to the Department and addressed below.

Specific responses have been developed for each comment provided. These responses are found in the Responses to Comments companion document. Comments that raised multiple points are addressed by referencing more than one applicable response.

Author/Comment	Response
Serial Email No. 1 (Submitted 354 Times)	
As a Minnesotan I value our prized wild and scenic rivers.	10.6 10.7
I strongly oppose off-highway vehicle (OHV) use in the MHSF's Wild Corridor.	10.2
The proposed network of OHV routes will destroy or damage the Headwaters' wild character, valuable wildlife habitat, the cultural and historic landscape of this recreational gem, and an ancient canoe route.	6.2 15.1 2.9
Serial Email No. 2 (Submitted 960 Times)	
The Mississippi Headwaters is a Wild River of national importance.	10.6
Minnesota promised to manage the first 47 miles of the river to preserve and enhance its Wild character and values. That includes traditional forms of recreation, particularly canoeing, which was practiced there when it was recommended as Wild nationally, and designated as Wild by the Mississippi Headwaters Board.	10.8
The DNR should reject the plan to designate ORV routes on the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. DNR instead should close the Headwaters to ORVs and follow the recommendations of its own Interdisciplinary Team, including Fisheries, Wildlife, Ecological, and Enforcement staff.	6.2 14.1
ORV users in Minnesota already have access to thousands of miles of forest roads and well over a thousand miles of ORV trails on state lands, plus several thousand more miles on federal lands. In comparison, this is the only reach on the Mississippi River to have qualified as "Wild" when the U.S. Dept. of Interior recommended that large parts of the Mississippi River in Minnesota be designated under the National Wild & Scenic Rivers Act, in 1977.	16.8 10.7
The Mississippi's Wild Headwaters is one of the few designated canoe routes in Minnesota that are on rivers considered "Wild" under Minnesota state law, and that makes this stretch of river and the lands around it all the more important for Minnesota's canoeists.	10.7
According to the Minnesota DNR's latest survey, more Minnesotans aged 20 and older engage in canoeing and kayaking than ride ORVs. Because ORVs are noisy and often violate areas posted off limits, access given to ORVs in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest means access taken away from those who desire high-quality non-motorized recreation, such as the experience of paddling the Mississippi's Wild Headwaters.	16.1
The Mississippi and its Wild Headwaters are of regional, national, and even international importance. Please protect the Mississippi's Wild Headwaters by keeping ATVs, dirtbike motorcycles, and off-road vehicles out of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.	4.3 2.9 2.3 12.1
Arrestad, Phil	
I have to let you know that I am disappointed with the non-closed status on OHVs in the MHSF. I have spent time in the area and value its unique natural setting and importance as the Headwater of the Mississippi river.	6.1
As you know OHVs already are crossing the river illegally and are causing damage in other areas too.	11.9
AS an outdoors person and professional photographer I have spent time in many areas of the state. I have been passed on closed spring trails by numbers of OHVS on the north shore. I have seen countless illegal trails through wetlands in the area around Outing and Emily. It is enjoyable to ride OHVS but it is clear that the irresponsible and illegal use of them has caused irreparable damage in many areas. The MHSF cannot become one of those areas more then it already has.	Comment noted
To protect the rights of riders is a political correctness that is being abused by riders who do not respect the rules and rights of others. The DNR's responsibility is to manage natural resources and not be an accomplice to the destruction of them. Wherever OHV access is granted or even remotely allowed near sensitive areas it is abused and damaged. This is a fact that I have seen for many years and not just conjecture. To think otherwise is irresponsible.	Comment noted
The other issue involves noise pollution. All resources should be shared but continuous noise of OHVs abuses the rights of others in the outdoors. Smoking has been banned in public areas because it exposes those who choose not to smoke to the negative effects of smoking from	12.4

Author/Comment	Response
others. We share the air. We share resources. These resources and the much needed connection with them should not be negatively effected by those using OHVS in special ares.	
There are many trails now and this small amount at MHSF is not needed. You are in a tough position but I ask that these comments be heard by your planning group and weighed with the responsibility of the DNR's task to mangle natural resources and not contribute to the detriment of them.	6.2
Ackerson, Peter	
As a Minnesota native, I strongly encourage the rethinking of allowing OHV routes along the Wild River of the Mississippi River. I now live in Georgia but still own a lake cabin on Eagle Lake in Otter Tail County. Seeing how careless planning can be hugely detrimental to the survival of natural wonders here in Georgia, I hope that common sense and a vision for the future generations of outdoor enthusiasts will override this MHSF draft plan. Minnesotans wouldn't dare to swim in the waters here in Georgia, but in time careless thinking could have the waters of Minnesota in the same shape. After all, that is why I own property up north; to enjoy how living near the water should be. Let's keep it that way.	12.7
Adams, Mary	
I am opposed to establishing OHV's trails in the upper Mississippi River corridor. Can this pristine, historical area not be set aside from the assault of motorized traffic? We all know the damage done by a 'few' and must we continue to repeat this process. I will save you from a long e mail.....you know the impact on wildlife, plants, invasive species, noise pollution, bank erosion.....I need not repeat it!. This is a precious area of historical significance. Please keep motorized vehicles out....lest they invade and rule. There is a time and a place to be courageous and decline such a request. That time is now.. Thankyou!	4.3 12.1 6.2
Adamson, Joel	
My name is Joel Adamson. I am vice president of the Grizzly Offroaders in Grand Rapids, MN, and am here on behalf of the Minnesota 4-Wheel Drive Association. Over the years, my wife and I have driven through several of the state forests represented tonight. Motorized use in the woods goes back as far as the 1920s and '30s when Grandpa put together an old doodle-bug out of an old jalopy. Our history goes back to 1976 when I bought an old Ford Bronco and we could go for drives through the woods. As our family grew, we put the kid's car seat in the back and went for Bronco rides through the woods.	Comment noted
Back in '76 there were two types of vehicles in the woods, Jeeps, Broncos, fourwheel drive pickups, etc. and motorcycles. As we all know, the numbers of Jeeps and motorcycles have dropped and ATVs have been born and their numbers have greatly increased. But the traditional users are still here. We have not gone away, we're just down in numbers. We still deserve a place to trail ride.	Comment noted
Contrary to what some would have you to believe, we are NOT mudder trucks. Mudder trucks are specialized vehicles used on private property in mud-type events. We also are NOT rock crawlers looking for extreme obstacles. Those types of people or vehicles head to off-road parks like Gilbert or other parks south and east of MN, or head west to the extreme trails out there. We are just individuals and families who like to explore and trail ride in the woods. We are not looking for challenge areas. The closed challenge areas in the Foothills State Forest are often brought up in meetings such as this one as examples of ORV damage. Interestingly enough, the damage there was not caused by ORVs, and that IS documented! But those areas are also closed – over and done with – a dead issue, so I hope the anti-motorized groups will leave it as the dead issue that it is!	Comment noted
There are few enough of us ORVers that there is no way we can be doing the damage in the woods that we are accused of. There were more of us in 1976, and there was no outcry of trail damage then. Nothing has changed as far as we are concerned.	13.1
I would like to see the MN DNR follow what was done in Chippewa National Forest – and that is that all of the trails that are open to ATVs are also open to ORVs. As a matter of fact, the USFS makes no distinction between the two user groups.	13.1
What we ARE looking for is to leave as open the old tote roads we've been driving for years. We are looking for unimproved trails through the woods, not graveled and graded roads Grandpa can	13.1

Author/Comment	Response
drive his Buick on. Thanks for listening.	
Adamson, Joel & Carolyn	
<p>When we go out in the woods, we are never sure where we will travel. We start in a direction, and just enjoy investigation any roads that look interesting.</p> <p>Sometimes they lead to a river. Sometimes a hill. Sometimes we find amazing wildflowers along the way. We find wildlife. We are often looking for a lake to canoe. Or just a quiet afternoon in the woods. Please don't take the roads away from the ORVers.</p>	6.1
Albert, Diane	
<p>The MHSF should be classified as "closed" not "limited."</p> <p>The DNR, counties, and U.S. Forest Service are providing thousands of miles of OHV trails in Minnesota; closing the relatively small MHSF to OHVs will not impinge on OHV driving in all these other places.</p>	6.2 16.8
<p>The headwaters portion of the Mississippi River is a national resource that should be protected for its wild qualities, not opened to further OHV damage.</p> <p>In the interest of all Americans, we must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi for future citizens. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a narrow corridor. It contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi in the river's entire 2,552-mile stretch. Minnesotans must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized river.</p>	4.3 10.15
I am against snowmobiles in Yellowstone.	Comment noted
I bike to work almost ever day. I walk the walk.	Comment noted
Allen, Ben	
<p>I am writing concerning the proposed route designation and vehicle use classification in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. I have had the opportunity to vacation in the headwaters area and I do not support the proposed reduction of ATV trails in the area. ATVs bring vital tourism money into the area, and forest trails and roads take pressure off residential areas and road ditches. From experience I know that most of the forest trails are unbearable when walking or biking in the summer due to mosquitos and other insects. Please consider the upsides of managed ATV trails before writing them off all together.</p>	6.1 14.10
Amey, Jeanne	
<p>please keep the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest CLOSED to all motorized vehicles. It is just simply the right thing to do for our environment and natural habitat. If this is opened up and made lawful for motorized vehicles - it sends the wrong message to everyone, especially people who are already breaking the law.</p>	6.2 4.3
Anderson, Gary	
<p>ATV use in Minnesota is out of control. The law that allows ATV's to go anywhere not posted closed leads to the following: If a sign is present closing a road or trail, remove the sign, then by definition it is open.</p> <p>By contrast the U.S. Forest Service rule is a trail is open if posted open, all others are closed.</p> <p>Which begs the question if you are law abiding do you know whose land you are on? Most assuredly they do not, people who use ATV's have contemp for forest, nature and signs, do not expand there ability to go anywhere they please.</p>	6.3 11.5
Anderson, Leroy	
The January meeting at Bemidji State seemed to be a sham. The inexperienced pro recreation	14.2

Author/Comment	Response
people receiving 2 minute opportunities to present their positions with timing place cards that render a non professional speaker ineffective, while allowing experienced presentations for the environmental extremist to run 10-12 minutes, presenting half truths and exaggerated facts not supported by good science.	
By denying motorized access, you are eliminating the ability of family access. When families are evolved in outdoor recreation they are getting wholesome physical and mental exercises creating in children a love and appreciation for the natural environment. They then become our next generation to protect the forest environment that the have come to love.	6.1
All the public land belongs to all the citizens. I believe no one can be denied the recreational access to it without accurate science of substantial damage being done by them. A trail mud hole a ¼ mile away from the river has no impact on the river. Any muddy water is filtered by natural plant growth long before it reaches the river. If there is any minute concern, fill the mud hole with natural field rock.	Comment noted
This is a multi-million dollar industry for Minnesota (the U of M has credible economic impact study available). Our state should be the largest promoter of the motor recreation; we have two of the largest manufactures of recreation vehicles in the US, plus all of their support industries such as TEAM Industries in Bagley, which has been an economic godsend of great jobs and community support for our area. They are good jobs with health insurance and retirement plans! We maybe are throwing the baby out with the bathwater. Our area also receives tremendous tourism dollars that misguided actions like this choke off.	14.10
I have real concerns about the integrity of the environmental extremists presentations attempting to create problems out of context. There was a very large civil air patrol recovery exercise on a recent weekend in the Bear Den area, very near the Mississippi river, evolving many recovery vehicles. These are not recreational riders! The extremists spent several hours the next day attaining the most alarming photos they could attain to present as damage done by recreational activity!	12.1
<p>If your clean water concerns are sincere your priorities should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide farmers with no till seeding equipment that injects a minute amount of fertilizer with the individual see giving that seed nutrients and no fertilizer runoff. That equipment is perfected but too expensive. It could be owned and operated or rented out by soil and water conservation groups. • Fund programs to get tough on lakeside septic systems. • Address runoff from city storm sewers and chemical and dirt run off from public roads. 	12.7
Stopping a 65-year-old hunter from driving his pickup near enough to his stand or hunting area so he can recover his deer, or go fishing, under the guise of environmental impact is ludicrous!	6.1
Anderson, Gail	
I wish to add my voice to those concerned about the category of "limited" use of off-highway vehicles in the Headwaters State Forest. I would be in favor of a "closed" classification so that ohv are restricted to roads and trails specifically designated and posted by the DNR for use by off-highway vehicles. I am concerned about how we care for the environment adjacent to and affecting the Mississippi River.	6.2
I have paddled from Coffee Pot campground to Lake Beltrami on the Mississippi. It is a fragile environment and has been violated by off-highway vehicles. I now live on the Mississippi River beyond Monticello on a cliff 80 feet overlooking the River. In this area the River is classified as a Wild and Scenic River and there are careful rules about not cutting any trees within 100 feet of the river, etc.	10.7
But the river is also wild and scenic in the Headwaters State Forest in my opinion and should be treated carefully in the Forest also. The Mississippi River belongs to all Minnesotans and it is a unique resource for this state and significant to this nation. Recreation is important and different forms of recreation need to be honored, but that needs to be weighed next to the responsibility we have to treat our resources well. The damage may be done by only a few but a few can do a lot of damage and enforcement is very difficult with OHV.	10.3

Author/Comment	Response
Anonymous	
I want to believe the DNR will be the guardian of our natural resources! I question whether you can be on this issue. I have many concerns about OHV/ATV damage and I would hope that the DNR could be "proactive" rather than reactive. I am very much against the Beltrami County opt out – managed classification but our county board and county personnel involved are a bunch of jack asses running their own agenda and have not acknowledged nor responded to any comments or concerns from their constituents that have gone against their narrow-minded promoter abuse plan. I personally would hope for all areas to be closed. Because of political pressures I believe they won't be. There will be massive confusion monitoring all of these different laws and that is another concern- this is not the Minnesota I want to call home!	5.1 6.2 11.2
Axelson, June & Dick	
We have volunteered at Itasca State Park for 14 years. We have been down the river towards Bemidji. This is the most pristine area we have been in, in years. We have seen the damage ATV'S have done there and in other sensitive areas. Granted, most damage is done by just a few people, but it is still damage. You can't patrol every stretch of this portion of the river. The only solution is to close the Headwaters State Forest to all motorized and ATV traffic. CLOSE IT, PLEASE.	11.9 6.2
Babcock, Barry	
I urge the DNR to close MHSF to OHV use. The DNR should be providing leadership rather than allowing county commissioners taking the lead.	6.2
This is the only river left in Minnesota that qualifies for "wild" status. To disregard this and establish ATV trails is a travesty to MN's special natural resources.	10.20
Coffee Pot must not be opened as part of a motorized trail system. Local people have been trying for years to protect this nonmotorized area from the increasing damage here. To open this would say to riders: "you win".	10.1
According to the DNR and biological county survey in Hubbard, many endangered, threatened, and species of special concern exist in MHSF. These are not compatible with OHV use.	12.1
With Regional Supervisor reversing the DNR work team majority recommendation to close the forest, makes one suspicious of a predetermined decision disregarding the public process.	14.1
Through years of on the ground experience and dialogue with DNR C.O.'s reinforces the knowledge that no matter how diligent law enforcement is, enforcement is totally inadequate. The prolific damage in MHSF is proof of this.	11.1
MHSF is a national and state treasure. It is astonishing that the DNR would be allowing a small user group to direct this process. With the overwhelming mass of state forest lands be managed for OHV trails, this forest should be managed for its wild lands. We deserve at least a small crumb thrown our way.	2.9
Babcock, Linda	
The only right and ethical thing to do is to CLOSE The Mississippi Headwaters Satae Forest to all ATV use. The DNR are the great protectors of our National tresssures. We the people, are asking you the protectors, to please CLOSE The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to all ATV use.	6.2
Bachman, Corey	
My name is Corey Bachmann, I have lived in Solway Minesota most of my life and an avid A.T.V rider. I've been to all of the river accesses in this area. I live right by one of them and do not see any of this so called "destruction." I know what A.T.V.'s are capable of and going into the river, you would sink out of site. Most of the river corridor; an A.T.V can't even get close to the river.	9.3
I attended the the last meeting at the Baux Arts Ballroom,which was hard to find. This wasn't a good representation of the "public."Most A.T.V. riders didn't even know of this meeting.	14.4
These extreme environmentalists don't understand A.T.V.'s. A little sand movement on the trails isn't going to hurt wild life or trees. If it wasn't for the snowmobiles and A.T.V's these trails would grow in and no one would be able to use them. A.T.V.'s are a fun, good way to see alot of the woods and good exercise too. It's the reason I live here.	8.4
Some people have no tolerance for other types of recreation and want to use the land only for	2.3

Author/Comment	Response
<p>themselves. It's still a peaceful area and little engine noise isn't going to hurt anyone.A.T.V.'s are very compatible with other types of recreation like; hunting,fishing, I even saw an A.T.V with a canoe rack on it</p>	
<p>Some of the people at the meeting, who went over the time limit to talk,didn't even seem familiar whith the area. I guess I'm just frustrated with the ignorance against A.T.V's and their riders. KEEP THE TRAILS OPEN.</p>	<p>14.2 6.1</p>
<p>Bachmann, Diane</p>	
<p>I think all the PUBLIC land in the Mississippi State forest should be left opened to ALL users. It is PUBLIC land Not just for certain groups So leave it open The ATVers are NOT destroying the land or driving on the river or in it-- if the bridge in Coffee Pot landing would of been left open they would not have drove where they shouldn't have! We pay license fees that should be used to keep the trails in shape. Do the hikers, bird watchers pay any fees to use these trails on PUBLIC land NO they do not! We all have been using these trails and roads for years and the river, trees, animals are still there!! So please leave this open for EVERONE</p>	<p>6.1</p>
<p>Bachmann, Shane</p>	
<p>I am writing this letter to express my great concern regarding the issue of ATV use on public land. I hope you take the time to not only read my letter, but to also review the attachments I have provided. I think both will clearly explain the possible downfall of the economy and the freedom of the publics' personal rights.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p>The fact that a minority group of individuals can bring about such a change in the way the majority of the public choose to live their lives astounds me. Does this group of individuals not recognize just how much money the ATV community generates for our economy? Starting with the purchasing of the vehicle, accessories, gasoline, registration....hotel and restaurant industries....it is immeasurable. As a member of the ATV community, I don't feel there should be any restrictions for the use of public land. If you even consider giving in to their classification review, and restrict use of any part of the public land, this will end in a snowball effect resulting in thousands and thousands of lost jobs and tax revenue. Personally, if these restrictions were in place, I would not purchase an ATV, as I would no longer have anywhere to ride. I believe this is the ultimate goal of the opposition.</p>	<p>14.10 6.1</p>
<p>I think the majority of the ATV community ride these vehicles, as they enjoy not only the sport, but also the surroundings in which we can ride. Prohibiting use in such beautiful surroundings not only robs me of my freedom, but of future generations as well.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p>Bair, Linda</p>	
<p>I know that many have written about all of the reasons that there should be NO ATVS allowed in MHSF. I concur. These machines have NO PLACE on state lands - they have earned the right to be banned.</p>	<p>6.2</p>
<p>Baland, Gene</p>	
<p>My name is Gene Baland, I live on Lake Vermilion in northern Minn. I am 67 years old and enjoy riding on my ATV on State Forest Rds, National Forest Rds, etc etc. I am very disturbed that groups can dictate the closure of all roads to ATV's. Why? If a car can travel down a forest road, why cant an ATV? You will deny and old man alot of enjoyment of traveling down a forest road on an ATV causing no one a problem, causing no damage to the road and just enjoying the last quarter of his life. My wife is 67 also and she enjoys our pleasant rides in the forests. Please take this into consideration when you are confronted with irrational environmentalists assuming all people riding an ATV are going to damage the forest. To lump me into a group that may cause damage in someway is unfair! An to restrict me from enjoying the state forests is totally unfair!!! An analogy would be if a teacher punished the whole class for one individual's actions. "If Tommy doesn't stay in line the whole class will miss recess". Please keep we old timers in mind when the decision is made.</p>	<p>6.1 11.5</p>
<p>Balbach, James & Jeannette</p>	
<p>PLEASE KEEP THE ATV. TRAILS OPEN. THIS IS A GREAT FAMILY BONDING TIME TO BE ON THE TRAILS WITH GRANDKID'S, KIDS, PARENTS AND GRANDPARENTS CAN EXPLORE THE TRAILS TOGETHER.</p>	<p>6.1</p>

Author/Comment	Response
<p>Barcikowski, Tanya</p> <p>Please... this is the source of the mighty Mississippi River, which picks up more than enough filth on its way down our grossly over-built, over-populated United States. I do not feel that motorized fun for a few humans who have low levels of the kind of intelligence borne of listening and contemplation weighs so important that these overgrown tykes, typically soft and flabby, unimaginative, TV-bred, intellectually undeveloped whatever their potential may be, deserves a presence where the Mississippi River takes form from other streams. Would that the collapse of the gasoline economy come sooner, to erase all that noise-intense, air and water-befouling activity. It is one of the lowest, most destructive forms of recreation.</p> <p>Leaving all the birth and rebirth of nature in this region of Minnesota aside, human recreation based on learning and awe through the unimpeded five senses is best served in the Headwaters region.</p>	6.2
<p>Barthel, George</p> <p>The Minnehaha Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America (IWLA) respectfully submits the following comments on the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest Draft Plan:</p> <p>The MHSF should be classified "closed" not "limited."</p>	6.2
<p>The headwaters portion of the Mississippi River is a <i>national</i> resource that should be protected for its wild qualities, not opened to further OHV damage.</p>	10.15
<p>The DNR, counties, and US Forest Service are providing <i>thousands</i> of miles of OHV trails in Minnesota; closing the relatively small MHSF to OHVs will not impinge on OHV driving in all these other places.</p>	16.8
<p>Barton, William</p> <p>Charles Kuralt once wrote that he "started out thinking of America as highways and state lines." But after years of being on the road, he "began to think of it as rivers. Most of what I love about the country is a gift of the rivers." As I testified at the local hearing regarding snowmobile use in Yellowstone National Park earlier this year: "Are we a bunch of lemmings stampeding towards the cliff of motorized use of all of our most pristine natural resources? Is nothing to be saved from this madness?" I am a "motor head" myself who enjoys loud hot rods and motorized recreation. I own a snowmobile. I own two street rods. Used within reason they have their place. Our most unique state lands are not the place.</p>	Comment noted
<p>It is my understanding that there are more approved open OHV trails in Minnesota than there are freeways now. I just heard on television this morning that there are 20,000 MILES of snowmobile trails in Minnesota!</p>	9.1
<p>How can we justify OHV use anywhere near the eadwaters of the Mississippi river - a world class unique and one of a kind natural resource - with any modicum of integrity towards stewardship of our resources?</p> <p>I SAY NO! NO! NO! - PLEASE DO NOT LET SHORT TERM ECONOMIC INCENTIVE LEECHES TALK US INTO ALLOWING OHV USE IN THE MISSISSIPPI HEADWATERS STATE FOREST!</p>	14.10
<p>The MHSF should be classified as "closed" not "limited."</p>	6.2
<p>The headwaters portion of the Mississippi River is a national resource that should be protected for its wild qualities, not opened to further OHV damage.</p>	10.6
<p>The DNR, counties, and U.S. Forest Service are providing thousands of miles of OHV trails in Minnesota; closing the relatively small MHSF to OHVs will not impinge on OHV driving in all these other places.</p>	16.8
<p>Three of the five DNR work team members recommended the MHSF be closed to all OHVs, citing the natural assets above and noting that steep hills and sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off-road driving. Significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river. Mike Carroll, DNR Regional Director in Bemidji, acknowledged making the final decision to classify the forest "limited" so trails on county lands could be connected.</p>	14.1 3.9 11.9
<p>Currently, OHV damage in MHSF is extensive. Campgrounds are rutted and damaged, e.g., Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point. ATVs are riding in the river in a number of locations, e.g.,</p>	11.9

Author/Comment	Response
Stumphges Rapids.	
Rather than protecting the historic sites noted above, the DNR Draft Plan has designated ATV routes in these sensitive areas, thereby rewarding past illegal behavior by legalizing it.	10.1
The Mississippi Headwaters Board (a state-created local counties board) designated the MHSF stretch of the river as "wild," which created a 1,000-foot corridor along the river where all OHVs are banned. The Draft Plan, however, disregards this protection and proposes ATV trails within this corridor, with some dead-ending at the river. As noted, illegal riding has already damaged the riparian zone.	10.8 10.2
A "closed" forest would not ban OHVs entirely. They would still be able to ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads. But state forest roads and trails would be closed to all OHVs. The forest is a checkerboard, with state and county land mingled. If the forest were classified as "closed," county and township roads would still allow OHVs to cross state land when going from one county parcel to another.	3.8
It will be difficult for DNR enforcement to strictly monitor any portion of this area because this part of the Mississippi is so remote. Classifying the MHSF "closed" would greatly aid in protecting the river itself.	11.2
<p>In the interest of all Americans, we must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi for future citizens. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a narrow corridor. It contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi in the river's entire 2,552-mile stretch. Minnesotans must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized river.</p> <p>"To waste, to destroy, our natural resources, to skin and exhaust the land instead of using it so as to increase its usefulness, will result in undermining in the days of our children the very prosperity which we ought by right hand down to them amplified and developed." Theodore Roosevelt, Message to Congress, December 3, 1907</p>	10.15
Baso, Monica	
I wrote comments as a representative of the Menahga Conservation Club about the planning being done for trails in the Huntersville Forest in July 2007. We are now writing regarding our clubs concerns about the planning being done for trails on the lands at and below the Mississippi Headwaters area. Our group has a strong interest in protecting our lakes and rivers from the abuse and damage of OHV and OHM's. We want your organization to keep focused on protecting our natural resources instead of creating play grounds for owners of these motorized toys that appear to never have enough places to play in. Our natural resources are not play grounds that can be built and repaired at will. The damage these toys make, in our forests and along our rivers, is not repairable. The eco-system is never the same again. This is not an issue that should be decided by big money, this is an issue that needs to be decided based on what is right for the land and the future generations that have the right to be able to enjoy this land.	11.9 14.10 4.3
It is our understanding from the media that three of the five DNR work team members recommended that MHSF be closed to OHV use stating that, " a sensitive natural resource of national significance, a long-term designated canoe route, and a stretch of wild river filled with wildlife such as trumpeter swans, red-shouldered hawks, goshawks and bald eagles. Steep hills and sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off-road driving, they wrote, and significant erosion already has occurred from illegal driving near and through the river. Closing ATV trails on state land in the forest was 'reasonable and prudent,' they said, because hundreds of miles of ATV trails are already available on nearby county lands and in other state forests. 'Remote and isolated canoeing opportunities are rare when compared to motorized riding opportunities in this part of the state,' they said. Mike Carroll, DNR regional director in Bemidji, acknowledged that the staff had a 'split decision' about what to do and said he made the final decision to propose keeping some trails in the forest open to ATVs. 'I felt that keeping the corridor open for connectivity [with ATV trails on county lands] was a legitimate point,' Carroll said." (Tom Meersman - Star Tribune, Dec 10). Our group takes issue with this connectivity issue, why do our natural resources have to suffer to make things more "convenient" for the owners of these toys. We need to be a voice for our resources not to convenience people who own toys.	14.1 3.9 11.9

Author/Comment	Response
The draft plan includes a trail and bridge across the Mississippi River at Coffee Pot Landing. ATV use has damaged this area repeatedly in recent years even though they were supposedly not allowed in this area. Why would this illegal use now be a precursor to opening this area up with a trail and bridge? There are numerous trails that have been created illegally that should not be allowed to be put on a plan just because they are there. Can't we "just say no"!!?	10.1
It is our understanding that a 1000 foot river corridor banning OHV's was created in the MHSF. Now, the MHB, DNR, and counties are disregarding this protection by proposing ATV trails within this protective corridor. Enforcement has not proven effective in stopping the damage currently caused by ATV's at numerous points in the riparian zone. Invading this corridor just increases the risk of owners riding these toys in the river.	10.17
A reminder about the lands the toys want to invade: The first 40 river miles lie entirely within Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest was established in 1943. Public lands within the Forest Boundary total 30,680 acres of which 8838 acres are state land and 21,843 acres are Beltrami, Clearwater, and Hubbard County lands. The forest contains 95 lakes and ponds. Sixty percent of the land is within 1000 feet of a stream or river. This forest contains incredible diversity including plants and animals of threatened, endangered, or special concern. DNR inventory has identified resident Timber Wolves, Trumpeter Swans nests (protected specie), Bald Eaglenests, Red-Shouldered Hawks, Goshawks, Bog Adders Mouth (endangered specie in Iron Springs Scientific and Natural Area within MHSF), Hump Bladderwort (rare), Ramshead Orchid (a threatened specie found in Hubbard County), Clustered Burr Reed (rare), and two mussels of concern; the Creek Heel Splitter and Black Sand Shell Mussels.	12.1 10.14
We want the forest designated as a "closed" forest. It still allows the OHV toys to be driven through the forest in county road ditches and on township road surfaces. It will be forest roads and trails that will be closed to OHV use. Licensed highway vehicles (cars & trucks) will still be able to cross and access this forest on "forest system roads" and "minimum maintenance forest roads" - the forest will not be made inaccessible to all motorized access. The DNR and counties plans for a "limited" forest would make many of the proposed 85 miles of trails and roads open to OHV use within the protective corridor, some even dead ending at the river. It is up to us, the citizens of Minnesota, to demand protection of one of the special places on earth.	6.2
Why is that toy owners can be so powerful and make so many demands on our natural resources? These toys, are just toys, they can be driven any where and have no benefits what so ever to our forests and waterways. Our DNR needs to be doing the job they were originally created to do and that is to protect nature not create play grounds for toys.	Comment noted
Bell, Karl-Edwin	
I have a very personal reason for writing this plea in regards to the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest (MHSF) Draft Plan. Having lived in Europe for a few years, it seems I have visitors from Germany and France almost every summer. The ONE thing I try to do is to drive seventy five miles to show them to pristine Itaska State Park so they can take the image of the Headwaters of the world famous Mighty Mississippi back to Europe with them. I took a friend from Russia who remarked that he had seen the headwaters of Russia's mighty Volga River, and declared "It is nothing to compare with this!" I believe this also plays into the great effort to proteoct this planet from human abuse.	Comment noted
As a Minnesotan whose home is in the 'North Country', I value our prized wild and scenic rivers. I strongly oppose off-highway vehicle (OHV) use in the MHSF's Wild Corridor. I see the abusive effects of this activity along the 'country road' and neighboring timberland where I live. The proposed network of OHV routes will destroy or damage the Headwaters' wild character, valuable wildlife habitat, the cultural and historic landscape of this recreational gem, and an ancient canoe route.	15.1 2.9
Bennett, Stephen	
I believe that our preservation of our natural resources comes before recreational interests (enjoyable as they may be at times).	Comment noted
The Mississippi Headwaters is a recreational gem - a designated canoe route offering silence, remoteness, and solitude. The river here is remote, narrow, and quiet. It is home to wolf packs, pine marten, fisher, black bear, river otter, mink, bald eagles, and the occasional cougar	10.6

Author/Comment	Response
The Mississippi Headwaters has deep historic and cultural significance. For millennia it was a major travel and settlement corridor for Native Americans. Explorers sought to find it, and vast fortunes were floated down it during centuries of the fur trade era.	10.6
I am deeply concerned about the plan to designate dozens of miles open to OHVs in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest, which encompasses much of the wild headwaters. OHVs on roads and trails would run into the Wild Corridor, along and even over the river. DNR's own ecological, fish & wildlife, and enforcement staff opposed designating these OHV routes. The proposed network of OHV routes will destroy or damage the Headwaters' wild character, valuable wildlife habitat, a cultural & historic landscape, and an ancient canoe route. I do not believe that such a plan is in the best interests of the region or the country.	10.4 14.1 15.1 2.9
The DNR should reject this plan to designate OHV routes, and instead close the Headwaters to OHVs as the DNR's Fisheries, Wildlife, Ecological, and Enforcement staff first recommended.	6.2
OHVs in Minnesota already have access to thousands of miles of forest roads and well over a thousand miles of OHV trails on state lands, plus several thousand more miles on federal lands.	16.8
The noise effects from increased traffic - louder, faster moving vehicles - will seriously damage the Wild character that qualified the Mississippi Headwaters for national Wild River designation.	12.4
The Wild character of the river will be harmed not just at bridges, but in many other locations where the river is close to proposed designated routes. Even where the designated routes appear to be well removed from the river channel, the intervening distance is often flat bog or other wetlands, meaning that sounds from OHV traffic on even more distant uplands will be clearly audible on the river.	2.2 10.22
ATVing and driving other OHVs is incompatible with all other forms of outdoor recreation, except possibly snowmobiling, according to the Wisconsin DNR's study of recreational incompatibility.	16.6
Because OHVs are noisy and often violate areas posted off limits, "access" given to OHVs in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest means access taken away from those who desire high-quality non-motorized recreation, such as the experience of paddling the Mississippi's Wild Headwaters.	2.3
According to the latest Minnesota DNR survey, conducted in 2004, more Minnesotans aged 20 and older engage in canoeing and kayaking (485,000 or 14%) than ride ATVs (357,000 or 10%).	16.1
The current plan is, I believe, injurious and unnecessary.	Comment noted
Bergquist, Ruth	
A "closed" classification makes the most sense for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. Some justifications for the "closed" decision are listed below:	6.2
The Mississippi River is probably the most recognized river in our country. The headwaters are especially historically and biologically important, attracting thousands of visitors each year to the Itasca Park that includes the river's headwaters.	Comment noted
Canoeing/kayaking, visiting a remote, quiet area that contains unusual and rare wildlife, rare plants and a "wilderness" experience has been the attraction that would disappear if motorized recreation was allowed or promoted in this area. The "quiet" activities enjoyed by a great majority of people visiting this particular area cannot compatibly exist with motorized recreation. I believe that allowing motorized recreation, which is an activity participated in by a very small percentage of the population, in headwaters areas of this great river would take away quality experiences by all other users.	2.5
Taxpayer dollars are spent employing educated, experienced and competent state employees in the fields of wildlife, ecology, and law enforcement who have studied the issues involved in designating motorized recreational trails/roads. Employees of this type were on the committee considering classification. Their recommendations, based on facts and experience, was that the best classification for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest would be "closed." We need to rely on their expertise and advice. It is not sensible to do otherwise.	14.1
My feeling is that too often decisions are made based on instant gratification and short-term goals. How about considering what the benefits are long-term? Minnesota needs to keep near pristine areas like the Headwaters for future generations to enjoy.	Comment noted

Author/Comment	Response
Bertrand, Linda	
<p>I am writing to you regarding the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest OHV plan. I am an ATV owner and have many family and friends who own ATV's. None of us support the "limited" nor the county's "managed" classification for any of the areas here in northern Minnesota. Our own family has discussed this matter in depth and all five of us would rather give up our privilege to use ATV's on state and county lands than to see what is sure to be a degradation of our forest areas in the coming years. We've all seen plenty of damage already. ATV users will not stay on just the designated trails, even assuming they can understand the different designations all over Beltrami County! As a tax payer in the state of Minnesota I believe it is the state's job, through the DNR, to preserve these forest areas for the upcoming generations; this isn't about rights; it's about privilege. The use of state land by recreationists should be decided by the footprint left behind. User groups who keep the forests intact and undamaged should be allowed to continue their use. Those that damage and destroy or change the integrity of these lands should not be allowed the privilege to continue. We all know that even responsible ATVers leave tracks; tracks become ruts and worse. River and waterways are especially vulnerable and apparently attractive to ATVers without conscience.</p>	<p>6.2 11.5 11.9 12.1</p>
<p>Enforcement is another huge concern. Nowhere is this issue being adequately addressed! We all know the reality is that there will be little chance of violators being caught in these remote areas. Area law enforcement agencies will not be able or willing to answer these calls and DNR officers are few and far between. And that is even assuming someone would be seen committing a violation. Do not enact a law you cannot enforce!</p>	<p>11.1</p>
<p>I did attend your DNR open house/ public input meeting last Thursday at BSU. There were many compelling arguments to close these areas by intelligent, articulate, educated individuals and groups- people that have expended a lot of effort and time to research and look at this issue in depth, maybe more so than the DNR? Why are you recommending this area to be limited considering there have already been ATV usage issues around the river? Why is the DNR using such confusing terms (managed, limited, closed) anyway; is this intentionally to confuse the public? What (or who) are driving these decisions- certainly not science or logic? And why were counties allowed to opt out? What I see ahead is a massive amount of confusion with different rules all over the place and a disgrace for the state of Minnesota.</p>	<p>6.1 4.2 5.1 11.2</p>
<p>We have been down this path before. Beltrami County enacted a no-wake law on the Mississippi riverways for boats and jet skis because of environmental and safety concerns. History has shown that we cannot expect all users to do the right thing- laws are the unfortunate necessity. There are probably lots of well intentioned ATV users out there but there are also many who could care less about the damage they leave behind. That is why you need to close these areas off completely.</p>	<p>11.5</p>
<p>This is my 50th year living in the state of Minnesota; and for the first time I feel distrust and disillusionment with the Department of Natural Resources. As guardian of our forests and lakes and rivers, you must do what is right to preserve them for the generations to come. Do not bend to politics; do the right thing. Close the Mississippi Headwaters areas. I wish I could hope for the same in our Beltrami County parks and the Buena Vista forest area nearby, but our county board has already made a huge mess out of that and have demonstrated that they are not interested in hearing their constituents concerns; another dark story for another audience I'm afraid. At least the DNR has been willing to hear from Minnesotans. You have the chance to make a decision that is right and good for the longevity of our forests- please do so and close the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest!</p>	<p>6.2</p>
Berman, Cathy	
<p>There is no entitlement of OHV owners to degrade the lands shared by us all. They are few in number but the damage their vehicles does is great and tough to undo. Please classify MHSF as closed, rather than just limited to all OHVs. We all know that rules for OHVs are difficult to enforce and temptations to break those rules are great. Please protect the headwaters portion of the Mississippi as a wild area, closed to further OHV damage. Please take the long-term view and protect this area from the damage caused by OHVs.</p>	<p>6.2</p>

Author/Comment	Response
Birnstengel, Bob	
I believe that the proposed plan is recommending entirely too many trails. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest and particularly the first forty miles bordering the Mississippi River should be left in a wilderness state. OHVs should be prohibited.	6.2
This area represents the last remaining wilderness on the infant Mississippi River. Minnesota (and the nation) is already losing its wild and semi-wild lands at an alarming rate. The Forest Service just came out with a study which found that the country is losing about 6,000 acres of open space every day, or four acres per minute. We have a responsibility here in northern Minnesota to slow or even reverse this trend.	4.3
You will recall that when the Mississippi Headwaters Board was originally created a decade ago to counter efforts to list the river as part of the National Wild and Scenic River Program that the MHB designated the headwaters as "wild" with a 1,000 foot river corridor banning OHVs. It was recognized then as it should be now that the headwaters represents a unique opportunity to retain a true wilderness. As you know, this area contains a variety of threatened, endangered, and special concern species. We need to make good on the promise of keeping this area wild.	10.17
We cannot allow ATV damage to continue. We all have seen the terrible damage to the riparian zone brought by these vehicles. Enforcement is near impossible without numerous, full time law enforcement officers on the scene constantly. To believe otherwise is foolish. The only true way to eliminate the damage to our natural resources is to prohibit these vehicles from the state forest altogether.	11.9 11.1
I therefore want to go on record as opposing the MHSF OHV plan as proposed. I would recommend as the alternative that it be scraped and a new plan which designates the area as a wilderness be adopted.	6.2
Blake-Bradley, Niki (1)	
It has come to my attention through a Minnesota Waters newsletter that OHV routes are being planned for the Mississippi River wilderness area. The person submitting the piece to the newsletter stated that "OHVs on roads and trails would run into the Wild Corridor, along and even over the river. The proposed network of OHV routes will destroy or damage the Headwaters' wild character, valuable wildlife habitat, a cultural & historic landscape, and an ancient canoe route."	4.3 15.1 2.9
Even though I have not had the opportunity to view the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest Draft Plan (yet... I plan to pick one up tonight from someone that has a copy), I feel that I must speak out against this intrusion as an avid canoeist, bird and wildlife watcher, and naturalist. In my career, I have had the opportunity to learn about the rules regarding Wild and Scenic areas. This plan would seem to flout those rules (especially if the trails cross the river or run in sensitive areas). As a biologist, I feel I have a "better than normal" understanding of ecosystems and the dangers they face through impacts.	10.12
The person submitting the piece to the newsletter also stated that "The river here is remote, narrow, and quiet. It is home to wolf packs, pine marten, fisher, black bear, river otter, mink, bald eagles, and the occasional cougar." These species often need large, natural tracts of land with little to no human "interaction". I can guarantee that the sounds of OHVs would be an impact for these creatures. In my opinion the corridor should be closed completely to OHVs and preserved in as natural state as possible. Please consider severely limiting the routes and maintaining the peace and serenity that typifies the region currently. Once I have had a chance to view the plan, I may be in contact again.	12.6
Blake-Bradley, Niki (2)	
It is my understanding that key DNR representatives on the work team (one DNR Ecological Resources person, one from Fisheries and Wildlife, and the <i>Off-Highway Vehicles [OHV] Recreation Officer from Park Rapids</i>) recommended that the MHSF be closed to all OHVs. This is/was due to concerns regarding the erosion potential of sandy soils and steep slopes naturally occurring in the area and impacts to the diversity of local flora and fauna. When a majority of participants in the planning process oppose opening an area to impacts which potentially may never be recovered from (especially one who knows OHVs intimately due to his/her job), I feel I must ask how it has come to pass that the area is still being listed as "limited". These people are experts in their respective fields, yet it appears that their knowledge and professional insight is	14.1

Author/Comment	Response
being over-looked for special interest groups.	
Due to the erosive potential of ATVs, dirt bikes, and 4-wheel vehicles (I'm excluding snowmobiles due to their movement during periods of no vegetative growth and frozen ground conditions, hopefully covered by a protective snow layer), significant erosion has already been caused in and near the river. This means that the 1,000 foot buffer zone along the river has been illegally breached and the area has already been compromised. Extreme damage from OHV use has already been observed at numerous locations. We can expect that it will only get worse if the area is kept open. Why would the MnDNR reward illegal behavior by condoning it (making it legal)? Doesn't this send the wrong message? If illegal behavior has already been documented, can we expect that those people who have no regard for the law will even stick to designated trails?	11.9 10.8
Compacted soils do not recover quickly, if ever, from impacts (at least, not without assistance). History has shown this to be true... you can still see ruts from the Oxcart Trail near St. Cloud if you know where to look. The costs associated with recovering damaged areas within the MHSF could be HUGE. Due to the impacts that have already occurred, I think it's safe to say that the DNR has not been able to enforce the current rules and regulations under "limited" designation; despite valiant efforts, the DNR Conservation Officers simply cannot be everywhere at once. Closing the MHSF will assist the (already heavily burdened) Conservation Officers in their enforcement efforts. It will also send a clear message that areas which have been previously designated for protection <i>truly deserve it</i> . I recommend that the Legislative funding which is allocated from gas tax dollars for Motorized Recreation be dedicated to restoration efforts as well... and perhaps re-assessed to determine how much funding the DNR needs to properly protect sensitive natural areas such as the MHSF.	11.9 11.4
The Upper Mississippi River, wild and scenic areas, are critical not only for wildlife and sensitive plant life, but also for water quality. Studies conducted by the Aquatic Toxicology Lab at St. Cloud State University have shown that this region retains a relatively "pristine" condition regarding the man-made chemicals which enter the water from various sources. The undeveloped area within the MHSF may actually contain the most pristine stretch of the entire Mississippi River. The City of St. Cloud, as well as numerous other communities, relies upon the Mississippi River for drinking water. Chemicals from gas, oil, antifreeze, etc. make water unsafe for drinking in <i>small</i> quantities. As you may know, drinking water is not treated for these chemicals but rather the biological constituents which can make people sick. Please keep OHVs out of the river's 1,000 foot protective corridor and help preserve the River's water quality for us as well as wildlife. The health of my family and friends depends upon it!	12.7
It is also my understanding that a "closed" forest doesn't mean that ATVs would be banned entirely, but that they would be able to continue to ride in the county road ditches and on township roads. Due to the extreme potential for OHVs to transport non-native invasive species to previously un-infested areas (and the costs associated with eradication or continual control), I feel that "ditch riding" should be discontinued. I have witnessed many wetlands which have been severely impacted by ATVs traversing through them (and not necessarily sticking to just one trail). Healthy wetlands (and ecosystems) can generally protect themselves from invasion. Non-native invasive species get their foothold in areas that have been impacted or stressed, and OHVs provide the "perfect" vector (yes, I feel invasive species act like a disease). Now, this is not to say that I feel that ATVs and other OHVs should never be allowed to operate. I feel that there is a time and place for every recreational activity. The MHSF is just not the place for OHVs... at least not on a continual basis.	3.8 12.5
Experts in the field of ecology, wildlife, and fisheries should be locating acceptable areas for trails (for all users, not just motorized groups), not only in the MHSF but in all public areas. At the very least, Environmental Assessment Worksheets (EAWs) should be prepared for trails proposed by user groups to ensure vital natural resources are continuing to be protected. I also support trail closure to maintain them, allow them to "recover", or just to keep things "fresh" for users. A complaint I often hear from ATV riders that I know is that "it gets boring going over the same trail every time". Perhaps it wouldn't be as boring if they were riding different trails every year or every other year. With the	14.5 7.1
It is obvious to me that the MnDNR has spent a considerable amount of time and energy to put	2.1

Author/Comment	Response
<p>together the MHSF Draft Plan. As a person who enjoys canoeing, hiking, backpacking, biking, bird-watching, photography, and simply being in wilderness areas where “sounds of man” are non-motorized activities, I sincerely hope that more effort is being made on behalf of non-motorized recreational trail establishment as well. It disturbed me to see that in 2002 only 424 miles of biking trails (non-motorized) had been established as compared with 18,941 miles for snowmobile and 953 miles for OHVs (from the Program Evaluation Report for State-Funded Trails for Motorized Recreation, by the Office of the Legislative Auditor, Table 1.4, Page 11). Many of the trails for hiking and cross-country skiing (as well as horseback riding) overlap, making the trail mileage listing potentially skewed. While I appreciate the potential for mixed use trails, I feel the table was not entirely accurate and appears to show more trails for non-motorized use than there actually are. It would certainly have been acceptable to show “mixed use, non-motorized trails” and/or trail mileages for those trails which are specifically designated for each activity alone (without sharing space). I also feel I must point out the lack of trail systems which encourage and foster good land stewardship. I want to note that I realize the data is dated, but it certainly points out the disparity between recreational groups’ “assets” and should be addressed.</p>	
<p>Thank you, for your consideration of my comments, requests, and recommendations regarding the MHSF Draft Plan. I appreciate the opportunity to comment and sincerely hope that non-motorized recreational groups are recognized as an integral part of the Minnesota “community”. When we use an area, you may not realize we’ve ever been there... but rest assured, we spend money on our recreational pursuits too! Limited impact can be a way of life... and should be pursued in the MHSF. Thanks again for the work you do to preserve natural resources in our beautiful State!</p>	2.11
<p>Blakesley, Douglas</p>	
<p>I am writing to you to share my strong opinion that the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest be CLOSED to motorized use. Although, I feel strongly that it is necessary to protect the area for wildlife and nature conservation/preservation reasons, of which I am sure you know inside and out by now, I am more compelled to argue that this location is simply wrong for motorized recreation. The DNR has an obligation to make wise and educated decisions regarding Minnesota's natural resources. This location should remain closed to motorized use quite simply because it CANNOT SUPPORT the activity. Erosion and degradation of the site is inevitable; the sandy nature of the soil does not support motorized activity. There are many responsible riders, but unfortunately there are just enough bad apples among them. Until measures can be taken to regulate and monitor motorized use the river corridor would most definitely be destroyed. Please as a steward to Minnesota's resources, recognize that this location is wrong for the activity.</p>	6.2
<p>Blau, Jim</p>	
<p>I am writing to comment on the plan for all terrain vehicle [ATV] use on the headwaters of the Mississippi River. A natural treasure needs priority management. This is a request to the DNR to support strong protection for our public land.</p>	Comment noted
<p>I strongly support the closing of skid trails and old logging roads to off-highway vehicles. The DNR's ecological, fish & wildlife departments , including enforcement staff opposed designating these off-road routes. The proposed network of routes will destroy or damage the headwaters pristine character, natural habitat and regionally historic landscape including an ancient canoe route.</p>	14.1 15.1 2.9
<p>Should the state allow for ATV use on skid trails and old logging roads only the land will suffer by the hands of those unmanaged and destructive riders. No precedence, nor the ATV community has had any effect in controlling destructive ATV use. What other entity can pressure the unlawful actions of those who chose to destroy our headwaters but to keep ATV's from that eventual malaise.</p>	11.5
<p>Citizens have sited more examples with pictures and first hand accounts of misused public lands by ATV's than any government body. This is one option within the hands of State government that could do more than many small provisions with a undersized staff of enforcement.</p>	6.2
<p>Bogen, Iver</p>	
<p>I'm sorry, but I find the opening of this pristine area of the headwaters depressing. Who can we trust anymore to maintain the natural world for us citizens and our progeny. It seems as if we citizens take a back seat to corporations and pressure groups such as the motorized vehicles that</p>	6.2

