

TABLE OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The following table is the summary of comments submitted to the county and acquired through the public hearing. Responses are indicated by a letter or by an individualized response based on the nature of the comment. The following generalized responses are utilized in cases where the commenter provides general statements of concern in the related theme or the response can be generalized across a large number of the comments:

- A. After the preparation of the EAW it has been determined that an EIS is required under two mandatory thresholds. Your comment regarding the need for an EIS to be completed is acknowledged and is considered in the final decision.
- B. After the preparation of the EAW it has been determined that an EIS is required under two mandatory thresholds. Your comment regarding the perceived effects on fish and wildlife species and/or habitat is acknowledged and is considered in the final decision and will be utilized in scoping.
- C. Workforce - The EAW utilizes existing information regarding traffic and temporary construction activities related to the development of the project. Your comment will be considered in the scoping.
- D. Boat traffic - The project does not propose any additional mooring spaces, or access to the lake and is not connected to any trail systems. The shoreline will be preserved in a natural buffer area. Limited public access is provided to Star Lake through two public access sites that provide parking spaces for 32 vehicles and trailers. Since there is no direct access provided and the proposed operation could be characterized as a destination resort, and not developed to provide direct access to the lake. However, the concern is noted and considered in scoping.
- E. Traffic – In general, traffic concerns raised by the project have been addressed in the entrance design (with turn lanes) and the consideration of traffic controls. The county highway Department has not identified any specific actions needed regarding the projected traffic volumes on county road 41 and the design as a collector highway, using current acceptable design and traffic engineering standards.
- F. Wetland mitigation – The loss of wetlands is regulated through the federal Clean Water Act (Section 404) and the state Wetland Conservation Act, at the county level. Sequencing is required as part of the regulatory process, which requires the applicant to identify avoidance, minimization, and mitigation for wetlands that will be impacted. The wetland mitigation siting requirements of both these laws are based on watershed boundaries, and allow for mitigation to be off site as noted in the comment. The wetland considerations are valid and subject to mitigation by ongoing regulatory authority. Consideration of the significance of these losses and the compensatory mitigation is a valid consideration in the EIS.
- G. The project is proposed by the White Earth Nation, through its White Earth Enterprises LLC, formed under the authority of the White Earth Tribal Code. Although the question of the proposer is noted, there was no ambiguity in the proceedings regarding the proposers. Financial assurance as a potential mitigation is noted for consideration.

- H. Waste Water – The federal Clean Water Act extends to tribal governments and is subject to oversight by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Additionally, the wastewater ponds will be permitted by the MPCA who will have plan review before issuance of a permit. The wastewater treatment proposal includes aeration in concrete basins for 30 days, 15 days per cell before it is discharged to the aerated secondary cell. Aeration removes odor by adding oxygen to the effluent so the ponds don't become anaerobic, which is an oxygen-poor condition that produces odors. Seepage is taken in to consideration for wastewater pond design and prior to coming online, the ponds will pass seepage tests, as is required by the MPCA. With the irrigation area, the vegetative crop will absorb the nutrients discharged. Also note that irrigation sprayers are controlled so that they extend and contract where needed and are programmed so there are no concerns with the irregular shape of the irrigation area mentioned. There is no permanent easement over the irrigated land. As irrigation is the only outlet for the sanitary treatment system the land will continue to be irrigated.
- I. Stormwater – The runoff from impervious surfaces to be constructed will be routed through stormwater ponding system to prevent contamination of the environment from stormwater runoff pollutants. The design of the stormwater ponding system exceeds the sizing requirements outlined by the MPCA. The discharge rate of the ponds will be released at a very reduced rate as shown in the stormwater modeling of the ponds. Additionally, the federal Clean Water Act extends to tribal governments and is subject to oversight by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
- J. Future phases - "The EAW addresses the comment as follows: If the project is successful, future stages may include expansion of hotel and gaming areas, expansion of the RV parking area, addition of rental cabins and/or a golf course, or other amenity improvements. No master plan, construction plans, or timeline has been established for these future stages. As planning for these future stages begin, the need for a new environmental review will be evaluated and appropriate reviews will be conducted."
- K. Gambling – Your concern is noted. Gambling is a socio-economic consideration, which is outside the scope of the EAW.
- L. Visual – The project is adhering to set backs. Visual screening is incorporated thru either berming, trees & vegetation, and in some conditions, both to reduce the visibility from the lake and CSAH 41. More specific information on the structures, parking lots, landscaping, site lighting and signage have been provided to the county as part of the CUP submittal process. In addition, the site plan includes minimal lighting designed with Dark Sky best practices.

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
1	Clarification of transmission vs distribution line. . . "replacement of existing overhead distribution line with underground distribution line."	The clarification is noted. Thank you for your comment.
1	The map shows the anticipated corridor centerline extending north on Highway 1 to Highway 108. The actual centerline ends at the Star Lake Substation property located in the NE1/4, SE1/4, Section 16.	The clarification is noted. Thank you for your comment.
1	The substation disturbance map shows the substation location correctly. However, the approximate corridor centerline should not extend any farther north than this point.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
2	I am deeply concerned that not only the fish population may be in jeopardy but if the waters become contaminated the home values on Star Lake will decline significantly in value.	The concern is noted. The EAW discusses the potential for effect to water quality and fisheries. Although home values may be affected by a decline in the water quality and fishery, there are many market forces that drive property values.
3	Considers the EAW to be thin, states opinion that the development is bad for Star Lake and is opposed.	See Response A above.
3	Comparison to Black Bear Casino is not an equal comparison.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
3	It would be realistic to anticipate significant increased boats on the lake from fishing opener through Memorial Day as well as other popular Holiday weekends throughout the summer.	See Response D, above.
3	I would suggest that the casino project threatens the water quality through increased boat traffic, boat discharge, and the potential for invasive species.	See Response D, above. Although the hotel will provide 25 additional RV sites and 180 hotel rooms, the facility is focused on gaming. Public access is currently provided on two DNR access sites, which have a combined 32 parking spaces for vehicles with trailers. No specific use data for the lake was identified. Any proposed change to access provided by the facility would change the project and need to be considered.
3	Chlorinated pools can have a great impact on amphibian populations. Will there be systems to reduce the number of amphibians killed by these pools?	No specific precautions for amphibian use have been identified in regard to the pools.
3	There are a few other rough fish missing from the EAW list but It seems purposeful to omit the most delicate species in the lake especially since there has been ample press coverage about declining tullibee numbers in the face of warming lakes. Any additional warming/pollution caused by the casino operation or its activities could be detrimental to the Tullibee population and needs to be addressed. Omission warrants an EIS.	DNR's Lake Finder identifies the following Fish Species: black bullhead, black crappie, bluegill, brown bullhead, burbot, green sunfish, hybrid sunfish, largemouth bass, northern pike, pumpkinseed, rock bass, smallmouth bass, tullibee (cisco), walleye, yellow bullhead, yellow perch, bowfin (dogfish), common carp, shorthead redhorse, and white sucker. However, the survey reports listed did not identify cisco specifically nor is there any population information provided.
4	Tribe should be allowed to govern itself and decide how to proceed	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
5	"plans would include maintaining and sustaining the undisturbed wetlands and vegetation". The word "PLANS" concern me as we have all seen many "PLANS" go by the wayside after approval. Also, even with no docks adjacent to the casino, I believe that area would see increased boat and pontoon traffic with boaters wanting to see the casino from the water with resulting additional damage to the wetlands and vegetation in that section of the south arm of Star lake.	The word "plans" refers to the current proposal and plans associated with the defined project. A change to the project would be subject to additional environmental review. With no access provided from the water to the project site, boating traffic would be anticipated to stay in the open water portions of the lake.
5	Questions 2:1 replacement ratio in another county.	See Response F, above.
5	Prairie Pothole Region produces many of the ducks raised in the upper Midwest. Our part of this flyway will be changed forever by this project. The increased traffic, noise, lights, and disturbance of wetlands, rice beds, and vegetation will have a negative effect forever on this flyway and the nesting and feeding of it's waterfowl.	The comment is noted. The project, as defined, is designed to maintain the near shore habitat that is associated with the Lake, wild rice beds, and maintains a vegetative buffer along the shoreline.
5	Concern about increased traffic, noise, litter and ability for roads to handle increased load	Your concern regarding traffic impacts is noted.
6	Should not be allowed to fill wetlands and opposed to the project being built in wetlands.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
7	Questions the validity of the White Earth Enterprises LLC as proposer.	See Response G, above.
8	Removing wetland and building on the land will negatively affect the ecosystems of Star Lake and the alternate placement sites of the wetland. An increase in human use will result in an increase of invasive species (i.e., zebra mussels) and will create lasting impacts on the lake and its inhabitants. Removing wetland from the floodplain means homes and roadways will be at risk of flooding.	See Responses F and D, above. Although wetland losses are never trivial, based on the size of the watershed, the lake size, and historic water levels, significant effect on flood levels would not be anticipated due to the relatively small area of storage provided by the wetlands proposed to be filled.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
9	The land was originally meant to be a wild rice area and should remain that way. Removing the wetlands will disrupt the lake and its inhabitants, as well as loons and bald eagles. Increased road usage leading to an increase in taxes for road repairs and safety measures on the curving, hilly roads. Ambulances, EMTs, and fire trucks will be hindered by the increase in traffic. There are many loons relying on Star Lake (included an article about loons in MN), as well as countless other bird species, fish, and animals. A casino will disrupt the nature experience of those attending Camp Joy. Recommends placing the wetlands in the Minnesota and National Historical Society to retain it for future Native American generations.	Comment noted. The wild rice beds as identified in the project description and EAW will not be physically disrupted by the proposed project. Wild rice harvesting will continue to occur. No access to the proposed site will be provided from shore, so boat traffic is not expected to increase substantially. On the shore/land interface, a 75-foot minimum vegetative buffer will be preserved, and will include a native mix, which will help to maintain water quality, in addition to the stormwater controls The county road system is maintained by the County Highway Department and, as you note, the projected increased traffic will effect the daily use of the highway system. Future improvements may be required if projected traffic counts are realized and would be considered as part of the normal highway improvement program. The EAW identifies that no new public access is proposed and that the adjacent shoreline will be maintained in a native vegetative buffer.
10	Negative environmental impacts of the project should be investigated by the government on how they will affect the environment, road system, taxes, and job market. Increased boat traffic on the lake affecting fishing and recreations. Asks that we do what's necessary to ensure the lake and surrounding area are not damaged by the project.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Responses A, C, D, E, and F.
11	Homeowner who petitions that the County Board requires an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to protect wildlife, bird species, and the water.	See Response A above.
12	Page 12 says there was a meeting for public input for the development of the Limited Star Lake Comprehensive Plan, but he said there was hardly any time for the public to submit their input. Instead it felt like it was all structured to share results of the Plan. Doesn't feel there was really an intent to gather public input by the partners.	Comment is noted. The EAW accurately identifies that the proposed development is compatible with the Limited Star Lake Comprehensive Plan. The process used to develop the plan is outside of the scope of the EAW. The plan is noted for the record. The plan is a reference only and has not been used to develop any ordinance or landuse plan for the area.
12	Asks the question: What happens if the project is not successful and/or abandoned prior to full completion? Will the land be restored to its native state? Who has the responsibility to monitor such restoration? Points to Minnesota Rule 4410.0200, subpart 60 and 9c, which requires ALL parts of future/possible actions be reviewed as part of a single project (i.e., potential RV expansion, additional cabins, golf course).	Since these elements are not currently proposed as part of or as separate projects and are considered speculative (are substantially NOT certain to be undertaken sequentially over a limited period of time) at the present time, they are not included as future planned phases. If these elements were to come forward in the future, their magnitude would need to be considered in context with the current environmental review, whether they were connected action to the project, as well as any additional thresholds that those subsequent projects may trigger at that time.
12	What will be the tax impact for the county and state taxpayers for road changes and upgraded maintenance as traffic increases due to the casino? The plan for road changes and updates should be expanded along with cost information within the context of an EIS.	See Responses A, C and E. The EAW process does not require information regarding taxation. Should an EIS be determined necessary, a detailed assessment of tax burden and impacts to county services will be prepared.
12	The Scope alone should require a full EIS. Many parts of the Plan are incomplete. No analysis of traffic impact of required workforce, need for additional housing for both temporary construction workforce and the permanent casino staff. How will the construction crews handle waste and water accommodations (more mobile home parks created to fit this need?)? A full EIS would cover this.	See Response A above. The EAW does not identify specifically the impacts on workforce, housing, or temporary construction workforce. If an EIS is ordered, these could be considered in the scoping of the EIS.
12	Neither the EAW or Limited Area Plan has done a complete analysis of the increased use of Star Lake waters (in reference to increased boat traffic). It's reasonable to believe there will be an increase in jet ski, pontoon, and boat traffic, which may introduce invasive species and puts pressure on lake fishing and water resources. A full EIS is needed to analyze this issue.	The comment is noted. The EAW does not identify a reasonable expectation of significant additional use of the lake. No additional boat access is being provided as part of the project and the current public access sites are limited in their capacity. If an EIS is determined necessary, scoping could consider the effect on lake useage as part of the EIS.
12	There is no reference in the EAW to the additional workforce traffic nor any data on the increase in area roads for issues like DUI drivers. The project includes a 216-seat bar with 979 parking spots and RV traffic. What does that mean for increased impaired drivers on area roads? In addition, the data on crime increase related to casinos, security cost, and emergency medical services are NOT well identified in the plans thus far - these should be part of an EIS requirement.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
12	Overall I do not feel the EAW as submitted has sufficient detail to justify approval of the project. A full and complete EIS should be a minimum requirement for a project with this magnitude of environmental impact.	See Response A above
12	In response to 9.a.i., this is truly a wetland and wildlife habitat area due to animals living there year round. In response to 9.b., a large, lighted casino with a parking lot and RV park does not fit a reasonable definition of "rural." There is existing research on the impact of casino development on property values, local economies, and communities but no references to them in the LASLCP or EAW.	Your comment is noted and this should be considered a wetland and wildlife area. We believe the statement in 9.a.i. cited is accurate; "no parks or trails are located on or adjacent to the project area." It is noted that you also would object to a characterization that the project fits the "rural" character of the area. Again the EAW statemet at 9.b. cited is "Land use within the area can be characterized as rural. Even with the rural character of the surrounding lands, the project is compatible with existing land use identified within the Limited Comprehensive Plan area boundary."
12	What legal right grants the Tribe and/or the County the right to combine Trust and Fee land to avoid problems with impervious surface requirements on Fee land? This right should be listed in the EAW and/or made known to the public. The Tribe is in violation of the existing shore land area impervious surface rules on its Trust Land with their proposed development plan.	The comment is noted. Impervious surface requirements are generally applied to the entire property on a unified site. It is important to note that the shoreland ordinance does not apply to the trust lands. However, the EAW identifies the entire project and the compatibility with the shoreland ordinance.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
12	Having an 85-foot-tall main structure with 180 rooms, bar, event center, fully lighted, does NOT result in minimal visual impact to the lake or surrounding area. The holding ponds will radically disrupt the rural nature of the area.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
12	What benefit is there for local property owners, tax payers, and those who enjoy wetlands and wildlife In Ottertail County to have the wetlands destroyed and replaced in Becker and Roseau counties?	See Response F, above.
12	The EAW lacks analysis for the environmental impact of temporary construction housing or workforce housing.	The comment is noted. No discussion on workforce needs is included in the standard EAW questions. Should an EIS be determined necessary, temporary housing will be addressed.
13	Would the Fee Land remain or would it be put into Trust Land to avoid paying real property taxes and special assessments? (with excerpt from Code of Federal Regulations, Title 25, Chapter 1, Part 151, Subchapter H, Section 151.11 Off-reservation acquisitions.)	The ability for the White Earth Nation to apply for trust status of the fee lands is not subject to local oversight.