Author/Comment	Response
intrude and ruin our environment.	
Bogolub, Larry	
I have found memories of starting a canoe trip at the headwaters of the Mississippi River in the 1970s. The water was clear, and the banks were pristine. The campsites (coffee pot landing) were clean and quiet on our five day trip.	Comment noted
I hope to take my wife and two boys on the same trip in the future. But I am concerned the environment will be tarnished by letting ATVs into this precious environment. This is a NATIONAL RIVER. ATVS MUST BE KEPT OUT!	6.2
Borkenhagen, Chip	
I'm writing to request your serious reconsideration of the proposed OHV trails running through the Mississippi Headwaters. It's hardly believable that this is being considered in the first place. I believe that if you do the research, more Minnesotans will tell you they are opposed to giving away our precious resources to the packs of destructionists many of these riders tend to be.	6.2
Bower, John	
Please do not allow motorized vehicles in the Mississippi headwaters. If I ever get a chance to visit the area I don't want to see it impacted by these vehicles. There are better places for them.	6.2
Boyer, Matt	
<p>Hello, I'm just writing a short note in regards to the closing of trails in Beltrami County around the Mississippi river.</p> <p>I believe that there will be a great injustice done if these trails are allowed to be closed. I've been to some of the informational meetings and have listened to both sides of the argument. It just seems to me that we could be spending a lot less money on enforcement of laws that we already have instead of closing trails and spending money on gates and barricades. I'm confused as to whom we are saving these forests for? Apparently the elderly and handicapped aren't suppose to ever enjoy any of natures beauty!!</p> <p>In conclusion I would just like to ask that we keep our trails open for EVERYONE!!</p>	6.1
Branch, Marty	
Please allow limited designation on the Forest Roads and Designated Trails in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.	6.1
Braud, Jim & Kathy	
<p>"This is a National River. Keep ATVs OUT!! Keep the Headwaters Wild!!"</p> <p>I know we are looking for ways to encourage tourists to do more activities in Minnesota but We have to be very careful about the choices we make in this matter.</p> <p>Chose another park to feature with these networks, not Itasca State Park.</p> <p>Like the Boundary Waters, The Mississippi Headwaters is a recreational gem - a designated canoe route offering silence, remoteness, and solitude. Wildness is important.</p> <p>Like "the Freedom to Breathe Act", some places need wildness for the masses.</p> <p>The proposed network of OHV routes will destroy or damage the Headwaters' wild character, the valuable wildlife habitat, a cultural & historic landscape, and an ancient canoe route. This is a one time chance. If we screw it up, the park will never be the same. I personally would be very offended to hear the sounds coming from an ATV trail as I am camping at that park.</p> <p>Just adding another thought also, only a few inconsiderate individuals, in a blink of an eye, could damage what took decades of care to flourish there. (Note the trails along the highways and byways with the cutting up the approaches and the ravines with soil erosion.) So be careful to limit the possibilities of where you allow ATV's.</p>	20.1

Author/Comment	Response
<p>I have relatives that go on ATV vacations. They can go elsewhere for that future vacation then Itasca State Park with ATV's.</p> <p>A planned entry to whatever the park from the camp site makes it sooooo easy to run around at all hours of the day and night.</p> <p>This upcoming particular Mississippi Headwaters decision for Itasca could be likened to the State of Minnesota, a few years ago, selling to public companies the birth and death records for all current residents of the state, 1900 up to the year 2002, and marriage records too ... For approximately 5 cents per name.</p> <p>That privacy genie is now out of the bottle and can not be put back in again.</p> <p>Scammers and identity theft is rampant in our current world. The State of Minnesota has just provided the identification information needed for identity verification to scam someone just born. Where was the foresight of our elected officials?</p> <p>Once the ATV' routes are "Out of the Bottle" there in Itasca State Park, we will never be able to bring back what we currently have.. A very special gem of a place.</p> <p>I encourage you to remember my thoughts on this -</p>	
Braun, Lois	
<p>I am contacting you to oppose the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest (MHSF) Draft Plan to allow off-highway vehicles in the MHSF. Off-highway vehicles are in total conflict with the value of wilderness. The damage they do to trails contributes to erosion, and the noise and air pollution they produce endanger wildlife, not to mention diminishing the serenity of the nature experience for others.</p>	2.3
<p>I myself have had visits to Itasca State Park and other State Parks in Minnesota marred by encounters with OHV and snowmobiles. If riders of these vehicles really wanted to appreciate nature they would get off their gas guzzlers and walk, bike, canoe or ski. There is plenty of land that has already been spoiled by their activities for them to go to.</p>	Comment noted
<p>MHSF's Wild Corridor is a gem, not just for our state but for our nation. Let's keep it so. Thank you for including these comments on the MHSF Draft Plan.</p>	6.2
Bridges, Craig	
<p>I would like to see the Mississippi Headwaters kept in the OPEN classification due to the ever increasing atv registration.I am a Hunter.Fisherman and Atv'r.I belong to the North Metro Trail Riders club out of Coon Rapids,MN.</p>	6.1
Brinkman, Randy	
<p>I fully support a designation to allow ATV's on forest roads, minimum maintenance roads and designated trails. I want the DNR to keep ATV access to forest roads and designated trails. The forest should not be closed.</p>	6.1
Brumfield, Richard	
<p>Please use your influence to prevent the use of ATVs in the Mississippi Headwaters. This is a National River and needs to be kept wild.</p>	4.3 6.2
Bullis, Robert	
<p>It is great frustration that I have read that your department has chosen to ignore the input from the paid professionals who work on the best practice for placing ATV trails. The inclusion of ATV trails in Headwaters State Forest is one of the most ill advised moves yet to come from St. Paul. Once again your true colors are showing. You have shown no regard for any input that does not advance the propagation of more ATV trails. The fact that at this time there are no legal trails in Headwaters and the camp sites are destroyed and river beds torn up only proves that the individuals that ride these machines have no regard for the environment. I also do not need to be harassed by the constant roar of these machines when I am trying enjoy a peaceful outdoor experience. I pay for a license for my canoe and your department does next to nothing to improve</p>	4.3 11.9 2.2

Author/Comment	Response
my canoeing experience. Portages in disrepair and camp sites over grown. Maybe if Artic Cat or Polaris sold canoe's you would show some interest. My only hope is that someone is able to fine out who is getting paid off so they can be exposed for the frauds that they are.	
Bunkers, Eric	
I support having ATV trails in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest area. My family would be able to enjoy this area in a different way, while still having more than enough opportunities for solitude via walking trail access, etc.	6.1
Buscho, Arden E.	
I'm opposed to the CLOSED designation being proposed by some groups pertaining to the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. To expect and legislate guidelines for proper usage is one thing; to arbitrarily shut out a whole group, of for the most part, responsible people who only want to enjoy the natural surroundings is quite another. Some of these opposition groups fail to realize that there also some irresponsible people among them as well.	6.1
Cann, Matt	
<p>I think most people of common sense would agree with the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nobody needs to drive their ATV's down or across the Mississippi unless it's frozen over. 2. People need to stay on the trails with their ATV's. 3. The DNR should have the authority to temporary shut down trails, or portions of trails when spring thaw or other conditions arise that will compromise the trail's integrity. 4. It makes good sense to designate weight restrictions on some trails. 5. There should be designated trails where no ATV's are allowed. 6. ATV's should be limited to an acceptable DB noise level. 7. That it is a good idea to add annual trail fee stickers to maintain, improve, and expand the trail systems. 8. That well constructed and fair laws need to be enforced. 9. That those who break these laws need to be dealt with and fined to pay for the trail repair and their labor to fix it. 	Comment noted
So how is it that people from special interest groups can converge on Bemidji and try to dictate the use of our trails?	14.6
Are these people really in our woods during the summer months enjoying the deer flies, horse flies, mosquitoes and woof ticks? In fact, I have not met too many people in the woods that didn't get there by riding an ATV or in some other vehicle.	Comment noted
People from the Twin Cities come up here to ride because a select few ruined it for them down there. This pumps revenue into Beltrami County's economy and maintains local jobs.	14.10
<p>The trees in this area have been logged off at least twice in the last century. The ground has been furrowed up to grow more trees that are meant to harvest again in the future. Much of this forest has recently been clear cut and re-planted. The equipment used for this type of farming moves much more dirt than any tire of an ATV. Roads and trails are required to farm trees and to maintain our ability to contain fires. All of this is plays a role in the health of our local economy.</p> <p>Are these people that want to shut these trails down to let the forest grow willing to quit using paper? Or do they believe that paper just comes from the store? Are they willing to live in a mud hut? Or do they believe that lumber comes from the lumberyard?</p> <p>I believe that some of the people who want to save "Mother Earth" have good intentions. Some of them were simply born 200 years too late for their proposed way of life. Some can't even be expected to have a clue.</p>	Comment noted
My biggest disappointment lies with the majority of us. Our complacency in not attending meetings like the one held at the collage last week could cost many of us some of our present freedoms. We do not need a loud few making the rules and laws for the majority of us. We all need to start attending these meetings if we're going to have any say about the land use of the area of which we live in. And shame on us if these trails are closed down by these special interest groups.	Comment noted
This all seemed to start when someone left ATV tire marks into the river banks somewhere in the	11.9

Author/Comment	Response
Mississippi head waters. That was an irresponsible and illegal act. This spark ignited a wild fire that has turned this land use issue into a complete circus act. It's because of this that I am disappointed in how the DNR handled this issue and how they appear to have rolled over to those special interest groups for a good beating. As an avid outdoors person and ATV rider, I felt that all my hunting and fishing license fees and the tax dollars that I contribute to finance the DNR to enforce the existing laws failed to get the job done. It's sportsman like me that pay their wage and finance many of the forest enhancement and wildlife programs. Not these special interest groups with their headquarters in California or some other big city.	
Let this unfortunate circumstance wake us all up that live in the Bemidji area. We all need to be better Stewarts of the land in our area and turn in those that vandalize and deface it. It is unfortunate that a few have caused such havoc for the rest of us to deal with.	Comment noted
On the other hand, I did review the DNR's trail plan for this area and thought that it was well constructed and fair to all users as it originally was prior to the meeting. Anything short of that would be an unfortunate loss to those who really use and enjoy this forest.	6.1
Cannon, John	
1. The MHSF should be classified as "closed" not "limited." 2. The headwaters portion of the Mississippi River is a national resource that should be protected for its wild qualities, not opened to further OHV damage. 3. The DNR, counties, and U.S. Forest Service are providing thousands of miles of OHV trails in Minnesota; closing the relatively small MHSF to OHVs will not impinge on OHV driving in all these other places.	6.2 4.3 16.8
Cardinal, Ken & Mary Kaye	
We are opposed to allowing ATV into this area. I own an ATV and feel there are many trails and areas that should/could be used for recreation without going into this area. There will always be a few that take advantage of the area and would ruin it for everyone else.	6.2 11.5
Carlson, Greg	
I am writing to express my opposition to the State Forest Plan allowing off road vehicles use of the Mississippi Headwaters area. Many persons, including myself, have worked hard to preserve our natural environment from deterioration and the use of off road vehicles causes erosion and leads to degradation of the River and the water quality in this area. Unfortunately the majority of operators of these vehicles pay little attention to trails and the regulations that prevent the damage the vehicles cause and the only successful prevention is to bar their use from such sensitive areas. One only needs to look at the damage caused to road ditches and other areas your department touts as necessary habitat for wildlife. The advertising of such vehicles by the manufacturers further encourages the abusive type of use that causes the damage to our natural areas that your department is to protect.	11.5
I urge you and the committee to revise the Plan to eliminate the use of off road vehicles from the Headwaters State Forest and all other State Forests and natural areas.	6.2
Carter, Clark	
Please do what you can to keep reasonable access for ATVs & other off-highway vehicles. I live in Wisconsin & like to ride a trail bike, but due to pointless government regulations here (you have to have at least 3 wheels to use a lot of the trails) I frequently ride in Minnesota. We buy supplies, motel rooms, restaurants, and gasoline, thereby helping the local economy.	6.1
In my opinion, we help the local economy much more than those who take day trips to hike and observe wildlife. But we are not asking that there be no place for those people, even though they are largely rich enough to buy their own land. We only ask for reasonable access in some areas.	14.10
Casson, John	
In follow-up to the Bemidji Public Meeting, it appears that little consideration, and for that matter little public sentiment, concerns wildlife habitat needs. Minnesota has a unique and nationally significant wildlife heritage, supported in great part by our public lands. We are increasingly losing this valuable heritage through indifference, neglect, disrespect and human pressures. It is the responsibility of our public officials to see that this erosion does not occur, and that our wildlife heritage is professionally managed and protected for all of the citizens and future generations. To this end, it is increasingly important that public access be managed with wildlife habitat needs as a	21.1

Author/Comment	Response
priority.	
Wildlife needs space. Its not very complicated. Public access does not need to be eliminated, but it needs to be managed and controlled to provide space. This is becoming more and more difficult as human demographics and recreational patterns change. It is not enough for public officials to react, they must be proactive. A standard measure of space and human impacts on wildlife is road and trail density. A density of 1 mile per square mile or less is typically considered to have no measurable impact on wildlife communities. This has been found to apply to many different species including many herbivores, carnivores, etc. However, impacts increase exponentially as densities increase. This is not to imply that all public lands should have road and trail densities below 1, but areas need to be managed, large enough and geographically located strategically to provide the space required for the wildlife communities Minnesota has always had.	21.2
The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a no-brainer for providing the required space for our wildlife. Its location, size, corridor features, not to mention its cultural and social values makes it a logical place to provide required wildlife space. If not here, where? The proposed road and trail plan results in a density of approximately 3.3 miles per square mile. This puts the MHSF in a category of severely abused and degraded wildlife habitat. Clearly, the goal for this area should be to support our wildlife communities, not to cause their decline. While a closed classification would probably not meet the 1 mile per square mile criterion, it would be a reasonable effort and one we, as citizens, expect from our public officials. Your efforts to satisfy everyone by cutting the baby in half serves no one. ATV opportunities are everywhere. They need not, and should not be here. Managing natural resources is a tough job and it will only get worse. Start doing your job and stop pandering to short-term selfish desires of special interest groups. Classify the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as Closed and insist the Counties do the same.	21.3
Chadwick, Amy	
I was bitterly disappointed to learn that the Minnesota DNR is proposing to designate ORV routes in the State forest in the Mississippi Headwaters area. I have used environmental information generated by MDNR before in my work and always viewed the agency to have sound environmental priorities, but it appears in this case the influence of powerful ORV user groups have trumped the opinions of your ecological resource management personnel. I believe ORVs should have their areas to recreate, but in your forests, as in the headwaters of the Mississippi here in Montana, the opportunities for motorized use are already common, and the opportunities for quiet recreation without disturbance from motorized vehicles are increasingly scarce. We all value the Mississippi River and the wildlife that is dependent on the remaining few sanctuaries from motorized use.	4.3 14.1 12.6
Please do not sacrifice these valuable resources for the enjoyment of a vocal minority. Please reconsider your recommendation to expand ORV use in the forest. Prevention is much, much less expensive than restoration, and once these gems are degraded, they are never quite the same.	6.2
Champlin, Charlie	
I just read in The Confluence, the newsletter of Minnesota Waters, of plans to establish OHV routes in the wild corridor along and over the river. This concerns me greatly as I feel it is the best interests of our state to maintain this wild habitat for as long as possible. I know I speak for many members of the Beltrami County Lakes and Rivers Association.	4.3 10.1 6.2
Cherwin, Bill	
I would prefer to see more State and National Forests accessible to ATVs and snowmobiles. There is plenty of "Wilderness Lands" now that are closed to motorized vehicles. ATVs and snowmobiles should be allowed access to existing and future trails and roads in any new designated lands in Minnesota.	6.1
Christofferson, Karen	
The Board of Directors of the League of Women Voters of the Brainerd Lakes Area at its December 18, 2007 meeting voted to send a letter in opposition to the proposed year-round ATV use in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. This action is in support of one of the major League principles - "The League of Women Voters believes that responsible government should be responsive to the will of the people...and should promote the conservation and development of natural resources in the public interest."	Comment noted

Author/Comment	Response
The DNR draft plan includes a trail and bridge across the Mississippi River at Coffee Pot Landing. This landing is a favorite spot for campers who are navigating the headwaters by canoe. The ATV use would eliminate this passive camping.	10.1
Much of the soil in the forest is sandy and fragile. The natural wildlife habitat, including protected species such as trumpeter swans, will be disturbed and possibly destroyed. These conditions were identified by three of the five DNR work team members who spoke against this proposal.	15.1
There are already hundreds of miles of suitable ATV trails nearby. There is no need to open this fragile land to ATV use. Please add this letter of opposition to the proposed plan to the written comments at the public hearing on January 16, 2008 in Bemidji, Minnesota.	9.1
Cichon, Mike	
I just finished reading an article about the proposed "limited" use of the State forest land south of US Hwy 2. I'm an avid ATVer with my whole family involved as well. We travel all over looking for places to stay and explore. I would be very disappointed if these areas were closed to OHV. I'm not much of a writer and I'm sure you have many more e-mails to read so I'll keep this short. I do back the "limited" use that has been proposed. Keeping places open for families that is always looking for areas like the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. So we can be together enjoying what they love to do. I know this probably does not mean much coming from a Wisconsin resident. I'm just tired of reading about the closure of available areas because a few want to have it their way. Thanks for giving me the time to let you know how a regular guy with a family would like the land used.	6.1
Cierna, Suzannah	
The headwaters and forests of the Mississippi are under your jurisdiction to protect and preserve. Do not cave to pressure from OHV drivers to drop restrictions to access. Please follow the recommendations of the MHSF Board to restrict OHV activity in these natural places of beauty and historic importance. The 1000 foot buffer zone is especially critical. Dropping restrictions will increase the amount of habitat destruction, water pollution, and soil erosion caused by OHVs. These outcomes are not compatible with the DNR's responsibilities. I urge you to show leadership in protecting a national treasure: the Mississippi headwaters and forest lands.	10.3
Connell, Chuck	
It seems like the DNR has once again spent endless hours figuring out a way to appease the ATV industry. If you really want to make an ATV park, make it at 500 Lafayette because after the ATV riders destroy the Mississippi we certainly won't be needing the DNR to "protect" our valuable resources. With every park you create for the OHV users, someone has to abuse the privilege and ruin something nearby... Let the ATV industry buy the land and make their own park they could even put up signs and keep us "walkers" out.... they could patrol it and maintain it.. Put in mud pits, hills to fly over all the things they want to have a great time riding BUT NOT IN THE HEADWATERS.... creekings have never improved the quality of a stream.	8.5
Cotant, Harold	
Last night you had a public meeting in Bemidji, and I was unable to get to, so I wish to at this time let you know that we need to keep ATVs out of this area due to their undesirable footprints. We do not have the required enforcement to keep them to obey the rules so we just need to keep them out of this Wild River Area.... My experience with working on the North Country Trail across the Paul Bunyan Forest and being on the Mississippi Headwaters Board advisory committee, I can walk you to a lot of places that we can not bring back to their natural state because of the ATV damage. All in all, let's just say that public lands are for the public and not for machine monsters.	Comment noted 6.2 11.1
Cousins, Woodie, Kim, Matt & Sam	
Like many people in northern Minnesota I make my living in the recreational vehicle industry, but I want to respond as a responsible citizen and someone who enjoys riding ATVs. My wife and I enjoy the outdoors, but as a Viet Nam Veteran I am not able to hike or ride bicycles like I once did years ago. My family has 4 ATVs and several times a year our grown sons still ride with us. It has been a favorite family activity since the 70s when Suzuki started selling 4 wheel ATVs. Each ATV is licensed and kept in top condition. We have several friends who also enjoy riding. Some are physically limited and could not enjoy the outdoors without the freedom that ATVs offer. If the people who want land use limited, took the time to spend a fall day riding ATVs with friends, and	Comment noted 6.1

Author/Comment	Response
<p>stopped along the trail to share some lunch while enjoying the scenery and companionship of people who love the outdoors, many of the critics would become advocates of ATVs. I hear that somewhere out there exists irresponsible people who abuse public lands, but in the 12 years I have lived in Minnesota, I haven't met them. The people I meet usually friendly and courteous and many belong to clubs that set rules for membership that involves minimum impact on land. I think that the people who ride ATVs on public land care as much about the preservation of nature as the environmentalists who would complain. My family often carries more trash out of the woods and off the trails than we brought in, and I don't think that my family is the exception. We have public land for people to use, and it is the right of everyone to use it in a responsible way. We all pay taxes that supports both the public land and the DNR to preserve the land. Surely we can find ways of enjoying it together. I would challenge anyone to stop any ATV group or single rider and ask for help or directions and get turned away. I don't think it would happen. Please don't prevent ATV use in the headwaters area.</p>	
<p>Crandell, Eugene & Deb</p>	
<p>Keep the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest Wild! Don't allow the snowmobiles to destroy our headwaters!!!!!!!</p>	18.1
<p>Crocker, Kyle</p>	
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Plan and Proposed Classification for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. Residing on the eastern edge of the MHSF for 15 years, I am intimately familiar with the area, having traversed most of its extent by ski, canoe and foot. Likewise, I have been closely involved with the classification process since its inception. While I respect the efforts of the Planning Team, as I said at the Bemidji public meeting January 16, I think the Plan is fundamentally flawed.</p>	Comment noted
<p>In spite of the participation of DNR staff specialists, the proposal is distinctly <u>not</u> a natural resource/trail management plan. Such a plan would have to be built on sound environmental data analyses and science-based standards and best practices (e.g. the USGS report: <i>Environmental Effects of Off-Highway Vehicles on BLM Lands</i>, 2007). The current draft proposal makes vague token gestures towards such bases. Yet at its core it is simply a <u>political</u> management plan. Any efforts on the part of DNR scientific staff to produce a science-based, resource-responsible plan have been irreparably distorted by an ideological policy, untenable by any rational standard, promoted by a few Beltrami County officials (re: Beltrami Resolution #07-03-11). Legitimate compromises and meaningful cooperation between DNR and county planners have been made impossible by this politically biased, highly controversial policy. The many inadequacies, misrepresentations, inconsistencies, and simple errors in the specific aspects of the Draft Plan all devolve from this corrupted approach.</p>	12.1 5.6 5.1
<p>There are many tragic implications of the Draft Plan for both the long-term viability of this unique natural (and cultural) resource, and its low-impact utilization by the scientific community (including Bemidji State University) and non-motorized recreational users. Most of these negative factors have been brought to your attention through the planning process. Details of the Plan are demonstrably <u>unenforceable</u>. Costs of mandated mitigation, not even estimated in your document, could escalate astronomically. Many designated routes and boundaries are in violation of existing Minnesota law and ordinance (e.g. the 1000' setbacks from OHWM required by Mississippi Headwaters Board regulations). And from personal experience, I among many can attest that uncontrolled OHV use will drive away traditional non-motorized users, even in the heart of winter, and not simply because of disturbed tranquility, but out of fear for our physical safety. The Plan does <u>nothing</u> to protect our civil rights</p>	Comment noted 11.1 10.12
<p>These and still more unacceptable implications that litter the whole of the proposal could be detailed at length. They undoubtedly are by others submitting comments at this time. At your request, however, I will focus the remainder of my observations on examples of basic errors of route designation in that portion of the MHSF proposed 'Area of Limitations' and lying mainly in SW Beltrami County. In itself it is a nonsensical notion to fill an 'Area of Limitations' with myriad unsigned OHV 'access routes,' all of which lead only to wetlands and river bluffs. <u>None</u> of these inventoried routes or 'trails' was designed of OHV use; they are remnants of (long) past logging</p>	Comment noted

Author/Comment	Response
practices. Nor can any of these beyond the Forest Road itself (Inv. Nos. 3774-3792-3801) be sustainably maintained for OHV traffic. Her are a few of the most conspicuous examples:	
Inv. #3797 for most of its extent can be characterized as a severely eroded gully, 2' or more below natural grade, running perpendicular to a slope with about a 30 ^o gradient. No science-based criteria would allow motorized use on it. Even if immediately blocked, it will take many years and thousands of dollars to mend.	22.2
Inv. #3834 is severely rutted in many places, with extended holes up to 1½' in depth, with extensive areas of washed sand. The river bluff where it terminates suffers from very serious erosion, with downed trees and collapsing soil. This 'access route' is also highly comparable in topographic and other environmental features to Inv. #1331 which is Non-designated. The only distinction between the two trails is that the latter lies in Hubbard County. Is this consistency compliant to any standard?	22.3
Inv. #3756 lies in an area in the NE section of the proposed 'Area with Limitations' with many anomalies, the chief of which is no legal public access to any of the unsigned 'access routes.' Doesn't this invite illegal OHV behavior? Inv. #3756 itself is a very old 'corridor of past disruption' impassable to even foot travel until three years ago when a local man cleared it with heavy equipment. Lying across classified wetland, it simply terminates in the riparian marsh of Grant Creek.	22.4
The present closure separating Inv. #3879 ('Access Route') from Inv. #3511 is a good example of how such 'Proactive Closures' will be established. As of 30 Dec '07 this 'closure' consists of an 8' sawhorse in the middle of 30' clearing, without any signage whatsoever. In effect, Beltrami County efforts to curtail OHV damage in the 'Area of Limitations' are a meaningless charade.	22.5
I will continue this review with a necessary caveat: the mapping of inventoried trails in the published proposed is often so poor that one route cannot be easily distinguished from another; the citations below may not be entirely accurate. As a scholar who uses GIS and other mapping professionally, I find this very disturbing.	Comment noted
Inv. #3803 runs a relatively short distance down a very steep grade to terminate in a bog and small lake, connecting with the main river marsh.	22.6
Inv. #3879 is badly eroded at its beginning, has section of serious rutting, and ends on the bank of a small lake.	22.7
Inv. #3790 (or its northern spur) runs down a steepening grade and terminates in a tamarack bog.	22.8
Inv. #3674 crosses a steep ravine with a seasonal watercourse at its bottom.	22.9
This review could be continued to include nearly all the inventoried routes in this area of the MHSF allegedly protected in the Plan. Yet the DNR no doubt has this data and has been forced to ignore it by political pressures. This characterizes the whole of the Draft Plan; it is an irresponsible betrayal of DNR's statutory obligation to protect public natural resources.	22.10
Again, I deeply regret that I have come to this inescapable conclusion. On the basis of all the legitimate evidence, the only way to properly protect the unique resource represented in the MHSF is through a 'Closed' classification and robust enforcement efforts.	6.2
Crosby, Stewart	
The Mississippi Headwaters is a recreational gem - a designated canoe route offering silence, remoteness, and solitude. The river here is narrow and it is home to wolf packs, pine marten, fisher, black bear, river otter, mink, bald eagles, and the occasional cougar.	10.14
We need to protect this wonderful place and keep it safe from ATV use. They have proven to be destructive in our other forests and this is one place that we really cannot afford to destroy. There are so few places left for quiet recreation. Please note my concern for the protection of this natural gem. I understand the need for all types of recreation and I understand that ATVs need a place to be driven, but I feel strongly that this IS NOT that place.	2.3
Please, keep this section of the Mississippi River, our nation's longest river, a natural and wild place for all Minnesotans to enjoy.	2.9
Dalen, Dean	
As a Minnesotan who enjoys motorized outdoor recreation in our State Forests, please keep the	6.1

Author/Comment	Response
Mississippi Headwaters State Forest open to motorized access. There are a lot of well- established forest roads and trails that currently exist and I'd like to see them remain available for motorized us. As a responsible ATV enthusiast, I understand the need to protect our public lands. I also believe they need to be available to all.	
Dan & Leany (1)	
I just wanted to comment on the plan. I realize the pressures you are under by the greens, but I hate to see the area closed off. Yes some wet areas should be blocked off or a load of gravel placed in a low area. But I hate to see our access closed for the 2 or 3 times we get to go on a ride there a year. The forests are always in a constant state of change nomatter what the folks that think they can preserve it forever think.	6.1
Dan & Leany (2)	
I do NOT understand why forests we have protected these many years from development, must now be opened to approved destruction by off road vehicles, and vehicles that have off-road capabilities.	4.3
Also, when will the money-stressed DNR get wise and lobby for legislation that assures that unless a forest or trail is MARKED OPEN people who enter or traverse these lands without the MARKED "open" sign will be fined or prosecuted. Assuming a closed sign will remain is ridiculous. I thought the state DNR was cataloging and assessing lands that might be sacrificed to this often destructive "sport". The only wasy to ensure cooperation for the "cowboys" and "takers" involved is to make sure they can only go on trails that are MARKED OPEN! Then if the sign is missing they can't plead innocence and the DNR and other enforcement officials don't have to wonder either.	4.4
Please do this. There are so many important issues--we shouldn't have to keep coming back to this one when there is such a simple remedy.	6.1
In fact the signs that say OPEN should apply statewide for all motorized vehicle.	Comment noted
Davis, Joshua	
This is about the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest Plan. I visit that area yearly, and the one thing I expect to find more than anything else, whether i'm hiking, canoeing, or camping, is quiet. The DNR needs to do a good job of keeping ATVs out of earshot of other visitors, and that means at least two miles from campgrounds, hiking trails, and canoe routes. Especially in the Headwaters region--this is a special place, and OHV noise and erosion will ruin it.	2.3
Davis, Matthew	
I would encourage you to protect the headwaters of the Mississippi River within the Mississippi River Headwaters State Forest from sustaining further damage resulting from designated OHV routes. In 2006 after moving back to Minnesota, I had the pleasure of shuttling my wife and her brother as they paddled from Itasca State Park to Bemidji. At one of the landings that I visited I was appalled at the ATV damage...including tracks where ATV riders had ridden through the river. Frankly, this is unacceptable in a civilized society and the only way to prevent it from happening over and over again is to not designate OHV routes in close proximity to the river. There are plenty of other places to ride here in northern Minnesota.	11.9
The River is a national treasure and protecting the headwaters area is our State's responsibility. Please consider protecting this wonderful resource for all Americans and not embarrassing us to everyone downstream by allowing the damage to continue.	6.2
Delong, Colleen & Herman	
We would not like to see off road vehicles in the headwaters park Please leave it in it's natural state.	20.1
Delong, Margaret	
Every summer my entire family would pile into the station wagon with the pop up camper in tow and head to the headwaters of the Mississippi. We would enjoy the wonder of nature that	10.6 4.3

Author/Comment	Response
<p>surrounded us, splashing in the cool, clean water and listening to the earth around us. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is of particular concern to people like me who love the wilderness. It is a magnificent, wild part of the river, a hidden treasure alternating between boreal forests and vast wetlands rich in the history of north central Minnesota. The region is habitat for trumpeter swans, red-shouldered hawks, bald eagles, wolves, fur bearers and an incredible diversity of waterfowl in its wild rice lakes, sedge meadows and bog lands. Jack pine and red pine forests intermingle within the wetlands, making for an amazingly rich ecosystem. Audubon believes this state forest and its narrow sensitive riparian habitat along the headwaters for the Mississippi river is not an appropriate venue for all-terrain vehicles. And yet, you are considering opening this pristine area to motorized vehicles. Can you please explain your reasoning for this serious lack in judgment?</p>	<p>6.2 10.14</p>
<p>Three of the five DNR work team members (YOUR team members!) recommended the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest be closed to all motorized recreation, citing the natural assets above and noting that steep hills and sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off-road driving. Significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river. Currently, motorized damage in Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is extreme. Camp grounds are rutted and damaged, such as Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point. All-terrain vehicles are riding in the river in a number of locations, such as Stumphges Rapids 3. Imagine the amount of oil, gasoline etc that is being deposited at the mouth of this grand river.</p>	<p>14.1 3.9 11.9</p>
<p>Rather than sealing off the historic sites noted above, the DNR Draft Plan has designated motorized routes in these sensitive areas, thereby rewarding illegal behavior by legalizing it. In essence, those of us who appreciate, protect and value our beautiful natural resource are being swept aside for those who don't seem to think rules were meant for them.</p>	<p>10.1</p>
<p>The Mississippi Headwaters Board designated Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as "wild," which created a 1000 foot corridor along the river where all motorized recreation is banned. DNR's draft plan disregards this protection and proposes motorized trails within this corridor, with some dead-ending at the river. Why on earth would you even consider such a plan? As noted, illegal riding has already damaged the riparian zone. This isn't rocket science! By closing the forest to motorized recreation, all-terrain vehicles would still be able to ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads, isn't that enough? Classifying the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as closed to motorized recreation would greatly aid in protecting the river itself.</p>	<p>10.10</p>
<p>In the interest of all Americans, we must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi for future citizens. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a narrow corridor. It contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi River in Minnesota. Minnesotans must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized river and migratory flyway.</p>	<p>10.6</p>
<p>Think about the irreparable damage that is being done and will continue to happen if you accept the draft plan. I implore you to do the right thing. SAVE THE HEADWATERS!!!!</p>	<p>6.2</p>
<p>Derby, Maryellen & Ted</p>	
<p>Please do not close Mississippi Headwaters State Forest roads and designated trails to ATV use. We enjoy traveling the forest roads, minimum maintenance roads and designated trails. With more areas opening in Minnesota for ATV use we are spending less time in Wisconsin. Please consider a plan to interconnect more of the trails in Minnesota.</p>	<p>6.1</p>
<p>DeVries, Wallace J.</p>	
<p>I would like to express my appreciation for what the DNR is doing to place trails here in Northern Minnesota. I think it is good that you are bringing the trail from Bemidji area down to Coffee Pot Landing. I would like to suggest that this trail be continued on South down to the Lookout tower near LaSell lake where there is a beautiful view overlooking the valley below and then on south to Itasca Park where an ATV parking lot could be located on the edge of the park and visitors could walk a short distance to see the Headwaters and visit the gift shop near by. I am from Freedom Ridge ATV Resort and I find I can spend a couple of days distributing advertising over in the Red River Valley and bring a whole lot of visitors over from Fargo, Crookston, Grand Forks and many other cities in the valley. They have only open country and not many trails there, and they really enjoy coming to ride in the woods of Northern Minnesota (and spent a lot of money too).</p>	<p>10.1 20.1</p>

Author/Comment	Response
Dietl, Martin	
"ATVs OUT!! Keep the Headwaters Wild!!" I am strongly against allowing OHVs in the Mississippi Headwaters area!! Please reject this ridiculous proposal!!!	4.3 6.2
Doebler, Gary	
Please keep the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest open to ATV trail riding. I am a responsible ATV'er, as are 99% of the riders I meet and ride with. We enjoy our sport and do not feel the forest should be designated as "closed". I have found that motorized recreation and more passive outdoor activities can coexist when properly managed which the DNR has done successfully in other state forests.	6.1
Doering, Sheila	
Our State forests are for all the public, not just a few preservationists. I oppose the "closed unless posted open" management style for any State forest. Minnesota already has over 1 million acres that restricts motorized recreation. State forests should not have such restrictions.	6.3
Donaldson-Evans, Mary (Prudhomme)	
As a native of Minnesota, I'm appalled by the plan to allow ATVs into the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. I've always been proud of my home state; this is not consistent with the image I have of fiercely proud, bucking-the-trend, environmentally conscious Minnesota. Please keep the ATVs out of this pristine territory!	4.3 6.2
D'Orazio, Ronald E.	
I wish to add my voice to those who oppose the establishment of a network of OHV routes in the Mississippi wild corridor. As you are well aware the upper 47 miles of the river are designated as a "wild river" under Minnesota law. This area has also qualified for designation as Wild under the national Wild and Scenic Rivers Act since 1977.	4.3 10.7 10.2
This part of the Mississippi River is a recreational gem and provides great wildlife habitat. It deserves and should be protected as much as humanly possible for generations to come.	
Downing, Mary Theresa	
Please reconsider the designation of the Mississippi State Headwater Forest as a "limited" area. That would ensure that the area is still wild whenever you or I visit it, soon or far in the future. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a narrow corridor that contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi River in Minnesota. We must save it for ourselves, our children and our grandchildren. This could be done much more effectively if it were designated "closed."	6.2 10.6
There are many arguments to be made for changing the designation to "closed." Three of the five DNR work team members recommended the MHSF be closed to all OHVs, citing its natural assets and noting that steep hills and sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off-road driving. Significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river. Currently, OHV damage is extreme: camp grounds are rutted and damaged and ATVs are riding in the river in a number of locations. Rather than sealing off historic sites, the DNR Draft Plan has designated ATV routes in these sensitive areas, thereby rewarding illegal behavior by legalizing it.	14.1 11.9 10.1 10.16
The Mississippi Headwaters Board designated the Mississippi Headwater State Forest as "wild," which created a 1000 foot corridor along the river where all OHVs are banned. The Draft Plan disregards this protection and proposes ATV trails within this corridor, with some dead-ending at the river, an invitation to continue illegally riding in the river. The "wild" designation was made specifically to keep the area the way it is, to prevent damaging changes.	10.8 10.2
It's important to note that a "closed" forest would not ban ATVs entirely. They would still be able to ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads. If the forest were closed, county and township roads would allow OHVs to cross state land when going from one county parcel to another.	3.8
A salient argument against the "limited" designation is the difficulty the DNR will have in strictly monitoring any portion of this area because it is so remote. Classifying the forest "closed" would greatly aid in protecting the river itself.	11.2
Minnesotans must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized river and save what wilderness there is left. Please change the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest from "limited" to "closed."	Comment noted

Author/Comment	Response
Draper, Charles	
Please keep ATVs out of the headwater forests. I was lucky to paddle that area as a younger man and think it would be a shame to open it up to the noise and damage that ATVs would bring.	4.3 2.3 11.9
Drentlaw, David	
Because the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a sensitive wild area, the likes of which are becoming encroached upon more and more every year, and because there have been many miles of designated Off Highway Vehicle trails added every year, please classify the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as closed to Off Highway vehicles and ATVs. As it is now, this state forest needs to recover from the damage already caused by such use (legal or illegal) causing erosion and disruption to wildlife. This area also has national significance as being the source of the largest river system in the USA.	6.2 11.9 10.15
Dunn, John	
I attended the meeting in Bemidji last week but I am giving you my comment now. It's apparent to me that the environmental activists present at that meeting are so radical that they would prefer all motorized use be banned from all public land. They stated that opinion as I recall. Personally, I suspect the canoeists who try paddling some of the upper stretches of the Mississippi stir up more sediment and do as much damage as anyone. I couldn't believe the fellow at the meeting who described scaring a pair (likely a nesting pair) of Trumpeter swans into the air from his canoe. I watched a pair of these birds raise a family last summer on private land. I sometimes drove to the edge of the swamp to watch them and there was a logger operating a skidder just opposite. These birds never once felt alarmed by the motorized activity going on all around them and continued eating off the bottom with their tails in the air. They never once took to wing until they left in the fall. If I had tried sneaking up on them in a canoe they would have felt threatened I'm sure. Maybe you need to restrict the rights of the people in canoes to insure protection of the environment!	Comment noted
I think it's imperative that as much public access as possible be maintained for motorized use on all public lands including this area. I support the "Limited" classification for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest at this time but I would like to see it revert to "Managed" eventually. These areas have traditionally been available for use by everyone and are all ready restricted to an unreasonable amount. The environmental crowd fails to recognize they have already been granted a great victory. They are never satisfied and if they were to get a "Closed" forest they would be back on your doorstep the next morning saying it's a "good first step" but we need to do more. They are totally unreasonable!	6.1
I am well aware of the damage ATVs can do and I have nothing but contempt for those users causing problems. I have ridden off road motorcycles since long before there was such a thing as an ATV and have always been a responsible rider. I remember meeting groups of canoeists, hikers, and campers years ago in the woods and actually getting along with them. I thought they had interesting ways to see the woods and they were curious and intrigued about the way I did it. I largely blame the ATV crowd for making the mess of things that currently exists but I'm convinced there is a solution to the problem. After studying the current process for inventory and re-classification, and trying to make sense of the maps you people have created, I've come to this conclusion. You have created an excessively complicated "White Elephant" that is doomed to fail in the long run. There has to be a better way to deal with problems other than the massive amount of regulation currently being implemented. I wish you well in your efforts, it seems you have a good temperament for a difficult job!	11.9 12.1
Dunnette, Joel	
I am writing to encourage you to keep strong restrictions on motorized vehicles use in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. The use of off-road vehicles in wild areas causes severe damage to the land, waters, plants, and animals of our state. I have seen and experienced the damage myself when I visit the natural areas of our state. The ruts, erosion, dust, noise and disturbance are blights on our land.	6.2
We must protect our natural resources not only for ourselves, but also for future generations.	

Author/Comment	Response
Please ensure that we have strong restrictions on use of off-road vehicles.	
Dvorak, Tom & Judy	
I am writing to ask you to reconsider the recommendation regarding ATV use in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. I am one of the 500 signers to petition the Beltrami County Board to reconsider their option to sign their trails as CLOSED, rather than LIMITED.	Comment noted
I have canoed the river in the Coffee Pot Landing area and seen the damage inflicted by abusive riders. Why are we even considering allowing the County's decision not to abide by uniform state rules by allowing a trail crossing through an area of natural and national significance that has been illegal up to this point?	10.1
The DNR Regional Manager has stated the "if there are difficulties with ATV's once the crossing is authorized, they may reconsider". Certainly a regional manager must realize that correcting damage rather than preventing it is extremely poor management!	Comment noted
The Mississippi River is a national river, of international fame. Although it is severely damaged, polluted and degraded all the way to the Gulf; we have the luxury of being able to enjoy a clean, wild, and natural headwaters. Surely tourism is not ALL tied to the ATV, OHV dollars! After residing out of state for 40 years, and living in many states with myriad problems with water resources and contaminated aquifers; we chose to return to the headwaters area precisely because of the clean water, and water recreation opportunities. We were sure the planners and developers here were all for keeping the waters and forests healthy. And as more and more folks are choosing to come here for these assets, isn't it imperative to guarantee those assets?	12.7
Please reconsider your recommendation, Mr. Johnson. And please consider ALL of your constituents when voting on these recommendations legislators!	6.2
Eichorn, Marlene	
I am writing to ask that you do not allow motorized use in the Mississippi Head Waters State Forest.	6.2
Elmer, Michelle	
I was recently made aware of the possibility for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to be designated as a closed forest. Please accept this e-mail as a vote against this action. Experiencing forests such as these from the seat of a 4 wheeler is very important to me and my family. Designating this as a closed forest will be detrimental to our way of recreation.	6.1
Elwell, Adele S. (Laddie)	
It is hard for me to imagine that the State of Minnesota could compromise the wild nature of the Headwaters State Forest by allowing the legal intrusion of OHVs! Having seen the damage at Coffee Pot Landing and at Stumphges Rapids and having been involved in some of the extensive affairs of the failed Mississippi Headwaters Board some years back, I believe strongly that this potentially pristine area must be protected.	4.3 11.9
As a professional biologist (ecology, parasitology), I am only too aware of the disappearance of wild places where wild animals and plants are relatively undisturbed by human intrusions. While I am aware of the desires of many conscientious OHV riders to have access to the Forest and the River, we should all recognize there must be some limits for all activities, and one person's right to pleasure should end when it intrudes on the rightful pleasures of others- to say nothing of intrusion on the rights of wild creatures and their environment.	2.3
Loggers and lumber barons despoiled much of the Mississippi Headwaters many years ago, and we can only imagine the environment that previously existed. With presently increasing population pressure (and the concurrent attraction of marketable wild lands) we must protect this area now for future generations.	Comment noted
As a citizen taxpayer in the State of Minnesota, I believe it is incumbent on the State to make sure that the Mississippi State Forest is protected from the noise and damage of Off Road Vehicles.	6.2
Emery, Frank	
Being an avid Sportsperson that spends many days during the year in many states including Minnesota on various vacations, I wholeheartly agree that trails should be open unless posted close so that all people that choose may have access. If roads are open to vehicles weighing tons, they should be open to atvs also. Every sport has bad apples, atvers, hikers, bikers, boating enthusiasts, hunters and the list goes on. Are you closing campsites down because a camper	4.4

Author/Comment	Response
leaves it messy, no you go on with life, educating people so the next one cleans up better. So I ask you again, please vote to keep the trails open for atv use in the MHSF.	
Erickson, Christina	
I am writing to you in regards to the Mississippi River Headwaters. The possibility of opening this wild area to ATVs and other off road vehicles makes my heart break. The intrusion and destruction caused by ATVs ruin exactly what we are seeking when we head to the outdoors. The noise, pollution, erosion, and lack of wildlife makes wild spaces no longer wild.	4.3 2.3
Please do not allow Off Highway Vehicles access to logging road in the Mississippi Headwaters.	6.2
Erzar, Bill	
In regards to the trail classifications for ATV's, OHV's, and Snowmobiles in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest and Southwest Beltrami County Forests and West Central Forests. I firmly believe that those /_trails and forest roads should remain OPEN_/ for access for motorized users. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	6.1
Fahning, Mr. & Mrs. John (1)	
We hope the plan will CLOSE the headwaters to ATVs.	6.2
Fahning, John	
MississippiHeadwatersStateForest is of particular concern to people who love the wilderness. It is a magnificent, wild part of the river, a hidden treasure alternating between boreal forests and vast wetlands rich in the history of north centralMinnesota. The region is habitat for trumpeter swans, red-shouldered hawks, bald eagles, wolves, fur bearers and an incredible diversity of waterfowl in its wild rice lakes, sedge meadows and bog lands. Jack pine and red pine forests intermingle within the wetlands, making for an amazingly rich ecosystem.	10.14
Some further points to consider in formulating your comments:	
Three* of the five DNR work team members recommended the MHSF be closed to all OHVs, citing the natural assets above and noting that steep hills and sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off-road driving. Significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river. Mike Carroll, DNR Regional Director in Bemidji, acknowledged making the final decision to classify the forest "limited" so trails on county lands could be connected.	14.1 3.9 11.9
Currently, OHV damage in MHSF is extreme. Camp grounds are rutted and damaged, e.g., Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point. ATVs are riding in the river in a number of locations, e.g., Stumphges Rapids.	11.9
Rather than sealing off the historic sites noted above, the DNR Draft Plan has designated ATV routes in these sensitive areas, thereby rewarding illegal behavior by legalizing it.	10.1
The Mississippi Headwaters Board designated MHSF as "wild," which created a 1000 foot corridor along the river where all OHVs are banned. The Draft Plan disregards this protection and proposes ATV trails within this corridor, with some dead-ending at the river. As noted, illegal riding has already damaged the riparian zone.	10.8 10.2
A "closed" forest would not ban ATVs entirely. They would still be able to ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads. Forest roads and trails would be closed to all OHVs. The forest is a checkerboard, with state and county land mingled. If the forest were closed, County and township roads would allow OHVs to cross state land when going from one county parcel to another.	3.8
It will be difficult for DNR enforcement to strictly monitor any portion of this area because this part of the Mississippi is so remote. Classifying the MHSF "closed" would greatly aid in protecting the river itself.	11.2
In the interest of all Americans, we must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi for future citizens. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a narrow corridor. It contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi River in Minnesota. Minnesotans must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized river.	10.15
Again, your comments and thoughts are needed if we are to be successful in modifying the DNR's plans and getting this valuable asset closed to ATV traffic.	Comment noted
Fanfulik, Paula	
As ATV and Snowmobile enthusiasts, we want access to Forest Roads and Designated Trails in	6.1

Author/Comment	Response
the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest, and the Forest should not be Closed.	
Fettes, Donald	
People thinking of buying a ATV should keep in mind that if they don't own land or some property to operate a machine they shouldn't buy one. The ads on TV brag about bigger and more horse power. Can go <u>anywhere</u> through mud, creeks, weeds, cattails, forest land! They destroy habitat and leave land and trails eroding. It's not the government's or taxpayers responsibility to provide a place suitable to ride these machines unsupervised. The only exception might be if used for ice fishing on lakes. P.S. They're expensive, gasoline driven and many young people would or could put his money for family <u>needs</u> , and physical exercise.	Comment noted
Fier, Bob	
I live on Gull Lake in Crow Wing County. We have a State Forest on the West Side of Gull. How about opening some ATV/UTV trails their?	Comment noted
Fischer, Vincent Sr.	
Although I have been out of Minnesota since 1959, I still have an affinity for my home state. I couldn't believe it when I read the Minneapolis paper and found out upon further research that the MHSF environment was being assailed. Your office has the power to instantly reverse this tragedy in the making. As of now, Mike Carroll is perceived as a lone mugger. Don't sit idly by and allow his asinine decision to ruin such a valuable environmental resource. By letting his folly take full rein you are as guilty as he is. Attached is my feeling on the subject. I may have to make a decision to release it to the papers such as the ones in Minneapolis or Bemidji if the problem is not resolved.	Comment noted
A plan for the destruction of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest?	14.1
Recently, Mike Carroll, the Minnesota DNR Regional Director in Bemidji, made the decision to reclassify this sensitive and rare area as "limited " instead of "closed so that there could be a legal increase of traffic of (ATVs) and (OHVs) in the area. Overriding the DNR work team's recommendations, that had cited already existing damage caused by illicit usage of these machines, Carroll sided with the past perpetrators illegal acts and gave them legitimacy. Was he one of the past perpetrators? Is the new classification his way of insuring his, his family's and his friends playground isn't usurped by the rights of the people of Minnesota? Forty seven miles of pristine watershed between Itasca and Bemidji is now at risk because of his reckless decision.	
Examine the history of the "Indiana Dunes" or the "Kankakee Grand Marsh" of Indiana to see what happens when the environmental needs of an area are ignored. Many organizations are now scraping to save even tiny remnants of once enormous parcels of these natural wonders that had existed in Indiana. These areas were ravaged before the realization of their real value was understood a hundred years ago.	Comment noted
If that environmental carnage is the current attitude of the Mn. DNR, then, instead of passively allowing the destruction of the area, why not make a profit from it? I see that there is the "Red Neck Fishing Tourney" down South. The Angel Carp jump out of the water and are netted. Import some. This could be the summer equivalent of the Eelpot winter tourney. The Snake heads are another aggressive alien fighting fish that are also extremely destructive. They can replace the more placid native fish such as Walleye and Northern Pike. I'm certain the DNR would have no trouble acquiring breeders for stocking in the MHSP. You may have trouble getting permits though, from the Feds. Kudzu, Gypsy Moths and, Emerald Ash Borers may also be available to speed up the destruction. Are Grizzlies under consideration for the area? Once the aquatic and biomass and attitudes are sufficiently disrupted, more opportunities exist.	Comment noted
With a growing shortage of dumping areas many scavenger companies are willing to pay extremely well to dump their trash. Possibly they would even start before degradation was completed. Our government and several foreign countries are having problems of where to dispose of their nuclear waste. Many major manufacturing and Chemical plants are having the same difficulty. Don't destroy the MHSF piecemeal. Go all the way at once. Make a few bucks. Is this the perception we should have of the MN DNR?	Comment noted
The moral high ground of the Minnesota DNR is being gauged. Your integrity is being engraved in the environmental history. What will your stone read? Use your authority to override Carroll's	Comment noted

Author/Comment	Response
mischief and save the Mississippi Headwater State Park's environmental integrity for the future generations. With the modern recording devices such as the internet, if this mess is left for the future, the name of Bill Johnson and the Mn. DNR will share the limelight of intellectual and moral failure with the likes of, Dr. Kerr, the man who brought the "Killer Bees" to the Americas.	
Flatt, Dwight & Anita	
I welcome any restrictions and diminishing existing ATV routes. I agree with others there are enough or too much ATV traffic as it is. Some ATVERS would like you to think that the majority of AVERS are responsible. That is a myth, there are those who are conscientious. I have seen the damage by erosion, and damage to the environment. They just go anywhere in the woods making their own trails, with very little regard to the damage and the eyesore they create.	4.3
It is getting more and more difficult for hikers and similar activities to be enjoyed. The noise is another distraction to being able to enjoy the natural environment.	2.3
Forst, Kenny	
I am writing this letter in regard to the proposed closing of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. As a responsible and active atv rider I find it as my responsibility to make you aware the fact that we are losing riding opportunities everyday. Since when did atv's become the absolute enemy of the environment. Nobody seems to raise a brow when you cut a path through woods and lay down a crude oil soaked mix of sand and gravel we call asphalt and label it as a bike trail. Oh, but heaven forbid we drive an atv over mother natures face, but wait, if we tar it everything will be all right. I would like you to tell me how this is rational thinking by any point of view possible. We both know that atv's do not have the devastating effects that some would like everyone to believe. These are public lands and should be left to recreate in as people deem entertaining, within reason of course. Are we going to make the whole state a walking park. That will be really good for you and the economy now won't it. I am sorry I have gotten little off track here but the bottom line is you probably drive on 50 miles of paved road per day and you don't think of the environmental impact of that for one second but compare that to a atv tire print through the woods and you tell me which is more devastating. Hopefully this puts everything in perspective for you. Now quit picking on the little guy and start handling real problems if you care so much.	12.1
Franzen, Linda & Edward	
Would like to say we are not happy and very concerned with the effect of off road vehicles on state land.	Comment noted
Freund, Theresa	
I am totally against all-terrain vehicles, motorbikes, and 4x4 "mudder" trucks in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest (as well as other state forests/parks).	4.3
My family loves the outdoors and we hike, snowshoe, fish, etc. I appreciate that the State is looking at ways to get all residents out to enjoy the valuable resources we have in our State parks. But I do not believe by catering to a few that like to rip up the soil is getting the message out on how precious and lucky we are to have the parks and forests. Quite the opposite will happen. This will just perpetuate how we can keep damaging the environment and nothing will happen. Some how it will magically heal itself.	20.1
Again I appreciate how the State/Legislators want everyone to enjoy the state parks and forests. This is not the way to go about it. Encourage residents to value what we have and not destroy it. Get residents to drive their cars to the parks and forests, slow down and take a hike (be green). Please pass my email to Legislators asking them to vote against allowing this to happen.	Comment noted
Garland, John	
I would like to see this managed.	6.3
George, Terry	
There is no reason that this forest could not be a managed forest. Beltrami forest is doing fine so would this one.	6.3
Giese, Mark M.	
The DNR should reject this plan to designate OHV routes, and instead close the Headwaters to OHVs as the DNR ÇOs Fisheries, Wildlife, Ecological, and Enforcement staff first recommended.	6.2
OHVs in Minnesota already have access to thousands of miles of forest roads and well over a thousand miles of OHV trails on state lands, plus several thousand more miles on federal lands.	16.8

Author/Comment	Response
The noise effects from increased traffic louder, faster moving vehicles will seriously damage the Wild character that qualified the Mississippi Headwaters for national Wild River designation.	10.6
The Wild character of the river will be harmed not just at bridges, but in many other locations where the river is close to proposed designated routes. Even where the designated routes appear to be well removed from the river channel, the intervening distance is often flat bog or other wetlands, meaning that sounds from OHV traffic on even more distant uplands will be clearly audible on the river.	2.3
ATVing and driving other OHVs is incompatible with all other forms of outdoor recreation, except possibly snowmobiling, according to the Wisconsin DNR study of recreational incompatibility. See http://www.dnr.state.wi.us/planning/scorp/plan/WIS_2005-10_SCORP_CHAPTER...	16.6
Because OHVs are noisy and often violate areas posted off limits, access given to OHVs in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest means access taken away from those who desire high-quality non-motorized recreation, such as the experience of paddling the Mississippi Wild Headwaters.	11.1
According to the latest Minnesota DNR survey, conducted in 2004, more Minnesotans aged 20 and older engage in canoeing and kayaking (485,000 or 14%) than ride ATVs (357,000 or 10%).	16.1
Goeb, Dave	
I think the state forest is a great place and I just started hunting and ATVing there the last two years. There is a ton of land not close to the river and it would a great disappointment if all ATVing were closed off because of a few law breakers. I hope that ATVing will be able to continue even if it's limited. Sad to say but even if the whole forest was closed off to ATV's the law breakers, though they are few, can still wreck things. Whether it be with a ATV, truck going were they shouldn't, people (canoer's) leaving garbage in or by the river. I hope the forest stay's open, it is a great place.	6.1
Goetz, Robert J.	
The Izaak Walton League of America chapters in MN and myself are very concerned about the direction your Draft Plan is headed. When there are so many other trails and opportunities for OHV riders why would we ever want to open up this historic and most pristine area along the Mississippi to more extensive OHV use? Classifying this for "limited" OHV use flies in the face of the decision of the MH Board's declaration of it being a "wild" area. With illegal riding in the area already causing considerable damage to this ecologically sensitive part of the river, why should we be rewarding such behavior?	10.6 16.8 10.17
Rampant commercial development around our lakes and streams is bad enough, making their enjoyment available only to the wealthy. Summer on our lakes is filled with the constant noise of personal watercraft. Enough is enough! Allow all Minnesotans to enjoy, in all seasons, this pristine area. Please classify it as "closed" to OHV use!	6.2
Green, Todd & Cindy	
I am writing today to voice my opposition to the possible designation of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as CLOSED. My wife and I enjoy the opportunity to ride our ATV on designated trails throughout MN, and would like to see the trail system expanded, not reduced. We are in favor of a "Limited" designation of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.	6.1
Grignon, Kay	
My home is on the lakeshore in Becker County, not far from Itasca State Park. <u>I strongly recommend a "closed" classification for MHSF.</u> I own an ATV, but use it mostly for yard work and hauling miscellaneous items, but I am well aware of damages that riding through the forest these vehicles do even when following all the rules. I have also spent many hours paddling the great Mississippi river in this area. Therefore, I know firsthand the conflicts between non-motorized and motorized recreation – <u>they are not compatible.</u> Look for wildlife, seeking solitude and quiet time or catching a glimpse of a bird not seen before is not possible anywhere in the vicinity of ATV riders.	6.2 16.6
Preserving the Mississippi Headwaters should be a state priority. It is part of our heritage. The impacts to wildlife, natural habitats, air and water are irreversible once these machines are allowed to roam this pristine area. Please keep motorized recreation out of the Mississippi Headwaters.	4.3 2.9

Author/Comment	Response
Gruetzmacher, Sybil	
<p>After reading an article in the Waters newsletter I would urge you to keep off road vehicles out of the Park. Please help keep the Mississippi Headwaters wild. I am sending this email to tell you I care about our Mississippi River and I want to keep the headwaters wild!</p> <p>I would urge you to get feedback from the citizens of MN before making a decision that would ruin this wild area.</p>	20.1
Grussing, Ann B.	
<p>Please add my name to the list of those who oppose having ATVs mudding up a National treasure. Everyday that I leave my home to drive anywhere I pass ditch embankments with exposed tree roots due to erosion from ATVs driven irresponsibly. It makes me sad and angry. No respect.</p>	6.2
Haarman, Janet	
<p>I am in favor of protecting the Mississippi Headwaters in the most comprehensive way possible. Therefore, I am in favor of prohibiting motor vehicle use in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest in the strongest way possible. I would like to see prohibitions on the largest amount of state forest and county forfeit lands.</p>	6.2
<p>I am very concerned about the Beltrami County Commissioners' vote to "Opt Out" of the DNR Planning Process. I am concerned that their vote eliminates what the DNR can do to classify roads and trails to limit motor vehicle use. The Beltrami officials can make their own plans and rules which are going to be less restrictive on motor vehicle use in the sensitive Headwaters and surrounding lands.</p>	5.1
Haefner, Rick	
<p>Closed designation would make the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest off limits to ATV's, OHM's and ORV's. It would also be illegal to use ATV's for Big Game Hunting, even on Forest Roads. A Limited Designation would allow ATV's on Forest Roads, Minimum Maintenance Roads, and Designated Trails. This Designation would allow YOU to experience the Mississippi Headwaters from the seat of an ATV. This will not be possible unless YOU send your comments to the DNR asking for access to Forest Roads and Designated Trails in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. I do not want these forest areas designated closed.</p>	6.1
Hageman, Brandt	
<p>Please do not allow any legislation which infringes on MY right to ride my atv on public lands. These lands are for public use, I pay taxes to maintain them as well as anyone else. I also own motorcycles, a snowmobile and a 6 wheeler and I need a place to ride. With no place to ride I would not buy them, not generate any taxes and eliminate jobs in this industry. Furthermore without fun ways to spend my money and time I would be more likely to do things which would actually hurt myself or others, like gambling and drinking. Offroad motorized activities are excellent family fun, please expand these opportunities.</p>	6.1
Hartwell, William	
<p>The classification of the MHSF should be closed to OHVs. I live just a few miles north and have witnessed a large amount of destruction of the trails and a lot of illegal riding, i.e., cross country. Hold Beltrami County to the same standards in the state forest North of Hwy 2. Science and popular opinion demand it. We will not allow our commons and way of life destroyed!</p>	6.2 5.1
Hedeem, Carter	
<p>I certainly appreciate the effort made by the DNR and other parties in trying to come up with an appropriate classification for this forest and others. However, after much of my own deliberation both before and after attending the Bemidji Public Meeting on January 16, 2008, I offer the following reflections supporting a designation of "CLOSED" for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.</p>	6.2
<p>After heavy ATV use trails become rutted and eroded on hills and curves, undesirable to say the least in a riparian area such as this. The soil in this area is especially vulnerable to ATV and OHV use in general. Please refer to and really use the soil type maps provided by Matt Norton from the MCEA (or others from your own data bank) in further decision-making.</p>	12.1
<p>Because way too many ATV riders can't be counted on to stay on designated trails, especially those in the proximity of water (think mud), this is not the area for ATV use. Think of the negative</p>	11.5
	11.9

Author/Comment	Response
impact already present at canoe landings. Combining these already demonstrated illegal behavior patterns in this riparian area, a thinly staffed Conservation Officer presence and the paltry penalties applied if caught, one has the recipe for even more illegal behaviors.	
ATVs don't have to be in every state forest. Considering the incredible number of ATV trail miles already existing in other state forests and elsewhere, the MHSF could be "closed" without any appreciable hardship placed on the ATV community.	16.8
According to a widely disseminated study pointed out at last week's public meeting, ATVs are considered incompatible with all non-mechanized activities, which in turn are of low negative impact to the forest.	16.6
A retired wildlife biologist stated at the meeting that the negative impact on wildlife from roads increases dramatically once the 1-mile per sq. mile mark is past. I leave it to the DNR to run the numbers and then to heavily weight the result in the decision making process.	21.2 21.3
The first 47 miles of the Mississippi River, including those within the MHSF boundaries, has qualified for designation as "Wild" under the National Wild & Scenic Rivers Act since 1977, and is designated "Wild River" under Minnesota law. It is the only Mississippi River segment so pristine as to qualify for this designation. Indeed, it is not only a local treasure but national as well, and thus deserves the best possible protection.	10.7
Unfortunately, under the legislation mandating this decision making process, this particularly unique ecosystem was not given the benefit of an EIS or even an EAW, or any set of standards that I am aware of. I doubt that ORVs in general would be permitted here under such deserving scrutiny. Even if not mandated, imagine if DNR staff just unofficially would use those criteria to make such a decision? Please consider what using such criteria would indicate in terms of mandating the MHSF "limited" versus "closed." Then act on it. It is the protection of the resource that is paramount in this decision.	14.5
Hedeon, Florence	
For more reasons than I can enumerate here, I request that the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest be designated closed to OHV travel.	6.2
If the "limited" classification remains in force, in Hubbard County managed land I would ask that 2895 - 2893 be abandoned and a new route be created connecting 1346-3439 to the township road. Coffee Pot landing is currently seriously abused by OHV users.	22.1
The Saturday, January 19 Park Rapids Enterprise printed an article by Laurie Swenson of the Bemidji Pioneer. There appeared to be a number of mis-representations in the article regarding forest classifications, but the real kicker was the page A2 headline "ATVs: Destructive riders are the minority". January 16 we heard testimony from ATV advocates to that effect, but the truth is on the ground in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest and on other public and private lands where riders take their pleasure. The nature of the ATV makes it virtually impossible to not significantly alter the environment in which they travel.	12.1 2.10
At the public hearing there was a stark difference between the attitude of ATV advocates: "This is about my freedom to use public land as I want to", and the proponents of protection of public lands: "We want future generations to know what wilderness is, the flora, the fauna, the quiet, the solitude." Everyone present knew that OHVs and their riders have left and will continue to leave an indelible mark where ever they travel. Furthermore, among recreational pursuits the OHV stands alone as incompatible with any other recreation.	16.6
Much of the debate over the classification of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest and other public lands pits its direct use value against its non-use value. As a unique area in Minnesota designated as a "wild river", arguably, the non-use value far exceeds any potential short term direct use value. Non-use is a small price to pay for preserving this special place so that it can be experienced as wilderness by future generations.	2.9
Hedin, Ross	
I believe ATVs SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED anywhere within the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. There are plenty of other areas for ATVs to be used. I see no reason to allow ATV riders to destroy this beautiful area. There is already illegal ATV use going on in the forest that has resulted with heavy damage. Opening the area up to more ATV use will only result with more illegal use and more damage. Allowing ATV use will adversely impact those people who are	4.3 11.9 2.9 1.2

Author/Comment	Response
utilizing the area for camping, canoeing, kiking, fishing, hunting, etc. The entire Mississippi Headwaters State Forest should be off-limits to all ATVs.	
Helgesen, Lisa	
I am a former Minnesota resident who still loves to camp and hike in MN state parks and forests. I urge you to give the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest the highest possible level of protection and classify it as "closed" rather than "limited." It is the most remote and unspoiled area of the Mississippi and deserves to be free of the damage and noise that OHVs bring to the wilderness.	6.2 4.3 2.9
Hennen, Kevin & Wanda	
Hello, My name is Wanda Hennen and I am a Regional Director to ATVAM (All-Terrain Vehicle Assoc. of MN) and also the Secretary to the Eastern Morrison County 4-Wheeler Club in central Minnesota. Members of our club and community travel all over the state and Wisconsin to ride ATV's. Our club promotes responsible and respectable riding and we educate and certify our youth to be safe and responsible riders. Manufacturers' are not going to stop making ATV's and people are not going to stop riding them. So if they are given places to ride legally, they will less likely ride in unacceptable areas. We need to inform the anti-groups that an Ambassador program is in the works and that this will help insure that people are riding respectfully and responsibly. Everyone can benefit from keeping trails open, for the recreation and wanting to be in the great outdoors and to the economy.	6.1
Hering, Kent M.	
The Mississippi River is a national treasure and the headwaters are the last remaining Mississippi River wilderness. Please keep OHVs out and keep the headwaters wild.	4.3 2.9
Hogensen, Sharon	
I agree with your desire to preserve the Mississippi Wild Headwaters Region. This is fragile territory and must be preserved for future generations. Please keep OHV'S out of it.	4.3 6.2
Hoirriis, Judith	
???????????????? I am? writing to you to request that you do all in your power to defeat the proposed OHV trail near the Mississippi River Headwaters.? I am apalled that this is even an issue.? I am a property owner in Minnesota and near New York city? and I can tell you that?the Headwaters are?indeed a TREASURE.? If you would like to see the damage done to an area in the name of "progress" I invite you to my home here in New Jersey.? Our water here is unsafe to drink.? We purchase the water we cook with here.? Two of my neighbors have died from?cancer and just this week I was found to have a mass the size of a large orange in my pelvis.? We don't know yet if it is cancer.? Our state has the highest rate of Autism in the country and it is also overrun with cars, people, (yes even ATVs)and?the pollution that comes along with it.? The deer, fox, raccoons, bears?and coyotes have nowhere to go.? They literally roam our neighborhoods.	10.1
???? We come to Minnesota every summer to escape the insanity that exists here on the east coast.? We come for the solitude, the clean air, clean water and the open space.? We come for the people who believe that there is value in preserving the wilderness, for us as well as for the wildlife.? We bring our checkbook and we are more than happy to spend our money in Minnesota.? We even own an ATV, but we do not use it to destroy the area.? We drive it on our own property and use it?as a work horse.? If the ATVers want a place to ride, let them purchase and area, supply on duty paramedics, clean up crews, maintenance staff etc..and provide a safe place for like minded people to ride where the noise and damage does not bother others.? The motorcross riders do this, race car drivers?do this and the ATV companies who so want us to destroy our National Treasures could do this too.? They could even charge admission like the others.? The Mississippi Headwaters and our national parks and preservation land are not the place for this kind of activity.? Please plead for common sense and vote this down.	2.3 6.2
Holbrook, John	
Please keep ATV's away from the headwaters of the Mississippi River. They are a menace to the environment and don't need to be everywhere.	6.2
Holinshead, Mathews	
As a Minnesotan I realize the scope and importance of the ATV industry. Jobs and profits are important. But they do not rank on the same scale as the priceless national treasure of which Minnesota is the sole steward and host, the Headwaters of the Mississippi, one of the nation's	2.9

Author/Comment	Response
most prized and significant wild river areas. A large network of OHV routes will simply erase the Headwaters' value for all but a few thousand ATV owners whose needs can easily be accommodated in many other, far more suitable areas.	
Homa, Lara (1)	
I am writing to tell you and the DNR that I am opposed to ATVs being allowed to use any trails or non-trails in any state forrest or public recreation type land. Vehicles are everywhere - let's keep a few places quiet, engine free and natural. ATVs are tearing up the land, are contributing to noise pollution, scaring animals, destroying habitat, we are wasting our tax dollars when the ATV destruction has to be repaired and many other unfortunate consequences. I have read information in the StarTribune and on the Mississippi Headwaters Protection Alliance	6.2 2.3
Homa, Lara (2)	
I am writing to inform you and your department that I am completely against motorized vehicles being allowed to roam around at the Mississipi Headwaters. There are several hundred miles of trails already established for this purpose. The headwaters is already protected and there is no reason to destroy the area with noise, pollution, to hurt the land and scare the animals. We need to keep as many places quiet and safe as we can. Please do not allow motorized vehicles of any kind around the Mississippi Headwaters. I have also informed the Governor, my congresspeople and MN Center for Environmental Advocacy of my position.	4.3 2.3
Hoops, Bill	
Bob Moore and I are working on the 70 mile looping trail here in Aitkin Co. I would like to please ask that you designate the Mississippi headwaters forest are "Limited" for our use and recreation.	6.1
Hopp, Mary K.	
Please do not allow a small minority of rich"toy" owners to ruin the last remaining areas of wilderness. Fine for them to destroy their own private lands if they wish, heck...buy some more and ruin it as well, but the DNR should not create a bigger problem than already exists. OHVs tear up habitat and deposit non-native plants (stuck under their vehicles). I have seen the resulting wash-outs caused by their ruts of "fun". I learned many years ago in a Civics Class that my rights extend only as far as they do not infringe on another's rights. Expanding any trails for OHV use intrudes on my right to enjoy the last remaining wilderness areas in my state. All we have now is all there is. You can't get it back .	4.3
Houdek, Joshua	
Please accept this note as official comments to the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest Draft Plan. I am contacting you to voice my opinion that OHVs do not have a place in and around the 47 miles of nationally designated wild and scenic stretch of the Mississippi River. I strongly oppose any proposed designated OHV routes in the MHSF Wild Corridor. On multiple trips up to this forest and the headwaters of our nation's greatest river, I've enjoyed quiet recreation. OHV's threaten the wild character of this area, will increase erosion, disturb other users and wildlife.	4.3
Hulett, Sharon	
The Mississippi headwaters is a wild river area, the Mississippi itself a national river. You must block any plans to allow ATV trails along and in the river forest. Please, please, please...ATVs are a big threat to the pristine environment and ecology. Shame on us as Minnesotans if we allow that to happen.	10.7 4.3 2.9
Husted, Rachel	
I am writing in strong opposition to a proposed plan that would allow ATV riders to despoil the beautiful wilderness of the Mississippi River Headwaters.	4.3
This area was designated as a wild corridor for important reasons. It is a critical ecosystem that supports fish, wildlife and a clean water supply for surrounding communities. These uses are clearly not compatible with roads and trails for all-terrain vehicles, motorbikes, and 4x4 "mudder" trucks.	2.3
Please revise the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest Draft Plan to prevent any expansion of trails for off-road vehicles. These areas deserve full protection.	6.2
Ilstrup, Sam (1)	
It is time for the MN DNR to quit pandering to Polaris and Arctic Cat and the ATV crowd. DO the right thing and what you know in your heart is the right thing and do not reclassify these lands. I	6.3 6.2

Author/Comment	Response
've seen firsthand how the DNR caves in to politicians and destructive business interests. My personal situation concerns aquaculture and I was forced to sue to reclaim my riparian rights. Be a man and protect these resources! Why did you join the DNR in the first place?	
Istrup, Sam (2)	
I read the Star Tribune article on this today. I would just like to express my opposition to any expansion of ATV use in this area. It would have a negative impact on the area. These areas (statewide) are becoming inundated with those fools. Take a stand!	4.3
Irish, Ken	
Please concenter my letter of support for motorized trail access in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. As our society ages, there be more people with limited walking abilities and physical limitations. They will not be able to enjoy our public land without some form of motorized transportation. It is a shame that people would want to close this forest to all motorized trail access and deny those less fortune people. Designating the forest as limited with 44 miles of motorized trail access will provide all people the opportunity to enjoy our public lands.	6.1
Iwaarden, Ellen Van	
I am writing to comment on the proposed plan to designate miles of the roads and trails in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest for off-highway vehicles (OHVs). I oppose this plan for the following reasons. Our state forests are precious spots, which I hope we can preserve in as natural and pristine state as possible. OHVs not only pollute with their noise and exhaust, their tracks destroy the landscape and ruin natural habitats for wildlife. Please reconsider this unwise plan to allow OHVs in this unique state forest.	6.2 2.3 12.1
Jacob, John	
Sir, I am from MN and have been to the head waters a few times. I see no reason for ATV to be in that area of state parks. This should be keep for the kids of the future. I thank you for your time.	20.1
Jacobson, Christina	
I do not have time for a lengthy e-mail, but I wanted to write in my support of keeping the Mississippi Headwaters wild & OFF LIMIT to off road vehicle use. I personally believe in multiple use management, and that all types of recreation have their use, but I do not think ATVs should be allowed in this area. Please do not open trails for ATV use.	6.2
Jacobson, Robert & Diane	
The Mississippi Headwater State Forest should be put in the limited designation group so it can be used.	6.1
Jeffrey, Susu	
Friends of Coldwater are concerned that because of a lack of will or enforcement funding, our state Department of Natural Resources is giving up on the Mississippi Headwaters.	11.4
The Mississippi in Minnesota is the aorta of North America. Friends of Coldwater believe the state does not have the right to abnegate its responsibilities because it's easier. A minority of Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) riders are criminally destroying the headwaters portion of the drinking water supply for more than 18-million Americans.	2.9
Furthermore the Mississippi headwaters is not ours to wreck. The Mississippi River is a national river, the Mississippi belongs to all of us who drink her waters and the Mississippi belongs to the future.	12.7
Friends of Coldwater urge the DNR to reject the plan to designate OHV routes and to close the Mississippi Headwaters to all OHVs. We doubt the DNR will have another opportunity to fight for the headwaters area security. Please fight for the safety of the land and waters. It is the right thing to do.	6.2
Jenison, Kate	
I believe that the DNR is failing miserably in its role of stewardship and protection of State lands in Minnesota. I believe that it is unethical/immoral to allow, support and promote the scarring of our woodlands as a legitimate recreational activity. My tax dollars are paying the DNR to protect and defend the land. The land mind you -- not the people who so mindlessly destroy the land.	4.2 12.1
Johansen, Matt	
I am writing to comment on the proposal to allow motor vehicle use on state lands. I feel it is outrageous that this is even being discussed. The Department of Natural Resources is in charge	12.1 6.2

Author/Comment	Response
of monitoring and protecting our natural resources. I know of no benefit to OUR natural resources by allowing motor vehicles to rip through pristine forests, streambeds, rivers, etc. There is no justification for motor vehicles in our state forests. They are air, noise, and ground polluting - they accelerate erosion (or cause it in areas where there was none), they ruin wetland ecosystems, they disturb wildlife (and people who enjoy the serenity "the woods" can offer)and degrade our state lands. There is plenty of private land around for people who "enjoy" driving around on a 4 wheeler all day long. If they are so intent on destroying the environment, make them use their own money to buy the land. I have no desire to have my tax dollars used so they can destroy the environment I care about.	
Johnson, Deanna	
This letter provides comment to the Minnesota DNR concerning the OHV plan for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. I live in Hubbard County and may very possibly be one of the most frequent visitors to Itasca State Park. I fully appreciate the precious resource we have in our own backyard. "Headwaters Country" – the birthplace of the internationally recognized Mississippi River is central to the culture, history and most importantly symbolizes the pristine natural beauty of our area. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is home to the only remaining wild portion of the river. I request the Department of Natural Resources change its draft plan for the Mississippi Headwaters Forest and classify it a CLOSED forest. A closed classification would greatly help in protecting this nationally significant river.	6.2
The draft plan for the Mississippi Headwaters Forest offered by the DNR is short-sighted and shows no consideration of our priceless natural resource or of our wildlife. The DNR leadership putting forth this draft plan for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest has neglected it's responsibility to protect our precious resource as evidenced by these facts	Comment noted
The DNR's own ecological, fish, wildlife and enforcement staff opposed designating OHV routes in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. This plan was put forth despite the fact that the majority of the DNR Mississippi Headwaters Planning Team members were opposed to the plan.	14.1
The draft plan disregards the 1000 foot corridor along the river where ATV's are banned and allows ATVs with the corridor with some trails dead ending at the river.	10.8
The DNR is not protecting historic sites and has designated ATV routes in these areas, and by doing so is rewarding illegal behavior by legalizing.	10.1
This draft plan shows that the DNR leadership making this decision is not protecting our precious heritage and resource, but instead has give into the insatiable greed and self-centeredness of the OHV user group and to powerful corporations. If the OHV plan offered by the DNR goes through, the wild character and valuable wildlife habitat of this area surrounding the infant Mississippi River will be greatly threatened and likely lost. These is already significant erosion caused by ATV use in this area and riders are being so brazen as to ride in the river itself.	11.9
The Headwaters region is not a Minnesota treasure, but a national and international treasure that should be protected for its wild qualities. There area already too many and thousands of miles available to OHV users in Minnesota. Why can we not protect this important and significant forest? People come from all over this country and internationally to see this historic river site. This special place must be protected for generations to come. A poor decision made now will destroy this precious resource forever and would be this DNR's legacy. Choose to be remembered for coming forth with a land use plan that protects and preserves our treasured resource and for thoughtfulness too the intrinsic worth and sacredness of our Headwaters land.	10.6 16.8 6.2
Johnson, Ira	
I am emailing you as an ATVAM member asking for access to Forest Roads and Designated Trails in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. Please consider the responsible ATV enthusiast and the economic benefits our state reaps for allowing our ATV's in these areas.	6.1 14.10
Johnson, Judy	
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft plan for the Mississippi Headwater Forest. The plan is a disappointment. It does nothing to protect this jewel of wilderness. Designating it as limited (closed unless posted open) is trying to please everyone when in fact it does not. It is utterly amazing that the agency Department of Natural (Unnatural as I see it) Resources has to be spineless in protecting 8,790 acres out of 4,000,000 acres of forested land (most of it cut over)	4.3 6.2

Author/Comment	Response
<p>and keep out of reach of All Terrain Vehicles (mostly to tear up and abuse). Logging continues in the Mississippi Headwater forest on county and State lands leaving behind even more trails. So "limited" designation is an insult! If I were the Commissioner I would close it to logging as well as ATVs. Is that asking too much? Our future depends on wise and responsible decisions. Do you want to leave a legacy of a bankrupt land? Continue on with what you are doing and we will be there soon. I apologize for being so critical but it's not for me that I write this – it is for future generations. Do what is right and you will never regret it.</p> <p>P.S. Notice the handsome little boy on the stamp – he is one of my 5 grandsons who loves the outdoors. It is for him and others like him that I took the time to attend the open house and back it up with this letter of comment. He loves Itasca!</p>	
Johnson, Richard	
<p>I am a native of Salt Lake City, UT who has come to live in Minnesota because I married a Minnesotan. I have come to love Minnesota for its beautiful natural resources and outdoor recreation opportunities. I am proud to live in the state where the Mississippi River originates.</p>	Comment noted
<p>I am concerned about the possibility of the DNR allowing motorized recreational use in the area of the Mississippi River. I oppose this and ask you to protect this area by prohibiting OHV use near the headwaters of this great river. I'm told this is the only pristine area of the Mississippi that still remains.</p>	4.3
<p>It seems to me that the OHV users already have plenty of trails in MN, many of them forested. I have seen photos of destruction caused in this area and other areas and I think the only way to protect this resource is to prohibit motorized use anywhere near this sensitive area.</p>	2.9
<p>PLEASE PROHIBIT MOTORIZED USE ANYWHERE WITHIN THE MISSISSIPPI HEADWATERS AREA. Thank you for thinking of future generations.</p>	6.2
Johnson, Larry	
<p>Because this part of the Mississippi is off the beaten trail and so remote, it would be next to impossible for enforcement to strictly monitor any portion of this area. OHV traffic should be off trails that cross or are in close proximity to wetlands, streams and rivers. The chance of a small percentage of renegade riders doing a great deal of damage in these areas is too great of a probability. The necessity of keeping these waters unpolluted and preventing further soil erosion dictates the need to keep ATV machines out of the river, off of the riverbanks and out of the forest. This natural resource must be protected.</p>	12.1 12.7
Johnson, Larry & Sharolyn	
<p>We are in favor of opening the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to ATV travel on forest roads and designated trails.</p>	6.1
Johnston, Bond	
<p>The MHSF should be classified as "closed" not "limited."</p>	6.2
<p>The headwaters portion of the Mississippi River is a national resource that should be protected for its wild qualities, not opened to further OHV damage.</p>	10.6
<p>The DNR, counties, and U.S. Forest Service are providing thousands of miles of OHV trails in Minnesota; closing the relatively small MHSF to OHVs will not impinge on OHV driving in all these other places.</p>	16.8
<p>Three of the five DNR work team members recommended the MHSF be closed to all OHVs, citing the natural assets above and noting that steep hills and sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off-road driving. Significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river.</p>	14.1 3.9 11.9
<p>Mike Carroll, DNR Regional Director in Bemidji, acknowledged making the final decision to classify the forest "limited" so trails on county lands could be connected.</p>	3.9
<p>Currently, OHV damage in MHSF is extensive. Campgrounds are rutted and damaged, e.g., Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point. ATVs are riding in the river in a number of locations, e.g., Stumphges Rapids.</p>	11.9
<p>Rather than protecting the historic sites noted above, the DNR Draft Plan has designated ATV routes in these sensitive areas, thereby rewarding past illegal behavior by legalizing it.</p>	10.1
<p>The Mississippi Headwaters Board (a state-created local counties board) designated the MHSF stretch of the river as "wild," which created a 1,000-foot corridor along the river where all OHVs</p>	10.8 10.2

Author/Comment	Response
are banned. The Draft Plan, however, disregards this protection and proposes ATV trails within this corridor, with some dead-ending at the river. As noted, illegal riding has already damaged the riparian zone.	
A "closed" forest would not ban OHVs entirely. They would still be able to ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads. But state forest roads and trails would be closed to all OHVs. The forest is a checkerboard, with state and county land mingled. If the forest were classified as "closed," county and township roads would still allow OHVs to cross state land when going from one county parcel to another.	3.8
It will be difficult for DNR enforcement to strictly monitor any portion of this area because this part of the Mississippi is so remote. Classifying the MHSF "closed" would greatly aid in protecting the river itself.	11.2
In the interest of all Americans, we must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi for future citizens. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a narrow corridor. It contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi in the river's entire 2,552-mile stretch. Minnesotans must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized river.	10.15
Kalina, Charles	
I, and my family, are frequent visitors to forests and wilderness areas. We take pride in our sincere efforts to leave no human trace when we visit, and continually strive to improve this ethic.	Comment noted
I am writing to urge, in the strongest terms, to "close" the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to off road vehicle use, not just "limit" ATV use. These headwaters contain sensitive lands, consisting of sand hills, near a major watershed.	6.2
I/we have seen the gross damage that ATV use causes. Off road vehicle use, even when legal trails are present, it has been our experience, still leads to unauthorized trails into areas that are off limits. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest will be no different.	12.1 2.10
America's ATV craze has taken wilderness managers, and forest managers by storm, with regulation of these vehicles lacking in funding, or laws current enough to handle the onslaught. Trash carried in by ATV users, extreme noise, thrill riding, destruction of top-soil, stream destruction, fauna destruction, harassment of wildlife, two cycle engine air pollution, destruction of wildlife habitat, and human injury, are all part and parcel of ATV use. Unfortunately, many budget strapped agencies do not have adequate funding to hire extra personnel to police these activities.	Comment noted
We now have an opportunity to start sensible regulation of ATV's. Closing the M.H.S.F. to ATV's, will not mean that ATV use will not be widespread, as there are thousands of miles of federal, state, and county trails open to ORV's in Minnesota. It is wrong, and totally unnecessary to open the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to ATV use, especially considering the sensitive nature of the sandy soils, which will surely erode if ATV's are not kept out of there.	16.8 12.3
Deterioration of M.H.S.F. is unacceptable enough, but there is the Mississippi watershed to also consider, with its habitat for wildlife, that often require undisturbed areas for breeding.	12.7
Finally, I/we go to wilderness areas specifically to escape the trappings of urban activity---the noise, crowds, chaos, litter, etc. We pride ourselves on non motorized entry, and exit, with a sincere determination to leave as little trace as possible. It is very important to preserve areas where motorized use is not allowed. They are becoming rarer every day.	2.3
Please CLOSE the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to ATV/ORV use.	6.2
Kalina, Matt	
Close the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to motorized vehicles.	6.2
In the interest of all Americans, we must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi for future citizens. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a narrow corridor. It contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi in the river's entire 2,552-mile stretch. Minnesotans must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized river.	10.15
The MHSF should be classified as "closed" not "limited." The headwaters portion of the Mississippi River is a national resource that should be protected for its wild qualities, not opened to further OHV damage. The DNR, counties, and U.S. Forest Service are providing thousands of miles of OHV trails in Minnesota; closing the relatively small MHSF to OHVs will not impinge on OHV driving in all these other places.	16.8
Three of the five DNR work team members recommended the MHSF be closed to all OHVs, citing	14.1

Author/Comment	Response
the natural assets above and noting that steep hills and sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off-road driving. Significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river. Mike Carroll, DNR Regional Director in Bemidji, acknowledged making the final decision to classify the forest "limited" so trails on county lands could be connected.	3.9 11.9
Currently, OHV damage in MHSF is extensive. Campgrounds are rutted and damaged, e.g., Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point. ATVs are riding in the river in a number of locations, e.g., Stumphges Rapids.	11.9
Rather than protecting the historic sites noted above, the DNR Draft Plan has designated ATV routes in these sensitive areas, thereby rewarding past illegal behavior by legalizing it.	10.1
The Mississippi Headwaters Board (a state-created local counties board) designated the MHSF stretch of the river as "wild," which created a 1,000-foot corridor along the river where all OHVs are banned. The Draft Plan, however, disregards this protection and proposes ATV trails within this corridor, with some dead-ending at the river. As noted, illegal riding has already damaged the riparian zone.	10.8 10.2
A "closed" forest would not ban OHVs entirely. They would still be able to ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads. But state forest roads and trails would be closed to all OHVs. The forest is a checkerboard, with state and county land mingled. If the forest were classified as "closed," county and township roads would still allow OHVs to cross state land when going from one county parcel to another.	3.8
It will be difficult for DNR enforcement to strictly monitor any portion of this area because this part of the Mississippi is so remote. Classifying the MHSF "closed" would greatly aid in protecting the river itself.	11.2
Close the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to motorized vehicles.	6.2
Kania, Laurie	
I am writing you to request that please "close" the old logging roads and skid trails and not open them up to motorized traffic. It is important that the Headwaters of the largest river system in the United States be kept wild.	6.2
Kannegeiter, Becky	
I understand that DNR is seeking input from citizens concerning Off-Highway Vehicle use in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest using a classification system. Please classify MHSF "CLOSED."	6.2
I am a frequent visitor to Minnesota because I enjoy the forests, hike, kayak, bike, bird watching, sail, cross country ski. There activities are relatively quiet, non-intrusive, and rarely interfere with other users of the forests, but ATV riding does interfere or reduces the enjoyment of all of these activities. Motorized recreation riders do destroy wildlife habitat, spread invasive weed seeds that crowd out natural native plants. Some of these are rare or uncommon elsewhere and should be preserved.	12.1
I have paddled this portion of the Mississippi several times. In recent years, I have seen extensive damage to Coffee Pot Landing, ATVs riding in the river, rutting, erosion and a general disturbance to this pristine place and wondered why such activities were allowed. A "Closed" classification would be a start too rectifying these problems and save this valuable wildlife habitat.	4.3 2.9
Karon, Jan	
Some things are sacred. Won't you help protect the headwaters of the Mississippi from noise pollution and other environmental degradation.	6.2
Kelzenberg, Dennis	
I DO NOT want the state forest Trails and minimum maintenance roads to be closed.	6.1
Keough, Janet R.	
I am writing to express my concern about allowing increased OHVs into the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. I am especially concerned about allowing any OHV use within the "Wild River" section of this important headwaters area.	4.3
OHVs, with their large tires and ability to travel in wet areas, cause PERMANENT DAMAGE to fragile soils in the riparian zones of headwater and other streams. Although most riders are responsible, a small but significant number are careless, irresponsible and even malicious in riding off designated trails...too often, the sport is riding through wetlands, streams and riparian	12.1

Author/Comment	Response
corridors.	
the Wild River of the Mississippi Headwaters State Park is an extremely important, but fragile resource - it warrants designation as a Wild and Scenic River and must be protected for future generations. The cost of signage, maps and barriers is small compared to the huge cost of trying to repair the damage after the fact - and, frankly, restoration once OHV damage has been done is impossible.	10.7
DNR staff oppose allowing OHV use of this fragile system. Listen to your scientists!!!	14.1
I beg you, do the right thing for future generations and resist the short term attraction of allowing OHV use in this State Forest. I recommend closing this State Forest for OHV. There are hundreds of other miles for OHV to travel.	6.2
The New York Times, last Sunday, ran a FULL PAGE article about the serious concern about OHV damage to wild lands - even traditional ATV hunting lands - in the Western US. this article was excerpted in the MS Star Tribune and the Duluth Tribune, but the NY Times ran the entire article.	Comment noted
Here is the NY Times article: NATIONAL December 30, 2007 Public Lands: Surge in Off-Roading Stirs Dust and Debate in West By FELICITY BARRINGER and WILLIAM YARDLEY Federally owned lands are being transformed into the new playgrounds, and battlegrounds, of the American West This situation is ALREADY being seen in Minnesota!	Comment noted
I beg you to reconsider the plan to allow OHVs in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. Please close this forest to OHV...protect this valuable resource for your grandchildren and their grandchildren.	6.2
Kilmer, Kathy	
About ten years ago, I was lucky to be able to spend several days in the Boundary Waters. It was a unique and memorable wilderness experience. At the time, I was so grateful for the many Minnesotans, including Sigurd Olson, who had the foresight to protect that special place. Now, I've heard that there are plans to open another treasured Minnesota wilderness to noisy, smelly, damaging off-road vehicles. With thousands of miles of roads and trails available in Minnesota for ORV use, off-road riders don't need to have access to the wild Mississippi River headwaters. Please keep this place as it is, with wilderness, wildlife and quiet recreation its highest and best use. Minnesota has a rich and honorable tradition of conservation. The plan to open the MHSF to ORV use would put a black mark on that historical record.	4.3 16.8 2.3 6.2
King, Gregory	
As a lifelong Minnesotan, outdoors enthusiast, and parent of two, I truly appreciate the legacy of beautiful natural resources that my grandparents and parents have left me. In return, I feel it is my duty to protect that part of Minnesota for my children and their children. As such, I am greatly concerned about the proposal before the DNR to designate ORV routes in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. It is my belief that ORV users in Minnesota already have access to thousands of miles of forest roads and trails on state lands and that, if anything, these environmentally damaging machines should be banned from the Headwaters altogether, following the recommendations of the DNR's own Interdisciplinary Team, including Fisheries, Wildlife, Ecological, and Enforcement staff. The Mississippi and its Wild Headwaters are of regional, national, and even international importance. Please protect the Mississippi's Wild Headwaters for our children by keeping ATVs, dirtbike motorcycles, and off-road vehicles out of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.	4.3 16.8 14.1 10.6 2.9
Kleymeyer, Charles D.	
The Mississippi is a national river and a national treasure. Please keep ATVs/OHVs away from it! Keep the Mississippi Headwaters wild! Only Minnesota can protect the headwaters of this grand river, for our children and grandchildren. Do your duty, please!	10.6 10.7 2.3

Author/Comment	Response
<p>Knaeble, Alan</p> <p>Please keep the Mississippi Headwaters region wild. Motorized vehicles should not be allowed to use this region, whether on proposed trails or off trail. My work as a geologist is commonly spent working in rural and remote areas of Minn. canoeing rivers, mapping, and working with the people that live there. In many of these places I see the disruption and destruction caused to the environment by motorized vehicles. The valuable natural resources that Minnesota still has left must be protected by setting stricter guidelines for off road vehicles, or else their indiscriminate use will continue to spoil our natural environment.</p>	<p>2.3 4.3 2.9</p>
<p>Knafla, Cheryl</p> <p>PLEASE do not open this area to OHV ... They are so destructive to the environment ... noise, tearing up the landscape, and also bring irresponsible persons into the area driving vehicles without respect to nature. We have enough destruction to our environment -- don't encourage more!</p>	<p>4.3 12.1 2.9</p>
<p>Knisley, John</p> <p>I recently became aware of the planned OHV routes through the Mississippi Headwaters area in Itasca State Park. Historically for the United States the Mississippi River has been recognized as one of the most important transportation/trade routes for this great country. Given its historical, economical, and cultural significance the birthplace of this great river should be held in high regard and protected so our future generations can hear, smell, and see the same waterway that we see today.</p> <p>Living in north central Minnesota for nearly six (6) years, I have been able to experience the beauty and majesty of Itasca State Park in both winter and non-winter seasons. I, like many others have enjoyed the great cross-country skiing, hiking, virgin pine trees, and the lakes and river throughout the park; above all, it's the tranquility of the park that draws me. Working for the Outdoor Program Center of Bemidji State University and also a member of the Itasca-Moraine Chapter of the North Country Trail Association I have had the opportunity to take many groups of young and old throughout the park, experiencing all it has to offer. Given the mission of these groups to be enjoying nature silently and leaving no trace it only seemed fitting to take people to such a unique piece of Minnesota.</p> <p>Already nearly all of the State Forest Land is open to public OHV use, leaving only State Parks for the use of non-motorized activities. If we soon start allowing motorized vehicles into our State Parks where will be room for those who enjoy the quiet stillness of nature, only on private land I presume? I understand there is a large population of OHV users in this state and they do contribute a large sum of money to the States Natural Resources, but to be fair, what will be left for those who choose not to or cannot afford to experience nature behind a windshield?</p> <p>I currently live in southern Minnesota at the merging of the Minnesota and Cottonwood Rivers. Here the rivers see constant use from OHV's and you can see the problems they cause, further destroying the already impaired waters. To enforce regulations on the problem OHV users is nearly impossible because of the lack of Conservation Officers and the sheer size of the river areas. I feel the same fate is set for Itasca State Park if OHV use is going to be allowed. Where Itasca State Park was once a place where families could be together in the serenity of nature and forget about all of the sounds and smells of our mechanized world will become nothing more than another playground for the motorized vehicle. I feel that the passing of allowance to build OHV trails through the park could be detrimental to the park, therefore I DO NOT support OHV use in Itasca State Park.</p>	<p>20.1</p>
<p>Kollenberg, Jon</p>	
<p>Please keep there Mississippi Headwaters State Forrest open for Atv use. We love the area.</p>	<p>6.1</p>
<p>Kottke, Laura</p>	
<p>My name is Laura Kottke and I grew up going to the Mississippi Headwaters every year to enjoy the pristine wilderness and majesty of the river. It is a very special place for me and millions of others. We would bike, canoe, hike and totally enjoy the beauty of the river. It is unbelievable to</p>	<p>4.3 2.3 6.2</p>