13	What is going to be done with the infrastructure (roads) leading to the proposed casino site? If you have big heaving trucks hauling dirt to fill in the wetlands then who will be responsible for repairing or improving those roads? The taxpayers should not be burdened with this responsibility we are already paying a considerable amount in real estate taxes for our property.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. Borrow sites within the project boundary are identified in the plans, so only hauling of sand bedding will be necessary for the construction of the project. This will total 2,238 cubic yards, or 150 truck loads. Typically, construction contractors are responsible for maintaining the integrity of public roadways during construction, and are required to repair roadways to their pre-construction condition at the time that construction is complete. This information is detailed at the time that the final plans are prepared.
13	Where would the additional man power come from for policing as well as emergency medical services? Who would pay for these services, hope it would not be put on the tax payers of Otter Tail County.	These comments are noted, but outside of the purview of the questions in the EAW. Should an EIS be determined necessary, impacts to public services will be addressed.
13	There is also a great concern regarding retention ponds, potable water, raw water wells, waste water treatment system with regard to who would be overseeing this to make sure that there would be no waste entering the lake?	See Responses H, ,I and J.
13	Overall: Please do the right thing and require an Environmental Impact Study Where would workers come from to support the Star Lake Casino as the White Earth Reservation is some 60 miles from the proposed Star Lake Casino?	See Responses A and C above. The workforce question and concern is noted but outside the purview of the EAW. Should an EIS be ordered, this could be considered as part of the scope.
13	We like the "rural" character of Star Lake, that is why we chose to purchase a year-round lake home there. It is quiet an peaceful and we enjoy fishing and water recreation on the lake and do not feel that a casino fits in with the surrounding lands.	Concern and Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
14	Concerns about keeping rural Minnesota rural without commercial buildings and parking lots of this size. As she works at a land surveying company she understands all that goes into this work and "it blows [her] mind that an EIS would have to be demanded by the county tax payers when it should just be an automatic requirement for a project this size." Concerned about how the road upgrades will be funded, doesn't think it should be tax payers because they don't need upgrades for their use, only the casino does. Fears an increase in drug and alcohol use with a casino.	Concern and Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
15	We would all be remiss if we did not agree that there is a need for an EIS.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.
16a	Hired EOR to complete an evaluation of the EAW, result: "It is the expert opinion of EOR, as well as SLCCG, that Otter Tail County should require the developer to conduct an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to avoid irreparable impacts to the natural and human environments in and around the project site." Tyler submitted the full evaluation for the Commissioners to review.	Thank you for the thorough and comprehensive review you commissioned. The comments are helpful and repsonses as follows.
16A	Other developments of similar scale, intensity, or use were either denied a Conditional Use Permit or required to complete a full EIS as an EAW was determined to be insufficient. Examples: Blue Heron Bay Project and a 30-unit RV park on the west arm of Star Lake. Noted similar impacts to water resources, fish and wildlife; increased traffic, air pollution; and impacts to the surrounding environment.	The comparison to Blue Heron Bay is certainly instructive. We note that the differences are also instructive in that the Star Lake Casino does not include a marina and the associated boating components. The EOR report also identifies the denial of a 30 unit RV park on the west side of the lake as instructive to the needs decision
16A	Future development plans are not in place, even though WEN has purchased a parcel of land adjacent to the main body of Star Lake. The RGU should explore the intended use of this parcel to ensure future development is considered in the environmental cumulative impacts of the EAW.	See Response J, above.
16a	The total floor area of 277,000 square feet is larger than the mandatory EIS threshold for unincorporated land of 250,000 square feet. The EAW mistakenly relies on the Limited Area Star Lake Comprehensive Plan as evidence that the development has been thoroughly planned, reviewed by the community, and will be designed and developed in a way to avoid environmental impacts. This plan is too limited in scope to provide sufficient environmental protection.	Comment noted. See Response A, above. See comments on Limited Star Lake Comprehensive Plan. The plan references do not suggest that it is prima facie evidence that the project is well planned, reviewed by the community, or avoiding of environmental impacts. It simply identifies that it is compliant with the plan and that the plan exists as part of the decision document. The board should not rely on it any more than any other information in the document, but as part of the whole of evidence. Lastly we concur with the assessment that the project exceeds the threshold of a development of unincorporated land in excess of 250,000-square feet and meets the mandatory EIS category.
16a	The EAW wrongfully compares the casino to the neighboring resorts and camps. The size of the casino is not compatible with the single-family cabins on Spruce Lodge's property.	The commenter is correct, it is larger in size. This facility is comparable to resorts in the region such as Thumper Pond.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
16a	The casino will operate year-round, whereas the other resorts/camps/lodges are seasonal. A year-round operation will generate considerable use of the local lakes in all seasons. The EAW has no evidence or information regarding impacts caused by this new, intense use of Star Lake. It also fails to describe or identify efforts to avoid, reduce, or mitigate such impacts.	The EOR report suggests that it is a forgone conclusion that the casino will generate considerable use of adjacent resources. We understand the assertion; however, this is an open question that would likely need to have additional study to verify, and would be subject to scoping within an EIS if so ordered.
16a	The EAW claims, without evidence or explanation, that the large, commercial facility is compatible with the "rural character" of the parcel and surrounding area. The proposer should more accurately consider and describe the compatibility of a large hotel and gaming facility with a rural character, as well as provide detailed plans for mitigating the impact of a large, uncharacteristic commercial use on the area's rural character. The EAW fails to present any evidence supporting the claim that the resort is "compatible" with the surrounding land use. The parcels are zoned as Residential and Managed Forest. A commercial building is not compatible with these uses.	The comments regarding the compatibility with the surrounding landuse are noted. If the Limited Star Lake Comprehensive Plan is insufficient to address the specific compatibility, we would agree that additional discussion is warranted. Further discussion on whether this is sufficient to order an EIS is considered in the conclusions.
16a	The EAW should more clearly describe how the project will achieve compatibility with the existing zoning requirements. The table outlining the zoning and land use regulations should specify each applicable standard or how the project meets the standards.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. A table summarizing the information would be helpful but is not required in our opinion.
16a	Future land use designations should be provided in text or exhibits in the EAW.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The land use table, combined with the text and supporting appendices and figures, provide the basis for the statements in the table. A revised table summarizing the information would be helpful but is not required in our opinion.
16a	EAW is deficient in the following specific [wastewater] areas: 1) Maintenance plan - says "at some point in the future" sludge will be removed, this is unacceptably vague and suggests the proposer has not considered the issues. Also needs specifics on the regulations with which the treatment system is to comply with. 2) The EAW should provide more information on whether aeration alone is sufficient to treat the waste - should include alternatives. 3) Claims no surface water discharges from the treatment system will occur are unsupported by any evidence. Should include procedures and contingency plans for if the system fails or overflows. 4) EAW fails to consider impacts from the wastewater treatment ponds to migratory birds and terrestrial animals. It should demonstrate that the treatment system was designed to avoid and reduce potential environmental impacts and contingency plans for a forcemain failure. 5) EAW should provide more information on how waste generation amounts were generated.	1) All lagoons require sludge removal. There is no defined schedule on when the sludge removal will take place. The wastewater system is constantly monitored, and sludge removals will be scheduled and completed when appropriate. Disposal could consist of hauling off to an approved landfill or land applied. The MPCA regulates where the sludge is disposed of, and the project Proposer will be responsible for complying with those rules and regulations for removal and disposal. 2) The proposed design is the result of several different treatment alternatives that were explored, including: --A mechanical plant with a surface water discharge, standard lagoons without aeration that discharged to Rapid Infiltration Basins. This alternative wasn't chosen because it was discovered that there wasn't sufficient infiltration available. --Lagoons with a surface water discharge, which wasn't chosen because the owner did not want to have any phosphorus discharged to the unnamed lake or Star Lake. The current aeration treatment and secondary aerated lagoon system will effectively meet all treatment criteria required by the MPCA. The irrigation application of 12" (application volume provided by the MPCA) is such that the vegetative crop will absorb all of the irrigated water and will also absorb all nutrients preventing any runoff in to Star Lake or wetlands. No alternatives are provided in the EAW, as the EAW doesn't request an alternatives analysis. However, there was an exhaustive analysis of alternatives that resulted in the proposed treatment recommendation described within the EAW. 3) The secondary aeration pond is designed to the capacity required by the MPCA and includes 3' of freeboard above the high water level of the pond, which provides a safety factor for overflow of the ponds. While it is not standard to include contingency plans for the failure of a pond, as there are factors of safety such as the freeboard put in place, project Proposers included this in the design as an extra precaution. 4) The proposed location of the aerated lagoon treatment system is in a place where there are no known terrestrial animals that will be disturbed and there are no known effects on migratory birds due to wastewater lagoons. 5) The forcemain will be a pipe that is pressure rated to 250 psi, which is a far greater pressure than a sanitary forcemain. PVC forcemain is an industry standard for pressure rated mains and it will be pressure tested after installation to verify there are no leaks in the pipe. After that test has been passed, there is no chance of failure unless the pipe is disturbed in the future.
16a	Wastewater irrigation discussion lacks detail and precision. EAW should include: 1) Evidence for the conclusion that no effects to groundwater from wastewater being used as irrigation water 2) The pollutant content of the wastewater used for irrigation 3) How the "automated system" will prevent the irrigation being sprayed into wetlands or adjacent properties. 4) Who is responsible for growing the wastewater-irrigated crops? Where and to whom will these crops be sold or distributed? 5) More information on the rate of irrigation - what does the 12-inch rate mean? 6) Insufficient information to determine if PVC is the correct material for a forcemain that crosses CSAH 41. A failure of the forcemain would be disastrous.	1) During preliminary design of the system, the WEN conducted numerous discussions with Steve Stark, a hydrologist with the MPCA, regarding the treatment methods. The MPCA will not permit a facility until it reviews the design and determines that there will be no degradation of the groundwater. I.e. the conclusion that no effects to the groundwater is based on the MPCA permitting process where that will not be allowed. 2) The pollutants/nutrients remaining in the treated wastewater produced by the site are such that other systems with the same level of treatment are allowed to discharge directly to a surface water. Due to the sensitivity to the environment of this project, the proposer has chosen to propose an irrigation system to avoid a surface water discharge and provide vegetative growth to absorb the nutrients. Vegetation utilizes remaining nutrients for growth and the vegetative growth will be harvested for non-human consumption. 3) Irrigation systems have controls that turn sprayer heads on and off to avoid areas that aren't intended to be sprayed. Irrigation is a standard system and is utilized by surrounding cities such as Henning, Battle Lake, Perham, and others. 4) White Earth Nation will be responsible for the crop to be planted and harvested, but more than likely a local farmer will be contacted to lease or rent the area for farming operations. Who the crop will be used by or sold to has yet to be determined, however there are laws that dictate that the crop is to only be used for non-human consumption. 5) The 12" rate stated in the EAW basically means that the area to be irrigated can only be sprayed over the course of the summer a total depth of 12" of treated wastewater. It is similar to saying that there is 12" of rainfall allowed to be irrigated over the summer. 6) PVC is an industry standard for forcemain. It will be pressure-rated pipe and the forcemain crossing will be permitted by the OTC Highway Department.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#

SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT

RESPONSE

16a	The EAW should discuss the construction process and impacts in more detail, especially disturbances to wildlife and plant communities, erosion and sedimentation BMPs, and construction traffic and noise. The proposer should specifically describe efforts to avoid and reduce environmental impacts, and endorse methods to mitigate the adverse impacts of the construction process.	The process is first mitigated by an efficient design. The Star Lake team proposed to reduce the amount of material to be imported or relocated by over 50% to reduce the amount of overall construction, schedule, and impact to the surroundings. The process is thought to minimize environmental impact in a variety of ways defined below: 1. Construction Process: a. Use of onsite material vs hauled in material - only the sand bedding and gravel will be imported. This will reduce truck traffic and shorten construction window. b. SWPPP plan and implementation – this will completely contain the site. Based on use of treaty land, the bulk of land-disturbing activity will be condensed to a smaller footprint, and all other activity will be confined by silt fence and other erosion control methods. Additionally, the earthwork contractor has staged additional storm collection sites onsite, and spoil piles will be intelligently placed to assure no runoff or offsite contamination. c. There has been an extensive construction stage review that will also reduce construction by almost 5 weeks, reducing noise and traffic. 2. Environmental impact: a. There will be 0 impact outside the construction boundaries, b. When the irrigation system is established and utilized it will increase growth and agriculture significantly. c. The earthwork contractor focuses on fuel-efficient machines. For example, its off-road trucks use 4-6 gallons per hour – this simple example can save more than 30% fuel and more environmentally friendly. d. Contractor will not disturb any areas outside of construction boundaries, minimizing any additional environmental impact. e. Contractor will have professional SWPPP enforcement on site with 100% enforcement to assure strict adherence to the SWPPP and other environmental concerns. f. Owner will have additional oversight to assure enforcement of SWPPP and any environmental impact.
16a	The EAW fails to describe the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff or BMP locations. It does not discuss erosion and sedimentation impacts, BMPS for the vegetation removal activities, or existing drainage patterns. Does not mention the MPCA Stormwater Manual, only quotes stormwater management which does not adequately consider or plan for erosion, sediment control, or stormwater management.	An SWPPP has been designed for the site that lists BMPs and outlines how soon exposed soils need to be covered. Also, all BMPs need to be in place prior to any land disturbance that would potentially be susceptible to erosion. The SWPPP for the site also details a number of BMPs that the Contractor will have at their disposal when needed to ensure that no sediment leaves the project site during construction. There will be perimeter BMP controls, including silt fences to further protect the adjacent land from receiving any sediments. All BMPs need to be maintained throughout construction until permanent vegetative growth has been established. The quantity of stormwater that will be treated via ponding prior to being released is the equivalent of a 100-year rain event, which is greater than 6" of rainfall in a 24-hour period. The release rate meets MPCA requirements for stormwater ponding. This treatment level exceeds the requirements of the MPCA for wet sedimentation basins.
16a	Discussion of impacts of stormwater runoff is very limited considering the project will include 10 times more impervious surface than pre-development. Details on how the proposer calculated impervious surface are inadequate. Does not explain what will be done with rooftop runoff. Pollutant treatment ability of the pond is not supported.	The impervious surface for the design of the stormwater ponds was completed by using AutoCAD to provide the exact impervious surface being proposed. Rooftop drainage will be directed in to a stormsewer, which directs flows to the ponds. All runoff from impervious surfacing created on the project site will flow through the ponds. The pollutant treatment of the ponds required by the MPCA is a 1" rain event over all new impervious surface created. The proposed ponds are designed to exceed the pollutant treatment level that is determined to be needed by the MPCA by retaining the 100-year rain event.
16a	Modern low impact development or green infrastructure practices would produce significantly better environmental results than stormwater ponds. There's no discussion on alternatives. Also does not consider the potential impacts of stormwater ponding on groundwater.	Noted. Ponds are being proposed at this time due to the depth to groundwater in the ponding locations. The Minnesota Stormwater Manual states that with respect to a minimum depth to water table that there is no minimum separation distance required with ponds. The NPDES Permit specifically states that infiltration of stormwater is prohibited when the depth to groundwater is less than 3'.
16a	Claims that erosion amounts will be reduced as a result of change in land use are unsubstantiated by any evidence. Active agriculture may continue on the irrigated parcel and any reductions in erosion would not actually occur, and erosion impacts of wastewater land application are not considered, even though it's in close proximity to Star Lake.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
16a	The SWPPP submitted for the CUP conflicts with the description provided in the EAW (says Rapid Infiltration Basins will be installed, not ponds), they should be consistent.	The SWPPP was originally put together when the proposer was planning on Rapid Infiltration Basins (RIBs) receiving and treating the wastewater. The SWPPP is intended to not be a rigid document and is anticipated to be modified before and during construction. Prior to submitting to the MPCA for the NPDES Permit, the SWPPP will be modified to remove any language referencing the RIBs.