Author/Comment	Response
me that anyone would even consider allowing ATVs to pollute the area. We have so few places free of traffic and noise and to take that away from the headwaters would be irresponsible. Please do not allow ATVS to become a part of that experience.	2.9
Krogstad, Blanchard O.	
I strongly support the banning of all motorized vehicles from the Headwaters State Forest. This is a beautiful area and the only such in the entire state. I don't want to see it defaced by vehicles that tear up the soil, drive down vegetation and vandalize the area.	4.3
We keep giving ground to these groups that seem beset with the destruction that sensitive people hold dear and try to protect. I sometimes fear that the DNR is intimidated by some of these aggressive, arrogant people who pursue the edge of legality and soon move across it.	4.2
We need to establish laws and enforce them. Fines must be increased beyond the point of merely being inconvenient.	11.4
CLOSE THE MISSISSIPPI HEADQATERS STATE FOREST TO ALL MOTORIZED VEHICLES, AND ENFORCE THE LAW!	6.2
Kruse, John	
Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to your planning process. I am opposed to motor vehicle use on state forest and park lands. ATV use is incompatible with other uses of wild lands, and is detrimental to the long term health of the forest.	16.6
ATVs are noisy, and disrupt the experience of anyone who is using the forests in a quiet way. While ATV riders may say this is merely a preference, it is known that noise raises one's blood pressure. Further walking, biking, and canoeing are good exercise, while ATVs create air pollution and are often involved in accidents. They disrupt the healthy activities of others, and don't add to the health of the riders.	2.3
ATVs cause erosion, and thus lead to the destruction of trees, the pollution of rivers, and the loss of wildlife habitat.	12.1
What I understood from the maps of proposed ATV routes is that they will be allowed in many places throughout the forest. I'll bet many ATVs will take shortcuts between the many "legal" roads, so the end result will be a fine-grained network of strips of dirt and mud in the forest. I think this is terrible thing to allow a the headwaters of the Mississippi River.	4.3 11.1
If ATVs must be allowed on public lands, they should be confined to very small areas, and along the sides of existing paved roads, to minimize destruction.	Comment noted
Lais, Dan	
There currently are thousands of miles of county and state land for OHV's and ATV's to operate. To many examples of trashed natural areas by OHV's and ATV's exist already. The steep slopes and sandy soils of the Mississippi Headwaters area are not compatable for that kind of motorized use. Extremely important to protect this pristine area and stretch of wild and scenic river. Highly recomend it be designated "closed" to OHV's & ATV's.	16.8 3.9 10.15
Langsdorf, Pauline	
I am opposed to "limited" opening of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest (MHSF) to Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs) including All Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) as proposed in the MHSF Draft Plan. This cherished natural resource should be closed to OHVs and ATVs. I believe that permitting "limited" access to this area would be detrimental. One only needs to look at the areas where OHVs are permitted to see the damage they frequently inflict on the land and the rivers as well as the negative impact on wildlife of the area. The MHSF roads and trails need to remain closed to this type of use. As a frequent visitor to his area I want to see this area protected so that future generations can experience this unique area without the degradation that results when OHVs are permitted. This area contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi River in Minnesota and it needs to be protected.	6.2 11.9 4.3 2.9
LaPray, John & Jamie	
Over the years my husband and I have followed the conflict between ATV and Snowmobile users versus other outdoor enthusiasts in our State Parks. Recently it came to our attention (Tom Meersman – Star Tribune, December 10, 2007) that some county officials want to follow the increased use of motorized off road vehicles in the upper Mississippi water way. We are very much opposed to the use these off road vehicles in State Parks. Please add our names to any list	20.1

Author/Comment	Response
that is being used to keep track of public opinion. It is important for future generations of Minnesotans that we say NO to ATV and Snowmobile users now.	
Larimore, Gene	
The DNRs Draft Plan for the MHSF recommends to the Commissioner a Limited forest classification with various OHV routes. I urge you to persuade the Regional Director to recommend a Closed forest classification with no OHV routes.	6.2
Recall the many presentations made at Bemidji State University last Wednesday that stressed the uniqueness and iconic nature of MHSF. This state forest is different from the others in that it is the last remnant of wilderness both in North Central Minnesota and along the entire Mississippi river. The wild qualities of this state forest symbolize northern Minnesota not only to Minnesotans and other Americans but to the rest of the world as well.	4.3 2.9
The headwaters of the Mississippi river, the "Nile of North America," deserve protection from elements such as OHVs that will degrade the river's various ecosystems, tarnish its iconic image, and embarrass Minnesota to the rest of the country and the world.	Comment noted
Larsen, Kristin	
I thank you for your hard work on the OHV planning team for the Mississippi Headwaters. I urge you to listen carefully to those voices calling for restraint in the use of OHVs in the area.	Comment noted
You probably know better than anyone else the myth of repairing damaged lands - it is not something that can be done without great expense and time, if at all. Months and years can pass and nothing will be lost if we have preserved our lands from harm because we are thoughtful and cautious. If we bend to pressure and let unfettered access ruin Northern Minnesota due to a few persons' inaccurate interpretation of the law (mandate for motor use.... I don't think so).	11.9
Please spare the area within 10 miles of the river from any further destruction, allow no riding in the areas that are proposed as "limited". Listen to the voices of those folks who represent so many voices of Minnesotans - in particular the Jack Pine coalition. These folks know the area and know the risks.	1.2
We have the whole world to drive cars and trucks around in, since when is driving around in a convertible with the windows open a sport? This is not a sport. This is consumption of fossil fuel for a joyride. This is not supported or engaged in by the majority of persons in our state, robs money from infrastructure repairs on our roads and fritters it away on minimally supervised activities of clubs to "maintain" routes, thus taking jobs from state employees who should do such work.	Comment noted
It amounts to a shameful Amway type pyramid scheme that results in election victories for folks at the top and unhealthy activity for those at the bottom.	Comment noted
Larson, Bette	
The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a narrow corridor having steep hills and sandy soils that make the area vulnerable to off-road driving.	3.9
Currently, OHV damage in MHSF is extreme. Camp grounds are rutted and damaged, e.g., Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point. ATVs are riding in the river in a number of locations.	11.9
The Mississippi Headwaters Board designated MHSF as "wild", which created a 1000 foot corridor along the river where all OHVs are banned.	10.8
The Draft Plan disregards this protection and proposes ATV trails within this corridor, with some dead-ending at the river.	10.2
A "closed" forest would not ban ATVs entirely. They would still be able to ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads. Forest roads and trails would be closed to all OHVs. If the forest were closed, County and township roads would allow OHVs to cross state land when going from one county parcel to another.	3.8
Therefore, I urge you to consider a "closed" designation rather than "limited" for this area.	6.2
Larson, Bill	
Bill Larson with the Northwoods Riders ATV Club. We spoke briefly on Wed, Jan 16 during a short break at the DNR open house. I should have taken that opportunity to speak publicly, but I don't do well in a public speaking senerio. (Dang..I should have taken that Toastmaster Course)	Comment noted
The Plan for the MHSF is a good, viable plan that encompasses all users groups, excluding no-one. To help make the plan come to fruition, our club, The Northwoods Riders ATV Club, is	Comment noted

Author/Comment	Response
ready to begin working with the DNR and the various county land administrators and foresters, as a volunteer group to get the work done on the ground. Signs need to be planted, trails GPS'd and mapped and informational kiosks built and maintained. I have worked closely with Bob Milne and John Winters in Beltrami Co to see our rec trails plans get past the planning stage and into a work session to get things done. Myself and the club will continue to work in the Mississippi HSF to get things accomplished in there as well.	
A forest that is currently managed for it's timber resources is a most likely place for off-road vehicle trails, and the MHSF is such a place. Certainly there will be issues, but these will all be dealt with as they arise, and the forest will continue to prosper and grow.	2.3
I encourage you and the planning group to send the current plan unto the Commissioner with a recommendation for approval.	6.1
Larson, Connie	
PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE, Keep the Mississippi Headwaters wild. The current park program is wonderful for those that want to come and visit, to come and look, and then drive home or back to their camp. The historic value of this NATIONAL river is it's wilderness, that what gives us a taste of our history. ATV's will ruin this experience, they will ruin the inherent value of this destination. ATV's are not there to experience the wilderness of our ancestors, maybe they bring money -I have no idea, but it is your/our responsibility to protect this national river. Keep the Headwaters wild, this is our family's summer destination every year, PLEASE don't push us out of Minnesota!	20.1
Larson, W. M.	
I support the DNR proposed plan as 'Limited' in the MHSF. As an avid ATVer, I see this as viable compromise among user groups. I would prefer the forest stay as Managed (it's current state) but I realize the need for some trail closures. Please pass on my support to the Commissioner!	6.1
Laumer, Jim	
I'm from White Bear Lake and an avid motor sports enthusiast. I would like to comment on the pending classification of Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. I believe Minnesota State forests should serve the recreational pursuits of all citizens including those that want to hike, those that want to ride horses and those that want to ride ATV's and Snowmobiles. With proper planning, all of these pursuits can be supported in Minnesota State Forests.	2.3
Lawrence, Peggy	
I don't know if you have every been involved with ATVAM, but it is a great organization that promotes ATV's for recreational use. Anytime you can be an advocate for this cause would truly be appreciated. There are miles of roads in each county up here designated for our use, but the anti-access advocates are constantly asking the DNR to detour access to beautiful forest/public areas that should be open for us to take our kids and grandkids to enjoy the wilderness and wildlife. Just thought I would share this as I know you are the type of guy that would maybe have some interest in this for the future of your kids and grandkids!! (Not to mention keeping the doors open here at the Cat House and our competitors to the North!)	Comment noted
Leach, Elaine	
I write in strong opposition to opening the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to off-highway vehicles.	4.3
The Mississippi River does not belong to the commissioners of the counties adjacent to the Headwaters nor to any agency within the State of Minnesota. It is a national river and one of the most significant natural resources in North America. The proposed network of OHV routes will permanently alter the Headwaters' wild character, valuable wildlife habitat, cultural and historic landscape, and an ancient canoe route.	15.1 2.9
Do you realize that one hundred Polish high school students to whom I taught conversational English in Kalisz, Poland, understood the importance of the Mississippi River to the all the people of the United States? I would be embarrassed and ashamed if any one of them accepted my invitation to visit Minnesota and found the Mississippi Headwaters had been destroyed or damaged by off-highway vehicles.	Comment noted
I believe it is your duty and your responsibility to protect the last wilderness on the Mississippi River. The National Wild & Scenic Rivers act of 1977 did not give you the right to make the headwaters an ATV destination thirty years later. Keep it wild!	4.3 10.7

Author/Comment	Response
I respectfully request that the proposal for opening the area to off-highway vehicles be rejected. I look forward to hearing from you.	6.2
LeBlanc, Colleen	
I am appalled that people are even considering allowing off-highway vehicles in the Mississippi Headwaters' State Forest.	4.3
I live in the country and have farm land. OHVs use our township roads and tear them up by making big circles in them. This is not a priority area for law enforcement to monitor, so damage is done continually. The ATV riders do not care about the damage they leave behind. Nearby, there is an area that was privately owned with an absentee landlord. The OHV's tore huge ravines in the downhills. They created an ugly eroded landscape.	12.1
I love the state and federal parks we have in Minnesota. We must preserve and add to what we have, not allow any of it to be damaged or destroyed. I canoe often. I go to the parks often. I do not want to hear or see OHV's when trying to find calmness in nature. I do not want our beautiful wilderness to be erased forever. A concerned citizen	2.3
Lee, Ed	
Please keep the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest open! The ATV clubs are doing a very good job of helping keep there riding places clean. Also most ATVers are very careful with the enviornment, We have a very few renagades,and we are working to educate them better. The same goes for the motorest,they have a few renagades also. I am 85 years old and enjoy ATVing very much. Please keep this Forest open!!!! I can not get out to enjoy the forest by walking like the younger folks can, they too will some day be old!.	6.1
Lee, Mary Jane & Gordon	
We are feel very strongly that the state forest be a closed forest and restrict the damage done to the ecology by motorized vehicules. This is the last remaining wild area and needs to be protected for future generations. We have that responsibility.	6.2
Lee, Vern	
Please keep the area open for all to enjoy. Keep Minnesota on the fore front of the fastest going sport in the country.	6.1
Lehrer, Mark	
I have become aware that the DNR is considering closing the forest to ATV's and OHV's. I'm writing this note to let you know I oppose closing the forest. While I don't think I should be allowed to ride my ATV anywhere and everywhere, the Headwater Forest roads and trails are ideally suited to ATV use. Closing them to ATV's makes no sense and really is impossble to justify. Please keep the forest roads and trails open.	6.1
Lenarz, Jeff	
Please keep Stumpage landing and the area in the head waters open to ATV's.	6.1
Lenk, Brendon	
Bill, I am an avid OHV user and hunter and I live Clearwater County. It was recently brought to my attention the DNR's plans to manage the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as a Limited state forest and that many are opposing this and would like the forest to be classified as Closed. I believe with a proper trail system and management system both motorized and non-motorized users can both enjoy this forest. Sensitive areas need to be closed to OHV's and OHV users that break the laws considering these areas need to be severely punished. It is a very small percentage of OHV users that destroy the land and they are the ones that need to be punished not the whole OHV user group. Most of the trails and forest roads in this area were established from the land being logged. Some of these trails have been around for over 100 years and it would make no sense to close them to OHV users. This area is by no means an untouched wilderness area like the BWCA. Sensitive areas should be managed or closed but the rest of the forest should be left open for OHV users, hunters and outdoors people to enjoy. With proper management and law enforcement this land will be able to be enjoyed by a multitude of users in the future. OHV users and hunters spend a lot of money in the state of Minnesota and many Minnesota company's welfare depend on the sell of OHV's and hunting products. We need to have places to use our OHV's. If this forest is classified as closed other state lands in the area will see much more pressure from OHV's and will deteriorate faster. Every year more and more	6.1 12.1 11.5 2.9

Author/Comment	Response
people become involved with OHV's. As the number of users go up it would be nice to have more areas to responsibly use OHV's. Sensitive areas can be closed, sound issues can be addressed, all users can use this area in harmony. Please decide to manage this land as a Limited state forest.	
Libbey, Wesley	
I would like to urge you to classify the Forest as CLOSED. I was a member of the Citizens 32 member Advisory Committee from the beginning in 1980 for 13 years during its formation and development. The committee always considered the upper river as the most pristine and deserving of greatest protection during my participation for all of years. I think Americans would concur that the beginning of this mighty river should be protected for all of them. Many thousands of them have walked the rocks at the outlet of Itasca State Park. I hope you might think that over my 98 years I may have absorbed some wisdom.	6.2
Lien, David A.	
That said, as you surely know, many sportsmen and women are becoming increasingly concerned about growing threats to the future of hunting and angling opportunities on our public lands resulting from habitat loss and degradation due to excessive road building and off-highway vehicle (OHV) over-use and abuse. With this in mind, we are asking the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to close all habitat-damaging and "unclassified" trails on state forest lands in the planning area and any other unnecessary or environmentally damaging routes, and to refrain from building any new trails. In particular, no OHVs should be allowed in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest (MHSF).	4.3
Former Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth called off-road vehicle (ORV) abuse one of the "four threats" to the health of public lands.	8.2
Today in America there are 7 million miles of roads; in our National Forest System alone, over 460,000 miles—enough to circle the earth 18 times. ¹ Just to put that figure into perspective, the Interstate Highway System is only 43,717 miles long.	9.1
Some 270,000 miles of roads and routes are legally available to off-road vehicles nationwide, over six times the length of the interstate highway system. Meanwhile, at least 60,000 miles of unauthorized ("unclassified") routes zigzag through public forests. ²	9.2
In Minnesota's Chippewa National Forest, for example, there are 5,831 road miles on all land ownerships. These roads provide unbroken access to within about 0.5 mile of all lands. ³	9.3
Regarding invasive species, a study by the Montana State University Extension Service found that, "People and their motorized vehicles are a major cause of knapweed spread. Vehicles driven several feet through a knapweed site can acquire up to 2000 seeds, 200 of which may still be attached after 10 miles of driving."	12.10
Poorly managed OHV use damages hunter, angler, and other quiet-user experiences, adversely affects wildlife habitat and behavior (including big-game and fisheries), and impacts water quality.	2.2
OHV-caused soil compaction triggers a cascade of negative effects ranging from impacts on water quality to a shift in plant and animal communities. After vehicle tires compact loose soil, rain or snowmelt can no longer percolate fully, and the subsequent surface runoff generates hillside erosion. ⁴ This is of particular concern in the MHSF.	12.11
Steep hills and sandy soils make the MHSF area vulnerable to off-road driving damage and significant erosion already has occurred from illegal driving near and through the river. ⁵	12.12
According to the Minnesota DNR, "It has been well established in Minnesota that ATVs are traversing wetlands on public lands, and that sediment from eroding slopes damaged by ATV traffic is entering wetlands and streams." ⁶	12.16
Closing OHV trails on state land in the forest is reasonable because hundreds of miles of OHV	16.3

¹ Conservation Northwest. "Roads shrink wild areas." *Conservation Northwest*: Fall 2005, p.9

² Matthew Daly. "New Illegal Trail Rule Criticized." *Associated Press*: 11/7/05

³ Al Williamson and Stan Kot. "Off-Highway Vehicle Road Travel Access Project Wildlife Report." *Chippewa National Forest*: April 2007

⁴ David G. Havlick. *No Place Distant*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2002, p.91

⁵ Tom Meersman. "ATVs could get foothold in hallowed headwaters." [Minneapolis-St. Paul] *Star-Tribune*: 12/4/07

⁶ Minnesota Department of Natural Resources-Ecological Services Division. "Assessing the ecological impacts of ATV trail construction and use on public lands: factors to consider and a review of literature." *Internal Peer Review*: 10/3/02

Author/Comment	Response
trails are already available on nearby county lands and in other state forests. ⁷	
According to a 2000 Minnesota DNR "Awareness and Satisfaction Survey," the statement that survey respondents <i>disagreed</i> with most was: "The DNR should establish more sites on public land for motorized off-road vehicle recreation." ⁸	16.4
According to a 2002 "Minnesota Deer Hunters' Opinions and Attitudes Toward Deer Management" survey, the typical Minnesota firearms hunter hunted with a group, used a tree stand at least some of the time, and <i>did not use an ATV</i> . Most hunted for the sport and to be with friends and family. ⁹	7.2
Multiple studies and surveys have shown that OHVs scare away big game and do not improve hunters' success. ¹⁰	7.6
Former Forest Service and Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation biologist Alan Christensen, states flatly: "Roads are the single biggest problem on the landscape...It's well documented and everything else pales in comparison." ¹¹	8.3
The approach of sharing public land sounds reasonable, but in practice it has often failed. What usually happens is that those who prefer quiet recreation are driven from areas where off-road driving becomes popular. ¹² So where's the multiple use?	19.2
Data shows that the people of Minnesota who do not use OHVs vastly outnumber those who do (even among deer hunters in the north central and northeast part of the state). Those who recreate in non-motorized ways on public lands outnumber those who ride OHVs in terms of both the number of people and number of recreational days, and Minnesotans react negatively to suggestions that the DNR should supply more OHV trails in public satisfaction surveys when questioned about how DNR should cater to recreation tastes.	16.5
When hunting skill and effort is reduced to twisting a throttle, hunting and habitat disappear. Motorized hunters have to continually reach further. And thus it spreads. Like cancer cells, if the use of ATVs continues to grow unabated they'll eventually kill the host. In this case, the host is hunting. ¹³	7.3
Top-of-the-line OHV models can also outpace sticker prices for many standard passenger cars. Hunting boots are cheap. Most hunters rely on "sweat equity," not OHVs. That's tradition. That's how it should be, how it should remain. According to NRA life member Chas S. Clifton, "Although I am 55 years old, I am not so feeble as to require motorized access everywhere I go hunting...[there are] plenty of heavily roaded public lands for those who do."	Comment noted
Trout Unlimited Public Lands Initiative (TU-PLI) coordinator David Petersen says that "a single ATV or dirt bike ripping round-and-round can silence gobblers...and chase wary deer plumb out of the country, and there are millions of these screaming nightmares out there, with more every year. At the same time, these multiple-abuse machines are destroying the precious gifts of solitude and adventure the rest of us work so hard to find." ¹⁴	2.3
Kevin Biegler, a member of the executive board and past president of the Twin Cities chapter of Trout Unlimited, says: "We're sick and tired of listening to ATVers cry about the need for more trails." They have 11,000 miles of DNR inventoried trails. "The state only has 1,900 miles of trout streams and one-third of them are not viable waters for sustaining recreational fishing." ¹⁵	Comment noted
Other Minnesota groups, like Minnesotans for Responsible Recreation and the Izaak Walton League, have spoken out against expanded ATV use in our state forests. "They call it managed, but it's really not managed at all. It's unmanageable," said Rick Fry, longtime Pequaywan resident	2.4

⁷ Tom Meersman. "ATVs could get foothold in hallowed headwaters." [Minneapolis-St. Paul] *Star-Tribune*: 12/4/07

⁸ Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR). "Awareness and Satisfaction Survey Results." *Bureau of Information, Education and Licensing*: June 2000, p.4

⁹ Responsive Management. "Minnesota Deer Hunters' Opinions and Attitudes Toward Deer Management." Presented to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources: 1/4/02

¹⁰ David G. Havlick. *No Place Distant*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2002, p.98

¹¹ David Petersen. "Our Very Survival." *Backcountry Journal*: Winter 2006-2007, p.2

¹² Tom Meersman. "Trouble on the trails." [Minneapolis-St. Paul] *Star-Tribune*: 12/9/06

¹³ Scott Stouder. "Standing up for Idaho's Rapid River." *Backcountry Journal*: Fall 2007

¹⁴ David Petersen. "Our Very Survival." *Backcountry Journal*: Winter 2006-2007, p.1

¹⁵ Lu Ann Hurd-Lof. "County attorney discovers loophole in ATV rules." *Park Rapids Enterprise*: 5/15/07

Author/Comment	Response
and Town Board supervisor. "We're trying to convey to [the DNR and county] that we don't want this [network of trails up here]. But no one seems to be listening to us." ¹⁶	
The noise and smell of an ATV can alert game animals from a long way off, so your chance of seeing game from an ATV is very small. That same noise and smell that is chasing deer away from you is also chasing them away from any other hunters in the area -- this can create very hard feelings among hunters who used stealth and stalking skills to get into good habitat only to have the deer scared off by ATVs! ¹⁷	7.9
An increasing number of hunting and other conservation groups are questioning the use of ATVs in hunting, says Montana Wildlife Federation president David Stalling. "Unregulated, irresponsible and out-of-control use of ATVs threatens our hunting heritage," said Stalling. "Simply put: unmanaged ATV use is reducing habitat security, increasing big-game vulnerability and, in the long term, greatly reducing hunting opportunities." ¹⁸	7.9
Midwest outdoorsman Tony Dean says that, "I tend to agree with Stalling. For a few years, my wife and I...hunted the Cave Hills area in Harding County on an annual basis. We'd arrive early for pre-hunt scouting, but come opening morning, ATV riders carrying rifles would be out in full force. As a result, the deer would almost immediately abandon daily patterns...hunting from such a vehicle stretches the boundaries of fair chase, and interferes with other hunters." ¹⁹	7.9
"Traditional hunters want a quality experience, but they are faced with ever-increasing negative impacts brought about by unmanaged ATV use on our public lands," says Stand Rauch, a lifelong hunter. "As ATV use grows unchecked, many hunters are being displaced from their most pristine and productive hunting areas on their national forests and critical wildlife habitat is being sliced into smaller and smaller pieces." ²⁰	7.11
David Petersen says that in these times of general overcrowding and shrinking quiet-use opportunities on our increasingly stressed public lands, it's hard to comprehend why hunters and hunters' organizations who are quick to sound alarms about real and perceived Second Amendment and anti-hunter threats don't raise a peep of protest while the best of what's left of America's unspoiled public backcountry is chopped into ever-smaller bits by new roads and motorized trails. ²¹	9.4
In "Trouble on the trails" Tom Meersman describes the damage being caused by OHVs in the MHSF: "As snow swirled at Stumphges Rapids campground in Mississippi Headwaters State Forest, flurries began coating a "No Motorized Vehicles" sign yanked from the ground and lying on its side. Boulders had been set across a trail to block all-terrain vehicles, but two of the rocks had been pulled away. Meanwhile, across the Mississippi River, a deep gouge in the side of a sandy bluff showed where ATVs had climbed the slope repeatedly to reach the top. Winter is setting in, but the scars of last summer remain." ²²	15.6
As award-winning DWM Cary Carron so accurately puts it, if something isn't done soon to reverse the take-over of public lands by OHVs, "It will be the end of hunting as we know it." We hope you will do everything in your power to help preserve our state forest and other public lands in their natural and wild state for future generations of hunters and anglers and other outdoors enthusiasts.	7.4
Lies, Diedra	
As a recent graduate of Bemidji State University, I was saddened to hear of the plan to allow ATVs and other OHVs into the Mississippi Headwaters area. One of my fondest memories of the region is my experiences with friends and clubs while exploring Itasca State Park, most notably the Headwaters area. The serene, calm setting seemed to be the perfect place to relax, appreciate the natural world and form lifelong memories. Please don't allow others to lose the chance to have such wonderful experiences by allowing in noisy, unpleasant machines.	4.3 20.1

¹⁶ John Myers. "Debate runs deep over ATV use in state forest." *Duluth News Tribune*: 6/17/07

¹⁷ Bureau of Land Management-Colorado (BLM-Co). "Hunting With ATVs-Responsibility or Regulation?" *BLM-Co* website (accessed 3/4/07): <http://www.co.blm.gov/gra/gra-atvethic.htm>

¹⁸ Tony Dean. "Hunting, ATVs a bad combo." *Argus Leader*: 1/3/07

¹⁹ Tony Dean. "Hunting, ATVs a bad combo." *Argus Leader*: 1/3/07

²⁰ Jason Kiely and Scott Kovarovics. "Now or Never: Getting a Grip on Off-Road Vehicles." *New Mexico WILD!*: Spring 2004, p.17

²¹ David Petersen. "Studies confirm that ATVs and elk don't mix." *The Durango Herald*: 3/16/07

²² Tom Meersman. "Trouble on the trails." [Minneapolis-St. Paul] *Star-Tribune*: 12/9/06

Author/Comment	Response
Liehou, Leslie	
The Mississippi Headwaters is a special wild, historic place with biodiverse ecosystems and wetlands where a person can enjoy the solitude of nature. This is the kind of experience that I seek when I visit Minnesota's natural environments. If you approve the DNR proposal to designate ATV trails around the Mississippi Headwaters, the noise alone will deny use of the surrounding public wildlands to me and other people who seek peaceful interaction with nature. Noise roaring over the terrain, polluting fumes and oil deposits from the vehicles would be detrimental to health and would be incompatible with many other forms of outdoor recreation. According to a Minnesota DNR survey conducted in 2004, more Minnesotans aged 20 and older canoe and kayak than ride ATVs. Moreover, OHV access would endanger the ecosystem and disturb wildlife. Illegal use could damage vegetation and be difficult to police.	10.6 4.3 16.1 11.9
Several years ago I researched and commented on a plan to create a system of ATV trails in Missouri's Mark Twain National Forest. Our observations revealed erosion and damage to plants and streams from illegal ATV use off the designated trails at established sites. Doubts arose about whether the Forest Service had the resources or the ability to enforce regulation of ATVs in the proposed trail area. Over 3000 responses during the comment period revealed strong opposition to the proposed ATV trails. Consequently, the MTNF personnel withdrew the proposal.	Comment noted
I request that your agency reject the proposal to expand ATV roadways near the "wild corridor" surrounding the Mississippi Headwaters. Instead, close the Headwaters to OHVs as the DNR's Fisheries, Wildlife, Ecological, and Enforcement staff first recommended. Protect the pristine character of this wild watershed of the source of the Mississippi River.	6.2 14.1 10.15
Lindquist, Brian	
Hi my name is Brian Lindquist and I'm just writing to say that ALL the tree huggers need to find something better to do. I have a ATV and I'm tired of not having any place to ride everything is for tree huggers or snowmobiles. Atv have pretty much nothing out there. Every body out the need place to ride there toys. So PLEASE take everything in and think about it it keeps people out of trouble and off the streets when the can get out to do thing they love to do. Atv have been around for years and the can be used for EVERYTHING now from riding to plowing fields. Atv need more trails and should be able to use snowmobile trails in the summer. We also should be able to ride atv all year around.	Comment noted
Long, Edith (Mimi) & Edward	
We were attendance at the January 16 Public Meeting in Bemidji - re the Draft Forest Plan for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest; - but did not speak at that event.	Comment noted
We lived on a 'farm' in the very south-west corner of Beltrami County for ten years: we have since moved (October 1) to Hubbard County, but continue to own the acreage, home and outbuildings in Beltrami County. Our land is more or less surrounded by the MHSF. My husband and I hiked, cross country skied and horseback rode throughout that area extensively. (and of course - Dick hunted also!).	Comment noted
PLEASE remove the area of the Mississippi River corridor from your present State Forest Plan. Your intended 'Plan' will continue the degradation of that area in the following ways:	6.2
Sensitive wildlife: we have seen, deeply appreciated and enjoyed endangered, threatened and just ordinary species of wildlife. They will not be there for our grandchildren under your proposed plan. But of course - the deer will be there... in multitudes, because you will have caused the withdrawal or destruction of any and all of the top of the line predators (except the human hunters on ATVs of course!).	12.6
The destruction of the forest trails. These are not the 'Forest Road' of which we speak - there is only one of those designated in our area, which is the road that begins on Hubbard County 27, goes over a bridge at the Mississippi River, and continues on to Clearwater County Highway 2. The so called 'trails' in that whole area - of which there are indeed more than your maps show - have innumerable MUD HOLES throughout their entire lengths. These mud holes are of course of varying depths and widths - but in the majority of cases, effectively prevent foot traffic of any sort, and even horseback riding!! The worst one is just before the Hubbard County line and south of our acreage -- at approximately #2819 - or was it 2820 or 2828?? -- on your map of the area. This muddy pond NEVER dries up - and the ATVers have even apparently decided that it's just too	22.11

Author/Comment	Response
deep for them and have begun making a side 'road' around! (and of course, the result of that will be yet ANOTHER mud hole within five years!)	
Your 'Forest Plan' states that ATVs are only to make temporary 'roads' during the hunting season to build deer stands and to retrieve game. So how do you explain the dozens of permanent 'Trails' throughout the area, which go to and in-between individual hunting party's deer stands?!! Not to mention the semi 'permanently' established camping areas that have been cut out of the forest???	7.7
We have observed your signage attempts down by the Forest Road river crossing bridge. Certainly you are aware that those signs are COMPLETELY IGNORED!! We have seen FRESH ATV tracks going into and all around the supposedly CLOSED clear-cut and tramped down 'camping' areas'. There is no way that the DNR - under present staffing, or ever for that matter - can police those areas!!	Comment noted
PLEASE listen to what we have said above - we are NOT exaggerating. The point made at the meeting about the future HUGE influx of people in Minnesota (and the whole Country) was EXCELLENT. The time is NOW to pro-actively preserve this special area for future generations - the decision is yours to make: please think before you act - stiffen your resolve - over rule the 'Powers that Be' and the ATV industry - and Close the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest Corridor to motorized use.	6.2
Lonnquist, Jane	
I urge you to take whatever actions you can to block the proposal to allow off-highway vehicles in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.	4.3
As a former staff member of the D.C.-based organization American Rivers, I understand the importance of headwaters in riparian health. As a Minnesotan, I feel a strong obligation that we act as responsible stewards of this Wild River -- a local and national treasure.	10.6
I am certain that the people who enjoy driving motorized vehicles for recreation can find other venues that do not jeopardize a national resource and infringe on the citizens -- both current and future -- who wish to enjoy it quietly in its natural state.	6.2
Louisiana, Duane	
Why would anyone anyone prevent us from enjoying our state forests? I feel it is wrong for a few tree huggers who don't know or enjoy the envoriment to take that privelege away from us that do.	Comment noted
Luckrow, Theodore	
I would like to express my support for the trail proposal. The proposal appears to protect the land near the river, while still providing recreational opportunity in other areas.	6.1
Lutz, Sandra	
I strongly urge that ATVs not be allowed to be used on the forest roads and trails in the Mississippi Headwater State Forest.	4.3
Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is of particular concern to people who love the wilderness. It is a magnificent, wild part of the river, a hidden treasure alternating between boreal forests and vast wetlands rich in the history of north central Minnesota. The region is habitat for trumpeter swans, red-shouldered hawks, bald eagles, wolves, fur bearers and an incredible diversity of waterfowl in its wild rice lakes, sedge meadows and bog lands. Jack pine and red pine forests intermingle within the wetlands, making for an amazingly rich ecosystem.	10.6 10.14
This ban would not totally shut ATVs out since they would still be allowed on the township roads and county road ditches. The steep hiles and sandy soils in this forest make it especially susceptible to erosion from ATV use. There is already significant damage in this forest from ATV's. In the interest of all Americans, we must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi for future citizens. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a narrow corridor. It contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi River in Minnesota. Minnesotans must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized river.	3.8 11.9 10.15
Thank you for taking my comments and I hope you will protect this beautiful and significant wilderness area of Minnesota.	6.2
Lyman, Robert	
I write to comment upon the pending proposal for ATV/ORV (hereafter ATV) vehicle use on public lands, and more specifically with regard to the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.	Comment noted
In short, I strongly urge the DNR to significantly limit the use of ATVs on public lands and even	4.3

Author/Comment	Response
more so in the Mississippi Headwaters. They are destructive to the land. Their destruction is even more problematic in wetlands and along shorelines. There are significant public costs in the repair of the damage they cause. And their use in the areas near to the Mississippi River significantly spoil the use by canoeists and others who seek a time of quiet enjoyment.	
I understand that the DNR must balance a variety of public uses. But the ATV activities merit much closer regulatory action than all other recreational use. Their destructive capacity, the costs to the taxpayers, and their interruption of the enjoyable use by others places them in a special category. Their use should be carefully circumscribed into limited areas where the damage can be contained.	2.10
It also must be taken into consideration that ATV users have an industry to support their lobbying efforts. That self-interest - for profit, rather than simple enjoyable use of public land - changes the nature of how the DNR must review the submitted comments and industry pressures upon it.	14.10
Finally, with regard to the Mississippi Headwaters again: there is only one river corridor under consideration, while there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of square miles of other alternative areas for ATV use. The quiet enjoyment of that area by canoeists and fishermen might be easily destroyed while there is a simple solution in establishing a protective zone around this precious resource.	2.9 2.3 16.8
Maertens, Jerry	
After considerable review of the DNR Draft Mississippi Headwaters OHV plan and attending the public input meeting on January 16, 2008, I have to conclude that anything short of a "closed" to OHV classification for all public lands within the Mississippi Headwater State Forest south of US Highway 2 would be a complete farce. I find the DNR documentation in support of a "limited" classification incomplete, in some cases a misrepresentation of facts, and a complete lack for any environmental and habitat protection/management. Comments by plan section follow:	Comment noted
<p>1.0 BACKGROUND</p> <p>This section states that Minnesota Forest management considerations "perpetuate rare and distinctive species of native flora and fauna." According to the January/February issue of the Minnesota Conservation Volunteer the Mississippi Headwater is home to the Headwaters Caddisfly. According to the profile it is "one of Minnesota's rarest endangered species." Mention is also made that this area "harbors 89 species in greatest conservation need."</p> <p>What if any planning consideration was given to the above mentioned fauna? If not why not?</p>	15.8
<p>3.2 CLASSIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS</p> <p>This section states "DNR modified its preliminary recommendation to match the county proposals." Section 3.0 lists eight criteria to determine classification. Modification of recommendations to match county proposals is not one of the criteria.</p> <p>How can this change be enacted? Could one assume that some resource protection was lost in the compromise? Why did the State modify its plan? Could the State not have held its ground?</p>	5.6
<p>3.4 RECOMMENDED CLASSIFICATIONS</p> <p>This section states "The DNR West Central Forests Road & Trail Designation Team discussed alternative classification proposals and developed consensus classification recommendations for State Forest lands in the planning area."</p> <p>How is it that this statement can be made since it is public information that three team members recommended a "closed" forest and 2 a "limited" forest and it is our understanding that this has not changed?</p> <p>It is also stated in this section "The team recommends that the Commissioner of Natural Resources classify State Forest lands within the planning area as described in the following text." To be accurate should not this above statement read "Mike Carroll, regional director, after discussions with the team recommends.....?" How can Mike Carroll over-ride the 3 to 2 position of the team when DNR documents state "RMTs and the Commissioners Office must rely upon the teams collective wisdom and judgment to make difficult classification and designation determinations?" Obviously the team is not calling the shots.</p>	14.1
3.4.1 MISSISSIPPI HEADWATERS STATE FOREST – LIMITED	2.5

Author/Comment	Response
<p>Again it is stated in the document "The DNR team proposes a <i>limited</i> classification for DNR Forestry-administered forest lands in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. A <i>limited</i> classification affords a better opportunity to align DNR and county land management than would be available under a <i>closed</i> classification."</p> <p>Shouldn't the DNR also provide protection to other activities within the area such as the established canoe route? Shouldn't the users of this river be afforded a quality "wilderness" experience? A quiet experience as well as shielding from as much motorized traffic as possible.</p> <p>The DNR seems to be obsessed with providing an OHV experience at all costs. In looking at the "big picture," how many forests have been closed to OHV travel? How many acres in total? It sure is sad how the DNR operates on this.</p>	
<p>This statement is also disturbing "The planning team also invested substantial effort considering anticipated future demand for a motorized recreation corridor connecting public forest lands in Hubbard County to public forest lands in Beltrami County, especially the designated OHV trail area recommended in the Beltrami County Recreational Trails Plan. Specific to this trail corridor issue, the agencies propose designation of 1.3 miles of ATV/OHM trail on DNR lands, including the proposed designation of an ATV/OHM trail across the existing snowbridge at Coffee Pot Landing."</p> <p>To propose an ATV/OHM Mississippi River crossing at coffee pot is not only absurd it is a gross violation and rape of the public and all previous DNR programs in the area. Since when is priority given to Beltrami County? What about all users of the river? How many motor vehicle river crossings are there? Why can't a connector route be developed along one of these public roads? Is Stumphges now a township road? Wouldn't this road be open to HLV and OHV even if the forest was classified "closed."</p>	10.9
<p>5.0 ROUTE DESIGNATION POLICIES AND PROCESS</p> <p>It is also mentioned "county, state, and tribal forest management agencies have agreed to mutually recognize forest roads that have been formally designated by each agency."</p> <p>If there is agreement, how is it that Beltrami County has only forest access routes? No breakdown as to what is a forest road and what is a trail? You call this agreement and cooperation?</p>	5.7
<p>6.5 AREAS WITH LIMITATIONS ON OFF-TRAIL AND NON-DESIGNATED TRAIL USE</p> <p><i>"Beltrami County-Administered Forest Lands. Use of non-designated routes (e.g., access routes, restricted access routes) by HLVs and OHVs is allowed unless otherwise restricted. Offtrail travel by ATVs is prohibited. Approximately 7982 acres are included in this area."</i></p> <p>The above Beltrami County statement in the proposed plan seems to differ from both DNR and Hubbard County statements about the area of limitation. Am I correct in interpreting the above statement as all Beltrami County access routes will be open during the hunting season except those "restricted?" Could one then say that the only crumb given here is that the OHVs will not be permitted to travel cross-country on Beltrami County lands. Big deal! Working together????????????????</p>	5.8
<p>Some additional thoughts and comments:</p> <p>Why are there so many trails and roads within 1000 feet of the river corridor open to OHV travel? There are too many to list. Should the Mississippi Headwaters Board rules be enforced. Yes! We were told that if the trails were used prior to the Headwaters Board nothing could be done. But wasn't the Headwaters Board before ATVs?????? Again little or no concern for the resource.</p>	10.10
<p>Since this planning process was an opportunity to also determine whether or not motorized traffic should be permitted on some forest roads, Why do roads 2831, 2893, and 2727 remain open? They all are very close to the river.</p>	22.1
<p>Again I would like to reiterate that anything short of "closed" for this forest is a farce. According to DNR data this would only be the forest #4 out of all the state forests. A very poor showing?????</p>	6.2
<p>Maertens, Shirlee</p>	
<p>I strongly urge the DNR to please reconsider the classification of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to a "closed" status. Without all the repetition of the same arguments and reasons you and the team have heard for the closing of this forest to OHVs, I stand with those who gave comments</p>	Comment noted

Author/Comment	Response
and testimony in Bemidji on Wednesday, January 16. I particularly concur with public comments of Dr. Kyle Crocker of Bemidji who has literally walked the walk so to speak, with Willis Mattison (biologist/ecologist, Det. Lks area) and John Casson's (wildlife biologist, LaPorte). These people and many of the others spoke to the issues with scientific information and studies to support closing the MHSF.	
I've looked at the map and it seems rather obvious that within the whole of MHSF boundary, there exists just too many open trails. Because of the map colors used, it is very difficult to distinguish between county lands (really State land) and State lands. This is a narrow forest and even though the State says the Forest is limited, it really doesn't appear that there are many places where ATVs cannot go.	4.3
And ATVs do not need to go all over; they do not NEED to go in the MHSF. There are hundreds of miles of roads and trails on other public lands as it is. Those folks from Solway, MN commenting on being able to go into this area is quite simply, I suspect, because they live there and it's in their back yard--- but it doesn't follow that it's their right to be able to go there. I don't blame them for not wanting to lose that convenience but under the circumstances, it's important to keep this closed to motorized recreational vehicles.	16.8
And Beltrami County? There is nothing I read in the "criteria (that) shall be considered when classifying forest lands for motor vehicle use" that says DNR must be compatible with the county. Since when does a LGU (county) supersede the State? (I suppose since they were allowed to "opt out.") But Why are you facilitating Beltrami County and their wide open OHV policy? Besides, the County has everything north of #2 very liberally "managed" and by closing the MHSF, this might serve somewhat as a starting point and a catalyst for the County to begin more adequately to regulate ATVs with designated trails per se. If the regs are otherwise so confusing, people don't have to go there. (Most people do not want this "everything opened" status.)	5.6 5.1
For me one of the biggest and most important reasons for closing this forest is simply because it is the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest and it just happens that the mighty, although in this region, it's the infant Mississippi River that flows through the forest. Does this mean nothing to you, DNR, that this river has a very significant place on this planet and it happens to be in our back yard right here? Because it does have this status and because there still remains a very small part, 40 little miles of nearly 2500 miles, that this very first segment of the river is the only part of the total river system that still remains most natural and semi-wild. That in and of itself should justify a closed classification.	10.6
One should not have to justify any further about the significance and the historical importance of this river and the land it flows through in the MHSF area to justify a "closed" classification. Some things are not compatible: motorized recreation and primitive areas.. We just simply need to protect MHSF and keep the lands much as they were and allow them to revert back to some semblance of an earlier Minnesota landscape.. This would seem to exclude motorized recreational vehicles covering the many miles of trails/roads available to ATVs in the forest.	2.3
According to DNR website, only four of the first near thirty forests classified were designated "closed." And these were just small little forests. My gosh, now think about it: that really seems disproportionate and very 'piggy' on the part of the motorized crowd. How can you see it any other way? And really, what IS the driving force? Tell me honestly,--- industry? politics? Actually, it might be easier to accept as we can 'fight' neither industry nor politics really because nothing else matters then. The die is cast and we wouldn't have to burn up our time and energy for which very few of us if any receive any kind of compensation for our efforts except to say we fought for a land ethic we thought important.	8.3
Lastly, in one of the handouts (p 2 of 5, Direction07.doc), it is stated that even though there will be "differences of opinion among team members,. . ." RMTs and the Commissioner's Office must rely upon the team's collective wisdom and judgment etc". How are we to interpret that? I don't feel that is what has occurred.	14.1
Magnuson, Gina	
I am concerned about the proposal regarding motorized vehicles and the Mississippi River Headwaters.	Comment noted
While I believe that individuals have a right to recreate, I don't support the right for large, heavy	12.1

Author/Comment	Response
vehicles to go over land and waterways. Areas that are run over do not recover. It is as simple as that. I have seen what snowmobiles do to paved trails and unpaved areas. No one from the state or any volunteer organizations comes out to repair the damage. Then it develops into erosion and loss of cover. Until they can make those vehicle light enough so they "leave no mark behind", I think that they are breaking the rule of the outdoors. A trip to the outdoors should leave nothing behind but fond memories.	2.10
Mahler, Andy & Linda Lee	
We strongly urge you to reject any plan that would permit OHVs/ATVs/ORVs in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest and the river's designated "Wild Corridor" for the following reasons.	4.3 10.2
OHVs in Minnesota already have access to thousands of miles of forest roads and well over a thousand miles of OHV trails on state lands, plus several thousand more miles on federal lands.	16.8
The noise effects from increased traffic – louder, faster moving vehicles – will seriously damage the Wild character that qualified the Mississippi Headwaters for national Wild River designation.	12.4 10.7
ATVing and driving other OHVs is incompatible with all other forms of outdoor recreation, except possibly snowmobiling, according to the Wisconsin DNR's study of recreational incompatibility. See: Wisconsin SCORP	16.6
Because OHVs are noisy and often violate areas posted off limits, "access" given to OHVs in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest means access taken away from those who desire high-quality non-motorized recreation, such as the experience of paddling the Mississippi's Wild Headwaters.	3.8 2.3
According to the latest Minnesota DNR survey, conducted in 2004, more Minnesotans aged 20 and older engage in canoeing and kayaking (485,000 or 14%) than ride ATVs (357,000 or 10%).	16.1
For these and other reasons, The DNR should reject this plan to designate OHV routes, and instead close the Headwaters to OHVs as the DNR's Fisheries, Wildlife, Ecological, and Enforcement staff first recommended.	6.2 14.1
Maki, Greg	
I am in favor of allowing the trails to be used by motorized vehicles such as ATV and OHV. I agree that "tread lightly" philosophies need to be followed. I disagree with those who feel all state forest land should be off limits to motorized vehicle use. A few points to consider:	Comment noted
I've got a trail running around my property. If even one summer goes by where I don't drive the trail a few times and cut away brush, the trail is reclaimed by nature. The "extreme damage" that people worry about takes very little time for mother nature to repair on her own.	12.13
Much of the "untouched wilderness" that people talk about when referring to the last "wild" stretches of the Mississippi were clear cut years ago. If people could see how the landscaped looked then, they would realize that the "damage" from ATVs is minor and easily erased by nature. Same goes for road ditches. People talk about all the damage to the environment when there are two grassless tracks in a ditch. Don't they remember what it looked like when the bulldozers were creating the road. Those ditches aren't natural and they looked way worse before.	19.13
People that complain about ATVs affecting their enjoyment or safety while hiking, dog walking, etc on forest trails need to realize something...the reason many of those trails stay open is due to the motorized vehicle traffic. I've never run across anyone walking/hiking through the middle of thick forests or brush. They walk on the trails kept open by vehicles. If ATV are banned, then hikers should be charged registration fees for their boots and the money used to keep their trails open. And what about fire safety...many of the ATV trails create fire breaks or access to remote areas that would allow fire fighters to combat forest fires.	8.4
People a quick to point out the damage near the river caused by ATVs. I agree with rules keeping ATV, trucks, etc. out of the river and away from the river bank. Having a 100 ft-100 yard buffer is fine, don't ban the entire state forest. If you are caught abusing the rules...immediate confiscation of the vehicle...no exceptions. Enforce that a few times and people will obey. I doubt that all of the damage near river access points is just ATVs. I'm sure there are people driving their on-road cars and truck into sensitive areas.	11.5
Horses...horseback riders try to badmouth ATVs as being so hard on the environment. I've followed a pack of a dozen horsed going down an ATV trail. Horses can chew the heck out of the	8.1

Author/Comment	Response
ground too. The thing horseback riders have going for them is the number of people doing it is so low. If the numbers were reversed such that the number of horseback riders was equal to the number of ATVs today, and vice versa, everybody would be up in arms about the horses leaving torn up trails, piles of crap, destroying habitat by eating the natural grasses and flowers.	
If you add up the actual square footage of the trails and compare that to the total square footage of the state forests you'll see a very very small percentage of the land is being utilized for motorized vehicle traffic. That leaves plenty of other state forest land for the other groups and their interests...but like I said, how many birdwatchers want to actual walk off trail through thick brush?	12.14
Special areas...nesting areas, places containing rare foliage, etc should be protected. I doubt many ATV people would disagree. It is when people want all or nothing that creates the problem. Don't block a significant percentage of the population from enjoying public land.	15.9
Minnesota contains two major OEM for snowmobiles and ATVs. That creates many jobs within the state. Not just OEM jobs... but their suppliers too, gas stations, clothing, food, resorts, etc. Ban ATVs...hurt the economy.	14.10
Don't punish the general public for the actions of a smaller number of people abusing the rules. Keep the trails open and punish those who abuse the rules.	11.6
Manning, Barbara	
Please leave us one truly wild place in the state. You know the reasons why, you know this is the right thing to do.	6.2
Martin, Chris	
Please do not close this area to ATV's and camping We get up there twice a year with our grandson. And it would be a shame to have him miss out on such a beautiful area of Minnesota. And this is a great teaching area to show him what nature is all about and how to care and respect it. Do not shut him out and us because others don't care.	6.1
Mastro, Mark	
Please make the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest a A Limited Designation and allow ATV's on Forest Roads, Minimum Maintenance Roads, and Designated Trails. We love to experience the Mississippi Headwaters from the seat of an ATV.	6.1
FACT: Minnesota ATV families take at least three ATV Vacations each year, accounting for over 950,000 nights in a Hotel, Motel or Cabin rental per year. They help our economy! *sources: University of Minnesota Tourism Center "Minnesota Recreational ATV Riding"	Comment noted
Mattison, Willis	
Failing the public Trust – The MnDNR's primary charge is to manage, promote and protect the natural resources of the state of Minnesota. By sophistic logic rather than good social and environmental science the MnDNR has caved to the political pressures from the ATV and their powerful industrial/recreational lobby and sanctified the degradation by motorized recreational vehicles of enormous tracts of land identified as State Forests. Surely, the most revered and valued of these State Forest tracts, on the state, national or world level, would be the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. The MnDNR management has failed the trust placed in it by the people of the state of Minnesota to responsibly manage, promote and protect this national treasure. Government workers in the environmental protection or natural resource management field are often easily categorized into one of two stereotypes based on the pattern of decisions they make. They are either the career bureaucrat who makes decisions that are believed to help him or her advance their career and please the “powers that be” or they prove themselves to dedicated public servant willing to speak truth to power at their own peril. Experience has shown that the career bureaucrat is most often the one promoted to management positions over the dedicated public servant for obvious reasons. Any final decision to allow the proposed ATV access to the Headwaters State Forest to become final will be a victory for the career bureaucrat and a defeat for the true public servants among the MDNR staff. Shame on you.	14.3
Failing the spirit of the Environmental Policy Act – While the OHV lobby were successful in getting special legislation passed that allowed the MnDNR's State Forest Classification an exemption from adhering the requirements for environmental review under the State Environmental Policy Act, the MnDNR had a morel obligation in principal to meet the goals of the	14.5

Author/Comment	Response
<p>Act. The process that was used to review the potential adverse environmental impacts of allowing the proposed ATV intrusion into the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest was scuttled internally by MnDNR's management. It is public knowledge that your technical staff whose responsibility it was and on whose judgment expertise has been relied on time and time again for all other environmental reviews was overridden by politically motivated management. No public explanation has ever been provided nor have any questions asked about how and why this override was answered by the MnDNR in this process. Shame on you.</p>	
<p>Failing to acknowledge substantive and highly pertinent public comment pointing out major shortcomings in draft plans.- Time and time again, substantive, well founded and researched criticisms and suggestions for improvements in the plan for allocation of State Forest area on the basis that would apportion some of the areas more suitable for motorized uses while coincidentally setting aside appropriate area for non-motorized outdoor recreation. Statistical rationale for the apportionment based on the MnDNR's own studies of what percentage of the State's population actually used ATV's on publicly owned land was offered yet ignored by the MnDNR without explanation or justification. In fact, the entire public process was flawed in that the MnDNR staff and management never allowed themselves to be placed in a forum where they were actually required to respond to the salient points offered from the public. Granted, the public forum format employed by the MnDNR toward the end of the public participation process was a significant improvement over the "open house" format that the MDNR selected and was justifiably criticized in earlier public comment. However, when MDNR blithely listen to questions, challenges, strong comments and public calls for revision to plans to meet substantive objections, the public is left to shadow box with itself. The MnDNR rarely responded to public input with a reasoned response either accepting the comment and indicating that it was justified and would be incorporated into the next revision of the plan or rebutting the argument from a citizen an offering up some rationale indicating that the idea offered had been considered and rejected and on what basis it was rejected. This is not a meaningful public involvement process, it is a sham disguised as a public process. Shame on you.</p>	14.6
<p>Failing the many generations to come- We and the MnDNR management who have made these unjustified decisions to sacrifice our national treasures at the alter of the motorized recreation lobby must accept the full criticisms that will be leveled at it by many future generations. Individual names of these MnDNR managers will be forever tied to these decisions. Anyone who has visited the Mary Gibbs Mississippi Headwaters Center can read the history of this heroine of the Headwaters and how she stood up to the logger barrens and the politicians who carried the mail for them. These people are mentioned by name and their names will live on for centuries in natural resource management infamy. Generations from now, when our children's children read the history of the Mississippi Headwaters one can easily believe that this history will name names. It will only be appropriate to have these names live in public shame. Shame on you.</p>	14.7
<p>Failing to follow good science and advice of technical experts- Time and time again, individuals with impressive environmental and natural resource credentials both wrote and rose to speak their most strenuous objections to the proposed plan allowing access to the Headwaters Sate Forest. These objections were supported by citing widely accepted natural resource stewardship principles. No one speaking in favor of allowing the level of motorized recreational access proposed by the MnDNR draft plan could cite similar credentials or references to justify their support of the proposed plan. The message here is abundantly clear. The MnDNR by adhering to the proposed plan for the Headwaters State Forest will clearly demonstrate that is more interested in heeding the very vocal but irrational and irresponsible motorized recreation industry and their fanatics than they are to hearing comments based on good science from within or from the general public. Shame on you.</p>	2.9
<p>Failing to hear the higher calling from civic minded citizens – Having participated in much of the public review process for many of the State Forest Classifications for OHV access and particularly in the process for the Headwaters State Forest it is apparent that the motivation of people offering testimony and comment generally falls into two broad classifications. One class consists of the ardent supporters of the MnDNR's draft plan that allows excessive intrusions and resulting adverse impacts on the resource tend to speak for their individual rights and wants and desires. The recount their escapades into and through the State Forest on their machines and</p>	10.11

Author/Comment	Response
<p>wax nostalgically how they want to be allowed to experience this again and again with their children, their grand children, their friends and others. Their motives generally come from a very selfish, experiential mentality that fails to recognize that their love of their sport exercised in a fragile and unique environment is experienced at the expense of the resource it self, at the expense of other fellow out door recreationalists, and the expense of future generations who will not find the “wild” river corridor that is the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. The other class tends to be those who while they do recount the beauty, the majesty, the thrill, the awe, the respect and even the spiritual nature of their own experience of the Headwaters State Forest they speak to protect an preserve it not for themselves so much as for the resources own unique and intrinsic value an for preserving the treasure for future generations. They most often speak, not for themselves but for the greater public good. They are the folks that have come to realize that very often the greatest reward that a person can experience from preserving a wilderness does not come from a person’s experience in the wilderness but in the knowing that the wilderness is still there. They take great satisfaction not in using up the resource by playing in it with their mechanized toys in doing what they can to ensure it is preserved and protected. It is apparent but sad; whose comment and testimony the MDNR management has decided carries the most weight to influence the state’s final decision on the resource. Shame on you.</p>	
<p>Failing your personal and professional responsibilities- Most of you reading this know that I come from a long history of public service in Minnesota State government having served 28 years with the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency in a management position similar to those who sit in a position of control with the MDNR now on this issue of OHF use of our State Forest. I know well the kind of pressure that can be brought to bear on natural resource decision makers and I do sympathize with your dilemma. You are clearly in a position to choose to do “the right thing” for society, our natural resources in general and the Headwaters of the Mississippi River in particular. If you stand up and speak truth to power, you will very likely place your very career in jeopardy because you will be bucking the outside political forces that can reach deep into your department and with a flick of the wrist deflect your fate and future in unfavorable directions up to and including your termination. The public knows well the fate of a previous MnDNR regional management person who dared stand on principle and speak for the greater public good. Often I found myself in positions where I had to make a value judgment. Do I give in on this battle and allow the public resource to be polluted or squandered in order to live to fight another day. Or is this the battle I cannot allow myself to loose and still respect my self and maintain some semblance of integrity. This, my friends in public service, this resource; the Mississippi Headwaters is, in my opinion, the battle you cannot lose and still respect yourself. If you let this one pass and stand idly by, shame on you.</p>	14.8
<p>Failing to practice “technological abstinence” or apply the “precautionary principle” – Those of you who may have studied the great debates regarding the over arching guiding principles that serve mankind best in the long run are no doubt familiar with the philosophies of technological abstinence or the precautionary principle. The first notion is basically one where mankind with all its ingenuity and growing technology is constantly developing new gadgets to perform various useful or entertaining tasks for their fellow man. Many of these are clearly beneficial and remained, in the judgment of history to be considered beneficial developments. From time to time, we have the luxury of looking back on a technological development and discover that what might have been perceived as an advance for mankind and the planet we live on turns out to have impacts that if we had known these impacts earlier would have given us pause. One needs only to review the history of global fossil fuel use and global warming as a case in point. Had we known what we know now, we surely would (or maybe I its more realistic to say “should”) have made different decisions about world energy policy.</p> <p>The notion implicit in the technological abstinence philosophy is that we might do well from time to time to stop and evaluate a new technological development or discovery and try to predict whether or not, in the long run, the discovery represents and advancement or a long term problem or detriment. Mankind has seldom if ever practice the self restraint it would take to make the decision that a new technological advancement is really as good for the planet as it might first appear. This is to suggest that the so-called all terrain vehicle technology that was thrust upon the</p>	14.9

Author/Comment	Response
American public back in the 1960's and 70's may have been one of those developments that was a genie society would have been better of if we had not let it out of the bottle.	
Failing to apply proportionate allocation of resources, space and time between incompatible outdoor recreations types –The notion of apportioning public lands in the form of State Forests between incompatible outdoor recreational activities was offered in previous comments on MnDNR classification plans. Thus far the MDNR has been silent on why it has continued to show the motorized sports community such favor be providing a hugely disproportionate fraction of State Forest acreage. Various data, some from MnDNR's own internal reports show that the percentage of Minnesota's outdoor recreation population that choose motorized sports on public lands to be very small and certainly less than 10 percent. Yet the MnDNR continues on a path that will award the vast majority of the State Forest acreage to the big winners, motorized sports. Previous comments have cited the Wisconsin SCORP study that demonstrated that not only were ATV's incompatible with all other forms of outdoor land-based recreation but that the ATV riding community practice their sport on public lands at the expense or loss of quality for all the other forms of recreational activity. Knowing this, the MNDNR has charged ahead with this unjustified disproportional favor to the motor sports sending a clear message to the non-motorized users of State Forest that they don't matter. Shame on you.	14.10
Failing to acknowledge and account for enforcement shortcomings Over and over in previous comments and testimony it has been pointed out that the adverse impacts assumed by the MnDNR's plan to sanctify OHV use in State Forests was grossly underestimated because the department failed to either recognize that enforcement efforts to date were incapable of keeping the ATV riding public on established trails. Several enforcement strategies that were offered with some promise to improve compliance with trail restrictions were not even acknowledged by the MnDNR in subsequent plan revisions. Here in the Headwaters, the off-trail excursions have been and promise to continue being especially egregious. What the MnDNR permits the MnDNR promotes. Therefore, the MnDNR has demonstrated active promotion of rogue, off-trail riding and will apparently tolerate it in the Headwaters as well. Shame on you.	11.4
Mattson, Jeri Lu	
I was saddened to review the draft forestry plan for the Mississippi River. Once again, bottom line corporate interests are supported at the expense of our environment.	Comment noted
The headwaters of the Mississippi is a narrow quiet river. To even consider allowing ATVs to ruin the landscape is unforgiveable. I have seen what these vehicles do to our forests, protected lands and even the ditches lining the highways.	4.3
How can you support tearing up the landscape with loud destructive machines? Have you tried to walk on land after ATVs have gone through? The growth is flattened; the soil is compacted and/or eroded with ruts and damage to plants and trees.	2.9 12.1 2.10
I know your arguments will be the same - it is only a few ATV drivers who are irresponsible and cause damage. Do you also apply this logic to our criminal laws? Since it is only a few who commit crimes, is it OK to repeal legal protections because the "majority" are good citizens? Even one irresponsible ATV driver can cause damage that takes years to repair - if it is ever repaired. I have seen too many forest roads made impassable for anyone except other ATV drivers.	11.5
Please think about the legacy we are leaving for our children.	Comment noted
May, Mary	
Please do not allow ATV's on the wilderness beginning of the Mississippi. The damage they cause is huge and I have seen it first hand.	4.3 6.2
McCarthy, Terry	
I urge you to please support protection to the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest by not allowing the intrusion of OHVs into this national resource of great natural and historical significance. There are numerous other areas less sensitive and significant where they can go. What a disservice it would be to spoil the integrity of this grand river and region. There is only ONE headwaters of the Mississippi!	4.3 6.2 2.9
McCarthy, Thomas	

Author/Comment	Response
I am writing to urge you to STOP your plan to make the MISSISSIPPI RIVER HEADWATERS STATE FOREST an ATV destination.	4.3
I have hiked in many areas in northern Minnesota where ATVs are allowed. Even the legal use of these is very destructive with extensive damage even in the short time they have been used. In addition, illegal use in the vicinity of allowed areas is rampant.	12.1 2.10 11.9
In a time when environmental resources are being rapidly destroyed and obesity is a growing problem the State of Minnesota should be encouraging constructive, healthy outdoor recreation, not destructive and unhealthy activities like ATV riding.	Comment noted
I'm also particularly concerned that the Minnesota DNR leadership is starting to follow the Bush Administration approach of ignoring scientific evidence by not even following its own staff recommendations on this issue.	14.1
McConnell, Shirley	
It is hard for me to believe that after all these years of protecting the historic Wild Mississippi Headwaters the DNR would even consider opening this quiet remote area to OTVs. We are talking here about on 47 miles of the great Mississippi that is home to pine martins, black bear, river otters, mink, wolf packs, etc. The thought of those powerful engines running after wild life and making muddy sloughs out of wetlands sickens me.	4.3 10.6
Rather than allowing this, I would like to see the old logging roads and skid trails allowed to return to nature, leaving the area entirely pristine. Vast areas are already open to OTVs, many places much more travelled where they should not be allowed either. Is the OTV lobby so powerful that it can deface every mile of our beautiful North Country?	6.2
McKeown, Anthony	
The Headwaters State Forest should be closed to all OHVs. Although an ATV trail may be only a few feet wide the acoustic trail is at least a mile wide. That's ten football field lengths on each side of the trail. That's a lot of area that effectively excludes all non-motorized users. And we all know that the ATVs are not going to stay on the trails. Traditional use and motorized use don't mix. Do you have your kids play on the railroad tracks?	6.2 2.10 2.3 16.6
McLaren, Deborah	
The Mississippi is a national river and a national treasure. Please keep ATVs/OHVs away from it! There are numerous ATV trails in Minnesota – they don't need to invade our precious public spaces, particularly this one. Remember, once its invaded you can never buy it back. Keep the Mississippi Headwaters wild! Only Minnesota can protect the headwaters of this grand river, for our children and grandchildren. Do your duty, please!	10.6 4.3 16.8 10.7 6.2
McNamara, Curt	
The damage done by off-road vehicles is atrocious, and their noise and exhaust ruin the outdoors experience for anyone within a mile. Please stop this now.	2.10 2.3 6.2
McReady, Doug & Nancy	
We would like to state our opposition to the proposed management of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest of having all trails posted as closed unless posted open.	6.1
This is backwards thinking is pushed by the anti-access, anti-motorized environmental groups. This is just another scheme to shut the majority of State Forest users out of the forests. State Forests are for all the public, not for just the vocal minority who do not like the use of motorized recreation.	Comment noted
Please continue the current management, which means all trails open unless posted closed.	6.3
McReady, Nancy	
Conservationists with Common Sense (CWCS), an organization with over 4,000 members, works to preserve access to and multiple recreational uses of public lands and waters. We are very much opposed to the management plan for all roads and trails within the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to be managed as closed unless posted open. We also oppose any such classification for any other State Forests. Minnesota has over 1 million acres in the Boundary Waters Wilderness that restricts motorized recreation. To add State Forests with such restrictions is unnecessary.	6.1 6.3
Access to State Forest roads and designated trails, and State Forests, should not be closed to any	2.3

Author/Comment	Response
particular user group. Such management is being pushed by the anti-access, anti-motor preservation groups who are a vocal minority. Our State Forests are for all the public, not for just a few.	
Medion, Francois	
I wish to add my name to the following comments written by the Izaak Walton League of America and certify that I agree 100% with all the points listed below.	Comment noted
The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is of particular concern to people who love the wilderness. It is a magnificent, wild part of the river, a hidden treasure and, an amazingly rich ecosystem. The MHSF should be classified as "closed" not "limited."	6.2
The headwaters portion of the Mississippi River is a national resource that should be protected for its wild qualities, not opened to further OHV damage. The DNR, counties, and U.S. Forest Service are providing thousands of miles of OHV trails in Minnesota; closing the relatively small MHSF to OHVs will not impinge on OHV driving in all these other places.	10.15 16.8
Furthermore, three of the five DNR work team members recommended the MHSF be closed to all OHVs, citing the natural assets above and noting that steep hills and sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off-road driving. Significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river. Mike Carroll, DNR Regional Director in Bemidji, acknowledged making the final decision to classify the forest "limited" so trails on county lands could be connected.	14.1 3.9 11.9
Currently, OHV damage in MHSF is extensive. Campgrounds are rutted and damaged, e.g., Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point. ATVs are riding in the river in a number of locations, e.g., Stumphges Rapids.	11.9
Rather than protecting the historic sites noted above, the DNR Draft Plan has designated ATV routes in these sensitive areas, thereby rewarding past illegal behavior by legalizing it.	10.1
The Mississippi Headwaters Board (a state-created local counties board) designated the MHSF stretch of the river as "wild," which created a 1,000-foot corridor along the river where all OHVs are banned. The Draft Plan, however, disregards this protection and proposes ATV trails within this corridor, with some dead-ending at the river. As noted, illegal riding has already damaged the riparian zone.	10.8 10.2
A "closed" forest would not ban OHVs entirely. They would still be able to ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads. But state forest roads and trails would be closed to all OHVs. The forest is a checkerboard, with state and county land mingled. If the forest were classified as "closed," county and township roads would still allow OHVs to cross state land when going from one county parcel to another.	3.8
It will be difficult for DNR enforcement to strictly monitor any portion of this area because this part of the Mississippi is so remote. Classifying the MHSF "closed" would greatly aid in protecting the river itself.	11.2
In the interest of all Americans, we must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi for future citizens. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a narrow corridor. It contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi in the river's entire 2,552-mile stretch. Minnesotans must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized river.	10.15
Metzer, Bob	
I have spent a fair amount of time in this area over the years. It is a place I hold near and dear to my heart. I am now retired and can't get around as well as I used to so I use an ATV too take in the wonders God has provided for all of us. I understand why some folks don't want machines ripping up the landscape and making so much noise you can't enjoy a quiet walk in the woods. Most of us who ride ATV's respect the rights of others and hate to see the area's where irresponsible riders have torn up an area. That puts a black mark on all who ride. I belong to an ATV club and whenever we ride, we always ride with respect for the land. We always pick up litter and we stay on designated trails. Please keep this area open to those of us who can't get around as well as we would like.	6.1
Meyer, Keith	
closing these trails would be a huge mistake...voiding many people who don't get the chance to ride the right to use these PUBLIC trails...do not let the mishaps of a few ruin this luxury for the majority	6.1

Author/Comment	Response
Myers, Mason & Gwen	
Please revise the current DNR Draft Plan for MHSF to classify it "Closed" to OHV/ATV travel because:	6.2
The Mississippi Headwaters Board's designation of it as "Wild", thus protecting a 1000 foot corridor along the River where OHVs & ATVs are banned, should be respected.	10.8
The unique collection of natural assets - forests, wetlands, wildlife habitat - located there should receive maximum protection.	10.6
The remote location will make it impossible to enforce the details of restrictions in the "Limited" classification; only "No travel" will be enforceable.	11.2
Damage of OHV/ATV travel on the ground will impact the Nation's mighty River at its source by adding erosion sites to the River bank. This last stretch of wilderness on this River must be preserved for posterity.	11.9
Designating ATV routes in ecologically sensitive areas, like Coffee Pot, because riders are already going there is simply a stupid move.	10.1
The DNR, State and County law enforcement agencies need to find a place to draw the line of control which OHV/ATV riders cannot cross to begin making the point that they are, in fact, subject to laws. This well-defined, relatively small location is an ideal place to do it.	11.4
The issue of OHV/ATV control is a burning one for many in Minnesota. Heretofore, every imaginable technique has been used to diminish a sense of public and private responsibility in the OHV/ATV crowd, e.g.: Only one miniature vehicle license plate required; minimum fines when caught that do not amount to more than the cost of doing business for riders; no risk of vehicle/equipment confiscation as hunters and fishermen face; no responsibility, through license fee allocation, for repairing damage caused by riders; reduced staff of Conservation Officers to "save money." Evidence of forest and stream damage by OHV/ATV's is everywhere in the State, indeed, in the Nation. Truth is, I do not believe the political will exists to challenge this small group of renegades. I would appreciate some evidence that I am wrong. Certainly, within the present structure of regulation and enforcement, riders are free to go where they want with the benevolent disregard of DNR regulations.	4.3 2.9 11.1
Meyers, Marilee	
It is truly beyond my comprehension that the headwaters of one of the mightiest rivers IN THE WORLD has the potential of becoming even further degraded by the presence of off-highway vehicles near and across it. Beltrami County has a precious jewel in the Mississippi headwaters. How can the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources who, I was taught as a small child and still believe, is the steward of our natural resources, possibly consider keeping the Headwaters State Forest open to off-road vehicles, particularly when damage to riparian areas is already well documented?	4.3 11.9
I realize that OHV owners and drivers buy license plates which help support the DNR. I also realize that only a few "abusers" are creating the havoc existing in areas of the rivers bank. However, until ALL off-highway vehicle drivers make a concerted effort to respect the river and its unique environment, I strongly encourage the DNR to close the Headwaters State Forest to motorized vehicles. Beltrami County is large and expansive, containing miles of land where off-road vehicles are appropriate and safe. Is it truly necessary to allow motorized vehicles in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest?	6.2
Protection and preservation is ever so much simpler and cheaper than restoration. Once property and shoreland is degraded to the point that wildlife habitat is destroyed, it is seldom possible to achieve restoration to the point that lost wildlife returns in full abundance, particularly wildlife living on the edge of their existence. Restoration can, and has been done, but not without significant financial support and considerable time.	Comment noted
Please consider carefully the ramifications of keeping this state forest open to motorized vehicles before making your final decision. I have high hopes.	4.3 2.9
Mielke, Paul & Dawn	
As a direct descendant of the person who made the Headwaters and Itasca State Park possible, I feel we must address the proposed plan for motorized use of trails. Uncle Theodore (Wegmann) would not have supported discriminating against any one group or type of user. This land was	Comment noted

Author/Comment	Response
intended for public use, not defined as wilderness. I have pictures of the fields where now stands huge red pines so don't profess to us the irreparable harm an atv would cause. In fact snowmobiles seem to help the reseeding of grasses where I look in the summer.	
ATV users pay fees for the vehicles in the form of licences, so use these (and snowmobile trail and licence fees) for what they were intended; the maintenance and enforcement of trails and their use. Open up the trails and nail those who intentionally damage the forests. Define 'damage' responsibly. Common sense is a wonderful thing and for those who are anti-motor, make them clear the trails and maintain them without the use of brush cutters and chain saws. It seems if it directly affects people, then reason overrules emotion. I ran into this when the skiers wanted snowmobiles out of Voyageurs National Park; it was great until they realized they couldn't use a snowmobile to pull the groomer and dogs are banned because of the parvovirus, so they would have had to groom by hand. There was instant agreement to responsible motorized use.	12.1
Mother nature can cause more damage in one storm than all of us can cause in a lifetime.	Comment noted
Mikkelson, Greg	
I was dismayed to learn that the state is considering turning the headwaters of the Mississippi River into a site for recreational all-terrain vehicles. This of course would be an ecological travesty. Please do what you can to keep the headwaters wild and beautiful, and ATV's out of the area.	4.3 8.5 6.2 2.9
Milburn, Scott	
The Board of Directors of the Minnesota Native Plant Society, a 26-year old non-profit organization with approximately 350 members throughout the state, is concerned about off road vehicle (ORV) use in the pristine and sensitive area of the Mississippi Headwaters. We believe that DNR should reject the current plan to designate ORV routes in the area, as the majority of DNR's Interdisciplinary Team made up of Fisheries Wildlife, Ecological and Enforcement staff first recommended.	4.3 14.1
The Mississippi River is of national importance and any proposed nearby land-use changes need to be scrutinized more thoroughly. The Headwaters area in Minnesota is the only part of the 2,500-mile stretch of this great river that is still in its natural state. It is the only stretch on the Mississippi to have qualified as "wild" when the US Department of Interior recommended that large parts of the river in Minnesota be designated under the National Wild & Scenic Rivers Act in 1977.	10.15 10.7
In contrast, ORV's already have access to thousands of miles of forest roads and well over a thousand miles of ORV trails on state lands, plus several thousand miles on federal lands. ORV traffic has a long record, both in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest and elsewhere in Minnesota of accompanying off-trail traffic damage to wetlands, soils, water quality, and the integrity of native plant communities. Our Society has a vested interest in this particular issue, but it goes beyond just our group. We need to consider future generations of Minnesota Citizens. The Mississippi River is a great source of pride and allowing ORV use in the proposed routes threatens the surrounding ecosystem. ORV traffic, by its very nature and with its accompanying noise excludes enjoyment of the resource by other uses such as nature viewing and canoeing.	16.8 2.3
Please protect the Mississippi Headwaters by prohibiting ATV's, dirt bike motorcycles, and ORV's entirely from Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.	6.2
Miller, Sherry	
As an ATV rider I want access to Forest Roads and Designated Trails, and the Forest should not be Closed to us. A Limited Designation would allow ATV's on Forest Roads, Minimum Maintenance Roads, and Designated Trails. This Designation would allow ME to experience the Mississippi Headwaters from the seat of an ATV.	6.1
Moe, Tony	
I believe the plan for the Mississippi headwaters state forest is about as fair as you can be you could get a few more miles of trail but I think the team did a good job working with the county. I hope after the forest plans are in place we can continue to improve and expand recreational trails for everyone.	6.1
Morgan, Cheryl	
I've just heard that there is a plan to allow off-road vehicles in the state forest near the headwaters	4.3

Author/Comment	Response
of the Mississippi. I'm against it. The more territory we give to fast, noisy machines, the less escapes from noise and fast-paced society we have. And then there's the damage done to our natural places. It's a bad idea in general.	6.2 11.9 2.9
Moriarty, Mary	
I am opposed to the current draft plan for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. I can remember taking my children there when they were little and I had hoped you would have preserved this area for future generations. I'd like to be able to take my grandchildren there when they are a little older.	6.2
Classifying the forest as "limited" rather than "closed" allows OHV's to continue doing damage to the forest as they have already done to camp grounds like Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point. Please seal off access to the river at the historic sites.	11.9
Since the Mississippi Headwaters Board designated the forest as "wild", it created a 1000 foot corridor along the river where all OHV's are banned. Why does the Draft Plan disregard this protection? There should be no ATV trails within this corridor.	10.8
I know the selling point of the ATV clubs is that they are family clubs and that these are family activities. Ruining the MHSF should never be a "family" activity. It's just an excuse to rip up what we have so carefully preserved. The right of recreational vehicles and their drivers does not supercede the right of all Minnesotans to preserve this historic and treasured area. Use some common sense and some sense of our shared heritage in this state to protect the rights of all Minnesotans.	2.9
Mork, Ellen E.	
The League of Women Voters of the St. Cloud Area urges you to change the classification of the MHSF from "limited" to "closed" use for all Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs), including ATVs, in your plan.	6.2
The first 47 miles of the Mississippi River from Lake Itasca is designated as a "Wild River" under Minnesota Law. The Mississippi Headwaters Board has created a 1000 foot corridor along the river where all OHVs are banned. The draft plan contradicts that protection.	10.8
The MHSF is a unique wilderness, a diverse, fragile and rich ecosystem deserving of greater protection. The proposed network of OHV routes will destroy or damage the headwaters' wild character, valuable wildlife habitat, a cultural and historic landscape, and an ancient canoe route.	10.2 15.1 2.9
Currently, significant erosion caused by illegal driving near and through the river has occurred, as well as extreme damage at some campgrounds, e.g. Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point. The proposed ATV routes in the Draft Plan would reward this illegal behavior.	11.9 10.1
Three of five DNR work team members recommended the MHSF be closed to all OHVs because of the forest's natural assets and vulnerability to vehicles. A "closed" designation would not ban ATVs entirely. They could ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads. OHVs could also use these roads to cross state lands.	14.1 3.8
It will be difficult for the DNR to enforce rules or monitor any portion of this area because of its remoteness, but classification of the MHSF as "closed" is more likely to protect the river and make some enforcement possible. A "limited" classification would be virtually unenforceable and result in continued and greater degradation.	11.2 3.8
The last remaining stretch of the most pristine part of the Mississippi needs to be protected for all Americans. We look to the DNR for the good stewardship it requires. Our League and the State League maintain positions supporting the protection and wise management of natural resources in the public interest, and the preservation of the physical, chemical and biological integrity of the ecosystem.	10.15
Please amend your Draft Plan and close this forest to OHVs.	6.2
Morrow, Jean	
I respectfully request that you close the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to motorized vehicles. The headwaters deserve protection. The mark of a successful person is one that has spent an entire day on the bank of a river without feeling guilty about it. (Chinese Proverb)	6.2
Moryc, David	
On behalf of our 65,000 members and supporters nationwide and particularly our strong and	Comment

Author/Comment	Response
active members in State of Minnesota I would like to thank you for accepting these comments on the management of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest and the upper Mississippi River's "Wild Corridor." American Rivers has concerns about the potential for degradation of the Upper Mississippi River, a Minnesota and national treasure, if proper care is not taken to protect its outstandingly remarkable values.	noted
Founded in 1973, American Rivers began with the mission to promote and protect our National Wild and Scenic Rivers. While we have expanded our range of activities to include protection of freshwater resources and restoration of damaged rivers, American Rivers continues to take our role as the champions of the Wild and Scenic River System seriously.	Comment noted
As you know, the first 47 miles of the Mississippi River – the "wild headwaters" – are designated a "Wild River" under Minnesota law, and are eligible for designation as Wild under the federal Wild & Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA) since 1977. The Mississippi Headwaters are a recreational gem - a designated canoe route offering silence, remoteness, and solitude. It is also prime wildlife habitat – home to wolf packs, pine marten, fisher, black bear, river otter, mink, bald eagles, sandhill cranes, trumpeter swans, and the occasional cougar. And it has deep historic and cultural significance. For millennia it was a major travel and settlement corridor for Native Americans. Explorers sought to find it, and vast fortunes were floated down it during centuries of the fur trade era.	10.20
The idea of creating a National Wild and Scenic River System emerged from Congress' recognition (as far back as 1960) that "special attention should be given to the dwindling number of American streams that are still in a relatively natural state." H.R. Rep. 90-1623 at 3802. America's "unspoiled and free-flowing streams, or their segments, that symbolize [the] vanishing heritage of our original landscape" need to be "preserv[ed] and protect[ed]." S. Rep. No. 90-491. Many "of our remaining free-flowing rivers are under threat of dams, pollution, and other destructive assault. If some of them are to be saved or restored to their natural state, legislative action is urgent." Id.	10.21
In the WSRA, Congress declares up front that it is "the policy of the United States that certain selected rivers of the Nation which, with their immediate environments, possess outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, or other similar values, shall be preserved in free-flowing condition, and that they and their immediate environments shall be protected for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations." 16 U.S.C. § 1271. The "established national policy of dam and other construction . . . needs to be complemented by a policy that would preserve . . . selected rivers or sections thereof in their free-flowing condition." 16 U.S.C. § 1271. Just "as the Nation has set aside some of its land areas in national parks, national monuments, and national historic sites, and the like, so some of its streams which have exceptional values of the sorts . . . scenic, recreational, esthetic, and scientific – ought to be preserved for public use and enjoyment." H. R. Rep. No. 90-1623 at 3802.	Comment noted
Under section 5 (d)(1), the "Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Agriculture shall make specific studies and investigations to determine which additional wild, scenic and recreational river areas within the United States" qualify for inclusion in the NWSRS. 16 U.S.C. § 1276 (d)(1). This section "requires the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to conduct 'specific studies and investigations' to discover rivers eligible for inclusion in the NWSRS. Under the WSRA, when a river has been determined eligible, protective management requirements under section 5 (d)(1) of the ensure the river and the surrounding area are protected as a potential Wild and Scenic River pending a suitability determination.	Comment noted
The U.S. Dept. of Interior recommended in 1977 that the first 41 miles of the river be designated "Wild" under the National Wild & Scenic Rivers Act WSRA, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1271-1287, and that 11 other sections of the river in Minnesota be designated as Scenic or Recreational. It is a recommendation that has yet to be carried out. A Minnesota state law requires the first 400 miles to be managed to preserve and enhance its "outstanding and unique natural, scientific, historical, recreational, and cultural values," and the first 47 miles are classified as "Wild." Accordingly, under state law, Minnesota is required to manage the Wild Headwaters of the Mississippi to preserve and enhance its Wild values.	10.22
Under the Minnesota State Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Wild rivers are those that exist in a free-	10.23

Author/Comment	Response
<p>flowing state with excellent water quality and with adjacent lands that are essentially primitive. To be eligible for inclusion in the Minnesota Wild and Scenic rivers system, a river or segment of a river, and its adjacent lands must possess outstanding scenic, recreational, natural, historical, scientific, or similar values. The river or its segments shall be classified into one or more of the three classes of rivers: wild, scenic, and recreational. Each river shall be managed so as to preserve and protect the values which qualify it for designation and classification. Wild rivers should not be paralleled by conspicuous and well-traveled roads or railroads. Minn. Statute 103F.361-103F.377.</p>	
<p>The Wild character of the river would be in jeopardy if the proposal to designate Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) trails on state and county-administered state forest lands in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest moves forward. Included among these are a number of trails that come very close to the river, violating the Wild River corridor. While American Rivers does not oppose the proper use of OHV's on public lands, opening this area to OHV use would degrade the outstandingly remarkable characteristics of the Upper Mississippi River and its headwaters and is incompatible with its designation as a Wild River the federal designation of eligibility under the WSRA. American Rivers urges you to close the Headwaters to OHV's</p>	<p>10.24 6.2</p>
<p>Moyer, William L.</p>	
<p>My wife and I own a cabin on Little Bass Lake north of Bemidji, and we canoe on the Mississippi River in Beltrami County during the summers. We are very concerned about the DNR's draft plan for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest (MHSF). Your draft plan classifies the forest as "limited" instead of "closed," which will open trails for off-highway vehicles, including all-terrain vehicles. We are definitely opposed to this change in status and want to see the area remain closed.</p>	<p>4.3 6.2</p>
<p>This wild area is almost unique with its miles of river with wetlands and forest filled with all types of animals and birds. We are avid bird watchers and thoroughly enjoy our canoe trips along this part of the river. There are hundreds, if not thousands, of miles of off-highway vehicle trails in Minnesota already and areas like the MHSF are becoming unique. We really would hate to see this wonderful area despoiled with noisy vehicles. We encourage you and the DNR to retain the current closed status and keep this area closed to vehicles.</p>	<p>10.6 16.8 4.3 2.3</p>
<p>Myers, Mason</p>	
<p>Please revise the current DNR Draft Plan for MHSF to classify it "Closed" to OHV/ATV travel because:</p>	<p>6.2</p>
<p>The Mississippi Headwaters Board's designation of it as "Wild", thus protecting a 1000 foot corridor along the River where OHVs & ATVs are banned, should be respected.</p>	<p>10.8</p>
<p>The unique collection of natural assets - forests, wetlands, wildlife habitat - located there should receive maximum protection.</p>	<p>10.6</p>
<p>The remote location will make it impossible to enforce the details of restrictions in the "Limited" classification; only "No travel" will be enforceable.</p>	<p>11.2</p>
<p>Damage of OHV/ATV travel on the ground will impact the Nation's mighty River at its source by adding erosion sites to the River bank. This last stretch of wilderness on this River must be preserved for posterity.</p>	<p>11.9</p>
<p>Designating ATV routes in ecologically sensitive areas, like Coffee Pot, because riders are already going there is simply a stupid move.</p>	<p>10.1</p>
<p>The DNR, State and County law enforcement agencies need to find a place to draw the line of control which OHV/ATV riders cannot cross to begin making the point that they are, in fact, subject to laws. This well-defined, relatively small location is an ideal place to do it.</p>	<p>11.4</p>
<p>The issue of OHV/ATV control is a burning one for many in Minnesota. Heretofore, every imaginable technique has been used to diminish a sense of public and private responsibility in the OHV/ATV crowd, e.g.: Only one miniature vehicle license plate required; minimum fines when caught that do not amount to more than the cost of doing business for riders; no risk of vehicle/equipment confiscation as hunters and fishermen face; no responsibility, through license fee allocation, for repairing damage caused by riders; reduced staff of Conservation Officers to "save money." Evidence of forest and stream damage by OHV/ATV's is everywhere in the State, indeed, in the Nation. Truth is, I do not believe the political will exists to challenge this small group</p>	<p>4.3 2.9 11.1</p>

Author/Comment	Response
of renegades. I would appreciate some evidence that I am wrong. Certainly, within the present structure of regulation and enforcement, riders are free to go where they want with the benevolent disregard of DNR regulations.	
Myking, Larry	
I would like to see the subject state forest classification be "limited" and not "closed." I am retired now with time to enjoy these areas. Unfortunately my mobility has become somewhat limited. I think that it is important for people to be able to enjoy this beautiful forest area from the seat of an ATV. I want access to Forest Roads and Designated Trails, and the Forest should not be Closed.	6.1
Naylor, William	
Last week I attended the public comment meeting for the proposed OHV plan in the Mississippi Headwaters state forest. Going into this meeting I had very little knowledge about the issues. My initial attitude was that the OHV contingent should be allowed to travel on the designated trails.	Comment noted
At this point I would like to say that I was very dissatisfied with the way the findings were presented. From the DNR perspective I think it is accurate to say that the meeting was only being held to explain the finer legal points of the proposed plan. To me that was the least interesting part of what is a very complex issue. You briefly mentioned that the members of the committee had different perspectives but I did not feel in any way that there was any transparency in the process. I know that the DNR is a very process oriented organization, so why hide those processes from the people you serve. Would a document trail be available to me upon request? Why not put that on the website? I am glad that during the comment period matters which had not been explained began to come out.	2.7
While listening to the many people who got up and commented I began to be swayed from my initial attitude. It's never easy to make a decision that you know some people won't like. The more I listened though and thought about what the Mississippi means, the more I felt that at least the riparian corridor should be designated as closed to all motorized vehicles. It is a wonderful area to recreate in and to go ahead with this plan, I feel, disregards the historical and scientific evidence that OHVs are degrading that experience. To treat it as just another State Forest belittles the metaphorical and actual beauty of this special area. I know that the pro-OHV contingent considers any closing of trails as one step on a slippery slope towards the closing of many more trails but let's be realistic, this is a special area and is deserving of special treatment. Please reconsider the classification the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.	6.2
Nelles, Richard D.	
I have been a DNR volunteer for the past 37 years. For the past eleven year, work on projects for Dr. Glen Delguidce, Dave Garshallis, Dr. John Erb, and Perry Logering. I have averaged 603 hours per year for the past eleven years on these projects, can be verified by Renee Vail DNR Volunteer Program Director. I covered the area from Grand Rapids to Bena to Walker to Hill City. All on or off forest service roads, minimum maintenance roads and logging roads. Over the past eleven years I have observed continuous damage to these areas caused by OHVs. In the winter we would haul in 801 lb. traps for catching deer. Three or four to a sled pulled by snowmobile. If we didn't have a large amount of snow we were tipping over sleds because of ATV ruts from the summer. This is an example of damage. Now my most admired department (DNR) wants to allow OHVs into the Head Waters. Based on my experience, the Head Waters over a period of years will be partially destroyed by OHVs. Please consider my thoughts.	4.3 6.2
Nelsen, Deborah	
Please consider the fragile beauty and unique nature of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest and do what you can to prevent further damage to this area by off road, all-terrain vehicles.	6.2 4.3 2.9
Nelson, Jack T.	
I'm writing in support of the proposed plan and the Limited classification. The groups have put a lot	6.1

Author/Comment	Response
of effort into the plan and have accomodated the various groups where usage is appropriate and to protect other sensitive areas.	
Nelson, Ronald L.	
As a home owner and property owner on the Upper Mississippi river, I have very strict regulations that I must comply with and restrictions on the use of my property. I am very happy to accept these obligations as they only serve to maintain the beauty of the Mississippi River. As a result, I follow them to the letter.	Comment noted
I care about the portion of the Mississippi that I live on, but I care even more about the Mississippi Headwaters. To allow ATV's and other other off road vehicle activity in this area would be a gross travesty and would very quickly destroy that wild portion of the river.	4.3
If you allow this activity in the area that the river starts, I will no longer feel obligated not to kill out the wild rice that grows in the river in front of my property. This makes it difficult for me to get my boat in and out, so if the State does not respect the river, I will just kill it all out. I can then cut down all the trees on the river portion of my property so that I can have a better view of the river. Why should I maintain the natural view from the river. I will also feel free to build any building on my riverfront. Why should I maintain 350 feet? All of the above would not be near as destructive as allowing ATV's, etc. in the Headwaters area.	2.9
I know that you are under pressure from the ATV industry, but let's keep what little true wild area that we have left.	6.2
Neururer, Pete	
Please don't close anymore areas to ATVs and please keep the Mississippi corridor open to ATVs. No all of us can walk as far as we would like too. We're all getting older and still like to see these areas and the older the more laws we respect.	6.1
Nicklason, Pete	
I am a public land user in northern minnesota. I do not agree with the closing of public lands to motorized vehicles. These lands are for everyone to use! If there is a public hearing or meeting on this issue I would like to be informed please!	6.1
Nietzke, Roger A.	
Bill we need to protect the headwaters of the Mississippi and not allow OHV trails in this area.This land is pristine and has valuable wildlife that would be effected by these trails.	4.3 10.6 6.2
Nordstrom, Tracy	
I email to urge you not to allow ATV's to utilize the old logging roads along the Headwaters of the Mississippi. My family and I spent time each summer in Itasca State Park, it's environs, and the various communities near the Headwaters. We are walkers and biker; my kids love tracking for turtles, fox, beaver, a myriad of birds, and the like. The presence of ATV's in this treasured, fragile, historic area would be detrimental to the experience of visitors, nature lovers, and locals who value this wilderness experience.	4.3 2.3 6.2
Norquist, Ben	
Let me begin by admitting, up front, that I am not thoroughly versed in all of the issues surrounding the proposal to expand ATV access within the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. Also, please realize that I can fully appreciate the extreme challenge attempting to properly balance the competing needs of our state's various outdoor enthusiasts.	4.3
Nonetheless, based on the preliminary knowledge I have been able to gather thus far, I wish to express my sincere concern regarding the proposal to expand ATV access within the MHSF. One of the arguments I have seen raised in support of the proposal is the fact that damage has previously occurred within the MHSF due to illegal ATV use and that, therefore, the proposal to have designated trails will ultimately serve to protect the MHSF. While this argument may at first appear to make sense-to some-I am confident that those involved in this critical decision-making process cannot realistically believe that this type of logic holds up under scrutiny. While this point was arguably pertinent when there were minimal designated areas/trails for ATV use within the state, one must admit that that ATV enthusiasts nowadays have access to an extensive array of trails throughout the state. True wilderness areas (and experiences), on the other hand, continue to dwindle.	6.2 11.9 3.8 16.8 2.3

Author/Comment	Response
I respectfully urge you to reconsider the DNR position on this matter in light of the concerns expressed by myself and numerous other outdoor enthusiasts.	Comment noted
Norton, Helen	
Please don't cave to these 'sportsmen' and women whose sport is so destructive to life they never think of or see - and whose sensibility for others' interests and enjoyment is just about nil. Why should these few (and the Minnesota companies who make and market the damn things) have the right to destroy not only nature but other people's right to enjoy nature? To reward their behavior - behavior that already ignores signs and barriers specifically addressed to them - with greater access to rare and fragile sites is the worst sort of public policy – reward the loudest, the brashiest, the most destructive. Please show a little restraint - hell, a lot of restraint - be conservative. Protect the land and the river.	12.1 15.7
I own part of a farm in the southeast corner - West Concord. We visit the farm at least once a year and visit family and friends in Minnesota more frequently still. We love the trip to the Mississippi's source and the all the trips we take to Minnesota. Please, take care of the land and its waters and say no to spoilers.	6.2
Norton, Matt ; Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy	
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft plan to designate roads and trails for travel by off-highway vehicles (OHVs) on the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest (MHSF) and some surrounding areas (the Draft Plan). I am the staff forestry and wildlife advocate and a staff attorney for the Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy (MCEA). MCEA is the legal and scientific voice protecting and defending Minnesota's environment, wildlife, and public health. MCEA has studied the rise of off-highway vehicle (OHV) motorized recreation over the past dozen years, and the resulting increase in social and environmental conflict, environmental damage, and management costs. MCEA has a long history of thinking about and commenting on public land management proposals, and we work hard to submit comments that are informed, clear, and helpful, so that all the information necessary to make the best informed final decision possible is in your hands.	Comment noted
I. LIMITED” IS AN UNACCEPTABLE CLASSIFICATION FOR THE MISSISSIPPI HEADWATERS. MCEA is extremely disappointed that the Draft Plan proposes to designate roads and trails for OHVs in the MHSF. There are few reasons offered as to why the MHSF should be opened to OHVs, none of them good. In contrast there are many very good reasons why it is essential that the MHSF be closed to OHVs. If the MHSF were to be classified as “Limited,” and roads and trails were to be designated for OHVs, then rare, important, and even unique forest resources and public values will be damaged, diminished, or destroyed in and around the MHSF. Such damage, diminishment, and destruction of protectible forest resources and public natural assets can be avoided	Comment noted
II. REASONS OFFERED FOR CHOOSING “LIMITED” CLASSIFICATION ARE WITHOUT MERIT. The Draft Plan provides several justifications to explain why “Limited” is the proposed classification for the MHSF. The first of them is demonstrably false. The others are logically unsound, fail to satisfy DNR management obligations, or fail to constitute a basis for choosing the “Limited” forest classification for the MHSF.	Comment noted
A. The DNR’s Inter-Disciplinary Team Agreed The MHSF Should Be “Limited” The Draft Plan states three times (on page 2, on page 9, and again on page 12) that the DNR Trail Designation Team (Team) developed a consensus recommendation that the MHSF should have ATV/OHV trails. This repeated assertion is false. The Team was deeply divided and did not come to consensus. Three members of the five-person team – a majority – favored the “Closed” designation for the MHSF, in which the forest would remain open to people, cars, and trucks, but be closed to OHVs. These three individuals delivered written explanations of their positions to the DNR Region 1 Director. The memos of the five team members spell out their positions and reasoning, and are attached in electronic form to this comment letter for your review (see files in folder marked “No Consensus – DNR Team	14.1

Author/Comment	Response
<p>Memos"). The three Team members in the majority (representing the Ecological Resources, Fisheries & Wildlife, and Enforcement divisions) favored the "Closed" designation for a host of well-articulated reasons that will be delved into later in this comment letter. The other two members (the forestry and Trails & Waterways division representatives) favored the "Limited" classification and designation of roads and trails for OHV use. Deep disagreement was resolved by Regional Director Mike Carroll, as is the protocol "when consensus is not reached" (see email from Carroll to Barbara Reitter, dated 3/27/2007, on p.1 of the document marked "MHSF-DNR-No Consensus – 4of5 members"). Regional Director Carroll sided with the minority and chose the Limited designation, allowing OHV use in the MHSF. The decision to designate roads and trails for OHV use on the MHSF, including in areas adjacent to and crossing the Mississippi River, in fact was not a consensus position as the Draft Plan repeatedly states, but rather a deeply divisive proposition opposed by the majority of the DNR's interdisciplinary Team.</p>	
<p>B. Limited" Allows Greater Alignment Of DNR and County Land Management</p> <p>The DNR describes the "goal" of the planning process as being, "to develop a consistent, understandable, and enforceable approach to vehicular access across public and private forest land ownerships" (see Draft Plan at p. 5).²³ The Draft Plan states that, "a 'Limited' classification affords a better opportunity to align DNR and county land management than would be available under a 'Closed' classification" (see Draft Plan at p. 12). Without a providing a thorough explanation, the Draft Plan suggests that because two of the counties preempted the DNR's "cooperative" OHV planning process by taking early unilateral steps to adopt a more permissive OHV use policy in the MHSF, the DNR felt obliged to follow suit.</p> <p>There are at least three problems with the idea that the DNR should follow the counties' by classifying the MHSF "Limited" and designating roads and trails for OHVs on state-owned lands.</p>	5.2
<p>First, there were and remain serious inconsistencies among the counties' positions, such that the counties were not and still are not unanimous in their positions on how OHVs should be managed in the MHSF. Beltrami and Clearwater counties had indicated at the time the Draft Plan was written that they would manage their lands in the MHSF under the OHV-permissive "Managed" scheme. Hubbard County, in contrast, appeared interested in ensuring that routes remain open to cars only, a position more compatible with a "Closed" designation than "Limited" (see p.6 of the document marked "MHSF-DNR-No Consensus – 4of5 members"). The DNR therefore always had a choice between conflicting county positions; the choice was less about whether to follow "the county lead," than which county lead it should align itself with. The DNR Regional Director chose to align itself most closely with OHV users and the counties that provide the most OHV use, rather than the county that provides the least OHV use.</p>	5.3
<p>Second, the touted benefit – maximized "alignment" of DNR management with that of one or more counties – seems greatly exaggerated. The DNR's proposed decision to classify the MHSF as "Limited" certainly provides for more OHV driving opportunities than it does a true alignment of management policies. To suggest that DNR's and the counties management is now "aligned" ignores the very deep differences between Clearwater and Beltrami Counties' management and the DNR's. For example, two DNR Team members noted:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">In both cases [whether the forest classification is <u>Closed</u> or <u>Limited</u>] OHV restrictions will be different on county land than on state land, with regard to the big game/trapper exception. County land will be open to the cross-country travel while the state land will not. This will require the signing of the boundaries of all state land so users know where they are in relation to the boundaries between state and county land.</p> <p>(See pp. 3-4 of the document marked "MHSF-DNR-No Consensus – 4of5 members")</p> <p>Accordingly, DNR's choice has allowed for OHV use in the MHSF to cross DNR-administered</p>	5.4

²³ It should be noted that both county-administered and DNR-administered forest lands are state-owned. Title is held by the state and people of Minnesota, the difference being that when revenue is generated from timber sales on county-administered lands (CAL), which are held in trust for the benefit of the taxing districts, those revenues are deposited in the accounts of the county, whereas DNR-administered lands generate revenue that is deposited primarily into the General Fund (a slice of revenue is directed into the account of DNR-Forestry).