16a	Skimmer pumps and outlets are directed toward a wetland and will undoubtedly impact the wetland ecosystems. Alternatives should be considered, potential impacts should be identified, and methods to avoid, reduce, or mitigate impacts should be described.	During construction, temporary sedimentation basins are intended to be installed. The skimmer pumps that are shown in the SWPPP document are discharging into a wooded area and the outlet piping from the temporary sedimentation basins piping will be discharged into a pile of crushed rock to further remove sediments. By combining the temporary sedimentation basin with the skimmer pumps discharging into a pile of crushed rock and a wooded area there is no impact to the wetland ecosystem anticipated.
16a	EAW assumes the casino and hotel will be completed on schedule. There's possibilities of construction delays and/or development could be canceled part way through. The EAW should discuss alternatives and mitigation plans if one of these instances happens.	Comment noted. There are construction delays on many projects throughout the country. It is WEN's goal to see the project through to completion. The County expects that WEN has done its due diligence in hiring fully capable and expert architects and will hire general contractor with years of experience in this type of build.
16a	Applicant should demonstrate there are no options for wetlands replacement within the minor watershed, then major watershed, before locating wetland credits outside the major watershed. Does the proposed wetland fill acreage within the Trust Land constitute a significant percentage of the overall wetland acreage adjacent to the Star Lake perimeter? What is the percentage?	See Response F, above. The state Wetland Conservation Act and the federal Clean Water Act have viewed "in-advance" wetland mitigation (Wetland Bank Credit purchase) as being the preferred method of replacement as these are wetland conditions that already have been established, unless an appropriate wetland mitigation opportunity exists onsite (wetland restoration) that is found to be sustainable and feasible. The 7.4 acres proposed impact would be 0.16% of the wetlands in the subwatershed, 0.40% of the wetlands adjacent to Star Lake (1,888 acres), and 0.82% of the wetlands in South Arm (914 acres). The acres were tallied from the National Wetland Inventory website.
16a	Proposer should explain efforts to reconfigure parking and access roads to minimize wetland impacts and the use of BMPs able to support current wetland hydrology.	The location of the structure being located on the Tribal Trust Land is necessary due to the gaming facilities. Since the original concept drawing was created, the wetland impacts have been avoided and minimized several times by modifying the layout of the parking areas. Some changes include moving a roadway to avoid a wetland and moving the area for RV parking to avoid wetlands. Additionally, for the wetlands to remain in place, the SWPPP calls out the installation of a silt fence around the perimeter of all wetlands and also an orange snow fence to be installed surrounding all wetlands during construction to visually give the contractors working onsite limits to their construction and to prevent any sediment from leaving the site.

CATEGORIES:

GEN <i>General</i>	EIS <i>Environmental Impact Statement</i>	WF <i>Fish & Wildlife</i>	LU <i>Land Use</i>	TL <i>Transmission Line</i>	TR <i>Transportation</i>	WL <i>Wetlands</i>	WQ <i>Water Quality</i>	SE <i>Social</i>
------------------------------	---	---	------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
16a	How will the project be graded such that runoff currently flowing to Wetland Basin 5 on the east end of the project will be managed by a stormwater pond west of the casino and parking? Flow lines would help understand how proposed BMPs would function.	The proposed site design plans propose that the runoff from impervious surfacing will be collected via a stormsewer system that delivers the runoff water to the stormwater ponds. There are 3 stormwater ponds located onsite and runoff from the area where Wetland Basin 5 is currently located will be treated with two smaller stormwater ponds in this area of the site. Additionally, the site plan shows a vegetative berm that is to be constructed around the southern and eastern perimeter so the only direct runoff from the site would be rainwater that falls on a grassed backslope of the berm. The site plans have been submitted showing elevations of all proposed features.
16a	There should be a robust discussion on wetland sequencing. Should include alternative locations and a no-build alternative.	See Response F, above. Agency coordination has been ongoing for more than one year with regulatory reviewers from both the state (Otter Tail County, Board of Water and Soil Resources) and federally (the US Army Corps of Engineers). There were multiple alternatives provided, including the No Build alternative, and there was a substantial sequencing discussion developed as a component of the state and federal wetland permit application process.
16a	Have studies/modeling been completed to identify if the development would significantly affect recharge, temperature, or water quality?	The Owner has submitted to the MN DNR for a water appropriations permit based on pumping data of the well installed on site that showed ample water available. The data will be assessed before an appropriation permit is granted, which takes into account recharge of the aquifer. There has been no study/modeling completed with respect to temperature or water quality. Runoff temperature from the stormwater ponds was considered when the decision was made not to install rip-rap around the pond perimeter, which can increase water temperature. Water quality is achieved by providing permanent pool storage in the stormwater ponds of 1,800-cubic feet for every acre of the watershed contributing flows to the pond and by grossly exceeding what the MPCA has determined is the retention volume required in the ponds. The total release rate for the proposed stormwater ponds for the 1" rain event is less than 5% of the allowable release rate per the NPDES regulations.
16a	The project is located within 1,000 foot shoreland district. Does the current project location and set-back meet watershed and other regulatory set-back recommendations/regulations from shoreland? What constitutes "natural shoreline" and how is this being maintained given the proposed development plan fills 6.8 acres of wetlands which is contiguous with Star Lake? How will the project preserve the natural shoreline?	The EAW under question 9. Land use, b. Zoning Compatibility, indicated that the project meets or exceeds the setback requirements and shoreline protection as identified in the Otter Tail County Shoreland Management Ordinance. The 1,000' deep shoreland district begins at the OWHL (Ordinary High Water Line.) This OWHL is established by the DNR. For Fee Land east of CSAH 41 the setbacks are meet for the 112'-6" from Star Lakes OHWL. This includes the 50% increase for commercial projects as identified as one path of compliance by the Shoreland Management Ordinance. With the exception of a 2,006-square-foot area of fire truck access road/pedestrian path, this portion of the project is double the setback requirement. Additionally, the project will be screened by a berm at the parking lot and vegetation at both the parking lot and the fire truck access road/pedestrian path, as identified as a second path of compliance by the Shoreland Management Ordinance. For Fee Land west of CSAH 41 the setbacks are meet for the 200' from the Unnamed Lake's OHWL. For Trust Land, the buildings and equipment enclosures meet the recommended 112'-6" from Star Lakes OHWL. This includes the 50% increase for commercial projects as identified as one path of compliance by the Shoreland Management Ordinance. The fire truck access road/pedestrian path meets the 75' set back with the second path of compliance by the Shoreland Management Ordinance with the use of Vegetative screening. Approximately 4,000 square feet of the 8,000 square foot area of fire truck access road/pedestrian path will be a pervious paving surface. The fire truck access road/pedestrian path will be raised slightly as part of the storm water management. The existing shore line as defined by the Ordinary High Waterline (OHWL) and the Shore Impact Zone (SIZ) as defined as the by the county are to remain intact and undisturbed in the existing state during and after construction. The project exceeds Shoreland Management Ordinance 50% of this area to remain in the natural state. The county defines the SIZ as the as the area from the OHWL to 50 fee upland on Star Lake and the 100' upland on the Unnamed Lake. The DNR defines the "OHWL is the highest water level that has been maintained for a sufficient period of time to leave evidence upon the landscape. The OHWL is commonly that point where the natural vegetation changes from predominately aquatic to predominantly terrestrial."
16a	Is it prudent to place wastewater treatment ponds adjacent to Unnamed Lake? What will be done to mitigate potential issues? What alternatives were considered and rejected, why?	See Response H, above. Ponds are placed near water bodies including rivers and lakes throughout the state of Minnesota. The MPCA has guidelines for pond design that include factors of safety for issues that could arise and will analyze the proposed pond design for public and environmental safety before they would issue a permit for the wastewater treatment system. The proposed design is the result of several different treatment options that were explored. There were options of a mechanical plant with a surface water discharge, standard lagoons without aeration that discharged to Rapid Infiltration Basins, which wasn't chosen because it was discovered that there wasn't sufficient infiltration available, lagoons with a surface water discharge, which wasn't chosen because the owner did not want to have any phosphorus discharged to the unnamed lake or Star Lake. The current aeration treatment and secondary aerated lagoon system will effectively meet all treatment criteria required by the MPCA. The irrigation application of 12" (application volume provided by the MPCA) is such that the vegetative crop will absorb all of the irrigated water and will also absorb all nutrients preventing any runoff in to Star Lake or wetlands. No alternatives are provided in the EAW as there was an exhaustive analysis of alternatives that got us to the proposed treatment recommendation.
16a	How will boat parking be prohibited along the shoreline adjacent to the development? This could cause significant damage to the shoreline and emergent lake fringe. What downstream hydrological impacts will the development cause to Ditch 23? The EAW does not consider this issue.	There is a stand of cattail more than 100-feet wide between the shoreline and the open water. It is not likely that boaters will be able to access the shore. The stormwater ponding area will provide greater stormwater attenuation (holding back of the pulse of water after a rainstorm event) protections compared to the current condition, and the stormwater ponding area is designed to remove excess nutrients and sequester or break down pollutants.
16a	How will impacts from road salt and deicing materials be mitigated?	The use of road salt and other soluble deicing materials at the proposed site will be limited to that needed to ensure safety at the proposed project. In consideration of the proposed scale of the project, and the existing and proposed condition, the salt and deicing materials are not anticipated to result in degradation of adjacent lands or waters.
16a	What is the lowest elevation (basement) of the proposed infrastructure? What is the distance and elevation difference from the lowest construction elevation to the 1,329.5 ft designated OHWL and 100-yr flood level of Star Lake? Does the project meet watershed and other regulatory set-back recommendations/regulation from flood levels and OHWLs?	The EAW under question 9. Land use, b. Zoning Compatibility, indicated that the project meets or exceeds the floor elevation requirements as identified in the Otter Tail County Shoreland Management Ordinance. The 1,000' deep shoreland district begins at the OWHL (Ordinary High Water Line). This OWHL is established by the DNR. The buildings and equipment enclosures meet the Shoreland Management Ordinance's Lowest Floor Elevation Requirements – elevation must be 3 feet above the OHWL or highest known water level – the lowest floor level of the development is at 1335 which is 3.8 feet above Star Lake's highest known water level (HKWL) (1331.2) and 5.5 feet above Star Lake's OHWL (1329.5.) The fire truck access road/pedestrian path, on Trust Land, is located above the highest known water level. Otter Tail County and the DNR do not have preliminary and effective floodplain data for Otter Tail County. The project is located above the highest known water level as noted above.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
16a	The MN DNR requested additional study and/or data to identify the potential impacts to fish spawning and rearing areas near the project. The EAW does not discuss this additional data or study. EAW states several times that no substantial fish habitats are known within the Project boundaries. However the DNR NHIS letter indicates the south arm of Star Lake is an important spawning and rearing area. Proposer should specify whether the wetland area within the Trust Land is part of the habitat described by the DNR. EAW states invasive species have not been identified in Star Lake. However a preceding sentence states there are carp present. Carp are invasive species.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
16a	The DNR map indicates that 21-30 pairs of breeding waterfowl are found per square mile in the project area. The proposer must address the possibility that these pairs utilize the wetlands that will be filled. The EAW fails to consider how the noise, traffic, lights, and other sources of pollution and disturbance will affect water fowl and other migratory birds in terms of migratory behavior and hunting seasons. It must discuss how this will be mitigated.	All of the wetland areas within the Fee Title Land lacked open water during the summertime and contained surface saturation in springtime months. These areas are dominated with waist-high vegetation and no surface water for waterfowl to raise their young. Much of Basin 5 within the Tribal Trust land is the same. A portion of the wetland within the Tribal Trust Land might have some persistent water, but is dominated by vegetation and lacks open water. There is a cattle watering pond that was excavated in this Fresh (Wet) Meadow wetland type to the east (off of the property) where one breeding pair might be successful. The proposed plan calls for the establishment of three stormwater ponds plus the establishment of an upland buffer to the nearby edge of Star Lake that would allow for the rearing of waterfowl. As no outdoor amplified music or public address systems will be used, the proposed project is primarily an indoor entertainment center, substantial changes to noise is not expected to be a consequence of the project. There was a significant amount of effort made to design the facility in such a way that it would reduce the amount of light impact to the surrounding area. The development will be using best practices for Dark Sky Lighting to reduce impact on night sky, to adjacent properties by lighting trespass and nocturnal wildlife. Dark Sky practices included reduced lighting levels, downward directed lighting fixtures, lower mounting height for lighting fixture, and lighting colors below 3,000 Kelvin. Additional site lighting information and photometric is part of the Conditional Use Permit and will be provided with that application."
16a	EAW does not discuss how resident populations of plants and animals with limited or no ability to migrate to other habitats will be affected by construction and the new commercial facility.	The project proposes impacts to cultivated lands, which would include standard agricultural field weeds, pasture weeds, and field grasses such as smooth brome, timothy, orchard grass, and reed canary grass. During the management of the vegetation on the property, agricultural weeds such as thistle are expected to be eliminated. In the areas where the native prairie is planted, management strategies will be in place to help shift the plant community away from the cool season grasses (such as smooth brome, Kentucky bluegrass, and so on) to warm season grasses (such as big bluestem, Indiangrass, switchgrass, and various other species that would be best suited for this area). In the areas where there is good naturally existing vegetation (such as goldenrod, and other naturally existing species), the existing plant community will be left alone (except for spot spraying/treatment of undesirables such as thistle). With the addition of the native prairie community, it is expected that there would be an increase in vole, mole, and mouse species, which would in turn attract more owls, hawks, and other predators. Currently, the row crop farming and the mown lawns leave less habitat for the small mammals. With the proposed removal of some trees, there would be habitat removed for red squirrel, gray squirrel, chipmunk, porcupine, skunk, and raccoon. The removal of habitat for skunk and raccoon would benefit the nesting success of waterfowl and other ground nesting birds such as pheasants. There will be some habitat loss for whitetail deer.
16a	Loons often use the same nesting sites and prefer secluded bays and hidden lake shore, will nesting boxes be installed? How will the project mitigate for lost nesting habitat?	The project is not proposed at the shore, and does not propose any amendments to the shore. A thick buffer of cattail exists currently between the shore and the open water, and the project proposes an additional 75+ foot native buffer. Nesting habitat loss is not anticipated.
16a	Construction activities for the electrical projects are planned during the spring. The EAW does not discuss why these activities cannot be completed in the winter. This would limit impacts to wetlands, birds, and bats.	Timing of construction will depend on when permitting is granted and resources available. Also, this refers to GRE and Lakes Region Electric project not the project for which the EAW is written.
16a	Documentation of the discussions with the DNR Non-Game Specialist should be included in the EAW.	Comment noted; this was inadvertently omitted.
16a	The EAW fails to discuss the wetlands classifications, community types, and quality of wetlands being filled and their habitat value. Also fails to discuss how the habitat will be replaced within the site or as close to the impact as possible.	The types of wetland proposed to be impacted include Seasonally Flooded Basins and Fresh (Wet) Meadow. The wetlands on site are degraded compared to other wetlands within the watershed. It is likely that degradation occurred via agriculture and pasture practices. Reed canary grass was a strong component of these wetlands. In addition, the proposed upland buffer to Star Lake will provide much-needed protection of the lake and increase nesting habitat. See Response F related to wetland mitigation activities.
16a	The description of Wetland Basin 5 is inadequate. It is unclear whether it has a high relative abundance of native vegetation or whether it supports a diversity of invertebrates and wildlife.	Wetland Basin 5 does not have a high relative abundance of native vegetation. Reed canary grass is a major component of Basin 5, with some sandbar willow and black ash. This basin has been subject to sedimentation from row cropping and pasture activities and is relatively degraded compared to other wetlands within the watershed.
16a	The description of the project mitigation activities for potential impacts related to tree loss is inadequate. Proposer should also discuss how changes in water temperature affect fish reproduction.	The first iteration of the project configuration had a reduced tree loss as more of the project was located within the row cropped field and farmstead areas to the west of the current plan. This preliminary configuration was considered by the wetland regulatory agencies, and it was determined that a variant project configuration would reduce wetland impacts. This process, referred to as sequencing, is a necessary component of the wetland regulatory review process, and aims to reduce wetland impacts to the greatest extent possible. Tree loss is not a regulated activity and the project proposes restoration of lands to native upland buffer. Star Lake has unconsolidated bottom directly adjacent from the proposed location, so it is unlikely that spawning habitat exists here for any gamefish other than northern pike. There is also a thick stand of hybrid cattail between the project site and the open water. There is a distance of more than one mile by water between the site location and deeper water. Based on these characteristics, it is not anticipated that water temperatures will be modified by the proposed project.
16a	Proposer does not discuss where seed to restore native vegetation will be sourced. Native plantings should be based on current and historical vegetation use, seeds and plants appropriate for the soils, and hydrology of the restoration areas.	We concur. The final selection of native seed has not been made at this time. The project's intent is to use Native plantings based on current and historical vegetation, seeds, and plants appropriate for the soils, and hydrology of the restoration areas. Multiple sources for these natives are available within northwestern Minnesota, including Prairie Land Management, Inc. and Glacial Ridge Growers of Glenwood, Woodland Prairie Specialties of Waubun, and Prairie Restorations, Inc. of Princeton. The project intends to work with the landscape architect and growers to select the native plantings and develop an establishment and maintenance plan in conjunction with an experienced prairie restoration landscape contractor.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
16a	The EAW should describe mitigation activities for preventing the introduction of terrestrial invasive species during construction.	The project proposer will post signage in the RV Park notices of AIS concerns and how to prevent AIS. WEN will also source local wood for campfire to avoid transport of terrestrial invasive species.
16a	The EAW must discuss how the project will align with the objectives of preserving wildlife and habitat, specifically with the preservation of vegetation and integrity of the shoreline and shallow water zones.	The project proposes native upland buffer to enhance the sites ecological, wildlife, and habitat structures. This is proposed as an improvement to the current condition agricultural landuse, with the goal of allowing native communities to become reestablished. The native community restoration will further provide wildlife, habitat, and water quality benefits to Star Lake.
16a	A review of state-listed species within the county would provide a more robust discussion of additional rare wildlife and plant species for which project development could affect. The proposer should conduct a robust, field survey of the project site and surrounding area to determine the status of state-listed species. Proposer should also provide a map of USGS land cover and historical vegetation.	Comment noted. Listed species include the Grey Wolf (TimberWolf) and Northern Long-Eared Bat. Wolves are uncommon to this area, and there are no known roost trees or hibernacula in Otter Tail County for NLEB, based on the most recent survey information from the FWS. This site location was mostly intensive farmland and farmstead.
16a	The EAW states there are no known occurrences of Northern Long Eared Bat (NLEB) roost trees or hibernacula within one mile. Is this based on most recent mapping? How does proposed tree removal meet the guidelines set by the US Fish and Wildlife Service Final NLEB rule? The Information of Planning and Conservation (IPaC) Trust Resources Report suggests 20 migratory bird species of conservation concern, Gray Wolf, and NLEB may occur within the project area. If these species are located nearby it is likely some will utilize or be found within the project area. The EAW must discuss how the project will mitigate impacts to these species.	The NLEB informaton presented in the EAW is from the most recent USFWS data. Tree removals will be scheduled to comply with NLEB regulatory restrictions, which will be a condition of the CWA Section 404 permit. Migratory birds and gray wolf are all mobile animals, and may or may not occur at or near the project site.
16a	Creeping Juniper can grow on talus slopes, cliffs, exposed bedrock ridges - are any of these habitats available within the site?	Within the proposed footprint of the project, there are no known talus slopes, cliffs, exposed bedrock ridges, sand dunes, or sand barrens. There are old shelterbelts established, which would shade the Creeping Juniper.
16a	Have the plant surveys for Creeping Juniper that were requested by the DNR been conducted?	No. Previous known locations of this species were found along the sandy shoreline at a different arm of Star Lake, in 1949. Since the project is not proposed at that location, and will not impact known habitats of the species (talus slopes, cliffs, exposed bedrock, sand dunes/barrens, or sandy beaches), it is not likely present at the proposed site. Additionally, Creeping Juniper does not readily establish naturally in human impacted sites. The footprint of the proposed project has been impacted by human activity, it is unlikely that this plant would be present.
16a	The EAW fails to discuss under what circumstances the disturbance of red-necked grebes will take place and the timing of when the proposer will avoid disturbance during breeding season.	The Red-Necked Grebes almost always are in water and will rarely venture out on land. There is a thick stand of vegetation several hundred feet wide between the open water and the land where the project is proposed. Considering the nesting and travel patterns of the birds, there may be nesting sites at the interface of the vegetation and the open water. This location is at least 200 feet, and in some locations 350+ feet from the shore. As stated the the EAW, the proposers will maintain a natural shoreline, utilize proper stormwater management, maintain proper erosion control measures during construction and remove those erosion control measures as soon as vegetation is established, and plant a permanent native vegetated buffer, totaling an additional 75 feet. Considering these protection measures, and the natural vegetated buffer that currently exists, impacts to this species are expected to be minimal and temporary.
16a	OTC is located in the historic range of the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee. Will native plantings be used to provide habitat for pollinators?	Part of the restoration plan is to use a Native Prairie seed mixture in the Upland Buffer and elsewhere as a natural landscape feature. These native seed mixes consist of a ecologically appropriate mix of native grasses and forbs.
16a	There is no discussion of MN DNR Native Plant Communities, Biological Survey, Regionally Significant Ecological Areas, Sensitive Shorelines, Conservation easements, or Lakes of Biological Significance in the EAW.	<p>The MnDNR GeoSpatial Commons was queried for natural resources-related geodatabases and shapefiles. Among the many data sources consulted were several displaying field survey results from the Minnesota County Biological Survey (MCBS). No native plant communities mapped by the MCBS were documented on or near the project site. The nearest MCBS-mapped native plant communities are approximately 2.5 miles from the site and include mesic hardwood forests and marshes.</p> <p>Wetlands and upland hardwood forests have been documented and described for the project site, but they have not be included in MCBS survey results. The DNR database of MCBS Sites of Biodiversity Significance does not include any areas on the project site. The closest mapped area is approximately two miles from the site and is rated "below the minimum biodiversity significance threshold." The next nearest site is the location of the above-reference MCBS native plant communities with mesic hardwood forest and marshes. That area is rated as "moderate biodiversity significance."</p> <p>The DNR databases of Regionally Significant Ecological Areas applies to the seven-county metropolitan Twin Cities area and does not include Otter Tail County.</p> <p>A DNR sensitive shorelines database was reviewed. The geographic scope of the database is the northcentral portion of the state and does not include Otter Tail County.</p> <p>No conservation easements are known from the project area. A DNR and BWSR database of conservation easements documents that the nearest are over 6 miles away from the site. Databases of wildlife lakes and migratory waterfowl feeding and resting areas show no formally DNR-designated areas within the project area. This does not mean that Star Lake lacks wildlife and waterfowl habitat, merely that no areas have been formally designated as defined in state statutes and regulations.</p> <p>Star Lake is rated a DNR Lake of Biological Significance. There are four components that are evaluated to determine that rating: aquatic plants, fish, amphibians, and birds. Only one of these components needs to be rated outstanding for the lake to be considered a Lake of Biological Significance. Star Lake is rated moderate for aquatic plants; outstanding for fish; unranked for amphibians, and high for birds. The outstanding rating for fish could due to one or more factors including populations of walleye, northern pike, tullibee, overall native fish community, or fish-based Index of Biological Integrity (IBI). The high rating for birds is likely due to colonial water bird nesting areas, particularly the Red-Necked Grebe. Potential impacts to fisheries and water birds, and mitigation measures, are described in detail elsewhere. The project is not expected to have negative impacts on the natural resources that contribute to Star Lakes rating as a Lake of Biological Concern.</p>

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#

SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT

RESPONSE

16a	The EAW does not mention Star Lake's status as a lake of Outstanding Biological Significance. It also does not discuss how project design or mitigatino activities will address or protect this status.	Star Lake is rated a DNR Lake of Biological Significance. There are four components that are evaluated to determine that rating: aquatic plants, fish, amphibians, and birds. Only one of these components needs to be rated outstanding for the lake to be considered a Lake of Biological Significance. Star Lake is rated moderate for aquatic plants; outstanding for fish; unranked for amphibians, and high for birds. The outstanding rating for fish could due to one or more factors including populations of walleye, northern pike, tullibee, overall native fish community, or fish-based Index of Biological Integrity (IBI). The high rating for birds is likely due to colonial water bird nesting areas, particularly the Red-Necked Grebe. Potential impacts to fisheries and water birds, and mitigation measures, are described in detail elsewhere. The project is not expected to have negative impacts on the natural resources that contribute to Star Lakes rating as a Lake of Biological Concern.
16a	Descriptions of visual impacts are vague and include insufficient information. The EAW does not discuss the impacts of the 85-foot tall hotel and casino, large support buildings, entry signs, and large parking lots will have on visual environments. Proposer needs to consider alternatives to avoid or minimize visual impacts and how they will mitigate the visual impacts of all buildings.	See Response L, above. The project is located on both on Fee Land and Trust Land. In both locations the project is adhering to set backs. Visual screening is incorporated through either berming, trees & vegetation, and in some condition both to reduce the visibility from the lake and CSAH 41. More specific information on the structures, parking lots, landscaping, site lighting, and signage have been provided to the county as part of the CUP submittal process. Located on the Fee Land on west side of CSAH 41 will be the sanitary sewer facilities. This consists of two smaller treatment ponds that will consist of structures with earth and vegetated bermed side and a short concrete wall extending above. A larger holding pond will consist of earth and vegetated bermed side. The sanitary sewer facilities are supported by a single story of 900 square feet. A tree line will be planted along the west side of CSAH 41 to provide some visual screening. This facility is similar to many other sanitary sewer facilities located throughout Otter Tail County, including Dent, Underwood, Battle Lake and Perham. The irrigation system for the sanitary sewer facilities is located south of 380th street and east of CSAH 41 on the northern portion of the property. This irrigation system is similar used for adjacent farms and farm fields all over Minnesota and with the sanitary sewer facilities in Battle Lake. Located on the Fee Land on east side of CSAH 41 will be the majority of the facilities support facilities, including parking, water treatment, facilities support building and RV park. Outside of the 1,000 foot Shoreland Management District will be the water treatment building and it's on grade water storage tank, and the facility support building. These building will be similar in appearance and construction to farm buildings and barns located on adjacent properties and those removed from the property last year. The RV park and its support are also located outside of the 1,000 foot Shoreland Management District. The support building will be design to be similar in appearance and construction to farm buildings and barns. The RV park is not visible from Star Lake, being blocked by a grove of trees and the resort hotel and casino building. The RV area has minimal lighting designed with Dark Sky best practices.
16a	Proposer should describe how all signs, parking lots, and buildings will be lit, and how adverse the impacts of lighting will be minimized. Should include number, wattage, location, and type of lights; types, sizes, and locations of signs; and plans for how and when the building, signs, and facility grounds will be lit. The proposer should also describe how best management practices, including Dark Sky Lighting practices, will be implemented.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response L, above.
16a	EAW fails to adequately quantify or describe composition of [air] pollutants, and adequately discuss efforts to avoid, minimize, or mitigate these emissions. To which air quality standards will the project adhere? How will compliance occur? The assertin that the diesel generator will cause "negligible emissions" is not supported by any evidence. What type of generator is it and what is its emissions profile? How often will it be tested and how will it be operated during emergencies?	Potential to Emit calculations will be performed prior to installation to determine whether MPCA air permitting is necessary. If permitting is required, operation of the unit will be done under federal and state air rules. Emergency generators to power the facility are typically exercised under load monthly for up to one hour to verify that they are in working order. Under emergency conditions, they will run as long as they need to until repairs are made.
16a	The conclusion that impacts from vehicle emissions will be minimal is not supported by any evidence. It is impossible to draw conclusions when no modeling/calculations have been performed or reviewed. The EAW does not appear to consider the vehicle emission impacts of the routine operation of the hotel and casino (i.e., food delivery, hotel necessities, etc.). Proposer should discuss how these operations were considered in estimates and calculations of vehicle emissions. EAW does not explain how traffic related improvements will help mitigate vehicle emissions or how the improvements were included in estimates or calculations of vehicle emissions.	All traffic information developed for the project is presented in the Traffic Study addendum that includes Otter Tail County current evaluation of a realignment of CSAH 41. Otter Tail County is conducting a Feasibility Study to review the potential of realigning County Road 41 from its current connecting point to MN Highway 108 in order to improve traffic flow and overall connectivity while mitigating existing issues along MN Highway 108. MnDOT is also conducting a study of the MN Highway 108 and County Road 41 intersection, with the section of roadway immediately adjacent to the intersection along MN Highway 108, in order to determine potential effects of modifying the MN Highway 108 design and intersection improvements. The timeline associated with the outcomes of these studies is not known at this time. Review of the County Road 35 intersection with County Road 41 has been recommended as part of previous study and will be conducted at a later date.
16a	EAW fails to achieve the minimum standards of [the Noise] section. Claims are conclusory at best and significant amounts of required information are missing.	As no outdoor amplified music or public address systems will be used, the proposed project is primarily an indoor entertainment center, and all but one residential noise receptor is a minimum of 1/2 mile away, no noise modeling was performed. On quiet evenings, it is likely that some nuisance noise may be heard from the proposed facility. Otter Tail County has not enacted a noise ordinance, therefore, the site is subject to the State noise rules found at MN Rules Chapter 7030, which generally limits noise to 50 decibels or less in noise area classification 1.
16a	EAW does not adequately describe the sources of noise and how the sources of noise were determined. Proposer should discuss what other noise sources exist (other than traffic). Considering the project will generate significant new traffic, the proposer should also discuss how much noise the increased traffic will create. There's no mention on efforts to avoid or minimize noise generation. Should also discuss measures to mitigate the effects of the noise. This is required.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
16a	Entirely fails to include any detailed information about the characteristics, duration, quantities, or intensity of noise generated during operation. It is inadequate to state that "excessive noise" is not "expected" once construction is complete. Quantifiable descriptions of all types of noise generated, expected or otherwise, should be included.	As no outdoor amplified music or public address systems will be used, the proposed project is primarily an indoor entertainment center, and all but one residential noise receptor is a minimum of 1/2 mile away, no noise modeling was performed. On quiet evenings, it is likely that some nuisance noise may be heard from the proposed facility. Otter Tail County has not enacted a noise ordinance, therefore, the site is subject to the State noise rules found at MN Rules Chapter 7030, which generally limits noise to 50 decibels or less in noise area classification 1.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Willdlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
16a	EAW is deficient in explaining that the increase in vehicle traffic and peak traffic flows could be injurious to the public health, safety, and welfare. The estimated traffic increase is inaccurate in a number of respects. The "comparable sites" are not actually comparable (they are from California, no comparable sites are from Minnesota). Gaming Floor Area is not an accurate metric for projecting traffic generation. Estimates do not seem to include the differences in traffic during weekends and holidays. EAW states that the peak hour traffic and total daily trips fall just short of the thresholds that would trigger a traffic impact study. The proposer should disclose the exact details and methods of the calculations.	All traffic information developed for the project is presented in the Traffic Study addendum that includes Otter Tail County current evaluation of a realignment of CSAH 41. Otter Tail County is conducting a Feasibility Study to review the potential of realigning County Road 41 from its current connecting point to MN Highway 108 in order to improve traffic flow and overall connectivity, while mitigating existing issues along MN Highway 108. MnDOT is also conducting a study of the MN Highway 108 and County Road 41 intersection, with the section of roadway immediately adjacent to the intersection along MN Highway 108, in order to determine potential effects of modifying the MN Highway 108 design and intersection improvements. The timeline associated with the outcomes of these studies is not known at this time. Review of the County Road 35 intersection with County Road 41 has been recommended as part of previous study and will be conducted at a later date.