Author/Comment	Response
<p>lands, but it has not bought any real management congruence. Expensive signing, a difficult enforcement environment, and shifting OHV rules from one parcel to the next all still exist, now that DNR's Regional Director has chosen a proposed "Limited" classification. The main discernable difference is that DNR is facilitating and participating in the designation of roads and trails for OHV use in the MHSF and across and adjacent to the Mississippi Headwaters Wild River reach.</p>	
<p>Third, DNR's alleged desire for consistency, clarity, and enforceability across land management boundaries – even assuming, <i>arguendo</i>, they were achieved by a "Limited" classification – may not trump the DNR's obligations to manage public lands for the benefit of all Minnesota citizens using multiple-use and sustained-yield principles (not OHV manufacturers and not just those citizens who want to drive OHVs on public lands). In the case of the MHSF, DNR is damaging incredibly rare, highly valued, and steadily disappearing natural resources, including the wild character of the Mississippi Headwaters Wild River reach in ways that will be described in more detail in later sections of this comment letter. DNR is doing so by classifying the MHSF as "Limited" and designating roads and trails in it for OHV use, something which is very common and is growing more so all the time. Designation of OHV uses in the MHSF conflicts categorically with multiple-use, sustained-yield management principles because one should not diminish or destroy something valuable, rare, and already declining in order to increase something that is less valued, common, and increasing. OHV use produces a host of effects – noise, dust, speed-of-movement, vegetation, and soil damage – on the landscape that have been demonstrated and judged to be incompatible with all other forms of outdoor recreation, with the exception of snowmobiling (see Wisconsin's 2005-2010 State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, Chapter 4, summarizing the Wisconsin DNR's study of recreational incompatibilities: http://www.dnr.state.wi.us/planning/scorp/plan/WIS_2005-10_SCORP_CHAPTER_4.pdf).</p> <p>Planners and land managers know that "multiple-use, sustained-yield" does not mean that all uses must or should be conducted on every patch of ground, side by side on adjacent patches, or in the same larger management area, but rather that the larger landscape must be managed in a way that shows an understanding of, respects, and plans around the particularities of each use. Sometimes, as in the case at hand, multiple use management requires separating some of those uses from each other by effective distances so as to protect the resource integrity. In the case of the MHSF and the remote and high-quality traditional non-motorized recreation and other values it has been documented to afford, multiple-use, sustained-yield requires protecting the aesthetic experience of people like canoeists, by protecting the visual quality of landscapes seen from the river, and by protecting the "soundshed" of the Mississippi River where it flows through the MHSF from the engine noise of ATVs and dirtbike motorcycles. Because OHVs do not stay on designated routes and management tools used to "close" areas to OHV traffic are not effective at keeping regular OHV violators out of closed areas; and because engine noise from revving ATVs and dirtbike motorcycles can travel very long distances especially over water, reliance upon a 1,000' buffer, beyond which OHV use is common, is insufficient to protect the aesthetic integrity of the Mississippi Headwaters Wild River reach. Consequently, classifying the MHSF as "Limited" and designating roads and trails for OHV use, even if all are kept outside of a minimal 1,000' buffer around the river (the Wild River Corridor or River Corridor), is contrary to multiple-use and sustained-yield management of forest resources in the MHSF.</p>	19.1
<p>Nor is it permissible for the DNR's desire for "alignment" of motorized recreation policies to trump the DNR's duties to protect and enhance high-quality, unusual, rare, disappearing, or other important natural resources. Some of these protectible natural resources surely include, but are not limited to: state and federally listed threatened, endangered, and special concern species; forest resources as those are defined in Minn. Stat. §89.001, Subd. 8; "outstanding and unique natural, scientific, historic, recreational, and cultural values" of the Mississippi River and related shoreland areas, as those are defined in Minn. Stat. §103F.361 <i>et seq.</i>, documented in the U.S. Dept. of Interior's September 8, 1977 document, "Wild And Scenic River Study – Upper Mississippi River, Minn.," and discussed in the document marked "MHSF-DNR-No Consensus – 4of5 members" at pp. 6-10; and archaeological sites as defined in Minn. Stat. §138.31.</p>	15.1
<p>OHV effects – noise, dust, speed-of-movement, vegetation and soil damage, and also public annoyance and social conflict, habitat destruction, diminishment of wildlife habitat suitability,</p>	15.2

Author/Comment	Response
spread of non-native invasive species, and water quality degradation – will be discussed in greater detail, in sections below. For point here is that because of these negative OHV effects on land resources, wildlife, and people, all of the natural resources noted above, and probably others, will be damaged, diminished, or destroyed if the MHSF is classified “Limited” and roads and trails are designated there for OHVs.	
The preemptive moves by Beltrami and Clearwater Counties, opting out of both management options (“Limited” and “Closed”) available to the DNR, is not a sufficient basis or reasoned justification for the DNR’s proposed selection of the “Limited” classification for the MHSF. The DNR fails in its obligations to protect and enhance important natural resources by following the general direction of two counties determined to manage the MHSF for OHV recreation purposes when OHV recreation is incompatible with other uses of public land and with multiple-use, sustained-yield management principles.	5.5
C. Many Routes Are Judged Able To Sustain Varying Degrees Of Motorized Use. The Draft Plan states on page 12: “Particular attention was paid to addressing what framework of public access best recognized the need to protect sensitive natural areas along the Mississippi River corridor (and other areas) while recognizing many routes could sustain varying degrees of motorized use.” There are two serious faults with this statement.	Comment noted
First, rereading, it sounds like the result of the Team’s deliberations was pre-determined. The team was under direction to do two things: 1) protect sensitive natural areas along the River Corridor and in other areas; and 2) “recognize” [read: acquiesce to the proposition] that varying degrees of motorized use [read: cars and OHVs] was sustainable on many routes. Read this way, the direction effectively eliminated the “Closed” classification from consideration. MCEA argues in this comment letter that the need to protect sensitive natural areas in the MHSF should have eliminated the “Limited” classification from consideration.	4.1
Second, the general assertion that “some” or “many” routes could sustain varying degrees of motorized use is overbroad and lacking in specificity. More important, to the extent that the DNR asserts that it applies to a great many or all of the routes proposed for designation in the Draft Plan, the assertion is false. Many of the routes are not sustainable in a physical sense, in that they cross soils with severe erosion, rutting, off-highway motorcycle, soil compaction, or other limitations (see soils maps prepared and submitted by MCEA and associated Excel spreadsheet attached to MCEA’s comments). Many of the roads and trails proposed to be open to OHVs are known to cross lands that are highly likely to contain archaeological sites (see attached maps prepared and submitted by MCEA and associated Excel spreadsheet attached to MCEA’s comments). Many of the proposed routes violate the minimum 1,000’ buffer forming the Wild River Corridor around the Mississippi River, even measured from the river channel. ²⁴ Still other proposed routes may be outside of the River Corridor, but nevertheless are located where OHV engines will be readily audible to paddlers on the river, and thus violate the requirement that the Wild River’s many values, including quietude, be protected and enhanced by management decisions, for all future generations. Routes that degrade the Mississippi Headwaters’ Wild River values, which all organs of the state are obligated to protect and enhance, are by definition not sustainable.	17.1
The suggestion that many of the routes in the MHSF are capable of sustaining OHV recreational driving can only be made by an observer studiously ignoring the context in which those routes are situated. The most obvious context ignored by such a statement in this case is the location of these routes on the MHSF, surrounding much of the Mississippi River’s Headwaters reach, the	10.3

²⁴ It is incorrect to map the minimum 1,000’ buffer and River Corridor from the river channel. The buffer should be measured from the river’s Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) (see the Mississippi Headwaters Board (MHB) revised 2002 Comprehensive Plan at p. 27). The DNR Division of Waters has a guidance document on determining OHWM that includes an example for rivers that contain bulges such as are found in the several large marshes and bogs along the Mississippi River in the MHSF (see attached 1993 DNR Technical Paper 11). The DNR’s Draft Plan represents the buffer as being 1,000’ in width on each side of the river channel, and so it must be revised to comply with the direction in the MHB Comprehensive Plan. OHWM determinations along the Mississippi River in the MHSF should be conducted as soon as spring break-up arrives, or at latest by May 15.

Author/Comment	Response
only reach of the river to qualify as a Federal Wild River under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (NWSRA). The Mississippi River in the relevant area in and around the MHSF is also designated and managed as a Wild River under state law by the Mississippi Headwaters Board (MHB). There are other important contexts, too, of course, within which the generically alleged sustainability of routes proposed for OHV use should be more carefully judged. Some of these are alluded to above and in MCEA's prepared maps, attached.	
The implicit assertion of many routes' ability to be sustainable carrying OHV traffic is without merit. It is so broad and lacking in specificity that it affords no basis for asserting that any particular route is truly sustainable considering the context, i.e. reality, within which sustainability must be judged. On the basis of the information provided in and attached to this comment letter, it is clear that many of the routes proposed to be open to OHVs are clearly not sustainable.	17.2
<p>D. OHV Interests Want A Motorized Recreational Connecting Trail Between Public Lands In Hubbard and Beltrami Counties.</p> <p>The Draft Plan asserts in numerous locations that OHV interests "demand" a connecting corridor through the MHSF, and the Team apparently spent a great deal of effort trying to divine the amount by which such demands for OHV riding opportunities will increase in the area in the future. This is not a basis for DNR to violate its duties to protect and enhance the Mississippi Headwaters' Wild River values, or to protect other important protectible natural resources on the MHSF, as discussed above.</p>	3.1
First, OHV interests may be demanding a connector trail going through the MHSF, or OHV recreational driving trails within the MHSF, but more people both in Minnesota and around the country, are demanding that the forest be classified "Closed" to OHVs. The simple presence of demands, particularly conflicting demands surely does not on its own constitute a sufficient basis for classifying the MHSF for OHV traffic.	3.2
If the decision were made strictly on numbers of enthusiasts alone, canoeists' interests in seeing the DNR respect the state of Minnesota's promise to protect and enhance the Mississippi River's Wild values should prevail over the OHV riders' interests. According to the DNR's 2004 survey, more Minnesotans aged 20 and older engage in canoeing and kayaking (485,000 or 14%) than ride ATVs (357,000 or 10%). Canoeists have a far higher stake in seeing one of the few Wild Rivers protected for high-quality remote traditional paddling opportunities, than the less numerous OHV riders have in seeing yet another West Central state forest classified so that more roads and trails can be designated for OHVs. As noted by the majority of the Team (see "MHSF-DNR-No Consensus – 4of5 members" at p. 8).	3.3
If the decision were based on the relative value, rarity, and trend affecting the Wild River designated canoe route on one hand and OHV trails on the other, preserving and enhancing the Wild River's values should prevail over OHVing because, as discussed elsewhere in this comment letter, the wild character and wilderness values left on the landscape are extremely valuable, rare, and declining whereas OHV routes are widely dispersed, numerous, and increasing in number and distribution across the state.	2.1
Of course the decision must be made in a way that discharges pertinent statutory obligations, which require management to protect and enhance Wild River values of the Mississippi River's Headwaters reach, and to protect important natural resources elsewhere on the MHSF. As mentioned above, Wild River values are utterly incompatible with the noise, dust, soil and vegetation effects of OHV riding. Moreover, the DNR has provided huge amounts of OHV opportunity in recent years, and is under no conflicting statutory obligation to preserve OHV riding on the MHSF or in the effective zone around the Mississippi River's Wild Headwaters reach.	10.4
Finally, the current or envisioned demands for an OHV connector trail between Hubbard County public lands and other Beltrami County public lands cannot be a justification for classifying the MHSF "Limited" because the Draft Plan itself says so. The Draft Plan states that a connector trail could be feasible under either a "Limited" or "Closed" classification (see Draft Plan at p. 13).	3.4
<p>III.THERE ARE MANY SUFFICIENT REASONS WHY THE MHSF SHOULD BE CLASSIFIED AS "CLOSED" TO OHVs.</p> <p>The MHSF should be classified as "Closed" to OHVs. OHVs are readily distinguishable from cars and pickup trucks, and so the "Closed" classification will protect natural resources that the</p>	6.2

Author/Comment	Response
<p>“Limited” classification will not. The Mississippi River is a river of national and international significance, and the Headwaters reach is the river’s only segment qualifying for federal Wild River status. The Wild River and surrounding MHSF lands possess many unique natural, scientific, recreational, historical, and cultural values that the state is under legal obligation to see are protected and enhanced. These values will be damaged if the MHSF were to have roads and trails designated for OHV use. OHV enforcement becomes more difficult and less effective as the areas to be kept off-limits increase in accessibility and decrease in size.</p>	
<p>A. OHVs Are Distinguished From Highway Licensed Vehicles By The Way They Are Operated. The reason for distinguishing between OHVs on one hand, and standard cars and pickup trucks (for the sake of brevity and clarity, all highway licensed vehicles will be hereinafter referred to as cars), is straightforward and widely understood. OHVs are designed to drive off-road, over rough terrain and obstacles that would be effective barriers to cars. Many purchasers buy OHVs specifically for their engineered capabilities, and do in fact drive where ordinary cars cannot go. These two facts partly explain why OHVs so often are found where they supposedly are not allowed – on the wrong side of gates and “closed” signs, berms, and boulders or other obstructions placed there in the effort to keep OHVs out. Ordinary cars generally do not have these capabilities, and if they do have some standard off-road capability, it is a lesser capability than that found in OHVs, and it is rarely the main purpose for which they were purchased. Also, OHVs are generally smaller, narrower, and more maneuverable than cars, and thus are physically better able to squeeze between trees, gate posts, and boulders. In consequence of these significant differences, OHVs have a proven propensity and history of being driven where they are not allowed, whereas cars on the other hand do not.</p>	10.5
<p>One result of the way OHVs can be and often are driven, is the impossibility of containing them to “designated” routes or excluding them from off-limits areas. On the MHSF the DNR has found it impossible to exclude OHVs from “protected” areas that have been gated, bermed, and posted closed to them. On other forests that have already been reclassified to “Limited” the off-trail damage has continued. Prime examples of the DNR’s failed efforts to contain OHVs on the MHSF are well-known to the DNR and counties.</p>	11.1
<p>A second logical result of the differences between cars and OHVs is that where it is essential to protect and enhance the wild character of the land, the condition of natural resources, or high-quality traditional forms of outdoor recreation, it is imperative to keep OHVs out of the management area entirely. It is essential to keep OHVs out entirely by classifying the area as closed to OHVs. Classifying the larger area as closed to OHVs has several effects on OHV riding. It reduces the overall level of OHV traffic in the area. It makes detection of OHV violators much easier. And it makes enforcement riding because once they are legally permitted in an area. It is less accurate to say that it is easier to keep OHVs out of an area completely than to allow them in and try to keep them on designated trails, than to say it is more possible to do so. OHV traffic increases as a consequence of allowing OHVs into a forest. When OHV traffic increases, so does the absolute number of OHVs that are driven in ways that violate the rules, damage the natural environment, and diminish and interfere with others’ enjoyment of public lands.</p>	1.2
<p>B. OHVs Cause Tremendous Environmental Damage and Social Conflict. In important ways, no other land-based recreational activity compares to OHV riding. Because of its inherent differences from all other forms of recreation, OHV recreation requires more intense management oversight – monitoring, maintenance, repair and enforcement – than is required by any other form of outdoor recreation. Former Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth included unmanaged OHV driving as a second top threat among the “Four Threats,” in addition to non-native invasive species spread.</p>	8.1 2.10

Author/Comment	Response
<p>i. Power and torque No class of recreational activity has ever put as much power at the disposal of the outdoor recreationist as OHV riding. Tractive power and torque are selling points, with manufacturers currently engaged in an “arms race” of sorts, as they compete to make machines faster and more powerful. The consequences of this conferral of power are evident in manufacturers’ commercials, and appear on Minnesota’s landscape as rutted wetlands, churned-up streambeds, silt-choked spawning gravels in trout streams, eroded hillsides, compacted soil, and vegetation loss. It cannot be over-emphasized that the sheer power and weight of the machines means that even when ridden responsibly, or at least without intent to cause environmental damage, OHVs carry an inherent capacity to cause environmental damage that is unparalleled in outdoor recreation.</p>	Comment noted
<p>ii. Distance and speed A second feature of OHV riding is the fact that it allows its practitioners to travel longer distances and cover larger areas than any other form of outdoor recreation. Ardent hikers might cover 10 miles or more in a day’s effort; strong canoeists might cover 30 miles or more when traveling light, with substantial effort and under decent conditions. According to the DNR’s Genereux report (document is in DNR’s possession, and MCEA incorporates it herein, in its entirety, by reference), an average ATVer, by comparison, likes to cover 30 miles of trail riding in just 2 hours’ worth of riding, and an OHMer likes to cover 40 miles in under 2 hours. <i>Id.</i> at p. 53. The DNR defines a “rider day,” its unit for measuring volume of motorized recreation, as four hours worth of riding, and so a typical OHV “rider day” amounts to over 60 to 80 miles of riding. And some drivers travel farther. With the exception of bicycle touring (on roads), no other land-based activity comes close to these mileage amounts.</p>	12.1
<p><i>Sedimentation</i> - OHVs operating illegally near or in a stream, river, or lake, stir up or cause the erosion of sediment, and frequently also introduce the seeds of invasive non-native weeds. Sediment, pollutants such as phosphorus and hydrocarbons, and noxious weed seeds can be transported great distances by water, once they are suspended in that water. The entire area receiving the water-borne sediment, pollutants, and invasive non-native seeds is another area affected by OHVs. The sedimentation effects of OHVs are many levels of magnitude greater than for other forms of non-motorized recreation because recreational OHV operators behave differently than other recreationists when encountering wetlands, streams, and lakes. Whereas hikers, cyclists, canoeists, anglers, hunters, birdwatchers, and other non-motorized recreationists lack both the power and the inclination to destroy wetlands or churn up lakes or streams, recreational OHV riders have the power to do such damage and regularly choose to ride in ways and places that damage water quality, aquatic vegetation, and sediment structure of wetlands, streams, rivers, ponds, and lakes. While not all riders do environmental damage intentionally, the inclination among recreational OHV riders as a whole to ride in wetlands, streams and lakes, where environmental damage immediately results, is indisputable and is readily acknowledged among riders, land managers, and private land owners who have experienced trespass problems. Rather than dispute the regularity of these occurrences, OHV rider advocates typically argue about what percentage of their fellow riders are responsible for illegal behavior. Moreover, riders’ admissions as to their own behaviors tend to belie the familiar and frequently stated opinion that, “it’s just a few percent that cause all the problems.” A quick survey of the stories and advertisements on television, in any ATV magazine, and most ATV websites is likely to turn up images and story lines portraying and glorifying these activities. As a result of the behavior, and the innate ability of OHV tires to churn up more sediment than a pair of hiking boots, sediment loads from OHV riding are enormously larger than those generally associated with other forms of recreation. As a consequence, the area affected by the transport of such sediments and water-borne pollution is larger.</p>	12.2
<p><i>Erosion</i> - When OHVs ride over steep slopes or weak soils, the affected area can grow over time. At first it may be just the area where surface vegetation is destroyed and sediment travel begins. Over time, disturbed areas on slopes often grow in a down-slope direction as destabilized soil moves with gravity and precipitation; and spreading upslope as erosion below undercuts and causes the collapse of soil upslope. Depending on the relative weakness of the soil and other local site factors, the area affected by an OHV’s passage can spread and grow over time to cover</p>	12.3

Author/Comment	Response
<p>an area much larger than the tracks initially left by the OHV. The erosion effects of OHVs are inherently likely to be several levels of magnitude greater than those of similar numbers of hikers, cyclists, or skiers, for example, because the OHV without the rider typically weighs a couple hundred pounds (for OHMs), up to 900 lbs (for ATVs), or even several tons (for ORVs); and because that tremendous weight is coupled with powerful engines, aggressively-treaded</p>	
<p><i>Noise pollution</i> - OHV noise legally may approach 99 decibels at a distance of 20 inches from the muffler, according to the DNR's 2002-03 Recreational Motor Vehicles Regulations, at p. 13 (document is in the DNR's possession and MCEA hereby incorporates it by reference). This volume is considerably greater than the typical volume associated with average street vehicles such as a typical car or pick-up truck (i.e., those not intentionally modified with "glass pack" mufflers designed to magnify and make the engine/throttle noise heard at great distances). When revved and running, OHVs can be heard at great distances up to and over two miles. Even if a single OHV could be heard only within a radius of one mile, it still has a "soundshed" – the area where people and wildlife are affected by its noise – of 3.14 square miles (area = πr^2, with the radius = 1 mile). When a single OHV travels 33 miles (the average length of a preferred ride for ATVers and OHMers, according to the DNR's Genereux Study) on a trail, in the course of a 2 or 3-hour ride, it affects all the people and wildlife within an area of 69 square miles (33-mile long x 2-mile wide soundshed, plus a semi-circle on each end with a radius of 1 mile). Hikers, cyclists, canoeists, etc., simply do not generate the sustained high-volume noise of an OHV. A moderately noisy hiker might be heard over a distance of 100 yards at most (if talking exceptionally loudly), and thus the entire area affected on a 10-mile day-long hike would be about 1.15 square miles (600-foot wide x 10-mile long soundshed, plus a semi-circle on each end with a radius of 300 feet), or just 1.7% the area affected by an ATV. Because this calculation assumes, too conservatively, that OHVs can be heard only at or within distances of one mile, the actual comparison of soundsheds is, in reality, far more unequal. Hence, scores of non-motorized users could use the same area of state forest in a given day without noise disturbance and possibly without ever knowing the others are present, while a single OHV operator would intrude upon the experience of them all.</p>	12.4
<p><i>Non-native noxious invasive weed spread</i> – OHVs are highly effective vectors for the spread of non-native noxious invasive species. For example, a motor vehicle driven through a few feet of spotted knapweed can pick up 2,000 seeds on the vehicle frame, undercarriage, and any mud that may attach to the vehicle, and will spread 90% of those seeds over the course of a 10-mile drive. See "Montana Knapweeds: identification, biology, and management. 2001. Circular 311. Montana State University Extension Service," electronically-attached as, "knapweedbulletin.pdf". The plants germinating from the resulting swath of invasive seed spread will then lead to foreseeable secondary invasive seed spread downwind and/or downstream. In contrast, hikers, cyclists, canoeists and other non-OHV recreationists generally avoid becoming mud-caked and travel shorter distances, and as a result their innate capacity to spread the seeds of noxious non-native invasive weed species is lower than that of OHVs. The cost of controlling noxious non-native invasive weed species in Minnesota is enormous. The bill is paid by taxpayers, counties, private landowners, federal landowners, and the state. There is no doubt that OHV riding increases the number of non-native noxious invasive species in the state and the county, the rate of those species' spread, and hence the monetary and ecological costs of weed spread and control activities, like herbicide spraying and mechanical control. According to the USDA-Forest Service, "[n]on-native invasive species are most likely to spread into areas where ground disturbance has occurred. Sources of weed dispersal include OHV use on roads, trails, utility corridors, gravel pits, wildlife openings, landings, and old skid paths. Non-native invasive species near infested trails or utility corridors have the highest likelihood of spreading because of OHV use." Chippewa National Forest OHV Road Travel Access Project Draft Environmental Assessment at p. 16 (PR-630-2) dated 4/13/2007.</p>	12.5
<p><i>Wildlife disturbance, reduced reproductive success, and increased mortality</i> – "Motorized vehicle traffic can cause a visual or audible disturbance to some species of wildlife. If this occurs during a critical breeding time, it may cause nest or territory abandonment and lead to decreased fecundity rates. Increased densities of packed snow trails can reduce the competitive advantage of species like the Canada lynx, by allowing other predators that are not as adapted for deep snow</p>	12.6

Author/Comment	Response
<p>conditions, to access suitable lynx habitat and compete for prey species. Increased levels of access to the [f]orest can also facilitate the illegal killing of wildlife species.” EA at p. 16.</p>	
<p>In sum, the combination of inherent abilities (to do more damage, travel longer distances, and affect larger areas with their various effects) to disturb people and damage the environment make OHVs the most intrusive and inherently destructive form of outdoor recreation yet. MCEA refers the reviewers to the document by Duren, D. S. et al. 2007. Environmental Effects of Off-Highway Vehicles on Bureau of Land Management Lands: A Literature Synthesis, Annotated Bibliographies, Extensive Bibliographies, and Internet Resources. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2007-1353. and to the DNR’s “Assessing ATV Impacts” document, attached electronically to this comment letter.</p> <p>Because of OHV recreation’s singular status as the most inherently damaging form of outdoor recreation, and because of the incredible sensitivity, rarity, and incompatibility of the natural resources in the Mississippi River Wild River Corridor and surrounding lands in the MHSF, the DNR should classify the MHSF “Closed” to OHVs.</p>	<p>12.9 6.2</p>
<p>C. The Mississippi River And The Wild Headwater Reach Are Of State, National, And International Significance.</p> <p>As stated earlier in this comment letter, there is good reason the Mississippi River is referred to as America’s “Great River.” It drains 41% of the continental United States (1.25 million square miles, the third largest in the world), and its watershed includes all or part of 31 U.S. states and two Canadian provinces. It probably captures the imagination of more Americans looking for a memorable, remarkable river adventure than any other river in the country. The fact that the DNR seldom receives public comments from outside of Minnesota on such projects as this, but is receiving them on the Draft Plan for the MHSF, is an indication of the degree to which the Mississippi is a river cared about people nationwide.</p>	<p>10.6</p>
<p>The Wild River reach at the Headwaters as noted earlier is the only reach on the Mississippi to qualify as Wild under the NWSRA. It is managed and designated as Wild under Minnesota law, and is a designated canoe route, as well. According to Minnesota law and the 1977 assessment report from the U.S. Dept. of Interior, the Mississippi Headwaters’ Wild River reach offers the highest quality remote, traditional wild-character scenery, river-borne recreation, and other values found on the river (see also the document marked “MHSF-DNR-No Consensus – 4of5 members” at pp. 6-10).</p>	<p>10.7</p>
<p>D. The Wild River’s Values Must Be Protected And Enhanced</p> <p>Minnesota Statutes §103F.361-.377 provide that the values of the Mississippi Headwaters reaches, including the reach at issue in the MHSF, must be protected and enhanced for future generations. Minnesota law requires that other important, high quality, rare, or unique natural resources must be protected, as well.</p>	<p>10.8</p>
<p>E. OHV Enforcement Is Less Effective And More Difficult As “Off-Limits” Areas Become Smaller And More Readily Accessible By OHVs</p> <p>The document marked “MHSF-DNR-No Consensus – 4of5 members” suggests at p. 3 that the job of enforcement, primarily by DNR Conservation Officers (COs), will be equivalent whether the MHSF is “Closed” or “Limited,” but this is not correct. If the MHSF is “Closed” to OHVs, then it will be far easier to distinguish OHVs that are in violation of state law. When a forest is “Limited” and has trails that are open to OHVs, then an OHV that might have recently been illegally driving cross-country, but which has made it back to a designated route by the time a CO arrives, it is impossible to determine if the rider was recently in violation. The larger a “Closed” land area is, the more time is required to cross that “Closed” area, and the greater the likelihood of a violator whose tracks are found leading into the area will be intercepted before they exit and return to an area open to OHV traffic. COs have to patrol “border” areas, meaning places where legal OHV riding stops and illegal riding starts. With a “Limited” forest, all the legally designated routes for OHVs count as border, because of OHVs’ established propensity for going off-trail. A CO’s work is proportionate to the amount of border area that must be patrolled. As border density (the amount of border per unit area, such as the parcels that DNR owns and manages in the MHSF) increases, so does the difficulty of patrolling the management area.</p>	<p>11.2</p>

Author/Comment	Response
<p>Also, if the rhetoric is to be believed, then education of the OHV rider community is essential to achieve voluntary compliance with OHV management systems, such as staying on designated OHV routes and staying out of areas posted off-limits. The DNR's Draft Plan proposes to take several areas where DNR has a well-known history of failure to control illegal OHV use in areas posted off-limits (most prominently but not exclusively Coffee Pot Landing), and convert these sites of long-standing illegal OHV use into legally designated OHV trails. This sends a perverse message to riders regarding the rewards of persistent violations of gates, signs, berms, boulders, etc. To prevent perverse education of OHV users who have consistently violated the closures, as well as to protect the Wild values of the river, OHV use in those places should remain illegal, and restrictions should be more actively enforced.</p>	11.3
<p>IV. DNR Has Failed To Demonstrate A Need To Designate The MHSF "Limited." The "need"-based argument posits that roads and trails inside the MHSF should be designated open OHV traffic because people driving OHVs on one side of the MHSF need to get to areas on the other side. This argument is utterly without merit.</p>	Comment noted 3.7
<p>As a simple factual matter, it is not necessary to drive directly through the MHSF on an OHV to get from an area outside the forest on one side to an area on the far side. There is a large network of township, county, and state roads and highways that provides many alternative routes from one side of the MHSF to another.</p>	3.5
<p>Also, when a "need" is asserted, what is presented as a need is really an expression of preference; the person speaking would rather take one route than another, preferring a route that goes through the MHSF to other routes that go around it. The preference might be for a shorter route over a longer route, or it might not. Going around the MHSF rather than through it could mean a longer or shorter trip, depending on one's starting location and where one is trying to go. Or the preference might be for an aesthetically more pleasing route, whether because of scenery, or some other factor that distinguishes various alternative routes. All the same, it is strictly speaking a preference and not a need to take the shorter or more enjoyable route instead of a route that goes around the MHSF.</p>	3.6
<p>Moreover, wanting to drive an OHV does not create a need to do so. If a person insists on getting from one side of the MHSF to another without walking or bicycling or paddling a canoe, he or she can easily do what most people do: drive or be driven there in a car. And if that person wants to have an OHV with them when they arrive on the other side of the forest, they could do what most OHV owners do at one time or another, which is to trailer their OHV to a destination. In none of these situations is it "necessary" to drive an OHV from one place to the other, much less on a route that passes through the MHSF. Inside the MHSF, a person seeking to get from one location to another again may drive on a road that is open to cars to the vicinity, and then walk the rest of the way on foot, or perhaps pedal a bicycle or paddle. For those who have a documented physical handicap, of course, the DNR has the authority to grant permits to use an OHV in prescribed areas where others legally may not.²⁵</p>	3.7
<p>In sum, there are many options for getting from one place to another within and across a state forest. Closing a state forest to OHVs does not prohibit use of the forest to public use or travel, it merely requires that people drive cars, or else walk, paddle, peddle, or take an OHV on one of several possible alternative routes outside of the MHSF.</p>	3.8
<p>IV. THE DRAFT PLAN FAILS TO PROVIDE A REASONED BASIS FOR THE INTIMATED CONCLUSION THAT THE PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION SAFEGUARDS OR ENHANCES PROTECTED NATURAL RESOURCES. Lost in this Draft Plan is any serious discussion or defense of whether or how it protects and enhances the protectible natural resources found in and around the MHSF and for which the DNR is first responsible. In place of such a discussion the Draft Plan contains formless statements, and</p>	15.3

²⁵ Incidentally, this would be the case whether the MHSF were classified as Limited or Closed to OHVs. If, as the proponents of OHVs in the MHSF suggest, OHVs actually would stay on designated trails, then the drivers who wanted to get to places not served by a designated trail would have to walk. Of course, once the MHSF is opened to OHVs with designated roads and trails, the total OHV traffic will rise measurably, and with it the incidence of OHVs going off the designated routes and into where they are not permitted.

Author/Comment	Response
<p>assertions that are either lacking in substantiation or unsupported by reasoned explanation, or both. Here are a few examples:</p> <p>“The challenge was to develop designations that comply with existing laws and policies, adequately protect natural resources, and balance competing public desires for the management of, and access to, forest lands” (Draft Plan at p. 17).</p> <p>This statement mentions the challenges but fails to assert that the Draft Plan meets the challenge, or to provide explanation as to how that challenge was met.</p> <p>The planning team expended great effort considering the appropriateness of a <i>closed</i> versus <i>limited</i> classification for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. Particular attention was paid to addressing what framework of public access best recognized the need to protect sensitive natural areas along the Mississippi River corridor (and other areas) while recognizing many routes could sustain varying degrees of motorized use. The latter point was important given the public trail policies established by Beltrami, Clearwater, and Hubbard Counties on adjacent, non-DNR ownerships, where Beltrami and Clearwater Counties have an “open unless restricted” policy on forest trails.</p> <p>The DNR team proposes a <i>limited</i> classification for DNR Forestry-administered forest lands in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. A <i>limited</i> classification affords a better opportunity to align DNR and county land management than would be available under a <i>closed</i> classification. To this end DNR and the County Land Departments developed joint recommendations for all four ownerships that are presented in this draft plan. The goal was to provide a consistent “on the ground” management scheme as possible while recognizing the differences between DNR and county access policies. The <i>limited</i> classification also acknowledges that some degree of motorized access can be sustained on the existing trail inventory. Regardless of whether DNR lands are classified as <i>limited</i> or <i>closed</i>, a high level of coordination will be necessary on a continuous, ongoing basis to maintain access for all public lands located within the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.</p> <p>The DNR team considered the proposed adoption of a <i>limited</i> classification itself to be insufficient to fully protect important natural resource values along the Mississippi River corridor. This was especially true in terms of access afforded to ATVs, ORVs, and HLVs under the big game hunting and trapping exceptions (M.S. 84.926, subd 2 and 4). To address this concern, Areas with Limitations on Off-Trail and Non-Designated Trail Use are proposed for all or parts of 26 DNR Forestry-administered parcels in the vicinity of the Mississippi River. In short, the big game hunting and trapping exceptions will not apply. Beltrami and Hubbard Counties also propose to adopt a similar zone for county-managed lands along the Mississippi River to provide for more consistent management across the three ownerships. (Draft Plan at p. 12).</p> <p>The above passage describes the effort that was made to consider, “the need to protect sensitive areas along the Mississippi River corridor,” and to recognize, “that many routes could sustain varying degrees of motorized use.” It then simply states the DNR’s selected preference – the “Limited” classification – saying (incorrectly) that this choice was the Team’s. The explanation that follows in the second paragraph fails even to mention natural resources or the sensitive areas along the river corridor that “need” to be protected, much less to state a reasoned basis for concluding that a “Limited” forest can protect natural resources requiring protection from OHV damage.</p>	

Author/Comment	Response
<p>The closest this passage comes to addressing the MHSF's history of illegal OHV damage and threats of future damage to protectible forest and other natural resources, is the admission in the third paragraph that a "Limited" classification would not, "fully protect important natural resource values along the Mississippi River corridor." The blame for the failure of the "Limited" classification to protect important natural resource values along the River Corridor is laid "especially" but not solely upon the big game and trapping exemptions, which allow for cross-country ATV traffic and use of resource-damaging non-designated trails.</p> <p>This admission of insufficiency, however, is not further explained, and it raises important questions that go unanswered. How effective are Areas with Limitations? Will they be sufficient to protect the "important natural resource values along" the River Corridor? What are the other threats posed by OHVs operating in a "Limited" state forest – the ones not "especially" relating to the big game and trapping exceptions? There is no discussion to explore or answer these questions. The admission is followed simply by the assertion that Areas with Limitations would officially prohibit (not prevent) OHVs from driving cross-country, and OHVs and trucks from using non-designated trails during hunting and trapping seasons. The reader must guess or infer whether and how the DNR has reasoned that a "Limited" forest and irregularly-drawn Areas with Limitations will do the job of protecting important natural resource values.</p>	15.4
<p>The Draft Plan mentions resource protection at other points, also, such as: A <i>limited</i> classification will allow historic big game hunting and trapping access as afforded under M.S. Section 84.926, subd. 2 and 4, while protecting other resource values. Public access for other utilitarian purposes, such as berry picking, will only be possible by foot travel, or other non-motorized methods, on nondesignated routes under a <i>limited</i> classification. Both HLVs and OHVs are permitted uses on forest roads. (Draft Plan at p. 14)</p> <p>Again, however, this and all other subsequent mentions of resource protection fail to enunciate specific resources, fail to describe the specific threats or mechanisms of damage to those resources, fail to describe the operation and efficacy of Areas with Limitations and how performance and success will be measured, and in summary are little more than unadorned, unsubstantiated assertions of some desired future condition presented as fact.</p>	15.5
<p>V. DNR'S "AREAS WITH LIMITATIONS" AND DESIGNATED TRAILS ARE INSUFFICIENT TO PROTECT THE NATURAL RESOURCES AND WILD CHARACTER OF THE MHSF AND THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER'S HEADWATERS REACH.</p> <p>OHVs, once given designated roads and trails in the MHSF, will do as they have been doing, namely, persistently breaking the law and going where expressly prohibited, causing unnecessary damage to forest resources of extremely high importance and rarity, and diminishing others' enjoyment of the traditional outdoors recreational opportunities such as river paddling and camping, for which the Mississippi Headwaters is well-known and designated. The Draft Plan does not suggest that OHV use will conform to standards of law-abiding regularity never seen before, nor could it. Such a suggestion would be incredible. Nor does the Draft Plan suggest that the important, rare, and even unique forest resources in the MHSF will be unaffected by OHV use. What mention there is of OHVs' negative effects is a tacit admission that OHVs require special management because of their propensity to damage natural resources, and to interfere with and diminish others' enjoyment of those natural resources. For example, the Draft Plan states that special zones in the MHSF, "areas with limitations" within which OHVs will be legally required to stay on designated trails, "are established for the purpose of protecting unique natural resource values, providing improved user opportunities, or other reasons."²⁶ Draft Plan, p. 22.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>11.1</p> <p>11.8</p>
<p>One such "area with limitations on off-trail and non-designated trail use" is proposed by the DNR</p>	6.2

²⁶ Outside of an "area with limitations" it is legal to drive ATVs cross-country, and both OHVs and highway licensed vehicles off of the designated roads and trails, during 8 months of the year.

Author/Comment	Response
and two counties in recognition of, "the potential sensitivity of the Mississippi River corridor through the state forest." ²⁷ Left unsaid, however, is the fact that even if the OHVs were to abide by and stay on the trails inside the "areas with limitations," that compliance still would not protect the important sensitive, rare, and unique natural resources along the Mississippi River and in the MHSF. In reality, of course OHVs will neither stay on designated roads and trails of their own accord, nor because DNR tries to make them do so. The DNR's implicit suggestion otherwise is contrary to the DNR's own history of such efforts to control OHVs on the MHSF, and is an empty promise.	4.3 11.9 15.7
Norton, Samantha	
Please keep the headwaters of the Mississippi wild and undisturbed. Allowing ATV use on public lands in the headwaters would ruin a delicate ecosystem and national treasure. To ruin public lands for the entertainment of a small segment of the population is indefensible. Keep ATVs out.	2.3 4.3 6.2
Oathout, Candace D.	
The members of the Citizens Against Recreational Eviction - USA wish to express their support for, at a minimum, the designation of limited on DNR administered state forest lands. 44 miles of roads and trails etc. on 11,500 acres is hardly an unreasonable request. It will certainly help maintain a balance of recreational interests for all Minnesotans. The concerns put forth by the petitioners in Beltrami County are simply that, concerns voiced by a group of folks with one perspective on the issue. A reasonable amount of trails made available to OHV users will go far in assisting the DNR to control impacts that could impact the environmental integrity of public lands and waterways while giving motorized user groups opportunities to enjoy the area by trail also.	6.1 15.7
The idea that we are losing the "last remaining wilderness" anywhere is ludicrous on its face. In fact, there are 812,268 acres of designated wilderness in Minnesota alone. The reality is that a little less than 3% (or slightly less than 50,000,000 acres) of the United States landmass is designated wilderness.	2.9
Unfortunately, it seems that motorized trail enthusiasts have been and continue to be classed as second class citizens who somehow do not deserve to enjoy trail experiences comparable to non-motorized users although they contribute both tax revenue and hands-on volunteer work to support and maintain trails. We are grateful that the Minnesota DNR recognizes those contributions and is willing to support motorized uses of public lands in addition to other recreational uses.	Comment noted
Odendahl, Jeff	
I want to give you my comments on the Draft Plan for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. I'm a skier and hiker, and I've canoed parts of this area. I am very concerned that this draft plan still allows "limited" useage by ATV's and other off-road vehicles. I've seen some of the destruction these vehicles cause, and have heard of even more from others. I believe this area is very special and should be protected as much as possible from further environmental degradation. In this fragile area, even "limited" usage is too much. I ask the DNR to please close this area to ATV's and other off-road vehicles.	6.2 12.1 2.10 4.3
Ogden, Elinor K.	
I believe that the DNR draft plan designation for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest (MHSF) as "limited" is a mistake. It leaves one of the few wild areas of the Mississippi river open to the destructive use of OHVs. There is, unfortunately, no way that ATVs can be expected to tread lightly on the land. There are already sufficient County and Township roadways in the area available for OHV and ATV use and enjoyment.	6.2 4.3 2.10 3.7
Designating the MHSF as "closed" would save it as an important wildlife habitat. It would protect the river banks and hills from erosion caused by off trail ATV riders. It would save an important piece of forest land. The 1000 foot corridor along the river where all OHVs would be banned, as requested by the Mississippi Headwaters Board, should be maintained in the DNR draft plan. Forest land and wetlands are already under enough pressure from development. The MHSF is deserving of preservation. Designating it as "closed" to OHVs and ATVs will help preserve it in its	12.6 12.3 10.8 12.16 6.2

²⁷ It is worth noting that off-trail and non-designated trail uses, and resulting damage, are proposed to be allowed elsewhere along the Mississippi River in Clearwater County, and along other rivers and streams in the MHSF.

Author/Comment	Response
natural state for future generations to enjoy.	
Ohmdahl, Paulette	
Please do NOT close the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to ATV's. I want access to Forest Roads and Designated Trails, and the Forest should not be closed.	6.1
Olander, Joel J.	
I am writing in regard to the proposal to open additional trails for OHV's in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. The MHSF should be classified as "closed" and not "limited." This park is one the most pristine and beautiful parks in our state and OHV's would definitely detract from its beauty.	4.3 6.2 20.1
Closing one of our last undisturbed areas is the right thing to do. OHV's have thousands of trail miles in other areas where there use is permitted. I have seen first hand how OHV's have already damaged MHSF and if trails are opened the damage will only get worse.	16.8
I remind you that the three of the five DNR members recommended the MHSF be closed to all OHV's, citing the natural assets and noting that the steep sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off road driving.	14.1 11.5
Please do the right thing and set a precedent of good stewardship for this wonderful area. Do not succumb to the money and promised being made to be OHV industry and riders.	Comment noted
Olmschenk, Daniel	
The intent of this e-mail is let you know that my wife and I support the plan of limited designation use for the Mississippi Headwaters. We enjoy riding our atv's on different trails in the state and are thankful for the trails we have but there is a need for more trails. I am 63 and hope to keep riding for many years to come.	6.1
Olson, Allen	
I think most people with common sense would agree with the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nobody needs to drive their ATV's down or across the Mississippi unless it's frozen over. 2. People need to stay on the trails with their ATV's. 3. The DNR should have the authority to temporary shut down trails, or portions of trails when spring thaw or other conditions arise that will compromise the trail's integrity. 4. It makes good sense to designate weight restrictions on some trails. 5. There should be designated trails where no ATV's are allowed. 6. ATV's should be limited to an acceptable DB noise level. 7. That it is a good idea to add annual trail fee stickers to maintain, improve, and expand the trail systems. 8. That well constructed and fair laws need to be enforced. 9. That those who break these laws need to be dealt with and fined to pay for the trail repair and their labor to fix it. 	Comment noted
So how is it that people from special interest groups can converge on Bemidji and try to dictate the use of our trails? Are these people really in our woods during the summer months enjoying the deer flies, horse flies, mosquitoes and woof ticks? In fact, I have not met too many people in the woods that didn't get there by riding an ATV or in some other vehicle.	14.6
People from the Twin Cities come up here to ride because a select few ruined it for them down there. This pumps revenue into Beltrami County's economy and maintains local jobs.	14.10
The trees in this area have been logged off at least twice in the last century. The ground has been furrowed up to grow more trees that are meant to harvest again in the future. Much of this forest has recently been clear cut and re-planted. The equipment used for this type of farming moves much more dirt than any tire of an ATV. Roads and trails are required to farm trees and to maintain our ability to contain fires. All of this is plays a role in the health of our local economy. Are these people that want to shut these trails down to let the forest grow willing to quit using paper? Or do they believe that paper just comes from the store? Are they willing to live in a mud hut? Or do they believe that lumber comes from the lumberyard? I believe that some of the people who want to save "Mother Earth" have good intentions. Some of them were simply born 200 years too late for their proposed way of life. Some can't even be expected to have a clue.	Comment noted
My biggest disappointment lies with the majority of us. Our complacency in not attending meetings	Comment

Author/Comment	Response
like the one held at the collage last week could cost many of us some of our present freedoms. We do not need a loud few making the rules and laws for the majority of us. We all need to start attending these meetings if we're going to have any say about the land use of the area of which we live in. And shame on us if these trails are closed down by these special interest groups.	noted
This all seemed to start when someone left ATV tire marks into the river banks somewhere in the Mississippi head waters. That was an irresponsible and illegal act. This spark ignited a wild fire that has turned this land use issue into a complete circus act. It's because of this that I am disappointed in how the DNR handled this issue and how they appear to have rolled over to those special interest groups for a good beating. As an avid outdoors person and ATV rider, I felt that all my hunting and fishing license fees and the tax dollars that I contribute to finance the DNR to enforce the existing laws failed to get the job done. It's sportsman like me that pay their wage and finance many of the forest enhancement and wildlife programs. Not these special interest groups with their headquarters in California or some other big city.	11.9
Let this unfortunate circumstance wake us all up that live in the Bemidji area. We all need to be better Stewarts of the land in our area and turn in those that vandalize and deface it. It is unfortunate that a few have caused such havoc for the rest of us to deal with.	Comment noted
On the other hand, I did review the DNR's trail plan for this area and thought that it was well constructed and fair to all users as it originally was prior to the meeting. Anything short of that would be an unfortunate loss to those who really use and enjoy this forest.	6.1
Ortman, Debby	
Please accept these as comments from the League of Women Voters of Duluth. The LWV has a strong position on protecting our natural resources and wise management of these resources. LWVUS Position: Promote an environment beneficial to life through the protection and wise management of natural resources in the public interest.	Comment noted
We would like to request that the MN DNR consider closing the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to all OHV use. The only way to protect this significant resource is by not allowing any OHV use. Not all state forested lands should be open to OHV use.	6.2 4.3
A limited classification will not protect environmentally sensitive areas in this unique wilderness area.	12.1
MHSF is important because:Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is of particular concern to people who love the wilderness. It is a magnificent, wild part of the river, a hidden treasure alternating between boreal forests and vast wetlands rich in the history of north central Minnesota. The region is habitat for trumpeter swans, red-shouldered hawks, bald eagles, wolves, fur bearers and an incredible diversity of waterfowl in its wild rice lakes, sedge meadows and bog lands. Jack pine and red pine forests intermingle within the wetlands, making for an amazingly rich ecosystem.	2.3 10.6 10.14
OHV's cause significant erosion on hillsides, wetlands, riverbeds. Unfortunately having designated routes does not seem to control illegal use of OHV's and in particular ATV's who can easily go off trail and cause damage to riparian zones along the river. Also it is difficult to monitor and enforce violations.	2.10 3.8 11.4
Ostrowski, Mike	
This looks to be a well thought out plan allowing all users groups access to the forest. I have spent some time enjoying the 4-wheeler trails in the Paul Bunyan State Forest, and this plan for the MHSF would seem a natural extension for those trails. I would encourage the planning group to approve the plans as they now stand.	6.1
Ostwald, Brent	
Years ago, my brother and his family camped at Hungry Man campground, hauled our bicycles to Itaska St. Park and had a great time riding with our kids. I'm now going on 60 years old and ride an ATV way more than a bicycle. I would love to see the forest classified as limited to once again enjoy the scenery on a different set of wheels. Hopefully, it would connect to other trails in the area, maybe even to Paul Bunyan SF.????	6.1
Pari, Felicia	
I read the article in the Bemidji Pioneer about the Headwaters State Forest. Then I went to the DNR Web-site and looked over the proposal and maps. Although the maps were a little hard to decipher, having spent some time in the Mississippi Headwaters Woodland, I was able to figure	6.1