16a	EAW does not present a thorough discussion on traffic congestion, only presents conclusory information regarding the capacity of the roads. No evidence, calculations, or other verifiable information is presented. Also fails to discuss efforts to avoid or minimize or mitigate impacts to transportation systems.	All traffic information developed for the project is presented in the Traffic Study addendum that includes Otter Tail County current evaluation of a realignment of CSAH 41. Otter Tail County is conducting a Feasibility Study to review the potential of realigning County Road 41 from its current connecting point to MN Highway 108 in order to improve traffic flow and overall connectivity while mitigating existing issues along MN Highway 108. MnDOT is also conducting a study of the MN Highway 108 and County Road 41 intersection, with the section of roadway immediately adjacent to the intersection along MN Highway 108, in order to determine potential effects of modifying the MN Highway 108 design and intersection improvements. The timeline associated with the outcomes of these studies is not known at this time. Review of the County Road 35 intersection with County Road 41 has been recommended as part of previous study and will be conducted at a later date.
16a	No consideration of potential increase in boat traffic. How will the development mitigate these impacts?	See Response D, above.
16a	Does not consider the potential increase in snowmobile and ATV traffic during winter months and potential for guests to access (with or without permission) Star Lake through the proposed project. How will the development mitigate these impacts?	Project developer will post signage to snowmobile and ATV traffic directing them to and from the lake on preferred paths.
16a	The EAW states that none of the potential environmental impacts will result in cumulative impacts and that there are no foreseeable future projects that could cause environmental effects. These claims are unsupported by any evidence and do not even appear to consider the incremental effects of the various environmental impacts potentially caused by this project. Even if many of the environmental impacts provided in the EAW are mitigated the cumulative impacts of the project(s) will drastically alter the existing human and natural environments.	See Response J, above.
16a	Summary of the inadequacies and potential environmental impacts that support the Environmental Review Team's conclusion that OTC should require an EIS: Substantial, irreversible cumulative impacts; Adverse impacts to water resources, caused by the wastewater treatment and stormwater management project components; Short- and long-term impacts to fish, wild, and plant resources as a result of the construction process and facility operation; Adverse effects to the visual character of the site; Gross incompatibility of the proposed project and the existing character of the site and surrounding areas; and Negative impacts to transportation systems and highway safety caused by the increased trip generation and year-round operation of the casino and hotel.	See Response A, above.
16b	USACE has "Closed" the file on the Dredge and Fill Permit application filed by the developer last fall. SLCCG does not fully understand the full legal implications of this, but do feel it warrants your attention. It also feels like a slight to the many good citizens who took the time and effort to provide an approximate 130+ comment letters during the comment period. More specifically, the SLCCG respectfully submits that without the require "Dredge and Fill Permit," Otter Tail County should issue a positive declaration for an Environmental Impact Statement to provide the full due diligence that this matter deserves.	An inquiry to the USACE indicates that the permit application was administratively closed based on a lack of response from the applicant. However, the USACE has received a response and the permit application has been administratively reopened.
17	Replacing wetlands with 15.5 acres of impervious surface will lead to over 11 million gallons of unfiltered water draining into surrounding wetlands and Star Lake. Run off ponds in Becker and Roseau will do nothing for the quality of Star Lake. The proximity of the planned water runoff holding ponds and the seasonable high ground water table are not adequate per the MPCA. The EAW does not explain how the development will handle the increase runoff so an EIS is necessary.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The purchase of wetland bank credits for the purposes of on-site mitigation are not "run-off ponds", but high-functioning restored wetland that has been placed into the wetland banking system, for purchase and use by other landowners. As detailed in the EAW, the increase in impervious surface is regulated by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), which requires stormwater ponds be constructed to treat runoff prior to discharge into other water resources. The final design will meet the standards of the NPDES via the construction of infiltration, biofiltration, retention ponds, and other stormwater ponds. The additional stormwater will be treated prior to discharge into other surrounding water resources, via rate control and treatment via retention, and if determined feasible, through infiltration/biofiltration.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
17	Waste water treatment plan is extremely worrisome. The EAW says the current plan of locating the waste-water treatment area adjacent to the wetland is "the most adequate means of managing site waste water," "the most adequate" is not synonymous with safe. Unlike other cities with similar systems, this one is directly adjacent to wetlands and a lake, meaning any failure can lead to health hazards for resort goers and landowners. Animals who live in and rely on the lake will be negatively affected by an increase in the growth of algae. An EIS is absolutely necessary to prevent these risks or find a better alternative.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The wastewater ponds will be permitted by the MPCA who will have plan review before issuance of a permit. The preliminary secondary cell will have an operating range from 2' to 11' with a 14' levee height to provide 3' of freeboard. The secondary aerated cell will have a 240-day storage capacity for the design flow of 58,000 gallons per day and will be constructed with a liner to prevent seepage. No discharge will take place from the lagoon system to a surface water as irrigation will be used as the method of releasing the treated wastewater. The sanitary treatment ponds do not receive or discharge stormwater, so the risk for failure is low. The amount of freeboard (height needed to overflow) is high enough that it would handle an entire years worth of precipitation.
17	This is a rural area and should be left as one without the neon and flood lights, increased traffic, garbage, and noise pollution.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
17	The environmental impact of potential future expansions are not addressed in the EAW. The unknown plans of this expansion will increase the pollution and health hazards to the environment. Once the water quality of a lake is compromised and a wetland is destroyed they are impossible to restore.	Comment noted, thank you for your comment. Expansion plans are not identified as imminent to the project. As with any business expansion is possible based on market conditions. See Response J, above.
18	USACE closed the file on the Dredge and Fill Permit due to lack of response from White Earth Nation. The Pine Point alternative site would have better economic potential, yet this point was omitted from the applications submitted for the Star Lake Casino site. In the CWA, guidelines require that the applicant demonstrate there are no practical alternatives with less adverse impacts on the environment. A 12.4-acre lakeshore parcel was not included. This was to get around lakeshore ordinances (others have been denied doing the same thing), and USACE asked for responses to this and received none. An EIS must be done.	An inquiry to the USACE indicates that the permit application was administratively closed based on a lack of response from the applicant. However, the USACE has received a response and the permit application has been administratively reopened.
19	Is this a casino or a resort? These are NOT synonymous or interchangeable.	Your comment is noted. The EAW describes impacts identified from the specific uses identified in the project description. We do not see how the classification as resort or casino would alter the described impacts.
19	The proposer is not identified, only a contact person is. Per Minnesota Rules 4410.0200 Subpart 68, the entity that applied for or would receive the approval for the project and not a consultant, attorney, or other entity or person representing the proposer should be listed. What entity is the proposer? Different ownership titles on various parcels of land make it confusing as to who the ultimate project proposer is. What are the implications of having a project that spans multiple parcels, different landowners, and different jurisdictions?	The project is proposed by the White Earth Nation, through its White Earth Enterprises LLC, formed under the authority of the White Earth Tribal Code. Although the question of the proposer is noted, there was no ambiguity in the proceedings regarding the proposers. The differences between fee ownership by the band and the lands held in trust for the band may be confusing. However, the EAW correctly identifies the parcels being utilized in the project and their status. It further describes the nature of the oversight of project components in relation to the underlying ownership status. Since the EAW considers the impacts from the entire site, the jurisdictions and ownership differences are addressed. The needs decision will need to include a description of any differences in the extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing regulatory authority.
19	More details should be provided about the resort amenities and what phases they are planned for. Especially for what type of gaming they are planning and the size of crowds expected. An outdoor community theater is mentioned for the first time, more information about the size, noise level, and events/activities is necessary.	Comment noted. The proposed project is a resort with casino, which includes 850 Slot Machines, (includes slots located in bar tops) 12 table games, with an 84 seat VIP lounge, cage/bank, and Players Club. The food venues include buffet with 158 Seats, bar & restaurant with 144 seats indoors, patio with 85 seats, entertainment lounge with 36 seats, and a center bar with 26 seats. Administration or back of house includes, offices, training room, employee dining room, laundry, wardrobe, locker room, loading dock, storage, MEP support spaces, hotel resort scope, 180 key hotel rooms, indoor/outdoor hot water spa, hotel offices, grand hall/lobby, fire place lounge, porte cochere outdoor space to include walking trail, RV Park with a support building, and associated parking. In addition, there will be potable water treatment and storage facilities, and wastewater treatment ponds with the wastewater treatment system.
19	What is the proposer's strategy for protecting and preserving (not destroying) historical and archaeological sites and artifacts?	The site is subject to Section 106 historic preservation review under the federal permit actions as well as the Tribal Historic Preservation office.
19	Traffic during construction and once operational is a major concern due to the tight, curvy roads and their limited visibility. The primary roads are discussed in the EAW, but smaller, local township roads need to be addressed as they are commonly used by pedestrians. This project does meet the NEED for an EIS.	See Response A and E above.
20	The project will require a Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification (401 Certification) or waiver from the MPCA to verify compliance with state water quality standards.	Correct. The project is subject to Section 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act.
20	Concern that ESA investigations were not sufficient. Recommends the project be enrolled in the MPCA's Brownfields Program to receive liability assurances and assistance to manage ground contamination. Page 28 says the MPCA stated "the project site location does not require additional corrective action." Clarification that this was in regards to surface spill from a tank and not in reference to the other areas of concern identified at the project site.	Petroleum-impacted soil was identified below a storage tank discovered among the debris piles onsite. The tank was not associated with any pump or piping, so it appeared to have been staged, but not put into use, on the property. The analytical results for the impacted soil were reported to the Minnesota Duty Officer on August 22, 2016, along with a description of the horizontal and vertical extent of the observed soil contamination, which consisted of approximately 10 cubic yards. The notification was assigned incident report #160445. A follow-up phone call was received from Brittany Schuller, MPCA, on September 1, 2016. Because the tank had no piping associated with it or registered use on the property, it did not appear as though it was in use at the time of the spill. Thus, MPCA determined the incident did not meet the definition of a tank release and the incident would not be assigned a leak number. Ms. Schuller stated that MPCA would not be issuing any official response to the report, aside from the phone call. MPCA closed the incident report prior to finalizing the Phase II investigation. As none of the other soil or groundwater samples collected during the Phase II investigation were detected above a level of concern, no additional reporting to the State was performed.
20	This project needs an EIS. This response does not constitute approval by the MPCA.	This was an invalid comment summary. The MPCA letter indicated that a response to their comments was requested along with the needs decision regarding an EIS.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
20	EAW is missing information on abandoned wells, the drilling log, well construction log, registration information regarding the production well installed at the project site, and the planned location of the second production well. Sediment discharge will affect several surface waters, so a 50-foot natural buffer is necessary or equal alternative. The SWPPP will need to show the locations where temporary erosion prevention covers will be applied along with the timeline for completing them. Proposer should consider methods of volume reduction along with proposed stormwater basins, like stormwater harvest and reuse, green roofs, pervious pavement, and/or bioretention or part of the water quality volume. 401 Certification requires the proposer to provide additional details on proposed/expected BMPs to ensure construction won't increase TSS/sediment entering nearby surface waters.	Attached is information on Well #1 that was installed on site. Items attached pertaining to the production well are the plans, the test hole log and the production well log for the new well #1. The redundant well location has not been identified, however the test pumping of well #1 showed stability at over 200 gpm. The water level was also stable for 8 hours at 240 gpm so it is expected that the redundant well would be located within the vicinity of well #1.
20	Calcium chloride has the potential to contaminate groundwater and surface waters. A non-chloride alternative has been used successfully and may work better.	Comment noted and referred to the proposer for consideration.
21	This site is about as environmentally unsuited as a site could be for a casino. I support the need for an EIS.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.
22	Liz Foster-Anderson is no longer serving as the Executive Director of the White Earth Enterprises, LLC, and therefore cannot be the "contact person." White Earth Enterprises, LLC is not registered with the MN Secretary of State as either a domestic or foreign entity. As of June 16, 2017, Central Minnesota Land Company LLC has an inactive status with the MN Secretary of State and was dissolved on March 1, 2017, making it questionable if the organizations are stable enough to complete the project. Should the project continue, the OTC should require deposits and monetary insurance to protect the county and taxpayers. Project Location section includes an erroneous Tax Parcel Number for the fourth parcel listed. The EAW was certified as complete and accurate.	The project is proposed by the White Earth Nation, through its White Earth Enterprises LLC, formed under the authority of the White Earth Tribal Code. Although the question of the proposer is noted, there was no ambiguity in the proceedings regarding the proposers. Financial assurance as a potential mitigation is noted for consideration. The tax parcel number has been corrected in the final EAW. The tax parcel number has been updated from 560015018001 to the correct 56000150108001.
22	The land was designated to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe. There is no legal documentation from the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe granting the WEB authority to develop this property commercially for a single band.	Please see Minnesota Chippewa Tribe Land Ordinance #3. This documents White Earth Nations right to govern the trust land.
22	The omission of the Fee Land Parcel acquired by Central Minnesota Land Company LLC is extremely significant. Developers bought this parcel as part of their quiet (secret) acquisition. This is very material as it provides the proposed "family resort" facility with extensive potential future development and lake access which is ignored in the EAW. This is misleading as the EAW says there is no known future projects in the vicinity.	The commentor is referring to Parcel # 56000100070000 Section-10 Township-135 Range-041, 17.60 AC LOTS 10 & 11 EX TR. This is not considered part of the project as no project development is being conducted at this location. There is no future developed being considered or designed at this time and future development is unknown at this time. See Response J.
22	The EAW requires a full disclosure and analysis of potential effects of potential future expansion now, not when those projects begin later.	Although it maybe reasonable to speculate that there are connected actions like this, it is speculative and the project proposer must provide an accurate description. If the project were to change the environmental review would likely need to be supplemented at that time. See Response J, above.
22	EAW says the project will receive no federal or state funds, but the project includes substantial electrical line and substation requirements provided by Lake Region Electric Cooperative, which is a substantial recipient of subsidized federal gov. financing through the Rural Electrification Administration.	The electrical substation is a connected project defined by the Environmental Quality standards and is listed as such in the EAW; however, the connected project funding is not a subject matter of this Proposers EAW.
22	The adjacent land use is minimized in the EAW, including the most densely populated parts of Star Lake. A comprehensive EIS would acknowledge and examine the existence of more than 120 year-round and seasonal residences, small resorts, and church camps in close proximity to the project site. EIS should study the effects of traffic, noise, sewage pond odors, public safety, loss of enjoyment, crime, and property values in relation to these residences.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, D, E, H, above.