Author/Comment	Response
out what was what. My family has canoed the Mississippi River, also riding 4-wheelers and camping in the area. There are some trails that need to be closed and it looks as tho the DNR has addressed that situation. I think the proposal of limited with some trails open to 4-wheelers is a well thought out plan.	
Parker, Rebecca	
Please keep atv's out of Mississippi headwaters area.	4.3 6.2
Parson, Charles	
This letter reflects my concern with ATV use on public lands in Minnesota and particularly in Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. A few years ago some neighborhood teens created a shortcut through my woods. They only rode their ATV's along this route for one weekend, while I was out of town. Their path has not grown back and I resent it every time that I walk by their "road". So, I know what ATV use can do when riders leave roads. In the Mississippi Headwaters they are permitted to ride on any trail that they can find on the majority of the area, which is controlled by Beltrami County. Inevitably they will deviate from trails on state lands and have "fun" creating new paths. It happens everywhere that these machine riders are encouraged to play.	8.4 11.4
Please do all that you can to keep ATV's out of public lands. Just because citizens own them and because they are built in Minnesota does not mean that we should encourage them to be ridden to the detriment of our public land. They are inherently destructive and in most cases serve no useful purpose. If there is such pressure to provide sites for them to be used, let the private sector create the sites.	4.3
Within the upper Mississippi they have done considerable damage and should be banned, or their opportunities for access should be strictly limited. Please do not encourage motorized recreational activities in this area.	11.9 6.2
Paul	
The more the public can't access and have fun on public land the more people will become more and more inactive. Our freedoms in our state are going away one by one. Whats next? It just seems to me that that we are going in the direction that if it's fun it must be bad!, and must be done away with. If someone is abusing the land go after them. If they are having fun that shouldn't be a crime.	6.1
Pavlish, Art & Donna	
I am writing to ask consideration in keeping the Mississippi Headwater State forest open to access on forest roads and designated trails - and not be closed. As an avid ATV enthusiast more open roads and trails reduces use on other areas and provides more choices to all. Thank you for your consideration of this request.	6.1
Peck, Linda	
State owned land in the MHSF should be classified as CLOSED, not limited, as recommended in the draft plan. Any land owned by other levels of government in the MHSF should also be classified as closed.	6.2 5.9
The natural habitats here are a mosaic of forest types, wetlands, and meadows adjacent to the Mississippi. It is a rich ecosystem that deserves protection. It has been designated as "wild" by the Mississippi Headwaters Board. "Wild" designation created a 1000 foot riparian corridor in which OHV use would be banned. However, the draft plan proposes ATV use here even though much damage along the river has already been documented by illegal use of these machines. The remoteness of this riparian corridor makes any meaningful enforcement difficult.	10.12
Although major efforts have been made in the MHSF draft to address the mix of county, state, township, private, and tribal land ownerships, this scattered ownership does not lend itself to respecting and implementing the interests of the various user groups. It complicates protecting the natural resources (habitats); it complicates making trail connections; it complicates oversight and decision making; it complicates violation reporting and enforcement responsibilities.	5.9
To preserve this fragile and significant habitat complex along the Mississippi River in the MHSF and to close its use by OHVs, perhaps serious consideration should be given to having all the land within the riparian corridor owned by the state. Land swaps amongst various owners might be a way to accomplish this. Scattered state-owned lands outside the MHSF could be traded to the	14.11

Author/Comment	Response
<p>county/township/etc. in exchange for county/township/etc. owned land within the MHSF. For instance, a state-owned pine plantation, small acreage or degraded DNR holding outside the MHSF might provide more economic value to the local level of government (other owner) than the wetlands/forest meadow lands they own within the MHSF. The Legislature could order the DNR to work on this negotiation. Ideally the various divisions within the DNR should partner in this effort with insights of DNR field biologist/ecologists laying the ground work.</p>	
<p>Presently, OHVs can pass from one jurisdiction to another using county ditches and township roads. They cross state-owned land in the process. Unfortunately, OHVs are major transporters of invasive plant species, common in many road ditches, from one area to another (See enclosed article: Non-Native Invasives Threatening Chippewa National Forest that appeared in the Summer 2007 issue of the Minnesota Plant Press – the newsletter of the Minnesota Native Plant Society). One invasive plant species found in the ditches around MHSF is the spotted knapweed. What plans are there to prevent the spread of this plant and who is responsible? Perhaps we need to ban OHVs from riding in ditches at all, and legally require them to use the right side of the road like automobiles.</p>	12.15
<p>Existing forest roads, within all forest classifications (managed, limited, closed), that cut through, bisect or fragment crucial interior habitat areas should be closed permanently and revegetated. Access to these more isolated areas should be restricted to foot traffic. This restriction should also apply to hunters and trappers. Allowing off-trail use by them creates a “trail” that invites others to follow. Any machines reaching this permanently closed interior section of the forest/meadow/etc. would be parked at identified locations along the perimeter of the closed habitat area. Users would now proceed on foot and leave the machine behind. If this were implemented, many interior bird and mammal species, more sensitive to habitat fragmentation and human disturbances, may be able to stay and/or return to the protect interior and successfully reproduce.</p>	10.13
<p>Science should guide the location of any trails. This should apply to all trail-user groups. The potential impacts incurred by a specific user group should not cause degradation or impairment of the habitat / resource / i.e., trail locations for each user group must fit the tolerance of the specific habitats for this use. If degradation occurs, then the trail should be closed temporarily while “healing” occurs naturally or restoration is undertaken by some authority. We close roads for improvements and repairs, we can do the same on trails on our public lands.</p>	14.12
<p>Throughout the draft document, reference is made to the state statute (Minnesota Laws 2003, Chapter 128, Article 1, Section 167 as amended by Minnesota Laws 2005, 1st Special Session, Chapter 1, Article 2, Section 152) that directs the Commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources to “review the recreational motor vehicle use classification in all state forest lands and to DESIGNATE forest roads and trails.” The word designate is very troublesome for me. It is my understanding that the effect of designation is to transfer funds from the state to local levels of government. From there, the dollars are granted to various motorized recreational groups in the region. These local clubs develop and maintain the vast majority of the state’s designated trails. According to the Office of Legislative Auditor (OLA) Program Evaluation Report: State Funded Trails for Motorized Recreation (January 2003), “DNR and local governments have provided little oversight for the grant-in-aid programs, leaving snowmobile and OHV clubs to operate largely on their own.” See page 40 of this report.</p> <p>The OLA Report recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Legislature should require that environmental assessment worksheets be prepared for many types of OHV projects (p. 30). - DNR needs to develop a better understanding of how many miles of trails the department’s OHV budget will potentially support (p. 26). - DNR should devote at least as much enforcement time per vehicle to OHV as it provides to snowmobiles (p. 71). - DNR should take several steps to improve the oversight that the snowmobile and OHV grant-in-aid programs receive (pp. 56-62). - The Legislature should reexamine the studies that it has used to allocate a portion of gas tax collections to the four dedicated funding accounts for motorized recreation (pp. 100- 	14.13 12.1

Author/Comment	Response
<p>102).</p> <p>It is sad that most of the recommendations in the OLA report have not been addressed. It seems to be the one OLA report that has been "lost" by the Legislature. Unfortunately, the approach now followed by Minnesota for trails on our public lands favors a certain user group – motorized users of OHVs and snowmobiles – over non-motorized users like hikers, bikers, bird watchers, naturalists, photographers, etc. Also, unfortunately, OHV users can quickly and effectively damage the natural resources in our public lands when some users do not abide by the rules. The cost for enforcement and to correct any damage is paid by all of us, and demands on the conservations officers are overwhelming.</p> <p>I drive a car, I use a bike, canoe, hike and bird watch. I buy gas, but no gas tax dollars are allocated to local hiking clubs to develop trails nor to local bike clubs for bike paths. There seems to be something wrong with this picture, especially in light of global warming concerns and the low gas mileage for most OHVs.</p> <p>Perhaps designated should have no dollars attached to it. Instead the MNDNR ecologists/naturalists should carefully select routes on state lands that can tolerate and remain ecologically sound with OHV use. OHV users would then be restricted to these selected routes. Any gas tax dollars now collected would go to oversight, enforcement, mitigation and repair. Once appropriate trails have been selected, maps would be created depicting trails open to OHVs. Now the DNR would set up a permit system for OHV users on state land (forests). People can get storm water permits and burn permits, why not establish a similar permit system for OHVs? People could apply for a permit on line and it could be fine. Permit holders would receive maps showing selected trails open for use and a copy of the rules from the DNR. In return, the permit holder would return a signed document indicating they have a permit when and wherever they use their machine. This paper trail would help with enforcement and the penalties meted out. Penalties should be more severe depending on the damage caused and the number of past violations. At some point confiscation of the machines might be in order. The machine would be auctioned off and the dollars raised used to repair the damage, etc. caused.</p>	
<p>Pederson, Alan</p> <p>I just wanted to send a note regarding closing off areas to ATV's. Public parks are for the people to use and enjoy. If places are getting shut off for this use, it takes away an opportunity to teach my children the proper respect and beauty of our beautiful country. The responsible park user understands the eco-system and does everything they can to make sure the area is not harmed and left the way it was when they entered. Please keep the current rules in place. We all pay taxes to use this land that belongs to the American public and continue to contribute to this great nation that we all love.</p>	20.1
<p>Peterson, Fern, Todd, Jack & Will</p>	
<p>We are contacting you to express our deep concern regarding the MHSF Draft Plan that classifies the forest as "limited" rather than "closed" to OHVs. This unique wilderness area deserves to be closed, without any trails open to OHVs, including ATVs.</p>	6.2
<p>Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a magnificent, wild part of the river, a hidden treasure rich in the history of north central Minnesota. This narrow corridor is habitat for trumpeter swans, red-shouldered hawks, bald eagles, wolves, fur bearers and an incredible diversity of waterfowl.</p>	10.14
<p>Three of the five DNR work team members recommended the MHSF be closed to OHVs. Significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river. Currently, OHV damage in MHSF is extreme, and rather than sealing off historic and/or vulnerable sites that have been damaged by off-road driving, the DNR Draft Plan has designated ATV routes, thereby rewarding illegal behavior by legalizing it.</p>	14.1 3.9 11.9
<p>A "closed" forest would not ban ATVs entirely, as you know. They would still be able to ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads.</p>	3.8
<p>In the interest of all Americans, we must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi for future citizens. We must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized</p>	2.9

Author/Comment	Response
river. Citizens around the country who love the wilderness and value preservation are watching the DNR's performance on this issue.	
Peterson, Lin	
"Lets stop cross country travel of ATV's on our State Forest Lands"	Comment noted
I would like to comment on ATV use that I've observed over the years in the outdoors in Becker County. Our family has a cabin on Tulaby Lake, in the White Earth Reservation, and have been very active in the area since the mid-1950's. We are not opposed to motorized trail use, etc. However, we need to do a much better job limiting cross country travel.	7.12
My concern is that ATV's are destroying our once pristine State Forest Lands, and have opened up areas that were (up to now), accessible only by foot - for those of us who enjoy getting as far back into the woods as possible. They have "invaded" our hunting area to the point where we have relocated our hunting efforts to the Tamarac Refuge - which doesn't allow ATV's, and we can still have a quality hunt without seeing or hearing them. Today's hunters apparently think they can't get a deer out of the woods, build a stand, or grouse hunt without riding on one.	7.9
There's a "loophole" in the laws that have caused the "invasion" into State Forest lands - I am not talking about designated trails and forest roads - I am talking about cross country travel - that turns into a ATV trail. The woods around Tulaby Lake are literally crisscrossed with hundreds of trails - where 10 years ago - their weren't any.	7.7
The "loophole" I'm referring to is in the 2007 Minnesota Hunting and Trapping Regulations Handbook, pg 114, reference to the "cross country travel ban" - the exceptions noted in the handbook are as follows: - ATV use for big game hunting or constructing stands during October thru December is allowed - ATV use for retrieving harvested game is allowed during September thru December ...	Comment noted
In reality, what happens is ATV users end up creating a trail to deer stands - these quickly become a "permanent" trail in the woods. They then become a trail that gets used year round by other ATV users. If anyone is interested, I'd be glad to take someone around our area and show them the trails I'm referring to.	7.7
As you all plan your new ATV trails thru our State Forest Areas, please consider an improved way to limit cross country travel?	6.2
Petty, Terry W.	
Please keep the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest open and maintain access to forest roads and designated trails for ATV use.	6.1
Pfennenstein, Joe	
I agree with Rob Bullis' letter in the Outdoor News (1/11/08) about limiting access for ATV's on state lands, especially in the Headwaters State Forest. Get out and walk! I think it's more than a few bad apples making them all look bad. They have more than enough areas to wreck already. I would like to see more areas kept walk in for hunting. I've been out west hunting to CO and I won't go to the areas that are open to offroad ATV's. They drive every where all the time and the game leaves! Then you have to walk in farther than they drive in. Let's keep the ATV's away.	6.2 4.3 7.9
Place, Darren Lori	
Please leave the access to forest roads and designated trails and the forest open for recreational use	6.1
Plakanis, Vesna	
Please, please, please oppose the new proposed OHV's in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.	6.2
As a child growing up in beautiful Minnesota, the only thing that kept me sane growing up in my dysfunctional household was the peace and serenity that the area around the Headwaters afforded me. I was lucky enough to go to a school in New Brighton that made Environmental education a part of the standardized program. We learned to canoe, swim, fish and play in nature as a part of our school program. I am 43 years old and can honestly say that the Mississippi headwaters saved my life. I know that I am not the only one. Talking to old school mates today I hear the same refrain, "thank God we were lucky enough to be in that program." In the world today of teaching to the tests, I think we were the last lucky generation that was allowed to soak up the	Comment noted

Author/Comment	Response
lessons of nature.	
I trace my childhood to the fact that today I own a successful nature guide service. As a part of my training, I have learned that Nature Deficit Disorder is a real problem with today's youth, contributing to ADD, ADHD, bipolar disorder, depression, diabetes, and more. The book, "Last Child in the Woods" describes how we as a society have created these childhood illnesses by taking away quiet and natural places for children to play. Creating yet one more noisy area in some of the last untouched wilderness in our great country will only further degrade the quality of life that we American's so desperately need.	Comment noted
Please, don't take away this haven. I am sincere when I say that it saved my life. ATV's are dangerous, noisy and create unprecedented damage to an areas by creating runoff, scarring the land, and crushing habitats and small animals found in wetlands. Very few places are left in the world where one can hear only the sounds of nature. Please don't be responsible for taking one more away.	4.3 12.1 2.10 6.2
Preus, Mary	
We have seen from our own land in NE Wisconsin and my husband's family's land near Walker MN how much damage ATV's and such vehicles do to forest paths. People do not stay on trails but go off in any direction possible, tearing up the ground, destroying small trees and plants, and scaring off wildlife. Please keep this type of conveyance out of the Miss. Headwaters area.	4.3 11.5 6.2
Proescholdt, Kevin	
The following are comments from the Izaak Walton League of America on the Draft Plan for Forest Classification and Forest Road and Trail Designations for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest (MHSF). The League is a national conservation organization composed of about 40,000 members who hunt, fish, or otherwise enjoy the outdoors in some 300 local chapters across the country. Since 1922 the League has provided conservation advocacy on a broad range of issues to protect our nation's natural resources. The League has some specific comments which follow:	Comment noted
The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is of particular concern to people who love wild country and wild rivers. It is a magnificent, wild part of the Mississippi River, a hidden treasure alternating between boreal forests and vast wetlands rich in the history of north central Minnesota. It covers the first 47 river miles between the river's headwaters in Itasca State Park and the city of Bemidji. The region is habitat for trumpeter swans, red-shouldered hawks, bald eagles, wolves, fur bearers, and an incredible diversity of waterfowl in its wild rice lakes, sedge meadows, and bog lands. Jack pine and red pine forests intermingle within the wetlands, making for an amazingly rich ecosystem.	10.14
The League believes that the headwaters region of the Mississippi River is truly a national resource. We believe that people across the nation care about what happens in this state forest, and that the overwhelming national interest is to keep this region as undeveloped and protected as possible. We hope that the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) will listen to the voices from across the country who are urging that the headwaters not be trashed by off-highway vehicles (OHVs).	10.15
The MHSF should be classified as "closed" not "limited." The DNR would make a terrible mistake by classifying this forest as limited. Already, OHV damage in the MHSF is extensive. Campgrounds are rutted and damaged at places like Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point. ATVs ride in the Mississippi River in a number of locations such as Stumphges Rapids. Rather than protecting the historic sites noted above, the DNR Draft Plan has designated ATV routes in these sensitive areas, thereby rewarding past illegal behavior by legalizing it.	14.1 11.9 10.1 10.16
A "closed" forest would not ban OHVs entirely. They would still be able to ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads. But state forest roads and trails would be closed to all OHVs. The forest is a checkerboard, with state and county land mingled. If the forest were classified as "closed," county and township roads would still allow OHVs to cross state land when going from one county parcel to another.	3.9
It will be difficult for DNR enforcement to strictly monitor any portion of this area because this part of the Mississippi is so remote. Classifying the MHSF "closed" would greatly aid in protecting the	11.8

Author/Comment	Response
river itself.	
Three of the five DNR work team members recommended the MHSF be closed to all OHVs, citing the natural assets above and noting that steep hills and sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off-road driving. Significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river.	14.1 3.9 11.9
The headwaters portion of the Mississippi River is a national resource that should be protected for its wild qualities, not opened to further OHV damage. In the interest of all Americans, we must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi for future citizens. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a narrow corridor. It contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi in the river's entire 2,552-mile stretch. Minnesotans must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized river.	10.15
The DNR, the local counties, and U.S. Forest Service are providing thousands of miles of OHV trails in Minnesota; closing the relatively small MHSF to OHVs will not impinge on OHV driving in all these other places.	16.8
A closed classification for the MHSF best matches the "wild" designation for the stretch of the Mississippi River that runs through the MHSF. The Mississippi Headwaters Board (a state-created local counties board) designated the MHSF stretch of the river as "wild," which created a 1,000-foot corridor along the river where all OHVs are banned. The Draft Plan, however, disregards this protection and proposes ATV trails within this corridor, with some dead-ending at the river. As noted, illegal riding has already damaged the riparian zone.	10.17
The Izaak Walton League of America appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments to the Minnesota DNR regarding the Draft Plan for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. League hopes that the DNR will not abdicate its stewardship obligations for this beautiful forest to the motorized recreation interests that have already damaged it so badly. Please re-classify the MHSF as closed.	6.2
Profant, Carmine	
I strongly oppose off-highway vehicle (OHV) use in the MHSF's Wild Corridor. OHVs currently have many legal routes available for recreation, and we need to be careful stewards of our precious forests, waters and wildlife. We must preserve and protect Minnesota's true wilderness and habitat areas from the encroachment of roads and recreational vehicles.	10.2 4.3
Quistgard, Gayle	
I believe it is important for this forest to remain open to multiple use. The limited classification can work, but I think the managed classification is more understandable to the public. Also, most of the forest is in Beltrami County and they have adopted a plan that uses the managed classification. Makes more sense to have the same classification as they do.	6.1 6.3 5.9
Radford, Jeffrey	
I feel the DNR should not accept the plan to designate ORV routes in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. Off-road vehicles already have access to thousands of miles of roads and trails in the state; enough is enough!	4.3 16.8
The Mississippi/Wild Headwaters are too important for their inherent wildness to allow in ATVs, dirtbikes and off-road vehicles. Please keep them out of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.	6.2
Ramer, Kelly	
Please reject the plan to allow ATV use around the headwaters of the great Mississippi. This would be a tragedy to the peace and beauty of that place.	4.3 6.2
Ranum, Mark	
I understand that the DNR is currently undergoing a classification review for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. As an active user of ATV's I would like to add my comments to the review process in that I would very much like to see this forest classified as "Limited Designation". I'm not suggesting that this forest be overrun with trails specifically for ATV or OHV/OHM use, but a few select trails seems more than reasonable to me.	6.1
Rauchwarter, Brian	
As an avid ATV rider along with my family and friends I would really like to see this Mississippi Headwaters State Forest & SW Beltrami County riding area be left as managed or to at least be "limited" so we can enjoy our great states trails and forests on ATV. I spend a lot of money at local	6.1

Author/Comment	Response
businesses when I take my family on these atv trips a couple times a year also, which these small towns really need. The less riding areas that means I have to go to another state to spend my money. Please take this into consideration during your meetings.	
rbxx1100	
??????? I think your plan is fine	6.1
Reber, Butch	
Please be aware that we care very much about the treasure we have in the Mississippi Headwaters Wilderness area. We are very concerned about the damage that will be done to the area if ATVs are allowed in the area. There can be no disputing that ATV traffic in our wilderness areas adversely affects wildlife, wetlands, rivers, and terrain. They also are a gross violation of the solitude and quietness of nature's wilderness.	4.3 2.3
Please do not allow ATVs or any kind of off road vehicles to plunder the Headwaters Wilderness area, one of our Minnesota treasures. Please keep the ATVs out and keep our wilderness wild.	6.2
Redleaf, Karen, Eric Angell & Christine Frank	
The Steering Committee of the Climate Crisis Coalition of the Twin Cities wishes to express our strong opposition to permitting All-Terrain and Off-Highway Vehicles to be driven in the northernmost reaches of the Mississippi River. We agree with the majority of work team members who recommended that the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest be closed to ATV/OHV use because it is "a sensitive natural resource of national significance." The observation of Messrs. North and Naplin that the steep hills and sandy soils of the area make it vulnerable to off-road driving is spot on. They also recognized that significant erosion has already occurred from illegal driving near and through the river. They also stated that closing ATV trails on state lands and in the forest was "reasonable and prudent", and we wholeheartedly agree. Unfortunately, Mike Carroll, DNR Regional Director in Bemidji, overrode their majority opinion, falsely characterizing the situation as a "split decision" among the staff. This sort of dishonesty and corrupt dealing within a state agency that has been mandated by the public to protect our pristine areas and natural resources is intolerable.	14.1 3.9 11.9
It is not the duty of the MNDNR to underwrite the state's ATV/OHV industry by encouraging the use of these destructive vehicles on public lands. It is unfortunate that former commissioner Gene Merriam saw it as such because he set a terrible precedent by allowing ATV/OHVs onto the state trail system in the first place. Allowing these wide-tired, deep-treaded monstrosities in our nature preserves is just another way that private industry is making deeper inroads into our wilderness areas so they can further exploit the timber, peat, grazing lands and mineral ores. It's a convenient foothold on which to justify the Wise-Use policies of profit-seeking economic interests and the politicians who are in their pay.	14.3
The damage ATV/OHV operators do to our riparian, wetland, woodland and grassland ecosystems takes decades, even centuries, for Mother Nature to repair, but do these fools care? Not in the least. Part of the kick from operating them is the sick thrill the drivers get out of tearing up the landscape and seeing how much havoc they can wreak. Therefore, there is no such thing as "responsible use" of these pernicious machines. You know yourself, Mr. Johnson, that there is widespread violation of signs prohibiting use on restricted trails and many drivers go off the trails altogether because certain dare devils don't find them challenging enough. You know also that it is bloody nigh impossible to enforce the regulations, catch the violators and convict them for crimes against Nature. For that reason, these fossil-fuel burning abominations should be completely banned from all wild areas so that animal and plant life can remain undisturbed to breed, forage and grow according to the niche each species occupies in its respective habitat, free of noise and pollution. Such a thorough prohibition would also allow the rest of us sensible people who actually respect Nature to enjoy the peace and quiet we've come for.	12.1 2.10 11.4 2.3
The fact is that the number of those who engage in non-motorized use on public forest lands in Minnesota is roughly 7 to 8 times larger than the idiots who have to have an engine roaring beneath them, making as much noise and doing as much damage as possible. There is no need whatsoever for motorized transport in our state parks. The burning of fossil fuels for recreation is destructive, wasteful and utterly senseless when one can enjoy Nature's tranquility in far healthier and more eco-friendly ways on foot, in a canoe and by bicycle. There should be cleanly-powered	16.5

Author/Comment	Response
shuttles to bring park visitors to the gates so they can recreate within our wilderness areas by the aforementioned means.	
The Climate Crisis Coalition is for the abolition of the internal combustion engine, which has a pathetic efficiency of only 1%. Instead, we are for clean mass transit powered by wind & solar energy. Burning fossil fuels, biofuels or anything else in engines is a profligacy the planet can no longer afford. Humanity has taken the gift of fire and abused it to a terrifying degree and now we are paying for it dearly with the threat of catastrophic climate change. There is no need to burn anything. The sun does the burning for us and quite efficiently too. All we need do is harness that great flame in the heavens with the well-tested, proven and tried, efficient and renewable technologies we already have available to us.	Comment noted
In conclusion, the Climate Crisis Coalition urges you to scrap the draft plan that allows ATV/OHV driving on the 17 miles of state-owned roads and trails and 67 miles of county roads and trails which threatens the pristine canoers' paradise that exists in the virgin Mississippi Headwaters for starters then go on and do what your agency was intended for-protect and preserve the ecological integrity our state forests, parks and recreation areas.	6.2
Reed, Liz	
Hello, the MHSF should be classified as "closed" not "limited." The headwaters portion of the Mississippi River is a national resource that should be protected for its wild qualities, not opened to further OHV damage. The DNR, counties, and U.S. Forest Service are providing thousands of miles of OHV trails in Minnesota; closing the relatively small MHSF to OHVs will not impinge on OHV driving in all these other places. Please reconsider!!	6.2 4.3 16.8
Rehmann, Todd D.	
I am an owner property in Itasca county and learned of the DNR's draft plan to designate the jewel of Minnesota, the headwaters of the Mississippi, as "limited" to off highway vehicles (ATVs). I AM APPALLED that our Department of Natural Resources could make such an unwise recommendation but I'm confident that this will be rejected by our legislators and state executives. The headwaters are managed within the state park system but they are a national treasure and must be treated as such.	20.1
The north woods and their resources need to be managed with a respect to many shared uses. There is room for motor boats, ATVs, snowmobiles and perhaps other future recreational vehicles not yet invented. HOWEVER, the use of these vehicles (like cars, planes and skateboards) must be managed to a reasonable, limited and designated range and scope. As a state we do a pretty good job with boats and snowmobiles. Minnesota, like most states, is in a learning stage when it comes to ATVs and we are doing poorly so far, causing nearly irreparable damage to some areas that are natural gems and in some cases literally sacred to native americans.	2.3
For the sake of the majority of Minnesotans, our future generations, our economic vitality of the north woods, our wildlife habitat and for the decent standards of stewardship for state property, REJECT "limited" in favor of "closed." I also urge you to develop through your DNR appointments and through plain old "leadership" greater fair mindedness within the DNR. By any measure, their recommendations (this one being a prime example) more often than not put in jeopardy the life blood of our state. This one is hard to believe and impossible to explain to my two boys.	6.2
Reindl, Leslie	
It has come to my attention that your office is considering opening more land and trails to off-highway vehicles, this time in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. Some of your own staff apparently oppose this action.	4.3
Have you heard of global warming? Have you heard of the pollution caused by the burning of oil as gasoline, that is affecting the climate? Aside from the obvious effects of more noise and careless traffic into our remaining wilderness areas, you will allow more pollution from unnecessary use of oil. Where in the world has common sense gone?	Comment noted
Please reconsider this action, and decide against it.	6.2
Reynolds, John	
For the record I oppose the limited classification of this forest for the same reasons given by the majority of the DNR team as well as the long history of the DNR looking the other way on ATV regulation.	6.2

Author/Comment	Response
I would like the public record to show that ATV sales are dramatically dropping and that it is disengenous for Messrs. Carroll and Johnson to keep saying that ATV numbers are rapidly rising and then use that falsehood as an excuse for continuing to make bad resource management decisions.	16.7
Enforcement will be underfunded as it always is and the DNR simply cannot say it doesn't know that when it rams these plans down our throat. The DNR has no intention of ever closing any trail once it is designated no matter how badly it damages the environment. ATV riders will ride through the river at the river crossings and the DNR will say "Oh Well" we didn't know that would happen. BS!	11.1 11.2
Reynolds, Peter	
I attended the meeting in Bemidji last week with very little information about the issue at hand. As I am grateful for the opportunity to have my influence on the decision the DNR will be making in the next year, I am as well dissatisfied with the DNR's initial plan. If the ultimate goal of the panel is to "Protect the River Corridor." then I believe that OHV's should not be allowed in that specific area. In short, The Mississippi Headwaters State park should be closed to all OHV's. I appreciate you taking the time to listen to my thoughts.	4.3 6.2 20.1
Rinsem, Jim	
I am writing and asking for consideration for ATV areas to remain as multi user designated trails for future use. I am president of a 250 mile GIA snowmobile trail system in the south metro and my wife and I recently purchased 2 ATV to be able to enjoy some of the same scenic areas we snowmobile on but in the summer for recreation.	6.1
We fell that Minnesota needs to be more like our neighbors in Wisconsin and provide as much or more summer ATV and multi user recreational opportunities.	Comment noted
We also want to make sure that you understand that we believe that no special interests even ours should be allowed to over run the interests of other groups. When it comes to shared lands differences and conflicts can be eliminated thru responsible and reasonable negotiation along with the formation of multi user recreational task forces	2.1
Riversmith, Bridget	
The DNR should reject the plan to designate ORV routes on the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. DNR instead should close the Headwaters to ORVs and follow the recommendations of its own Interdisciplinary Team, including Fisheries, Wildlife, Ecological, and Enforcement staff. This is the only reach on the Mississippi River to have qualified as "Wild" when the U.S. Dept. of Interior recommended that large parts of the Mississippi River in Minnesota be designated under the National Wild & Scenic Rivers Act, in 1977.	6.2 14.1 3.9 10.7
ORV users in Minnesota already have access to thousands of miles of forest roads and well over a thousand miles of ORV trails on state lands, plus several thousand more miles on federal lands. According to the Minnesota DNR's latest survey, more Minnesotans aged 20 and older engage in canoeing and kayaking than ride ORVs.	16.8
The Mississippi and its Wild Headwaters are of regional, national, and even international importance. Please protect the Mississippi's Wild Headwaters by keeping ATVs, dirtbike motorcycles, and off-road vehicles out of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.	10.15
Ryan, Jeanine	
Keep the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest Wild.	6.2
Rypka, Ken	
I am an avid user of atv trails and access roads in Minnesota.I have been advised that there is some plans to close the mississippi headwaters area to all off road and trail use..I would like to voice a request to keep these areas open for atv utv use as much as possible. It is a wonderful experience to ride through areas such as this and enjoy the the scenery and wildlife, and my experience has been that most wildlife such as deer etc. pay very little attention to atv's passing. I am limited from walking any distance, and atv,s are the only way for me to enjoy the outdoors beyond where the automobile can travel. Thank you so much for any help you can be keeping atvas such as these open	6.1
Salminen, Kathy & John	
I'm writing this letter to express strong concern over the ill-considered move to make the first 47	4.3

Author/Comment	Response
miles of the Mississippi accessible to ORV's. My husband and I live in the woods outside of Duluth where development is currently beginning to encroach on the wilderness there. We have to travel to places such as the Mississippi headwaters to find nature in truly pristine condition and are appalled that this very special area is being made vulnerable to the damages done, both physical and in terms of noise pollution, by ORV. There's a place for everything but clearly the place for ORV's is not in the pristine wilderness tracts along the Mississippi. We'll watch for a response from you and will appreciate your strong reconsideration of this move.	12.1 2.10 2.9
Sanborn, Keith	
Please don't allow the desecration of the Mississippi headwaters by trails and vehicles. They destroy habitat and the precious peace and quiet which are all too rare already.	6.2
Sandford, Shaun	
Please do not close any more trails to motorized vehicle use, specifically the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. It is very important to a lot of people to have ample riding opportunities for ATV's, OHV's, and motorcycles. I love to get out riding and enjoy the outdoors, and the best places to do this are State Forests.	6.1
Sazama, Colleen	
Please do not close the Mississippi Headwater Trails to ATV's. Please allow me to continue to ride on the Trails throughout Minnesota. I have lived in Minnesota all my life, and worked over 28 years in one job. My disabilities from Multiple Sclerosis have made it impossible for me to walk any distance, and just like you; I enjoy the beauty of God's nature. Please help me and others like me, do not support legislation that would take away my 4-wheeling right to enjoy this land with my family.	6.1
Sazama, Ken	
I'm writing in regard to the Mississippi River Trails and I am requesting that all the designated trails be left open for public use by ATV riders. The majority of ATV riders are very aware of appropriate riding and follow it and are even more considerate of staying on the trail and not doing any type of damage than the average citizen.	6.1
We pay additional licensing fees to the state of Minnesota and those funds should be used for the upkeep and enforcement of the laws to ride these trails. Please do not allow groups that do not pay any additional licensing fees make decisions for the majority that would like to be able to continue to enjoy riding these trails. Keep the trails open to ALL.	Comment noted
Schad, Jennifer	
Please help to keep off-road vehicles out of the Mississippi river. Minnesota is responsible for a large part of the health of this great river. Let's protect it.	4.3 6.2
Schaedig, Terry	
I hope you will greatly limit the use of ATVs on the public lands in your jurisdiction. I work as a forester; recreate as a hunter as well as many other activities that take me outdoors.	6.2
The outright damage done by ATV riders is really tremendous, much of it in country that is too remote to repair even if funds were available.	12.1 2.10
There is a great loss of solitude in the woods. It is extremely difficult to access areas by foot or often by canoe that have not had trails blazed to and through them. As a foot hunter I have tried to do so and it is very discouraging to find so many areas with ATV trails.	2.3
The widespread use of ATVs also seems to foster a disregard for nature, something that would be less likely to happen when one moves at a slower pace, more in tune with the natural world.	Comment noted
Schaenzer, Dave	
I have been to the headwaters several times in the summer when we dropped out kids of at camp and in the winter to ski.	Comment noted
I want to encourage you to keep the off road motorized vehicles out of the park. When we ski in other parks and a snow mobile goes by, we can smell and taste the fuel in the air. When we hike in the woods we can hear the ATVs for miles before we can see them. I want to enjoy the wilderness without the foul fuel smells and without the roaring engines.	20.1
Scharlemann, Denise & Robert Cochran	
We are writing you to express my concern about permitting motorized recreation in the 1000 foot corridor of the Mississippi River in the Headwaters State Forest. We are avid bird and nature	10.8 10.10

Author/Comment	Response
<p>watchers and understand the many problems the natural world is facing due to habitat destruction. The local Audubon chapter has articulated many reasons why motorized recreation should not be permitted in this corridor and I have pasted them into this e-mail for your information. What troubles me in addition to the damage to habitat is the overturning of the protection this has been determined to need. We have so few wild places left that any change that makes them less wild should be done only under great duress. Rewarding law breaking behavior is never an acceptable basis for change.</p>	
<p>Providing appropriate areas for motorized recreation is important. The headwaters corridor is not an appropriate place for this activity for the following reasons listed in the latest Audubon newsletter:</p>	4.3
<p>Three of the five DNR work team members recommended the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest be closed to all motorized recreation, citing the natural assets above and noting that steep hills and sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off-road driving. Significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river. Mike Carroll, DNR Regional Director in Bemidji, acknowledged making the final decision to classify the forest as open for motorized use.</p>	14.1 3.9 11.9
<p>Currently, motorized damage in Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is extreme. Camp grounds are rutted and damaged, such as Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point. All-terrain vehicles are riding in the river in a number of locations, such as Stumphges Rapids.</p>	10.16
<p>Rather than sealing off the historic sites noted above, the DNR Draft Plan has designated motorized routes in these sensitive areas, thereby rewarding illegal behavior by legalizing it.</p>	10.1
<p>The Mississippi Headwaters Board designated Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as "wild," which created a 1000 foot corridor along the river where all motorized recreation is banned. DNR's draft plan disregards this protection and proposes motorized trails within this corridor, with some dead-ending at the river. As noted, illegal riding has already damaged the riparian zone.</p>	10.8 10.2
<p>By closing the forest to motorized recreation, all-terrain vehicles would still be able to ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads.</p>	3.8
<p>It will be difficult for DNR enforcement to strictly monitor any portion of this area because this part of the Mississippi is so remote. Classifying the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as closed to motorized recreation would greatly aid in protecting the river itself.</p>	11.2
<p>In the interest of all Americans, we must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi for future citizens. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a narrow corridor. It contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi River in Minnesota. Minnesotans must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized river and migratory flyway.</p>	10.15
<p>Schik, Karen</p>	
<p>I am incensed that the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has plans to destroy the very resource they have been charged to protect. NO WHERE does it say that the DNR must accommodate motorized recreational activity in our precious state parks. Why does the DNR persist in destroying natural areas for the sake a few vocal recreational groups?? That is NOT what Minnesotan's want from our DNR. It's time to JUST SAY NO. Soon MONSTER TRUCK owners will need a place to trash too - will the DNR roll over and accommodate them? I demand that the DNR protect MY interest and the interest of thousands TO PROTECT NATURAL AREAS AND THE SOLITUDE, SILENCE, and WILDLIFE HABITAT, they afford.</p> <p>You cannot allow motorized trails and maintain the beauty and serenity of a park. Itasca State Park is our first and arguably most precious park in the state. It is a destination of dozens of migratory songbirds, and thousands and thousands of Minnesotans who want to experience nature. Motorized vehicles are not nature. Not matter how carefully the trail it built their very presence will destroy the serenity of that park that belongs to ALL of us. Motorized people have NO MORE RIGHTS than the rest of us. I will fight to protect MY RIGHT for peace and quiet in our state parks.</p>	20.1
<p>Schimke, Kathleen</p>	
<p>I have firm views on ATV's and what they can do to our forests. Just because some company manufactures these vehicles doesn't mean a whole new "sport" (I use the term loosely) that is a detriment to our land should not be controlled. To call it a sport is a joke....riders sit and wheel</p>	Comment noted

Author/Comment	Response
<p>away through anything in their path. My daughter and her husband own 160 acres of hardwood forest near Hinckley.* Hay Creek runs through the property. A while Hay creek was described as one of the best trout streams. ATV's have torn through their destroying the creek's banks, even blocking water flow with the resulting debris. These yahoos don't care about private property, they just want to race through forest, roadside ditch, up and down hills. Even children ride them. There certainly must be a healthier alternative for their bodies, their safety, and the environment.* He is a graduate forester from the U. of M. Grouse hunting and trout fishing are popular there. But the trout population especially is in jeopardy.</p>	
<p>Schlatter, Charles E.</p>	
<p>As a taxpayer and state forest user, want to voice my concern at any further officially sanctioned Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) trail development within the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. To that end, I opine that state forest be classified as "Closed" as opposed to "Limited". I understand that a majority of DNR team members recommended to protect this environmentally sensitive and relatively pristine area. What then is the rationale for going against the team's recommendation?</p>	<p>4.3 6.2 14.1</p>
<p>As a Minnesota grouse hunter for more than thirty years , I range far and wide on a variety of state forest properties -- on foot. I have personally seen the significant environmental damage done by recreational use of OHV's. I don't understand how such a resource-intensive activity can fit in with any concept of stewardship of our state's forest resources. On the contrary, OHV traffic has the following negative effects on forests:</p>	<p>12.1 2.10</p>
<p>Constant noise: I can hear these vehicles from miles away. When I use a state forest, I do so partly to appreciate peace and quiet.</p>	<p>12.4</p>
<p>Litter: OHV traffic brings with it the trappings of beverage cans and food packages. Is the DNR prepared to cover the expense of cleaning up the mess?</p>	<p>12.8</p>
<p>Environmental damage: The fact that ATV's leave unanticipated damage particularly to wetlands and sandy areas is well known. OHV operators consistently look for ways to detour around obstacles, which exacerbates the problem. From my own observation, OHV use leads to wide ditches across bog areas, huge mud puddles, dug-out areas where OHV's have been stuck, and erosion on grades.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p>I understand there is already significant damage from unauthorized OHV traffic on the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. Closing the forest to OHV's would seem to be an appropriate first step to repairing the damage. Additional trails will likely increase it.</p>	<p>11.9</p>
<p>I hope that the DNR acts on its role as steward of our forest resource in this case. My children and theirs would really like to have the Mississippi Headwaters to visit and enjoy - quietly. Please don't be party to taking this away from them. Designate the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as "Closed" to OHV traffic.</p>	<p>6.2</p>
<p>Schmid, Brad. A</p>	
<p>I am very much in favor of maintaining rights to access these forests with my ATV. Designating this area as closed would negatively affect local commerce, tourism, wildlife and hunting.</p>	<p>6.1</p>
<p>Schmit, Les</p>	
<p>I am an avid snowmobiler and ATV rider. I do not want to see our access to State lands further eroded. I truly enjoy being able to get out and ride in the forests with my family. Do not deny us this. It is our land too.</p>	<p>6.1</p>
<p>Schoesboe, Ellen</p>	
<p>I have recently learned of a DNR plan to designate the Headwaters of the Mississippi as an Off-Road-Vehicle park.</p>	<p>8.5</p>
<p>I have visited the headwaters in northern Minnesota, and been enchanted by the quiet, peaceful, beautiful places. I enjoy canoeing, camping, and hiking in these lovely wilderness parks.</p> <p>Please do not introduce ATVs and other off-road vehicles into the wild parks. This will cause much noise, erosion, and pollution, mudding and destroying the forest floor, scaring away all the wildlife and ruining the enjoyment of everyone who goes there to camp, hike, and enjoy the beauty of a wild river. I would not at all enjoy camping or hiking in a place full of muddy ruts and constant loud engine noises. The beauty, peace, and quiet of northern Minnesota is what attracts me to these natural places.</p>	<p>20.1</p>

Author/Comment	Response
Please do not introduce off-road vehicles into the Headwaters of the Mississippi. Please preserve this wild place for the enjoyment of the people who already go there for recreation.	4.3 6.2
Schwartz, Gary M.	
I have review the information about the status of MHSF. I believe it should be listed as 'closed.'	6.2
Schwartz, Richard Stephens	
I am disappointed in policing – e.g., arrests – of trashy ATV/OHV drivers who take pride (“just having some fun”) in destroying public trails, streams, land and forests. The failure of the DNR to prevent the intentional destruction and prosecute the guilty is irresponsible.	11.7
Scotland, Lee & Polly	
You have a big task. Trying to please everyone. We believe every person should be able to enjoy our beautiful land. There is a place for silent sports and a place for motorized vehicles. But please,please, PLEASE do not let the motorized vehicles into the environmentally fragile areas of the Mississippi River spillways. Please contain all motors to areas that will NOT destroy sensitive lands. We ask this in the names of our children and grandchildren.	4.3 6.2 2.9
Scott, Patricia	
I oppose opening the Mississippi Headwaters state forest to OHV's.	4.3 6.2
Scott, Stephan	
We are residents who live in the Itasca area of Minnesota, and are adamantly opposed to any ATV activity in the Headwaters of the Mississippi River. These machines do nothing but damage to our natural resources, despoiling not only the immediate area of activity creating silt and erosive effects, but also increasing the turbidity of the water. Inviting this kind of degradation to our natural resources is irresponsible at best. I encourage you and the DNR to do everything in your power to discourage this kind of activity.	4.3 12.7 6.2
Severinghaus, Tom	
I care about the Mississippi River, it is a National River. Please keep the ATV's out and keep the headwaters wild.	6.2
Shaw, Ed	
I am writing to support keeping off road vehicles out of the Mississippi headwaters area. ATVs seem to be all over northern Minnesota, they do not need to be there.	6.2
Simcox, John	
Please do all you can to protect the Mississippi from polluting vehicles.	6.2
Skersik, Dan	
The trails should be open unless posted closed. This will enable the DNR to protect sensitive areas and allow responsible use elsewhere. Most of the ATV/OHV enthusiasts I know are conservationists and follow the laws which are in place to protect the land and be courteous to others. Most of the opposition's complaints are based on illegal activity from the research I have been able to obtain; therefore, it is an enforcement issue. The use of ATVs is a way of life in rural Minnesota and is a great form recreation for families and tourists alike. Please keep these trails open for ATV use. Our local and state economy is dependent on the manufacturing jobs to build the vehicles and the tourism revenue that is brought to our communities.	6.3
Please do not let the special interest groups from outside our community dictate what we do with the lands in our communities in which we live. I would hope the residents of these communities would be the most qualified and intimate stewards of the environment in which we live in. Please protect our right to operate ATVs in the Headwaters Forest and other public lands suited for ATV use.	6.1
Sloane, Jim	
Once again attempts are being made or considered to close more trails to Off Road Vehicles. I personally no longer care what Minnesota does in this regard. Why have I come to this point, its simple. I'm building a second home in Wisconsin where ATVers and Snowmobilers are appreciated.	4.3
Over the years Minnesota, as a whole, has continued to make it impossible to enjoy the great outdoors doing the things my family and friends had come to enjoy. I'm or was a business owner in the greater Minneapolis area but recently sold out to an out of state corporation. As soon as the	Comment noted

Author/Comment	Response
transition is complete my home will go up for sale and we're out of here for good! Along with that goes my tax dollars. (state income, sales tax, property tax, license fees. hunting and fishing license fee, etc.) so I ask you who's the winner? Definitely not Minnesota! I really don't want to leave but what's in it for my family?	
Maybe these individuals who are pushing for all these closures ought to focus their energy on defeating all these high priced cry baby professional ball players and their owner demands for new tax supported ball parks. I'm sorry but when and where is this state going to sit up and take notice. Or, are the likes of Al Core and all the bleeding heart liberals, save the frogs & owls, and Hanoi Janes going to be running this state. Frustrated and sorry to see Minnesota going in this direction. Sorry for dumping on you, its frustrating to have rights continually taken away when a person of retirement age can no longer enjoy his autumn years doing what he enjoys. I pray to the good Lord above that all things will come to pass. (Ops, now I'm not politically correct).	Comment noted
Smith, Jim (1)	
A moment of your time, please. I send this enote to you and your colleagues in order to entreat you to please leave the Mississippi Headwaters Forest Areas closed or off limits to ATVs, dirt bikes, and four wheelers. The damage these awful machines do to property, hiking trails, bridal paths, streams and brooks as well as sensitive wetlands is incalculable. My personal and professional experience with these contraptions has been ALL BAD! And..... I have reaped some problems because of it.	4.3 6.2 12.1
Enclosed are a couple of attachments that might help to shape your opinions on this issue. One is self explanatory, the other is a response I sent to a captain of The Connecticut Conservation Police who responded to a complaint I made concerning a dirt biker tearing up a sensitive woodland area in a neighboring town. I do hope you find this of interest.	Comment noted
Smith, Jim (2)	
You may recall I sent you some info (email) on some of the problems we have encountered here in Connecticut with Off Road Vehicles (i.e., ATVs, Dirt Bikes, and Four Wheelers). I hate to say it but those comments just highlight the tip of the iceberg as far as the issue is concerned here. I enclose, for your interest, some articles I have saved over the years regarding these absolutely dreadful contraptions.	Comment noted
As you can see the information regarding the problems in Maine was first brought to light in 2003. I don't know how much, if any, things have improved since then. I do not know Mr. Brooke but I can tell you that based on my own experiences he has the problem identified exactly right and if something isn't done about it on a very broad scope we will lose the great outdoors just about every where it still exists.	Comment noted
The other article is just a snap shot; really, of the problems we have here in Connecticut on a day to day basis. I would urge you do not open the Mississippi Headwaters Wilderness Area to these awful machines. I am sure you will regret it if you do. This is one genie that should never be allowed out of the bottle. Believe me, I know from first hand experience.	4.3 6.2
Smith, Mitch	
Thank you to you and your staff for accepting hopefully hundreds if not thousands of letters similar to mine. I promise you I am speaking not only for myself but all of my friends and family that are in support of keeping the Mississippi Headwaters area open to all of the public and anyone who wants to visit these areas with any sort of transportation. By foot, horseback, ski's, snowshoes, or motorized vehicles of any nature, these public lands need to be accessed by people like myself as well as the Handicapped who need some sort of transportation to view and experience the great outdoors. Let's not take these privileges away from the many of us who have done zero damage to these areas or the environment.	6.1
Sobotta, Gary	
I just wanted to let you know I support MN DNR proposal to restrict ATV use to "limited" trail use in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest and Southwest Beltrami County. ATV's have a negative impact on our environment so restricting them to the trails suggested below will help minimize that negative impact.	6.1
Solterman, Susan	
The Minnesota DNR's draft management plan for the Headwaters State Forest proposes to allow	4.3