22	The EAW contains a material and misleading error where it incorrectly states the OTC and WEB adopted the Limited Star Lake Comprehensive Plan on Jan. 3, 2017, when it did not adopt the plan. The EAW analyzed historical average traffic counts, not the frequency and impact of peak traffic conditions. The 24-7-365 casino with special weekend and holiday events will result in higher traffic levels and peaks. The Plan does not adequately address costs and sources of funding and provides no assurance that the identified social, safety, and infrastructure concerns can or will be actually addressed. The Plan has no legal standing and there is no definitive plan to resolve issues identified.	You are correct that it was not adopted as a comprehensive plan and does not have the same weight as a comprehensive plan. See Response E, above, regarding traffic.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
22	The EAW says Star Lake is large and highly developed, nothing could be further from the truth. The south arm should be protected as a Natural Environment body of water. It should be protected through the application of Natural Environment Standers as it was in 2010 in the DuCharme campground proposal. An EIS should be ordered to included analysis under the Natural Environment Standards. Even though OTC has no control over what happens on federal Trust Land, as the RGU it should consider the cumulative effects of the total project as what happens on Trust Land doesn't stay on Trust Land.	Star Lake is classified by the Shoreland Management Ordinance as a General Development Lake. The comment regarding "largely and highly developed" is in relation to this General Development Shoreland Classification and is simply quoting the definition of what a General Development Lake is. The project effects and need for an EIS is being considered as a whole. See Response A, above.
22	An EIS would require an analysis of project alternatives, including the environmental conclusions under a "no-build" scenario. There are reasonable project alternatives that have not been evaluated or disclosed by the proposers which could substantially reduce the disturbance of the environmentally sensitive south arm of the lake. The proposed dredge and fill of the 14.5 acres of federal Trust Land could potentially be eliminated. The EAW requires discussion of how the project will change the number or type of watercraft on any body of water. Their statement that no increase in watercraft on Star Lake ignores their ownership of the lakeshore and potential docks that may be built there. There will be an increase of "gawker" traffic and curiosity seekers which is not taken into account. Float plane traffic, ATV, and snowmobile traffic in the arm need to be addressed.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The EAW process reviews the project as proposed and does not necessarily include an alternatives analysis. The proposed project is evaluated for it's potential to include significant environmental effects. See Response A regarding Environmental Impact Statements. See Responses A and D.
22	The issue of lighting is lacking detailed analysis considering its potential impact. A lighting plan, including its effects on migrating and nesting birds, should be available to the public.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. There was a significant amount of effort made to design the facility in such a way that it would reduce the amount of light impact to the surrounding area. The development will be using best practices for Dark Sky Lighting to reduce impact on night sky, to adjacent properties by lighting trespass and nocturnal wildlife. Dark Sky practices included reduce lighting levels, downward directed lighting fixtures, lower mounting height for lighting fixture, and lighting colors below 3,000 Kelvin. Additional site lighting information and photometric is part of the Conditional Use Permit and will be provided with that application.
22	The odor and noise impacts are minimized by the proposer. The negative effect on the Environment and Neighborhood from promotional entertainment should be disclosed.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
22	The EAW does not discuss the potential for proposed dredge and fill activity involving 450,000 +/- cubic yards of sand and gravel fill to result in pressure related elevation and rotational shift. Meaning sand bars or lakes may be formed in the lake, such as when it happened with the County 41 bridge. The size and scope of the project and incomplete consideration of detrimental social, economic, safety, and infrastructure issues on the surrounding townships require the rigors of a full EIS. The entire project needs to be considered as a whole entertainment complex, and all alternatives which could minimize the detrimental environmental consequences should be identified, evaluated, and considered.	See Response A, above. The proposed foundation system for the building consists of stone columns that will be constructed beneath the fill soil and through the soft and weak alluvial deposits. Global stability will need to be reviewed as part of the design submittal package for the stone column design build contractor. The stone columns are required to support the foundation loads, however, they will also provide lateral resistance against a global stability failure that would be required for soils to bulge up within the lake. Based on the number of stone columns needed for foundation support, we anticipate there will be sufficient lateral resistance to avoid a global stability failure, but this will be included in the contractor submittal.
22	This project requires an EIS because it will have significant environmental effects on water quality from Star Lake to Otter Tail River and beyond. The EAW of record has numerous errors, omissions, and speculative unsubstantiated conclusions.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.
22	The fact that "minimal information available" is the very reason why a more in-depth analysis required by an EIS should be ordered.	An EAW utilizes best available and reasonably available data. Your comment is noted and considered in the needs decision.
22	Anticipating incorrectly can lead to potentially catastrophic results. The EAW doesn't seem to consider the near-by residences who draw water from shallow sand point wells. The plans to meet the "100-year, 24-hour rain event of 6.13 inches" seems dreadfully inadequate based on the changing severe weather patterns and recent year summer storm experiences. Parking lot spring snow pile melt off (with all its pollutants) are not acknowledged or given special care.	Current engineering design standards have been applied to the project.
22	Replacing the wetlands in Roseau and Becker Counties does nothing positive for Star Lake, Otter Tail County, or downstream waterways.	See Response F, above.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
23	The fourth Fee Total Land is misidentified as 5600150108001, it should be 56000150108001. what other mistakes are there in the EAW? The 12.4-acre parcel on the lakeshore is not listed. Is this a mistake or intentionally omitted? MN Rules 4410.4400 speaks to the requirement of connected actions or phased actions being included in the cumulative effects of the project. It would be less than honest for the proposer to suggest that this parcel is not related/connected to the total project because of how much they paid for the land (shows intention of utilizing it), it would provide access to the main basin of Star Lake for guests, and the recreational access to the lake negates the proposer's suggestion that there would be "no significant change in the number or type of watercraft on Star Lake."	The typo of the Tax ID number is noted and corrected in Final EAW. Although the concern over adjacent fee land is noted, the mere ownership interest does not contribute to the potential for environmental effect. The project does not identify the parcel as part of the project. Should the parcel become part of the project, an evaluation regarding whether it was a phased or connected action would need to be conducted and appropriate decision on environmental review completed.
23	USACE closed the Dredge and Fill permit application file. OTC should be careful about doing anything until USACE makes a decision on the dredge and fill permit. White Earth Enterprises LLC is not registered with the MN Secretary of State, shouldn't this be a point of concern for OTC? The Central Minnesota Land Company has an inactive status with the MN Sos. Liz Foster-Anderson is no longer employed at White Earth Enterprises, and she was project manager for the proposed development. These last three taint the credibility of the proposer's organization and its plans.	An inquiry to the USACE indicates that the permit application was administratively closed based on a lack of response from the applicant. However, the USACE has received a response and the permit application has been administratively reopened. See Gesponse G above.
23	Gross floor space is 277,000 square feet according to the EAW. MN Rule 4410.4400 says an EIS must be required on any area above 250,000	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.
23	The EAW does not include Tuilbees (Cisco) for which Star Lake is known to have a large and healthy population. Even more suspect due to published concerns and discussions on the general decline of the Cisco population and lakes that support the species. The Common Loon is another species that would be at risk due to negative environmental impacts The proposer's assertion that the unnamed lake west of Hwy 41 has minimal information and therefore is unimportant to discuss. The DNR classified it as an "Environmental Sensitive Lake" and it drains directly into Star Lake. The placement of the waste water system uphill and within OTC Shoreline Management Ordinance jurisdiction is a potential environmental travesty.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. DNR's LakeFinder identifies the following Fish Species: black bullhead, black crappie, bluegill, brown bullhead, burbot, green sunfish, hybrid sunfish, largemouth bass, northern pike, pumpkinseed, rock bass, smallmouth bass, tullibee (cisco), walleye, yellow bullhead, yellow perch, bowfin (dogfish), common carp, shorthead redhorse, and white sucker. However the survey reports listed did not identify cisco specifically nor is there any population information provided. The EAW correctly indicated that there was minimal information on the Unnamed Lake. It is a consideration in the needs decision. Waste water facilities are an allowable use in shoreland.
24	The EAW is superficial in nature, it does not address detailed technical concerns, such as: Impact on site prep and ore samples needed for ground stabilization. Moderate risk of the ground settling and the building being condemned. Preventing erosion is critical. The ground will shift if too much pressure is exerted in winter and if ice gets thick, the impact on a breach here would be devastating. No technical information on the construction process let alone the total impact on the lake during construction and site prep. I have never seen such a weak and superficial report on the environment on the impact on a proposed major construction project. This is simply an attempt to overlook the details and take huge risks with a significant area lake and furthermore with the impact on Dead Lake too. Demand the more detailed environmental study.	Your comments are noted. The level of information provided in the EAW regarding soils and geology was considered sufficient to determine the potential for significant effect. EAW's are intended to be a brief document which is designed to set out the basic facts necessary to determine whether an EIS is required for a proposed project or to initiate the scoping process for an EIS. See Response A, above.
25	The original purpose of the land was for wild rice harvesting and should remain so. Continue to be good stewards of our resources. Recommend an environmental impact statement be completed.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A above.
26	The destruction and filling of 7.4 acres of critical wetlands to the south bay of Star Lake and disturbance of another acre for a period of time during construction are the most important issues to Star Lake and Dead Lake property Owners. The effects caused by destroying these wetlands need to be further examined. The Wastewater System proposal may meet MPCA requirements and other communities use them, but the location of the system raises an issue. If there was a failure it would have negative impacts on the water quality of the watershed. Stormwater runoff during construction and after completion is another major concern. Overland flows into Star Lake or Unnamed Lake are a concern due to the exposed soil. The biggest concern is whether the plan is implemented by the developer and is inspected on a regular basis to maintain compliant with their plan.	Comments noted. See Response F, Response H, and Response I.
26	The EAW states that there will be no accumulative effects from foreseeable projects. This is completely false due to the fact there is planned expansion to development. There are going to be accumulative effects and this should be part of the current EAW. This is a requirement but it was omitted from the proposal.	The EAW addresses the comment as follows : If the project is successful, future stages may include expansion of hotel and gaming areas, expansion of the RV parking area, addition of rental cabins and/or a golf course, or other amenity improvements. No master plan, construction plans, or timeline has been established for these future stages. As planning for these future stages begin, the need for a new environmental review will be evaluated and appropriate reviews will be conducted. See Response J.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
26	The current characteristic of the land is rural and the current proposed development is not compatible	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
26	The development does not meet structure height, minimum impervious surface, open space requirements on the Trusted Land. All other landowners and developments are required by law to meet these expectations. This leads to frustration on landowners' side as they should not be able to combine Fee and Trust lands to look like they meet requirements.	Your comments are noted. As noted in the EAW the height is exceeded on the Trust Land. Other requirements cited here do not apply to Federal Trust Land. Tribal Trust Land is exempt from the shoreland management ordinance.
26	The casino, hotel complex, and parking lot will forever change the landscape on Star Lake and surrounding area. This will affect humans and wildlife.	Comment noted. The visual impacts were described in Question 15 pg. 36 of the EAW.
26	The size and placement of this proposal will have an impact on wildlife, fish, and plant communities. How will the animals living in this habitat be protected from disturbances?	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
27	It is my hope that an EIS be conducted before the proposed casino project is approved. Environmental, social, and economic risks have been explored and the results demand further review of this project. To ignore the risks and grant project approval before conducting a thorough study would be nothing short of criminal, in my opinion.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.
28	Increased traffic volume on Hwy 41 will pose a safety risk as it is the only corridor to our lake access. The increased boat traffic and the likelihood of contamination of our lake by AIS is also a concern.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response D and Response E.
29	This area is a special wetland in a very rural area. It should remain a wild rice field as part of their cultural heritage of harvesting wild rice to be passed on to generation after generation. Wetlands can be easily destroyed by stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces. The stormwater ponds planned to treat stormwater runoff is not adequate to treat a back to back big storm or an above average wet season. These need constant management and MN spends millions each year trying to clean up its lakes in Mpls. and St. Paul. Wetlands are home to many plants and animals and are important to the migration of birds. Once destroyed they can't be recreated. The open water treatment of the sanitary sewage system is not adequate for the amount of water that will be directed to them. The odor will be unscrupulous. If there is runoff into the lake from the sewage system it would be devastating. How will the impervious surfaces be managed during the winter? Over salting will harm the environment. Light pollution will destroy the night sky by removing the view of the stars. This will also mess up bird migration. Algae in the south arm will multiply and explode due to the phosphorous, sediment, and chlorophyll. Mark Dayton issued an executive order to avoid direct or indirect impacts on wetlands. Minnesota Statutes section 103A.201 subd. 2b states that wetlands of MN provide public value in many ways. I hope the EIS will be ordered for this proposed development.	Your comments are noted and your concerns will be considered as part of the final decision. See Response A, above.
30	An EIS must be completed before this project moves forward. The proposed casino, hotel, bar, restaurants, RV park, event center, and supporting infrastructure do not fit the area and its sensitive lakeshore environment. Reasons include: negative effects on the wetlands, water treatment and runoff concerns, and the roads are not large enough to handle the additional traffic during construction and after opening. Concerned with how this will affect bird flyways, nesting areas, and fishing. Concerned about wetland dredging and filling. Concerned about wastewater treatment and possible runoff - it will harm the pristine Star Lake and the waters it outlets to.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
31	<p>A majority of the landowners care about preserving and protecting the lake for future generations and believe it should be classified as Natural Environmental instead of General Development. Lists multiple references to articles or hearings saying the south and west arms of the lake are fragile and should not be developed on simply because they are classified as General Development. The EAW doesn't address recommendations made by the DNR to conduct surveys or studies on the project area.</p> <p>A survey of the South arm per the Minnesota's Sensitive Lakeshore Identification Manual" should be performed. 75% of the project area will be disturbed during construction.</p> <p>Do not trust the 18-month construction time estimate based on the Bagely Casino. What happens if there's a work stoppage? What if the duration is significantly longer than planned?</p> <p>What is the estimate number of heavy truck trips to the site/yards of fill? How much construction equipment will be transported there?</p> <p>What is the environmental impact of this much disturbance over this duration of time? Has an "Extractive Use Site Development and Restoration Plan" been prepared?</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Shoreland Management Lake Classifications are based on the size of the lake, the general depth of the lake, and the amount of existing development. According to the MN DNR, "these different types of lakes require different shoreland development standards." General Development Lakes meet the following criteria "Usually have more than 225 acres of water per mile of shoreline and 25 dwellings per mile of shoreline, and are more than 15 feet deep." In accordance with the DNR Shoreland Management Lake Classifications, Star Lake is a "General Development Lake".</p> <p>The DNR letter to the proposer indicated the Rare Species Guide should be reviewed to determine the biology, habitat use, and conservation measures for the identified rare species. This guide was used in the preparation of the EAW to determine how to minimize impacts to those and other species. The DNR letter requests that the DNR Regional Nongame Specialist, Christine Herwig, be contacted to determine the status of the red-necked grebes on Star Lake. As stated in the EAW, the DNR Regional Nongame Specialist was contacted and provided information on the red-necked grebes. As stated in the EAW, Ms. Herwig also provided recommendations on how to reduce the impact to those and other species, which are included in the EAW. The DNR letter indicated that if trees are to be removed with the proposed project, a survey for bald eagle nests should be conducted. As stated in the EAW, prior to disturbing trees, a survey for bald eagle nests will be conducted in accordance with DNR guidelines by a White Earth Conservation Officer or designated representative. In accordance with those guidelines, the survey should be conducted closer to the time of disturbance, and therefore was not done prior to the completion of the EAW.</p> <p>The Sensitive Lakeshore Identification Manual specifies that the areas to be surveyed are the water area adjacent to the shore, the shoreline itself, and up to 50 feet from the ordinary high water level. As shown on Figure 4A of the EAW, these areas will be undisturbed by the proposed project. Existing vegetation will be left in place.</p> <p>The County expects that WEN has done its due diligence in hiring fully capable and expert architects and will hire general contractor with years of experience in this type of build.</p> <p>Meyer Woodstone will be importing approximately 2,238 cubic yards of fill for the site, casino, hotel (approximately 150 truck loads).</p> <p>Meyer Woodstone will be transporting approximately 15 pieces of heavy equipment.</p> <p>The only immediate impact is removal of vegetation in the construction area. Immediate erosion control will be in place to assure no additional disturbance occurs on adjacent sites. Because all material is staying on site and only engineered soils imported the proposer finds that an Extractive Use Site & Restoration is not applicable to this project.</p>
31	<p>All of the numbers in the Combined Shoreland Development Area east of County Rd 41 are incorrect, should we trust any of the numbers?</p> <p>Are there really only 12.56 acres of the 20.2 acres of impervious area in the 1000' SMO zone? Should we be combining the measurements for Star and Unnamed SMO zones or evaluating each of them independently?</p> <p>Are concrete lined wastewater and stormwater ponds really pervious surfaces?</p> <p>Should we be including wetland areas that are to be dredged and filled in the calculation?</p> <p>Has anyone validated the accuracy of the measurements?</p> <p>What if thousands of gallons of sulfate-rich wastewater were inadvertently discharged into the lake or wetland?</p> <p>This project will completely change the hydrology of this important wetland buffer area. We request that Otter Tail County require an EIS be completed.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. See Response A, above. The numbers are correct to the best of our knowledge. The acreage and square footages are based on a civil survey. Measurements are taken from the OHWL of Star Lake. As a result, these acreages in the EAW do not match the acreages listed on the county property records. There is a discrepancy of approximately 38 acres of land to the lake side of the OHWL. There are 12.74 (11.45 + 1.29) acres of impervious surface within the Fee Land SMO district. The Fee Land SMO district is 83.11 (64.82 + 18.29) acres. This is the combined areas for Fee Land east and west of CSAH 41.</p>
31	<p>"Relatively minor changes in elevation and dense tree cover in the surrounding area will result in relatively minimal impacts to the view shed."</p> <p>34 acres of woods/forests before. 16.9 Acres after 422,000 yards of fill for parking/roads in 1000' Shoreland zone alone.</p> <p>This does not sound like relatively minor changes to us, especially considering EOT SWCD's assessment that the entire Star Lake Watershed has 178 acres of wetlands.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>
31	<p>What environmental impact will this project have on the nesting sites of birds?</p> <p>How does the casino plan to protect the natural shoreline from the affects of casino/resort goers?</p>	<p>The proposed project identifies a buffer zone of native, non-mown (i.e. 4-5 feet in height) prairie, intended to provide habitat for birds and further protect to the natural shoreline of Star Lake. See Response D, above.</p>
32	<p>Much of the area relies on the lakes. The land shouldn't be sold off to build on it. If it goes to an EIS, I know that it won't fly</p>	<p>Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.</p>
33	<p>An environmental study must be done as no individual would ever be allowed to fill in several acres of state-owned lake, so why would this commercial venture be allowed? We live on Hwy 41 and do foster care so new children have to learn to be careful crossing the street. People already ignore the 35mph, with a casino it would be even more dangerous. Star Lake is envied by area lake residents that wish their lakes could be as clear as Star. Let's keep it that way.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A. Wetland permitting in the state of Minnesota, regardless of project proposer, must go through a thorough regulatory review process, including sequencing, which must show wetland impact avoidance, minimization and mitigation of wetlands that cannot be avoided. The proposed project will be subject to the same regulatory framework, and is subject to the federal Clean Water Act (Section 404) and the Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act. Your comments regarding traffic and water quality are noted.</p>

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
34	Consider the environmental impact of this casino complex in this pristine lake area. I don't think any rules, regulations, or restriction can protect this area from what the damage could be in this sensitive lake area. 24-hour lighting non-stop will change the landscape. The odor from lagoons, the huge increase in traffic is a safety concern of major proportion, and water and land pollution.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
35	Star Lake is one of only four sites in Otter Tail County specifically identified as a destination for harvesters. Motorboat use can be very damaging to wild rice. All stages of wild rice growth provide food resources [to waterfowl]. It is also a breeding and nesting area for many species. 17 species of special concern use wild rice (listed in Tomorrow's Habitat for the Wild and Rare).	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
35	Statement claiming the project is compatible with the existing land use is false and inaccurate because: LSLCP is not an accepted guidance plan by the county, nor did the proposer or county allow the current users of the area a representation in the process.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comments. Development in the County is guided in part by the General Plans, applicable Specific Plans, and Shoreland Management Ordinances. While the construction of the project would not be subject to local land use policies, as discussed Page 9-11, the Tribe has agreed to develop tribal projects on the trust land in a manner that is generally consistent with the Counties' Shoreland Management Ordinance in meeting the spirit of guidance. Project would not disrupt neighboring land uses, prohibit access to neighboring parcels, or otherwise conflict with neighboring land uses. The proposer is not modifying the shoreland, or installing docks to the South Arm. The WET also proposes visual barriers, dark sky lighting, and implementation of restorative land uses practices. The LSLCP was accepted by the board, not adopted by the board. You are correct in that it does not have the same weight as a comprehensive plan. However, please note, area residence were invited to two open houses and one public meeting which provided comments either verbally or in writing, in addition an area resident written survey was conduct for public inpt.
35	None of the water quality, wild rice, wildlife and fisheries, or recreations increases are adequately or accurately represented in the EAW.	Comments noted. See Response A and B, above.
35	As the RGU it is OTC's responsibility to protect the fragile ecosystems and environment. This waste water system is different from those mentioned in the EAW because it is for a private, not dependent on this location, and the other 37 are not this close to sensitive wetlands. The Project puts undue threats on the environment with this waste water system. OTC should demand an EIS	The EAW discusses in detail the wastewater treatment process and it will be permitted by the MPCA to ensure that there are no undue threats to the environment. See Response A, above.
35	This development represents yet another threat to the future recreational use. The land was meant to harvest wild rice, this may not be a good business and is not compatible land use decision from an environmental stand point. The rules/laws that require a certain ownership are driving the site of this development. Find another site so the sensitive nature of the proposed site is not compromised. With over 40 years as a DNR Area Fisheries Supervisor, I have evaluated hundreds of shoreline development projects and few are more troubling to me than this site.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
35	The shoreline/water quality will be severely impacted.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
35	The new wastewater treatment and ponds could fail, harming water quality and wild rice surrounding the area.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
35	This area is a prime habitat for waterfowl species as well as hunting - further study and representation is needed. Some waterfowl are sensitive to light, sounds, and proximity of humans/infrastructure. The Red Necked Grebe would likely be disturbed (EAW changed it to potentially)	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. It is important to note however that the previous land use at this location included regular human activity also, with light, sounds multiple barns and multiple homes.
36	Commissioners in Mille Lacs County says we should do whatever we could do to stop the casino.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
37	We are concerned about a project that will ignore all laws/rules that protect Star Lake's quality. The impact on the habitat of south arm has the potential to reduce, fishing, hunting, and wildlife observation. Traffic safety. A failed pond would do irreparable damage to the lake. Reminder of Dead Lake project's failure due to not having an EIS and how it cost the taxpayers' money.	Commnet noted. Thank you for your comment.
38	Future development should be planned now, not reactive to this project	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response J, above.
38	A study whose projections and conclusions are based on many assumptions and projections has no merit as a document to support the developer's EAW. Ask the commissioners to require the developer to build its case on fact and science, not on projections found in a document not officially adopted by the RGU. An EIS should be used to support the proposal.	Comments noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.
39	Building a casino on the lake will do harm to the natural beauty and ecosystem of the area. Driving to Star Lake is not easy, it's dangerous, especially if people are coming from a bar. The cost to improve Hwy 108 would be cost prohibitive. The casino doesn't fit in a rural area. Do an EIS!	Comments noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Willdlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
40	Odor control needs to be addressed, it will reduce quality of living in the area. The fact that there are no limits for contaminants is concerning. What risks are there associated with both shallow and deep wells? General concerns about irrigating the irregular shape of the 65.5 acres. Will there be a permanent waste water treatment easement over the 65.5 acres of irrigated land? What assurance does the county have that this land won't be modified in the future?	The wastewater treatment proposal includes aeration in concrete basins for 30 days, 15 days per cell before it is discharged to the aerated secondary cell. Aeration removes odor by adding oxygen to the effluent so the ponds don't become anaerobic, which is an oxygen-poor condition that produces odors. With the irrigation area, the vegetative crop will absorb all of the nutrients discharged. Also note that irrigation sprayers are controlled so that they extend and contract where needed and are programmed so there are no concerns with the irregular shape of the irrigation area mentioned. There is no permanent easement over the irrigated land. As irrigation is the only outlet for the sanitary treatment system the land will continue to be irrigated.
40	How will the added demand on the lower aquifer impact the shallow well's quality and availability of water? Would the drawdown of the new wells be noticeable/detrimental (for example, White Bear Lake)	Attached is information on Well #1 that was installed on site. Items attached pertaining to the production well include the plans, the test hole log and the production well log for the new Well #1. The redundant well location has not been identified, however the test pumping of well #1 showed stability at over 200 gpm. The water level was also stable for 8 hours at 240 gpm so it is expected that the redundant well would be located within the vicinity of well #1.
40	Would the 24-hour action light be a traffic distraction and impact the south arm?	The permanently installed lighting and temporary maintenance lighting proposed for the project will meet the following lighting requirements defined as Darksky Lighting: All lighting will be of minimum necessary brightness consistent with worker safety. High illumination areas not occupied on a continuous basis will have switches or motion detectors to light the area only when occupied. WEN proposes to design and install all permanent lighting such that light bulbs and reflectors are not visible from public viewing areas. Lighting will be designed so exterior light fixtures are hooded, with lights directed downward or toward the area to be illuminated, and so that backscatter to the nighttime sky is minimized. The design of the lighting shall be such that the luminescence or light sources are shielded to prevent light trespass outside the project boundary.
40	This project begs to be expanded to a full EIS to ensure all impacts on the community as a whole are taken under consideration.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.
40	A full EIS is needed on the potential impact of the entire plan (future builds) not just Phase I	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A and J, above.
40	High-density storms are occurring on a more frequent/intense basis resulting in greater impact on the storm infrastructure than anticipated. What will be done if the system fails? What effects will it have on the lake? Who will be monitoring the system? The stormwater management plan does not take into consideration the irrigation field schedule of waste water discharge. The field parallel to 380th St. has overflowed during heavy rain events. How would the irrigated field affect the lake (i.e., fertilizer, pesticides) What measures are being taken and what control will the county have relative to impervious discharge on sovereign land?	Comment noted. The stormwater treatment system is oversized to accommodate more intense rain events by providing storage for a 6.13" rain event over all impervious surfaces created on site. The project proposer is responsible for the control of the maintenance of the ponding system. On the tribal trust land, the EPA has jurisdiction over stormwater BMPs and on fee land the MPCA has jurisdiction, and have the authority to enforce non-performing systems, so regulatory oversight exists. There are no impervious surfaces being created in the area of irrigation so there is no stormwater ponding provided. Irrigation will take place during dry weather conditions when the cover crop will be able to absorb the irrigated discharge. The land to be irrigated has grade as shown in the topographical contours indicated on sheet C-101 of the plans. The project proposer is providing stormwater protections to a 100-year rain event over all impervious surfaces on both the trust and fee land. The stormwater ponding areas are sized to handle large rainfall events. The sanitary system is designed to handle rainfall events that are multiple times larger than any rainfall event that has ever happened in this area.
40	Dent Fire Dept. capacity/training, equipment, and station size concerns. EMT response time, training/capacity concerns. Hospital capacity concerns for Perham, Pelican Rapids, and Fergus Falls Police Enforcement: traffic impact/enforcement, civil disobedience/crime potential/drugs & alcohol Work force/local opportunities Source of employees impact on surrounding communities and school districts Housing Stock	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The commenter's concern is socio-economic in nature, a topic that is outside the scope of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet.
40	The EAW minimizes what is potentially a significant impact on the local county and state highways servicing this project. The study overlooks potential safety throughout the local road network. Visitors who are unfamiliar with the road and were recently at the bar may cause traffic accidents. Visibility and safety concerns for specific areas: MN Hwy 108 and CR 41 Intersection E-W traffic on MN Hwy 108 Northside of Star Lake Hwy 108 South to Galaxy Resort CR 41 & West Arm Bridge 380th St & CR 41 Intersection CR 41 & CR 35 General comments on CR 41's size and ditches	All traffic information developed for the project is presented in the Traffic Study addendum that includes Otter Tail County current evaluation of a realignment of CSAH 41. Otter Tail County is conducting a Feasibility Study to review the potential of realigning County Road 41 from its current connecting point to MN Highway 108 in order to improve traffic flow and overall connectivity while mitigating existing issues along MN Highway 108. MnDOT is also conducting a study of the MN Highway 108 and County Road 41 intersection, with the section of roadway immediately adjacent to the intersection along MN Highway 108, in order to determine potential effects of modifying the MN Highway 108 design and intersection improvements. The timeline associated with the outcomes of these studies is not known at this time. Review of the County Road 35 intersection with County Road 41 has been recommended as part of previous study and will be conducted at a later date.
41	The 65-acre field that the waste water is going to be irrigated on has not had a good crop for many years because it's always too wet. Concerned there will be runoff into nearby wetlands with extra 12 inches of waste water is put onto it. Center pivots will be stuck and it will be a mess. An EIS must be done before this project can move forward.	Your comments are noted. Thank you. See Response A, above.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
42	<p>Water quality issues and the effect of wildlife habitat are big concerns. Taking away wetlands that filter water and are habitats will have a devastating effect for Star Lake. Careful environmental study is necessary for replacing and maintaining them.</p> <p>The water quality has deteriorated over the years, fewer wildlife and fish, and this has been a disturbing trend. The impact of environmental pollution and development has already taken a big toll on Star, a casino will speed up the environmental degradation.</p> <p>The "minimum requirements" should not be the bar for how close the waste water system will be to the lake.</p> <p>The lights and noise will ruin everyone's experience of the lake. Not compatible with the area's character or experience people expect to have at a lake.</p> <p><u>An EIS needs to be done.</u></p>	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.