Author/Comment	Response
<p>motorized recreation across and near the river. Audubon believes that this state forest and its narrow sensitive riparian habitat along the headwaters of the Mississippi River, and the river itself, is not the right place for all-terrain vehicles. Motorized damage of this part of the river has already caused extensive damage and must be stopped. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest should be closed not "limited" for motorized vehicles.</p>	<p>10.2 6.2</p>
<p>The Mississippi River within the boundaries of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest alternately flows between boreal forests and vast wetlands, providing habitat for trumpeter swans, red-shouldered hawks, bald eagles and many species of waterfowl. It is the wild portion of the river where one can hike along the banks or canoe its waters in a setting and get a sense of how the river must have been when it was first traveled by our ancestors. Indeed, this is the only reach on the Mississippi River to have qualified as "wild" when the U.S. Dept. of Interior recommended that large parts of the Mississippi River in Minnesota be designated under the National Wild & Scenic Rivers Act, in 1977. Emphasizing this policy point, the Mississippi Headwaters Board designated Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as "wild," which created a 1000 foot corridor along the river where all motorized recreation is banned. DNR's draft plan disregards this protection and proposes motorized trails within this corridor, with some dead-ending at the river. The Mississippi River Headwaters Trail is one of the few designated canoe routes in Minnesota that are on rivers considered wild under Minnesota state law, making this stretch of river and the surrounding land especially significant to Minnesota's canoeists and birdwatchers.</p>	<p>10.8 10.7 10.2</p>
<p>The DNR, acknowledges the abundant and diverse wildlife that call this section of the river home on its website:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"The large diversity of plant life supports 242 kinds of birds, 23 species of reptiles and amphibians, and 57 species of mammals. These include warblers who migrate to Central America each year, common tern, bufflehead, beaver, eastern hog-nosed snake, and the pine martin, which only recently has returned to this area. Also seen are the bald eagle and other birds of concern, predators such as the red-shouldered hawk, and water birds such as the sandhill crane and Wilson's phalarope."</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p>As mentioned earlier, three species in particular – the trumpeter swan, bald eagles and Wilson's phalarope – are included in Audubon Minnesota's "action list" which highlights particular species in conservation need. By identifying those bird species needing urgent help in Minnesota, conservation efforts may be prioritized. These three species in particular are included in the Fish and Wildlife Region Three's "birds of conservation priority" and the DNR's very own "birds of concern."</p>	<p>12.6</p>
<p>The difficulty in enforcing protected areas of the forest, such as its camp grounds, such as Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point (which are rutted and damaged) seemed to indicate that motorized users abused their privilege: the State could no longer protect the natural resources in the forest. Indeed, all-terrain vehicles have driven directly into the river in a number of locations, such as Stumphges Rapids 3. Significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river. DNR enforcement has indicated that monitoring is difficult because this part of the Mississippi River is so remote. Unfortunately, rather than sealing off the historic sites noted above, the DNR Draft Plan instead designated motorized routes in these sensitive areas, thereby rewarding illegal behavior by legalizing it.</p>	<p>14.1 11.9 10.1 10.16 10.2</p>
<p>The forest has wildlife species identified as vulnerable and possibly threatened. Sixty percent of the forest is within 1000 feet of a stream or river. Given those concerns, plus the evidence thus far that damage to the forest and river from motorized recreation has been extreme, it is appalling that DNR would not close the entire forest to motorized recreation, thereby setting an example for local government to follow on the county-administered lands within the forest.</p>	<p>1.2</p>
<p>The concerns described above were likely salient to at least three of the five DNR work team members when they recommended the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest be closed to all motorized recreation. Members of the team cited the natural assets above and noting that steep hills and sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off-road driving. Mike Carroll, DNR Regional Director in Bemidji, acknowledged making the final decision to classify the forest as open for</p>	<p>14.1 3.9</p>

Author/Comment	Response
motorized use.	
The Mississippi River is of national significance. We must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi river for our children and the rest of the country. Minnesotans are in the position to demonstrate good stewardship for this internationally recognized river and migratory flyway. By closing the forest to motorized recreation, all-terrain vehicles would still be able to ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads. Audubon Minnesota urges you to re-classifying the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as closed to motorized recreation.	10.6 6.2
Sorenson, Eric	
It has recently come to my attention that the closing of some trails in the Mississippi Headwaters Forest are under consideration to be closed. Why? What good will that do? Please do not close those trails, or any other trails for that matter! ATV trails do not damage anything! I farm for a living. From my angel, natural plants are the enemy! If left alone, they will easily overtake our crops. Wild plants do not need protecting. If left alone, an ATV trail will disappear in no time. Logically this means that there is no threat from ATV's or their trails. I use to have trails in the woods below my house that would go down to the sand bar on the river. I kept up that trail for 15 years! As soon as a couple of big trees fell down on the trail that I didn't have time to clear, (so I couldn't use the trail for a while) it only took about 2 months for that trail to completely disappear in the weeds. You couldn't even tell that there had been a trail there!! That's the way it works!	6.1
Please keep all the trials open, and heck, lets open up even more lands and forests to ATV'S. They are the best way to see and experiance nature.	Comment noted
Sorenson, John	
Please close Headwaters state froest to ATVs. I have hunted and fished all of my adult life(I'm 56). I never have felt the need to have an ATV. I have seen the damage they have done to OUR resources.	6.2 12.1 2.10
I hope that the state doubles Conservation officer numbers to deal with this problem of ATV damage. I would hope that this would be paid for by ATV license holders as a user fee.	11.1
Spindler, Richard	
I strongly support restricting or removing OHV use in the designated area as much as possible. I would like to see such vehicles banned entirely from the sensitive area. ATVs are useful for certain purposes, but when used as toys they cause noise pollution and have great potential for destroying important fauna. If they don't stay on the trails, which is not uncommon, there is great potential for soil erosion. When will we learn that we must protect resources from mechanized joy-rides in what should be wild land?	10.2 11.5 12.3 2.3
Stanton, Jinjer	
There are so few places anymore for people (or wildlife) to experience genuine nature or a world of sound untainted by the raucous machine.	2.3
Please preserve this area from the bully's who think that because they can, because of their motor and money power, they therefore have the right to disturb the peace and steal it from those of us who treasure natural silence.	Comment noted
These ruffians, who believe that ripping apart the land for sport is acceptable and that trampling on the rights of others is no big deal, do not deserve special treatment because they make more noise than the rest of us.	2.2
I may live in Minneapolis, but my heart is in the North woods. The headwaters of the Mississippi are sacred to all of us. They belong to all of us, not just to those rowdies looking for new land to despoil.	6.2
Stember, Susan Hausman & Larry	
We live less than a mile north of the Mississippi River in Grant Valley Township. We canoe on it to show them the amazing nature of our nation's greatest river. We are really proud of the preserved and intact environment we all live in. The Mississippi has the rare designation of National River; it is intended to be protected. ATVs leave a footprint that does not go away. Do not allow them there. Please.	4.3 6.2
Stets, Edward	
I am writing to urge the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to close its portion of the Mississippi Rivers Headwaters State Forest to all off-road vehicles. This particular state	6.2 12.1

Author/Comment	Response
<p>forest is an important remnant of solitude in a region of Minnesota increasingly dominated by off-road activities. I understand that a study panel within the Department of Natural Resources recommended keeping this state forest closed to off-road activities. I also have witnessed the damage that inevitably accompanies off-road vehicles in Minnesota's outdoors. Given the disproportionate amount of damage done by these vehicles and the agency's own internal recommendation that this state forest remain closed, I find it unacceptable that the draft plan would include allowing greater access (and therefore greater damage) to the state forest by off-road vehicles.</p>	10.2
<p>A quick look at the DNR-managed website summarizing progress on the state forest reclassification project shows that 38 state forests have a "Managed" designation, 15 have a "Limited" designation, and only 6 have a "Closed" designation. The decision to classify 64% of the state's forests as essentially unregulated is troubling and seems to go against the spirit of the legislation to control off-road vehicle use in the state.</p>	2.6
<p>I understand the allure of riding off-road vehicles both from the rider's perspective as well as the county, which is seeking greater tourism revenue. Nevertheless, human nature being what it is, off-road vehicles cause a tremendous amount of damage. They also necessarily harm other activities by changing the fundamental character of the landscape. In some extreme cases they can also make it dangerous for non-motorized uses of our outdoors. Therefore, allowing these vehicles into new areas is not really a form of sharing so much as it is handing it over to motorized uses.</p>	4.3
<p>As I am sure you are aware, the problem of off-road vehicle damage is not limited to Minnesota. The New York Times recently had a front-page feature story on off-road vehicle damage in Western states and the Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER) has highlighted the importance of this issue in all public lands. I have included copies of the story as well as a link to the PEER campaign. However, once again, Minnesota is poised to be the "state that works" by dealing with this problem in a rational and fair way.</p>	Comment noted
<p>For all of these reasons, I urge you to change the DNR management plan by completely closing the state-managed portion of this state forest to off-road vehicles.</p>	6.2
<p>Stockey, Tim</p>	
<p>I am another VOTING TAX PAYER that doesn't want to see access to our forest roads and designated trails closed to ATV's in our state and federal forests ! OUR FORESTS SHOULD NOT BE CLOSED</p>	6.1
<p>Stowers, Dale C.</p>	
<p>After all these years of seeing the damage caused to our uplands and lowland areas, I cannot for the life of me see why the DNR still wants to give more areas to the ATV riders to tear up.</p>	4.3
<p>If the ATV organizations were paying to fix the damage they cause then I could probably see it, but they're not, the Minnesota taxpayers are footing the bill for the repairs. Some areas will never heal no matter what.</p>	Comment noted
<p>There may be some responsible ATV riders but they're few and far between so lets just ban all of 'em from riding on public lands! Now!</p>	11.5
<p>Stropes Family</p>	
<p>I am writing to you today in regards to the Mississippi Headwaters that are currently in danger of being destroyed. I write to you not as a woodsman, or as a "tree hugger" but rather as a common citizen, a mother who would like her children to see and experience the greatness of the Mississippi Headwaters. You see, as a military travel it is just recently that we have moved in close enough proximity to afford our children the opportunity of exploring this great area. I want my kids and their kids to share in the history that traveled up and down these waters. By designating dozens of miles open to OHVs in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest, which encompasses much of the wild headwaters you will be robbing my family and so many others of opportunities of a lifetime. Do you know what it is to be able to say you literally stepped over the Mississippi River? How about the thrill a young child gets to see wildlife and nature as they canoe down the open waters. Please protect the headwaters and keep this river a national gem. Protect the simplicity of nature that is so hard to find today. Afford me and so many others the opportunity to explore and enjoy the same waters that settlers did long ago.</p>	6.2

Author/Comment	Response
<p>Sturm, Tim</p> <p>It would be a shame to allow ohv's into yet another area. I am an outdoors enthusiast, and a 4 x 4 owner and I believe they are a great tool, but I don't need to drive it all over the place. I use it to trap and hunt and it sure makes it a lot easier to do those things, but I feel better about myself when I have to carry a beaver thru the woods myself for a mile. Gives me a little more respect for what the people before me have done. In the spring I get a first hand view of what destruction the tires from a 4 x 4 can do. The more places we can protect the better off we are. We have almost urbanized all most all areas of the state, some should be allowed to those who are willing to work a little bit to see the true wild country, rather than press the throttle to get there.</p>	<p>4.3 6.2</p>
<p>Swift, Andy</p> <p>When I heard of the possibility of the Headwaters area being open to ORV and ATV's it was a shock. These are places held in my memory as pristine wild and scenic lands. Left as are to be remembered as such. Some of the best times in my life was in the 50's traveling with my 4H club to picnic and hike near Itaska Park. You can' imagine how appalled I am to think that this will be ripped and torn, polluted and defiled much the same as another of my past favorite places, The Foothills State Forest and Spider Lake area. When will they have enough land destroyed to realize what they are doing? Why would you allow this to take place? These beasts of destruction not only ruin public land but disregard private land bordering public and use it at their discretion. This I know since I own land next to The Foothills State Forest. Should they be allowed to use the logging trails and back roads of the Itaska region it will be another eroded, torn and polluted playground for the few, at the cost of so many! Please consider the consequences before allowing this!</p>	<p>4.3 6.2</p>
<p>Tam, Joan</p> <p>As a citizen of MN concerned about wildlife preservation and habitat preservation I urge you to ban off-road vehicles from this State Park, they don't need to be tearing up land in a state park, that is abuse of our natural resources.</p>	<p>20.1</p>
<p>Tanner, Scott</p> <p>I am very concerned with the current discussion about the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest Draft Plan. What concerns me the most is the consideration that this area be considered for a listing of " limited". This area must be listed as " CLOSED ". This area is a natural resource that must have it's remaining wild ares protected at all costs. The off road vehicles of all types have already proven they will not abide by limitations and rules. They have already destroyed part of this area and will do further permanent damage by the "limited " listing. There are currently thousands of miles of existing trails in Minnesota for off road vehicles, and the closing of this small area would not have a significant impact on them. I have attached further facts and research to help document my request.</p> <p>Please help preserve the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as the pristine natural wonder that it is today. Facts to consider on this issue before making an irreversible mistake:</p>	<p>6.2 16.8 11.9 16.8</p>
<p>Three of the five DNR work team members recommended the MHSF be closed to all OHVs, citing the natural assets above and noting that steep hills and sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off-road driving. Significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river. Mike Carroll, DNR Regional Director in Bemidji, acknowledged making the final decision to classify the forest "limited" so trails on county lands could be connected.</p>	<p>14.1 3.9 11.9</p>
<p>Currently, OHV damage in MHSF is extensive. Campgrounds are rutted and damaged, e.g., Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point. ATVs are riding in the river in a number of locations, e.g., Stumphges Rapids.</p>	<p>11.9</p>
<p>Rather than protecting the historic sites noted above, the DNR Draft Plan has designated ATV routes in these sensitive areas, thereby rewarding past illegal behavior by legalizing it.</p>	<p>10.1</p>
<p>The Mississippi Headwaters Board (a state-created local counties board) designated the MHSF stretch of the river as "wild," which created a 1,000-foot corridor along the river where all OHVs are banned. The Draft Plan, however, disregards this protection and proposes ATV trails within this corridor, with some dead-ending at the river. As noted, illegal riding has already damaged the riparian zone.</p>	<p>10.8</p>

Author/Comment	Response
A "closed" forest would not ban OHVs entirely. They would still be able to ride through the forest in county road ditches and on township roads. But state forest roads and trails would be closed to all OHVs. The forest is a checkerboard, with state and county land mingled. If the forest were classified as "closed," county and township roads would still allow OHVs to cross state land when going from one county parcel to another.	3.8
It will be difficult for DNR enforcement to strictly monitor any portion of this area because this part of the Mississippi is so remote. Classifying the MHSF "closed" would greatly aid in protecting the river itself.	11.2
In the interest of all Americans, we must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi for future citizens. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a narrow corridor. It contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi in the river's entire 2,552-mile stretch. Minnesotans must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized river.	10.15
Again, your comments and thoughts are needed if we are to be successful in modifying the DNR's plans and getting this valuable resource closed to OHV traffic and damage.	6.2
Tegland, Harlan Dean & Rita Marie	
Please tell the Minnesota DNR we want access to Forest Roads and Designated Trails, and the Forest should not be Closed.	6.1
Telfer, John & Patricia	
My wife and I appreciate the beauty, the quietness, and the wildlife offered by the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. Because we love the wilderness, we wish it to be protected from encroachment by motorized vehicles of any kind. Therefore we strongly oppose the decision by Mike Carroll, DNR Regional Director in Bemidji, to classify the forest as open for motorized use.	14.1 3.9
Currently, motorized damage is extreme. Camp grounds are rutted in a number of locations.	11.9
All-terrain vehicles are ridden in the river in a number of locations even along a 1000 foot corridor along the river where all motorized recreation is banned as determined by the Mississippi Headwaters Board.	10.8 10.2
This disregard by destroyers of our amazingly rich ecosystem must not continue. This state forest and its narrow sensitive riparian habitat along the headwaters of the Mississippi River is not an appropriate venue for all-terrain vehicles.	12.1
By closing the forest to motorized recreation, all-terrain vehicles would still be able to ride through the forest in county ditches and on township roads.	3.8
Thorndahl, Nancy	
The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest should be closed to Off-Highway Vehicle Use.	6.2
Why? The Mississippi is our nation's greatest river and one of Minnesota's few remaining natural treasures. It would be a huge mistake to allow Off-Highway Vehicle use in the surrounding forest, especially for the lame excuse that these riders need connecting trails to county land.	4.3 3.9
Minnesota's Department of Natural Resources should be a leader in protecting natural resources, not give in to the whims of participants in an activity that would destroy this pristine area.	Comment noted
Only a small number of the population are "trail riders" so Minnesota should be controlling ATV riding. Their access should be restricted to the least sensitive, smaller areas of the forest. Regulations would then be easier to enforce and conflicts with other users diminished.	16.5
Thorson, Marty	
I object to changing the classifications. I believe the trails should be open to motorized use. The vast majority of users respect the rights of others and are not a problem. Allowing motorized use allows access to forest and park areas that many would not otherwise see or use. Infrequently I can leave the metro area to visit friends and relatives in the Bemidji area. Rarely do I see more than a few people in an ATV group on the trails – they are not bothering anyone. The trails are a great asset just as they are now!	2.3 6.1
Thorson, Thore	
I attended the meeting at Hobson Hall in Bemidji on Wednesday evening I chose not to speak as I could see any one in favor of keeping the trails open had two minutes to speak if you were for closing you could speak for eight minutes ,by that along I am sure the decision has already been made as to what happens.	14.2
I don't go down to the Edina or Minnetonka a tell those people how they should use there local	Comment

Author/Comment	Response
land and I don,t appreciate them coming up here and telling us how our land should be used .	noted
Just looking at those people I tell you they are never going to use the Mississippi Corridor but they sure don't want me to use it either which I believe is part of a much bigger agenda.	Comment noted
I don,t own a four wheeler or a snow mobile I do own a old dirt bike that I like to take a ride on Sunday afternoon, I am way past the age of being able to walk very far to look at the scenery.	Comment noted
I should be against four wheels as my property jions the sooline right of way and it gets mighty dust y when ten or twenty four wheels go by but you know what these people pay taxes and have a right to these trails just like every one else. I also am in favor of the shooting range that will be less then a mile from my house, yes it will be noise some times but these people need a place for there sport also. Most people in our township recognize the need and know that the horse people and the motorized people can share the trails.	Comment noted
What we don,t need is more areas closed down only to force more people on to a concentrated area which always leads to problems.	6.1
Tjader, Frannie	
Headwaters Canoe Club members feel very strongly about Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. Our club was born at the headwaters of the Mississippi, 18 years ago. We have paddled the first 83 miles of the river countless times. We practice stewardship on all our club cruises, stopping to pick up trash and take care of the river.	Comment noted
Most of our members are involved in other recreation activities, too: primarily 'silent sports'. Some enjoy backcountry skiing in Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. They say that paddling is the best way to get to know the Mississippi River, but backcountry skiing is the best way to experience the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.	10.18
Although canoeists and backcountry skiers have little impact on the river or the adjacent forest, motorized recreation does. Environmental degradation reduces the aesthetic appeal of a day spent on the river or in the forest. It also reduces the opportunities to observe a diversity of vegetation and wildlife. But, feeling threatened by aggressive OHV riders can completely ruin your day.	2.10
As stewards of the Headwaters, we communicate with people from all over the country and from other countries who want to experience the Mississippi River. We hosted a group of Norwegian students on a cruise who told us that trip had been a lifelong dream come true. We visit with people every summer who are paddling from Lake Itasca to the Gulf of Mexico. For some, this is a celebration of their graduation or their retirement, a truly special once-in-a-lifetime event they have planned for years. It would be a shame if they felt let down by a river that has been mutilated by reckless adventurers.	10.19
This truly is a national resource of global importance. The Mississippi River and Mississippi Headwaters State Forest should be granted as much protection as can possibly be given. On behalf of the Headwaters Canoe Club, I urge you to designate Mississippi Headwaters State Forest "CLOSED" to OHV use.	10.6 6.2
Toomey, Kathy & Dick	
I would like to voice my objections to opening up of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to any ATV or off road vehicle traffic. This area should be preserved for future generations it is truly unique. I live exactly 6 miles from the west edge of Itasca Park and have witnessed the damage caused by off road traffic, including the making of unauthorized trails and driving over newly planted trees	4.3 6.2
If you want to see the devastation that these types of vehicles can do just go around the community of Two Inlets. It is an embarrassment to the State and anyone who cares for the land.	Comment noted
Trepka, Judy	
I am sending these comments on behalf of the League of Women Voters of Woodbury/Cottage Grove. It is the position of the LWV that an environment beneficial to life be promoted through the protection and wise management of natural resources in the public interest. Therefore, it is imperative that the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest be closed to all OHVs. We must protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi for future citizens. The MHSF is a narrow corridor. It contains the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi River in Minnesota. Minnesotans must set a precedent of good stewardship for this internationally recognized river.	6.2 10.15 10.6

Author/Comment	Response
IT IS CRUCIAL THAT THE DRAFT PLAN BE MODIFIED SO THIS VALUABLE ASSET IS CLOSED TO OHV TRAFFIC!!	
Trout, Jerry J.	
I am concerned that the vast majority of people are not aware of the damage being done to public lands as a result of decisions made by the legislature and at the higher levels within the DNR. The terrain, the wildlife and the psyche of those who hold natural wild areas near and dear to their hearts have all been devastated with the incursion of OHVs across our public lands. The current area of concern is the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.	2.3 12.1
A quotation to consider from Elie Wiesel, a holocaust survivor, "We must always take sides. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented." And I might add, a bigger concern than the silent majority (neutrality) is the uninformed majority. Most people just are not aware of what is happening where ATVs are allowed to run.	Comment noted
The explosion of OHVs across our public landscape was significantly aided by a vocal minority. Wildlife, the terrain and those who oppose OHVs are the oppressed. Public officials have not been able to recognize this due to being blinded by the viability of the industry in our state and the pressures brought to bear by the industry and a very vocal minority. I offer a contrarian viewpoint to that of legislators and DNR leadership:	Comment noted
OHVs, particularly ATVs, are an invitation to mayhem, implicit and explicit.	15.7
I did a cursory examination of the Cuffs and Collars data in Outdoor News in May of 2005. Nearly a third of the write-ups of Conservation Officer's actions had to do with ATV problems.	11.5
The Cass County Crime Report for Hackensack as reported in the Walker Pilot Independent often lists multiple ATV complaints within a week.	Comment noted
I have personally traveled on a forest road north of Akeley, now a formal ATV trail that has become so eroded from ATV travel that we can no longer take a tool trailer over that forest road for work on a national footpath that goes through the area. This has been a formal ATV trail for about one year and a relatively dry year. Maintenance costs of the formal ATV trails throughout Minnesota will be staggering.	Comment noted
One can argue that we need trails, resources should be made available to all. This is a sound argument for hunting and fishing. The carrying capacity of the forests and lakes for hunting and fishing allow those resources to be used. Game and fish violations are a negative impact upon the carrying capacity but a full recovery of the carrying capacity can be made with good management and most people obeying the law. But this is not the case with OHVs. A small group of people with OHVs can destroy a wetland or a stream and it may never be returned to its pristine condition.	12.1
The above points should make it clear that we are dealing with an unusual problem with OHVs. We as a society have been much too slow to recognize what is happening. A little problem here (drain on law enforcement people) and a little situation there (damage far exceeding available dollars to repair the damage) are not being addressed.	11.4
It is just a matter of time before a "Rachel Carlson alert" is articulated and it will be apparent we have been remiss. Our generation of leaders is coming down on the wrong side of history in this area, recognizing a monumental problem much too late.	Comment noted
I am not asking that OHVs be banned in Minnesota. I am simply asking that we recognize the problem and take a courageous step toward reasonable management and containment of the problem. A perfect place to start is with the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest by totally eliminating OHV travel within the boundaries of the forest.	6.2
Trudeau, Franco	
It would be disheartening to lose ATV access to the Mississippi Headwater forest area. I don't believe I am the only one who would feel this way.	6.1
Tuomala, Scott	
I'm glad that I was sent this e-mail because I want to address a few things. I would like to go to the meeting in January but I will be out of town for work.	Comment noted
I understand that State Land has to be controlled because of the bad apples out there. But because of these bad apples the rest of the people have to suffer.	Comment noted

Author/Comment	Response
<p>Example: We deer hunt in the Mississippi Headwaters area just north of Lake Plantangenet that has been closed to motorized vehicles. This is a area that my party has hunted for over 50 years. Now the people in my party are getting older and they have medical conditions that limit there ability to get around. Now they can't hunt this area because they can't drive there trucks even close to where the deer stands are, not to mention if they did shot a deer there is no way they could get it out. This is a sad story that is being played out all over the State.</p> <p>My suggestions is this. Make the areas that are closed limited areas. So what ever Zone the land falls into open during the hunting season. Example: The Mississippi Headwaters area that I hunt is in Zone 1. So for the two weeks that deer hunting is open. This area would be open to motorized vehicles. Of course ATV's would be allowed only in the hours out lined in the DNR's manual. This would allow people with medical conditions the enjoyment of hunting to the fullest. This would ensure that these State Forest Areas are protected from abuse and would allow everyone to enjoy the out doors, not just a few.</p> <p>I have addressed only deer hunting because it applies to me, but it may have to be expanded to include "Large Game" So hunters that hunt other animals such as Bear, the same option. Once again if a ATV is used it is limited by the DNR manual.</p>	7.8
Ulrich, Linda	
<p>We enjoy riding our ATV's and enjoy experiencing different forest areas as we live were it is flat. We want access for FOREST ROADS AND DESIGNATED TRAILS IN THE MISSISSIPPI HEADWATERS STATE FOREST It is a beautiful place that we enjoying visiting, we have walked the trails, rode bikes and enjoyed the water. We want to be able to enjoy riding the trails also. Please do not close this off to ATV use. There are many people who enjoy riding and do not have the land to ride on.</p>	6.1
Umphress, Karen	
<p>I agree with the proposal to move the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest and the State Forest Lands administered by the DNR from a Managed Classification to a Limited Classification. This acts in accordance with the county lands within the State Forest boundaries which makes it easier for the public to understand. I also agree with the motorized designation of the trails currently used for motorized recreation.</p>	6.1
<p>I would have preferred some of the currently non-designated routes to be designated for motorized use. I do agree with the designation of the non-motorized use trail from some of the currently nondesignated routes.</p>	Comment noted
Updegraff, Gwen	
<p>Please keep ATVs out of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest! Preserve the ecological health, clean waters and beauty of our state.</p>	4.3 6.2
Van Oss, Tom	
<p>I want to urge you not to classify this forest as closed in any part.</p>	6.1
<p>I want to tell you, I was once out on my ATV and came to meet a 95 year old woman out there on a ATV of her own which her son had bought for her. Now I assure you that but for the ATV she would not otherwise have been able to share in the forest. It belongs to her and all of us not just those who are adverse to ATV's whom in my experience, when you really get down to it, feel that way, often because they feel they can not afford to have one themselves.</p>	Comment noted
Vanderbeek, Fred T.	
<p>I have witnessed the ill effects of ATV's / off road vehicles on our wildlife and point blankly wish it for to stop. No matter how many "4-Wheeler Rallies" that retailers and manufacturers dupe 4-wheeler enthusiasts to attend, the actual fact is they are harmful to the ecosystem it isn't comical. I'm sending this in regards to: DNR plans public meeting Jan. 16 on motor vehicle use proposals for state forest land in Mississippi Headwaters State Forest and southwest Beltrami County (December 21, 2007)</p>	6.2
Vassar, Hubert	
<p>On the forest classification for the Mississippi headwaters State forest I strongly feel that A Limited Designation would allow ATV's on Forest Roads, Minimum Maintenance Roads, and Designated</p>	6.1

Author/Comment	Response
Trails. This Designation would allow me to experience the Mississippi Headwaters from the seat of an ATV. This will also allow ATV access for hunting. I believe that the state forests should be available for every body to enjoy.	
Velie, John	
Allowing OHVs in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is a dumb idea. Don't do it	4.3 6.2
Vetter, Mary Ellen	
I write in reference to the DNR's draft management plan for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. I wish to voice my objection to allow motorized recreation in a forest and river area that is inherently sensitive to the destuctive results of morotized vehicles. Evidence abounds that what damage that is already being observed will mean ruin that may never be recovered. This special, wild and fragile river corridor is not and cannot ever be suitable.	4.3 12.1 11.9
I do not object to ATV's - but they like all motorized vehicles must be restricted to common sense use. Would you allow motorized vehicles to run unregulated across a cemetery?	Comment noted
Please convey my objection to Mr. Carroll, DNR Regional Director in Bemidji and my support for closing the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest to motorized recreation.	6.2
Vlasek, Ray	
From previous discussions and notes, you probably know how I feel about OHVs in MHSF. This state forest should be closed to all OHV use in my opinion. I live in a state forest. I see the damage. I have canoed the Mississippi in the MHSF. The soil cannot sustain OHV use. The area is highly susceptible to erosion.	6.2 12.1 2.10 11.9
The only trail surface that can sustain OHV use without permanent damage is a paved surface. I have seen the ditch repair jobs that never last more than a couple weeks.	Comment noted
All unpaved surfaces need to be under a government road authority so that the damage is stopped or repaired. The clubs have already proven their lack of capability.	Comment noted
Voight, Mary C.	
The DNR's Draft Plan for MHSF classifies the forest as "limited," rather than "closed": This unique wilderness area deserves to be closed.	6.2
Mississippi Headwaters State Forest is one of the rapidly disappearing remaining wilderness areas in Minnesota and in the nation. I would like to suggest that the MHSF use parts of the model used in Banff and Lake Louise in Alberta, Canada. The Canadians believe that places of such incredible natural beauty belong to the whole world and need to be protected. Frequently we must give up short-term, local rights for long-term, national benefits. Someone must have a vision greater than personal self-interest.	2.3
The MHSF must be closed to all OHVs, because the natural assets and the steep hills and sandy soils make the area vulnerable to off-road driving. Significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river.	11.9
Currently, OHV damage in MHSF is extreme. Camp grounds are rutted and damaged, e.g., Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point. ATVs are riding in the river in a number of locations, e.g., Stumphges Rapids.	11.9
Rather than sealing off the historic sites noted above, the DNR Draft Plan has designated ATV routes in these sensitive areas, thereby rewarding illegal behavior by legalizing it.	10.1
The Mississippi Headwaters Board designated MHSF as "wild," which created a 1000 foot corridor along the river where all OHVs are banned. The Draft Plan disregards this protection and proposes ATV trails within this corridor, with some dead-ending at the river. As noted, illegal riding has already damaged the riparian zone.	10.8 10.2
A "closed" forest would not ban ATVs entirely; however, even in a "closed" forest, these legal crossings would still result in OHVs riding outside the legal paths, causing damage along the way. The forest is a checkerboard, with state and county land mingled. If the forest were closed, County and township roads would allow OHVs to cross state land when going from one county parcel to another.	3.8
It will be difficult for DNR enforcement to strictly monitor any portion of this area because this part of the Mississippi is so remote. Classifying the MHSF "closed" would greatly aid in protecting the river itself.	11.2

Author/Comment	Response
Waage, Donn L.	
<p>I understand that the DNR is considering allowing off road vehicles on the Mississippi Headwaters Wild River. This area is one of the best in Minnesota, both scenic, culturally and for wildlife. Years ago, the day after I graduated from High School, my buddy and I took a canoe and went from Itasca to the Iowa border. What a great experience for a young man. This experience was wonderful because of the wilderness and solitude it offered as well as the people we met along the way.</p>	<p>10.6 2.3</p>
<p>It is my belief that allowing motorized vehicles anywhere near the headwaters of the Mississippi would be a terrible mistake for Minnesota. I personally don't have a snowmobile or ATV but understand that some people like motoring everywhere. Motorized vehicles may have their place but not where they will have a major negative impact on a unique Minnesota resource.</p>	<p>4.3 6.2</p>
Waalén, Lanny	
<p>Due the damage that has already been caused by OHVs activities in the Mississippi Headwaters (not to mention all parts of this country), I urge this area to be classified as Closed. This state should be honored to have this river within its boundaries, and should protect it from this unnecessary willful destruction.</p>	<p>11.9 6.2</p>
Wallwork, Deb	
<p>I oppose the ATV development for the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest.</p>	<p>6.2</p>
<p>As a child, I was fortunate to participate in a wilderness program that took eight, nine, ten year olds out in canoes in the Itasca headwaters area.</p> <p>It's very difficult to describe what that was like. A young child is, of course, more impressionable than an adult. One is open to things, and subtle experiences touch one deeply. Having that wilderness experience, was, literally, life changing for me. We paddled for days without seeing a road, or telephone wires, or hearing the noise of cars. All of which faded away. The land had a voice, one just had to tune in to hear it.</p> <p>The deeper you go into a wild undeveloped area, the more it grows on you. When it's quiet, you begin to hear small sounds, the rustle of leaves in a breeze, crickets chirping, the wind sighing, the buzz of a dragonfly, the little drips and splashes and laughter of water. A sun which pours down from a wide sky onto your skin, so you look at the world in a new way. It takes time to adjust ones senses, to tune in, and when you do, it's deeply affecting. That's why these areas are so precious.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p>Theodore Roosevelt understood that. His wife and his mother died, within a month each other, and he was devastated. In his sorrow, he went to the wilderness to heal. When he came back, renewed and joyous, he had gathered the strength to lead a nation. Jesus, it is written, went to the desert so he could hear the voice of God. This is available to anyone who seeks it out.</p> <p>As president, Roosevelt gave us an enormous gift, setting aside natural areas to be left as they were. What a concept. Leave them alone. Keep them as they were, when Lewis and Clark set out to experience them. We need to keep faith with that plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p>The Headwaters area is such an area. It's not simply a recreational resource, or a tree plantation. Or a wildlife park. It's a piece of an ancient, timeless America, a tribute to the Creator, to our land's abundance. A sanctuary. Hunters, fisherman, they know this, the value of undeveloped land, and the company of wild creatures. And then there's the animals themselves. We call it habitat, but it is their home.</p> <p>The ancients Greeks, who gave us democracy, believed in a "music of the spheres". They understood there to be a divine order to the universe, with a perfect structure, like a snowflake, or the notes in a scale. In subtle vibrations, you could hear it, hear the earth spin, the ancient song of life's beginnings, the rhythm of a universe radiating energy.</p> <p>This all sounds very sublime and mystical. Yet, as a child, out in that canoe, I was in touch with it. Not everyone experiences this. Still, there's only one way one can. That's to go out in the wild, get away from human trials and struggles, arguments and trivialities, and soak in the beauty and the</p>	<p>10.6</p>

Author/Comment	Response
quiet.	
ATV riders have oodles of turf to play in, miles and miles of ditches and fields along highways and county roads to run and gun their engines and blast their way through the landscape, where they don't endanger wildlife and don't disturb others. The noise, the dust, the physical impact, it isn't compatible with these areas. It encourages aggression rather than stewardship of the land, which is against the vision of a land trust, a public resource, a state forest.	16.8
Some certainly look at these natural areas and think, no one uses them. That's simply not true. They are simply used, in low impact activities; fishing, canoeing, hiking. Activities that require what you simply can't find anywhere, quiet and emptiness. Wilderness lovers, fisherman and hunters, and the wildlife that depends on that land, exist in a shrinking territory. Undeveloped land is disappearing at a tremendous rate in Minnesota. A state forest is land that is reserved, for habitat, for resources for future generations, for recreation that doesn't have a high impact, that leaves the land intact for others to enjoy. That means we must set limits and hold to them.	12.1
As a young person I remember taking the road north in Minnesota deeper and deeper into the wild areas. It called up the era of the Dakota and Ojibwe, and the courage and adventurousness of voyageurs. Amongst those towering pines, and dense bush, was the occasional motel or deer park, but that was it. And the very unknown quality, of the huge forests, it was thrilling. So many of those roads have now turned into strip malls, screaming with signs and prices and buy this buy that, with the roar of a race track as backdrop.	Comment noted
Itasca is the most visited park in the state. Minnesotans love this area. We need to reserve it, preserve it, because in the future, there will continue to be a growing populations that want to escape their jobs in the cities, experience something different, who will want to come there. For the quiet, for the beauty, for the wildlife, for the experience of walking the land.	Comment noted
Under the current development pressure, Minnesota stands to lose the very qualities that once defined our state. No more Land of Sky Blue Waters. Looking at ads from the '50's, now, you'd have to go close to Canada to find what was universally depicted only a half century ago: moose, loons, serene lakes surrounded by pines, not ringed with roads, cabins and waterslides, paintball plantations and ATV parks. Unfortunately, this is a case where two different uses are simply not compatible. That's why we need the law to protect the Headwaters.	Comment noted
Please protect our wild areas. The value of wilderness simply can't be measured. Then other children might be able to experience what I did, out in a canoe. In the quiet, the stillness, the beauty. I believe there is a deep sense of spiritual connection that one experiences with the land, and that it is our heritage. Help us keep it always available: for our children, and our children's children.	6.2
Walsh, James	
It is totally unacceptable to allow ATV's in a section of park that is designated wild. People riding ATV's have proven that they are not interested in enjoying the wild status of the park. They are there to destroy a pristine piece of land. There is plenty of private land around the state for them to wreck up.	20.1
Please follow the recommendation of the DNR's scientists and keep the headwaters area off limits to motorized vehicles.	14.1 6.2
Ward, Bill	
Although I am a resident of Wisconsin, I ride my ATV in many states, including Minnesota. I know there is a lot of controversy over the use of ATVs in the Mississippi HeadWaters State Forest and that many interests want to see ATVs banned outright from the Forest Lands. While I agree that there are issues with ATVs being destructive of the environment, I believe an outright ban is the wrong approach.	Comment noted
I believe a better approach is the one that is proposed: designate the area as Limited Use. A complete ban would prevent a very large cross section of people from legally accessing the Forest. And, equally importantly, it wouldn't stop the damage caused by rogue ATVers. By definition, rogues don't follow the rules. A ban is a rule that wouldn't be followed in the	6.1

Author/Comment	Response
HeadWaters State Forest just as it isn't followed in many other areas. The fact the the area has been open in the past will just make it worse.	
In addition, a ban would also stop concerned ATVers from being able to help educate and enforce ATVing regulations in the area. I'm a member of the WI DNR Trail Patrol Ambassador program and also a member of the Burnett County Law Enforcement Citizens Auxiliary. I know the benefit of having concerned citizens out helping to patrol the trails. Take them away and the "bad guys" would still tear it up and the "good guys" wouldn't be around to stop them. The worst of all worlds, I believe.	11.4
Limited use is a good compromise between shutting it down and opening it up. I think it's the right approach and encourage you to implement the plan.	Comment noted
Waters, Thomas F.	
I am in favor of closure of the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest, because this forest including the river headwaters is such an important and NATIONAL significance, it should not be subject in the watershed to the damage caused by OHV recreational use. The area is of such great HISTORICAL value, that we should apply extraordinary protection to it. Current roads and foot trails are ample for all citizens to enjoy the river and its surrounding forest, without motorized use of additional area.	6.2 10.6 4.3
Weber, John	
A few years back, I served four years as a Hubbard County representative on the Advisory Committee of the Mississippi Headwaters Board (MHB). In that capacity, I became very mindful of the Legislature's entrusting MHB with the preservation and protection of natural and human values for the first 400 miles of the River. This was in lieu of Federal protection via the National Park Service.	Comment noted
The proposed "managed" OHV usage of the MHSF lands appears to be in direct conflict with the charge that MHB has been given over a quarter of a century ago by the Minnesota Legislature.	6.3
Until such time that OHV enforcement and education efforts match the aggressive nature of the machines and too many of their operators, MHSF lands should remain <u>closed</u> to OHV ridership. Thank you for considering these comments.	6.2
Wellner, Michael G.	
I am writing this to move across my point of preserving motorized recreation for future generations. Everybody must learn to "share" the land in their various pursuits of the great outdoors. There are people out there that do not THINK before acting, and they are ignorant of the consequences of their acts that result in the loss of our privileges to activities such as motorized recreation and shooting sports. I believe responsible motorized recreation for everybody is possible. Giving the responsibility of maintenance and monitoring of different trails to ATV and ORV clubs can help take the pressure off the DNR, keep trails in good condition and ensure that irresponsible motorized users don't have access to trails under a club's watch. The Mississippi Headwaters State Forest has a landscape inviting to those who wish to explore the trails with the use of a ATV or ORV. I support opening other areas in Beltrami Country to "Responsible" motorized use. I would like to see trails opened up in Northern Minnesota where you can ride into the backcountry, pass abandoned towns and camp. I believe riding and camping with the use of a ATV can bring revenue to businesses in recession impacted Northern Minnesota. I hope the Minnesota DNR is fair to ORV users in Beltrami Country especially when we are the minority and there is pressure from Environmental Activists who don't even LIVE in Beltrami Country, how can you let these people tip the scales over our motorized rights and opinions?	6.1
Wenthold, Tami J.	
The continued expansion of access from OHV traffic in our prestine wilderness is an abuse of natural resourses. The headwaters of the Mississippi is a gift that Minnesota should protect and act as stewarts for the rest of our country. Opening up areas for OHV traffic that is already abused by the very people requesting access is a crime. There is a small percentage of people wanting access with a great amount of financial backing from Artic Cat and Polaris. When will enough be enough - never. Not until they can run their vehicles where ever they want. Pay no attention to the vast amount of wild life that calls these areas their home - what does DNR stand for?? I have had great respect for this Department in the past but have been learning in recent	4.3 6.2

Author/Comment	Response
months that it does not have the majority of Minnesotan's best interest at heart. If we the people of this great state do not speak up and express out wishes of keeping our parks and state lands managed so the wild remains the wild - it will be lost. There is no more wilderness and it is getting smaller and smaller by the day. Please do what is right and what your know in your heart is the best for our land. Do not open up the head waters for OHV traffic. It is not just the headwaters on the chopping block at this time - all of our state land is at risk of being raped and abused by OHV traffic - limit the use of these land abusive vehicles.	
Wilson, Walter	
This 1000-foot corridor along the Mississippi needs to be classified as "Closed" for all off-road vehicles in order to preserve the pristine nature of this area. Please take this into consideration when making the final decision.	10.2 10.8
Wolter, Doug	
Please continue to allow ATV's, OHM's and ORV's to operate within the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest. Do not make it illegal to use ATV's for Big Game Hunting, even on Forest Roads. This closing of all access to OUR land is getting out of hand, we must have continued access to our public land.	6.1
Yahn, Stephan	
The wild and scenic rivers in Minnesota can only be preserved by restricting activities which are inimical to natural areas. I am opposed to off-highway vehicle (OHV) use in the MHSF's Wild Corridor. The proposed routes for OHVs will harm the wild character of the area, put wildlife at risk, and make it difficult to pass those lands to future generations in a natural state. Thank you for your consideration of my comments.	10.2 2.9
Young, Cheryl	
I ask that the DNR designate the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest area as an OPEN classification. Either limited or managed. Please DO NOT close the access to motorized recreation.	6.1
I have not had the opportunity to ride my ATV in the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest area yet. So I cannot give you specific trail designations to keep or eliminate.	Comment noted
My family are avid ATV riders. We are responsible ATV riders. We are members of the All Terrain Vehicle Association of Minnesota, a twin city ATV club called North Metro Trail Riders. Me and my husband are certified ATV safety instructors and plan on becoming trail ambassadors once the new safety and conservation program is implemented. We work with other clubs to maintain the Red Top ATV Trail System.	Comment noted
We travel all over Minnesota each summer with our camper, ATVs and kids. We would like the opportunity to visit the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest area in the future and be able to ride the trails on our ATVs.	Comment noted
Zentner, David	
Mississippi Headwater State Forest meets resoundingly the criteria to list it as closed to OHV use, at least as best I can discern the values relevant to a "closed" classification. At the Headwaters of the Mississippi it is described by expert analysis as a relatively small State Forest Unit, largely fragile (hills and sand), significant problems confirmed by past and present use, damage to camp grounds. Beyond that it is a national asset as well as a State asset, has within the "river corridor" the designation of WILD bestowed by the Headwaters Board for 1,000 feet back. The majority of the DNR Team recommended closing and I agree with their assessment.	6.2 11.9 10.6 10.8 14.1
The only justification for the limited designation that I've heard is that there is value in connecting trails, with no refutation what so ever that I am aware of the existing damage, national importance of the Upper Mississippi, nor the foundational fragile setting.	4.3
If Upper Mississippi Headwaters does not qualify for closed, it may be best to be honest and simply eliminate the designation, seems to me very unlikely it will be utilized.	Comment noted
Zicus, Michael C.	
I'm writing to express my opinion that the DNR should not classify the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as "limited." I'm 60 years old and I own 120 acres in Eckles township, Beltrami County where I've lived for more than 30 years. I began canoeing the upper Mississippi not long after I moved here, and I've hunted around the Pine Point area since then as well. The amount of	6.2

Author/Comment	Response
landscape damage that has occurred from uncontrolled ATV use in the time that I've known this area is appalling. The Forest should be classified as "closed."	
Frankly, I think the plan for the Forest is kind of a mess. In my opinion, this stems largely from the fact that 3 counties and the state are involved with each entity proposing different off-road regulations. This makes no sense to me despite the mixed ownership of the Forest. The ecological significance and land sensitivity of the area does not change as you cross ownerships, so why should the classification? There is no way that enough law enforcement can be brought to bear to control the illicit ATV travel that will result from this confusing mix of regulations. I am reasonably well educated and have read the material that has been prepared for the plan, and I still don't understand who will allow what and where. I seriously doubt that any judge would hear such an enforcement case because the rules will be so confusing.	5.9
The forest and the sensitive riparian habitat along the headwaters of the Mississippi River are too significant ecologically and nationally to take a chance that any further habitat degradation will occur. This is a fact that the Plan seems to have ignored (Clearwater and Beltrami counties certainly have by deciding to open things up as much as they have). ATVs and OHVs have already damaged this part of the river corridor extensively, and it must be stopped.	11.9
The regional administrator in Bemidji apparently made the final decision for a "limited" classification despite the fact that 3 of the 5 DNR planning team members from the northwest region recommended that the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest be "closed" to all motorized recreation. These are the resource professional in the field who truly understand the risk to the Forest's ecology. Their recommendation was based on the steep hills and sandy soils that make the area so vulnerable to off-road driving. But, they were over-ruled and I haven't heard any justification for doing it. Anyone visiting the Forest will find that significant erosion has already been caused by illegal driving near and through the river. I would offer the damage at Coffee Pot Landing and Pine Point (where I hunt grouse) as examples. I also pick blueberries along Stumphges Rapids road, and there are a number of locations in that vicinity where all-terrain vehicles have been driving in the river. I'd like to know why the field staff recommendation was ignored. There appears to have been virtually no environmental review of the recommended classification. Why not?	14.1 11.9 3.9 14.5
I also seem to remember that the Mississippi Headwaters Board designated Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as "wild," which created a 1,000-foot corridor along the river where all motorized recreation was to be banned. The draft plan disregards this protection and proposes motorized trails within this corridor, with some trails ending at the river (in reality I believe this will mean "in" the river). Why was this river designation ignored? The commissioners in Beltrami and Clearwater counties may choose to ignore this, but the DNR certainly should not.	10.8 10.2
It will be nearly impossible for DNR enforcement officers to monitor much of this area because it is relatively remote. Classifying the entire Mississippi Headwaters State Forest as "closed" to motorized recreation would be a good start in management of the Forest because the ambiguity as to where ATVs could be used would be eliminated. This would aid greatly in protecting the area including the river. I ask you to exercise the resource stewardship that is your mandate and help protect this last remaining stretch of wild Mississippi River for future generations. It is the most pristine stretch of the Mississippi left, and the DNR and Minnesota's citizens have a responsibility to be good stewards of this internationally significant river. Please classify the Forest as "closed" and work with the legislature and the counties to assure that this Forest get uniform protection across all ownerships. The resource needs and deserves as much, and it's the right thing to do.	11.2 10.6 4.3
Zimmerman, Allan & Carol	
Our family has owned property in Hubbard County since 1969. We enjoy the natural beauty of the Itasca Park area and particularly the Mississippi Headwaters area both during the summer months and during the winter. We have often taken friends from Arkansas, Colorado, South Dakota, North Dakota, and from New England to Itasca Park and, particularly, to the Headwaters of the Mississippi. Friends and relatives are thrilled to see the natural and relatively unspoiled beauty of the area and they contribute to the local economy by patronizing the local restaurants, motels, and resorts.	Comment noted

Author/Comment	Response
<p>We and our friends and relatives are horrified to learn that the manufacturers of the machines that are uniquely designed to destroy these natural areas by gouging the land, polluting the streams, and creating noxious noise now wish to expand the pollution and noise to the Headwaters area. The ATV's may have a legitimate use for a rancher who wishes to round up cattle on his own ranch or for handicapped persons as a means of transportation, but to permit such vehicles to tear up the natural environment in areas that have been protected for decades is counterproductive to Minnesota tourism in the long term and would destroy a precious natural resource in order to enrich the manufacturers of the machines at the expense of the rest of society.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p>Please do not let the greed of the manufactureers and the minority who have no regard for the environment destroy this precious and irreplaceable natural treasure.</p>	<p>6.2</p>
<p>Zimmerman, Mark</p>	
<p>I grew up in Hubbard County and my first adventures in the wilds were in the forests of central and northern Minnesota. I return to Minnesota once each summer, and have been appalled by the proliferation of OHV ruts in the ditches and off in the forest over the last few years. I heard myself this summer recommending that someone not visit Minnesota since "it's been trashed." We once enjoyed those forests without rutting them up. It's a sad change to witness.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p>The plan for this summer's return to the lakes included canoeing the Mississippi from the headwaters, but I'm told that we may want to head up to the BWCA where there is still something worth canoeing. I'm also told that there is a possibility of better protecting the first stretch of the Mississippi and allowing the areas damaged by OHV travel to recover. I urge you to devise a plan that will make my buddies in Minnesota report in a few years that the Mississippi is a worthy paddle. In a very real sense that stretch of river belongs to the nation, to all of us. Don't sell it out, protect it jealously; it's still a special place in my memories. I'd like to share it with my Minnesota niece and nephew and have it be a special memory for them too.</p>	<p>6.2 10.16</p>
<p>Surely, with all the ruts I've seen up there the motorized crowd doesn't need the Mississippi Headwaters State Forest along the river corridor too.</p>	<p>10.24</p>