43	<p>Letter talking about the County/Government's authority over the land owned by WEN, and how it will affect the need for an EIS.</p> <p>County needs to know exactly where the boundary separating the trust land from the fee land is - the EAW is deficient in not adequately identifying the western boundary line.</p> <p>EAW incorrectly presumes the county has no jurisdiction over Trust Land. State regulatory control may be exercised in the interest of conservation.</p> <p>The EAW doesn't identify what components should be considered in conducting a balancing test to determine to what extent the County can consider the environmental impacts of the development and EIS is necessary to address this issue.</p> <p>Federal jurisdiction is not mentioned in the EAW.</p> <p>The EAW is deficient in discussing permits and approvals required.</p> <p>The state's interest in protecting natural resources weighs the need for an EIS more.</p> <p>EAW is deficient in addressing the cumulative impact for both the Trust and Fee lands.</p> <p>EAW is deficient in naming the proposer and necessary relationship that will have to be developed between the proposer, the WEN, County, and LGUs to support the project.</p> <p>Boating impacts on Star and Dead Lake are not adequately addressed in the EAW</p> <p>The proposer has not shown there are no potential significant environmental issues and an EIS should be ordered.</p>	<p>See Responses A and D, above. The federal Clean Water Act preempts Minnesota's environmental regulations governing the development of wetlands located within the State.</p> <p>Federal law requires tribal gaming operations to be located on trust land. 25 U.S.C. § 2703. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act authorizes the Army Corps of Engineers to issue permits for activities that require the development of wetlands on tribal trust land. Before issuing a permit, the Army Corps of Engineers determines whether any less environmentally detrimental alternative will accomplish the applicant's goals. The Army Corps analyzes feasible alternatives in light of the overall purpose of the applicant's goals.</p> <p>Section 401 of the Clean Water Act requires states to set water quality standards. State water quality standards set the conditions that must exist in order to protect beneficial uses of water. When a project will impact waters within Minnesota requires a federal permit, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) reviews the project under Section 401 to ensure that it will not violate the water quality standards that the MPCA has established for that water body. In Minnesota, the MPCA's authority to review and approve, condition, or deny a federal permit that may result in a discharge to waters of the United States within its borders is limited to non-reservation fee land. The Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act sets forth procedures and conditions that must be considered for avoiding and minimizing impacts and for ensuring adequate replacement of lost public value from unavoidable impacts. Minn. R. 8420.0500-.0544 (2017).</p> <p>The White Earth Nation's proposed gaming facility at Star Lake will be constructed on tribal trust land. The provisions of the Clean Water Act governing wetland impact on trust lands apply to the White Earth Nation's permit to fill wetlands at Star Lake. The Army Corps permitting process takes into consideration impacts to surrounding areas. The State of Minnesota's role in applying environmental laws to the White Earth Nation is limited to the extent of jurisdiction as conferred by Congress. The Clean Water Act expressly provides that the Army Corps of Engineers has the authority to issue permits for projects involving the discharge of fill material on wetlands located on tribal trust land. The provisions of the Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act govern only the White Earth Nation's development of the fee land abutting the tribal trust land at Star Lake. Thus, the provisions of the Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act are not relevant to the Army Corps of Engineers in evaluating the White Earth Nation's proposal to discharge fill material into 8.41 acres of trust land on wetlands adjacent to Star Lake for purposes of constructing a gaming facility. Therefore, the application of Minnesota environmental regulations to the White Earth Nation's development at Star Lake is preempted by federal law and Minnesota's regulations cannot dictate development of wetlands on tribal trust land.</p>
44	<p>Recalled the trailer park being prevented a few years ago because West Arm would not be able to handle all the traffic generated, nor would the wildlife that inhabits this area. It was not compatible to the surrounding area. We now face the same dilemma, only on a much larger and more dangerous scale.</p> <p>South Arm is vastly important to countless birds, waterfowl, deer, and other wildlife. It's also important to fish as it is a spawning ground. The aquatic plants keep Star Lake clean.</p> <p>If the casino is built, the impact to the area would be substantial and irreversible. A casino is truly incompatible with the existing character of the site and surrounding areas.</p> <p>The roads are dangerous enough as it is.</p> <p>Please recommend an EIS be completed before it's too late and we are unable to go back.</p>	Comment noted. See Response A, above.
45	<p>Of note here, the federal grade and fill permit application on this parcel is temporarily closed due to lack of required responses from the proposer to the public comments submitted by the public las November. Many of those comments were environmental concerns and bear directly on tonight's discussion would have been nice to examine those responses as part of this EAW process.</p>	<p>An inquiry to the USACE indicates that the permit application was administratively closed based on a lack of response from the applicant. However, the USACE has received a response and the permit application has been administratively reopend. Army Corps of Engineers was aware that White Earth Nations responses would be received after the 30 day period closed. The Army Corps of Engineers can open and close the comment period at their discretion. They received White Earth Nation's response and acknowledge receipt of the responses.</p>
45	<p>...there are those who feel OTC has no control over what happens on the federal trust land and that OTC jurisdiction applies only to the fee land. In part this is true. But in very important part, is not true. In reality, your roll as RGU requires you to consider the full cumulative effects of the total project. What happens on the Trust Land does not stay on the Trust, and visa versa.</p>	<p>The differences between fee ownership by the band and the lands held in trust for the band maybe confusing. However, the EAW correctly identifies the parcels being utilized in the project and their status. It further describes the nature of the oversight of project components in relation to the underlying ownership status. Since the EAW considers the impacts from the entire site, the jurisdictions and ownership differences are addressed. The needs decision will need to include a description of any differences in the extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing regulatory authority.</p>
45	<p>We must all be sure we have done the best scientific and fact-based analysis possible. Much of the EAW is speculative without critical scientific analytical support.</p>	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
45	I submit there are reasonable alternatives that have not been considered by the proposers which could reduce the disturbance of the environmentally sensitive south arm of the lake. The proposed dredge and fill of the 14.5 acres of federal Trust Land could potentially be eliminated. For example, if the proposers scaled down their project and divided it-gaming only to the more suitable northwest corner (only) of the Trust Land and a more modest resort facility on the buildable portions of the Fee Land. This approach might eliminate-or at least limit-intrusion in the south arm marshes to the square footage required for gaming only.	Comment noted, thank you for your comment. Note that the proposed wetland impact totals 7.4 acres.
45	You will hear tonight many convincing arguments why this project will potentially-most probably result in significant adverse environmental effects. Many of which the Minnesota Environmental Rules mandate the RGU (OTC) to call for a full environmental impact statement.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.
45	In your role as RGU, you are required to look at the full cumulative effects of the total project. This is a HUGE project that proposes to operate 24-7-365 that will forever change the environment and the fabric of the rural countryside. An EIS provides the opportunity to thoroughly examine alternatives with the facts and science that minimize adverse environmental impacts.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.
45	Their project screams for an EIS, among other things, would explicitly call for and examination of alternative configurations and their environmental impacts. It would also allow the proposers to disclose their subsequent plans for the shoreline property on the big lake that they have not addressed.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A and J, above.
45	I accept the EAW was developed in good faith, but by definition it is only an overview of potential environmental effects! The consequences of being wrong on this one are permanent and forever. The proximity of the project is to this unique and incredible sensitive watershed is a problem, not so much the project itself.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
46	Documentation providing various tribal proclamation procedures and BIA documents on Guidance on Processing Mandatory Trust Acquisition.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
47	I have grave concerns about cumulative watershed impacts, stemming from parking lot runoff and storm water management in general, not to mention impacts of construction and facility operations on fish and wildlife resources. The proposed area is adjacent to wild rice beds and fish breeding areas. Further, from an aesthetic viewpoint, the proposed facilities will negatively impact the visual character of the site.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
48	...who is the new Shooting Star Casino going to benefit?	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
48	There are also problems with the viability of the project's business model. The proposed site is literally in the middle of nowhere - a 30 minute drive from the nearest interstate highway, down a poorly lit two lane road, and at least 90 minutes from the nearest major population center. The location raises the obvious questions of where the gamblers will come from and how they will get to the casino.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. Economics of proposed projects are not analyzed under an EAW. It is presumed that an entity such as the White Earth Tribe, as good business strategy, has conducted thorough economic feasibility studies, financial plans and market considerations prior to initiating their projects.
48	If we want to do expansion of my property on Star Lake there are requirements so we do not disturb the environment and lake. This needs to apply to other entities as well.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
48	Wet rice lands need to be protected as well. If this natural Reservation heritage disappears, it is gone for ever.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
48	Additional issues I am concerned about are abusive situations that can occur: abuse of chemicals, alcohol usage, along with prostitution on the land and on the water. These serious concerns would be extra expenses Incurred by local residents and/or residents of Otter tail County.	Comment noted, thank you for your comment. The commenter's concern is socio-economic in nature, a topic that is outside the scope of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet.
48	...will need to pay for include: upgrading the roads, increased road maintenance, increased police control both at the local and county level, a jail for temporary confinement, DNR policing of the lake(s), increased EMT and ambulance service just to name a few. There will be additional costs and issues to consider as time evolves.	EAW's do not study local fire, police, water patrol, EMT / First Responder resources. However, White Earth plans to partner with county law enforcement, local emergency services, as well as provide in house first responders.
49	Soil characteristics: % of soils with high potential for erosion = 1.5%; with potential for medium erosion = 86.5% "Because of these soil facts, throughout the construction and life of this project, there needs to be exceptional care taken to control for erosion runoff; where is the detailed, into the future, in the EAW? -Soil permeabilities are rapid for 37.7% of the project area and moderate for 62.3%. If secondary stage waste water is irrigated into Rapid Infiltration Basins, where is the data to show the construction of test wells in those areas to monitor the integrity of the water table against pollution from this irrigated waste water? Where is the data to show the staffing, and supervision of that staffing to monitor these	erosion and sediment control measures will be in place to prevent runoff from the site, and these details will be developed as part of the NPDES permit, that will be implemented by the contractor. There are no Rapid Infiltration Basins (RIBs) proposed with this project. All wastewater facilities will be operated by a licensed operator.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
49	The commercial building area proposed is 277,000. Doesn't this already require an EIS? -WEN states they would use revenues for this casino "to fund the restoration and preservation of cultural sites within WEN such as the tribal museum and historic burial grounds." Has the WEN already used their revenues from existing casinos for these cultural sites?	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.
49	Are future stages planned?" Yes. Increases in gaming area, expansion of RV parking, addition of rented cabins and/or a golf course -Then, OTC needs to consider these future plans in their decision about calling for an EIS	See Response A and J.
49	Land use compatibility:" "Generally compatible with the nearby land uses of agriculture, residential, commercial lodges and resorts." -This is a blatant falsehood and inaccurate comparison of existing land use! NO other resorts have 24/7 gaming facilities with the resulting traffic, nor conference centers for 300 people, nor hotels for hundreds of people. Franks Lodge may compare for RV parking. In addition, no other resort has required (from p. 2) "construction of haul roads, borrow pits for fill, 3-pond waste water treatment facilities! I"	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
49	OTC controls wetland mitigation/replacement, wetland permits, utility permits for wastewater treatment facilities -Here are areas where OTC can call for more detailed data through an EIS. Further, replacing wetlands in other counties or out of State, does nothing to replace the value provided by that wetland right there in the South arm of Star that they plan to remove by filling it!	Comment noted. See Response F. Under both state and federal laws, wetlands are replaced in-state. Out-of-state replacement is not a possibility.
50	The Star Lake Limited Area Comprehensive Plan Is referenced as supporting information in many areas of this EAW and using Otter Tail County's own words in a response to the MN DNR, this is "NOT" an official plan, acts to severely undermine the integrity of the EAW. As you may recall, "Disingenuous" is the term used by the MN DNR in their letter to describe their impression of the Star Lake Limited Area Comprehensive Plan, a description we tend to agree with.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The plan is a reference only and has not been used to develop any ordinance or landuse plan for the area. The plan references do not suggest that it is prima facie evidence that the project is well planned, reviewed by the community, or avoiding of environmental impacts. It simply identifies that it is compliance with the plan and that the plan exists as part of the decision document. The board should not rely on it any more than any other information in the document, but as part of the whole of evidence. If the Limited Star Lake Comprehensive Plan is insufficient to address the specific compatibility, we would agree that additional discussion is warranted. Further discussion on whether this is sufficient to order an EIS is considered in the conclusions.
50	The Star Lake Casino project, as outlined in the project description section of the EAW, is discussed as one single project, not two separate trust land and fee land projects. However, in subsequent parts of the submitted EAW, there are clear attempts to separate this into two projects, appearing to be a means of circumventing the required environmental review process noting a "lack of jurisdictional control" as the reason for doing so. Based on the very clear Minnesota rules, the cumulative effects of including any potential future phases. MUST be reviewed as part of this project's environmental effects. Subp. 9c. Connected actions. Two projects are "connected actions" If a responsible governmental unit determines they are related in any of the following ways: 1) one project would directly induce the other; 2) one project is a prerequisite for the other and the prerequisite project is not justified by itself; 3) or neither project is justified by itself.	The differences between fee ownership by the band and the lands held in trust for the band maybe confusing. However, the EAW correctly identifies the parcels being utilized in the project and their status. It further describes the nature of the oversight of project components in relation to the underlying ownership status. Since the EAW considers the impacts from the entire site, the jurisdictions and ownership differences are addressed. The needs decision will need to include a description of any differences in the extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing regulatory authority.
50	Otter Tail County, as the RGU for this project and now as the entity certifying the completeness of this EAW, must demand that these Minnesota rules and regulations are upheld and followed by the developer. To say the fee land and the trust land aspects of this project are not connected is very wrong and could only be done as a means of short-cutting the proper environmental review process. Something the Minnesota rules also clearly state is not allowable.	The differences between fee ownership by the band and the lands held in trust for the band maybe confusing. However, the EAW correctly identifies the parcels being utilized in the project and their status. It further describes the nature of the oversight of project components in relation to the underlying ownership status. Since the EAW considers the impacts from the entire site, the jurisdictions and ownership differences are addressed. The needs decision will need to include a description of any differences in the extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing regulatory authority.
50	...We won't reiterate all these issues here, however, the most significant, in our opinion, relates to this project's cumulative effects and connected actions. If there were ever a project that needed an EIS, this would be it. After all, this would be the largest commercial development of its kind in OTC and is being proposed directly on top of a centuries old, Star Lake wetland area. Those two factors alone are clearly enough to warrant an EIS to insure a complete environmental review is properly conducted.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.
50	This commercial development is currently being proposed on top of a very sensitive wetland area on Star Lake's south basin. As such, this proposed project must receive the most thorough environmental review possible, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), to insure Star lake and its watershed are protected.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
50	An EIS is obviously the only way to fully insure the potential for significant environmental impact is thoroughly investigated and all the risks identified allowing proper mitigation activities to take place. An EIS would protect everyone involved, the Otter Tail County Officials, the Otter Tail County Taxpayers, the People of the White Earth Nation, and the most importantly, the entire Star Lake watershed for future generations to come. There is simply no sound reason to put all this at risk by not ordering an EIS.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
50	In addition, the Star Lake Casino proposal, if built, would be the largest commercial development of its type ever completed in Otter Tail County. Per the EAW, this projects commercial development area is stated as being -277,000 sq. ft. Under Minnesota Rules 4410.4400 subp. 11.B, an EIS is mandatory for construction in an unincorporated area of a commercial facility that exceeds 250,000 square feet of gross floor space.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
50	The simple fact that this proposal requires over 8 acres of a prime Star Lake wetland extension to be dredged and backfilled with more suitable soils, clearly attests to the potential for significant environmental effects. There are clear Minnesota rules empowering you to insure these risks are properly identified and adequately mitigated prior to issuing the necessary permits. The proper course of action with this highly controversial project would be to order an Environmental Impact Statement to insure all environmental issues are properly identified, reviewed and the potential risks are adequately mitigated.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A and Response F.
51	Increase in light pollution - One of the greatest joys of spending time on the South Bay of Star Lake is the incredible night sky that one experiences on a clear night. A casino, with its three-story building and acres of lighted parking and roadways will ruin the rural night sky in this area forever. Future generations will not have the opportunity to view the sky and stars as we can now.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response L. There was a significant amount of effort made to design the facility in such a way that it would reduce the amount of light impact to the surrounding area. The development will be using best practices for Dark Sky Lighting to reduce impact on night sky, to adjacent properties by lighting trespass and nocturnal wildlife. Dark Sky practices included reduce lighting levels, downward directed lighting fixtures, lower mounting height for lighting fixture, and lighting colors below 3,000 Kelvin. Additional site lighting information and photometric is part of the Conditional Use Permit and will be provided with that application.
51	Environmental Impact Statement is necessary. Mr. Kalar and Otter Tail County Commissioners, the proposal to develop a casino on the shore of the South Bay of Star Lake will forever negatively impact the water quality of the lake, the rural character of the area, the amazing night sky and the safety of the surrounding County roads. For these reasons, it is vitally important that all potential impacts to the lake and surrounding landscape be studied through an Environmental Impact Statement - It is your duty to explore every impact of this, the largest proposed development in this area of Otter Tail County. Requiring an Environmental Impact Statement will help determine what impacts this development proposal will have on Star Lake and the rural area surrounding it.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
51	Negative impacts to the rural character - The area around the South Bay of Star Lake is identified in the County's Limited Area Star Lake Comprehensive Plan as rural and it is noted that this characterization is important to the property owners and residents in the area. As a property owner, I am telling you that the rural character of the area, including farming activities, is extremely important to me. The shoreline of the South Bay of Star Lake is not compatible with large-scale developments, residential, commercial or for a casino. This type of development would negatively impact the rural character of the area and the lakeshore.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment
51	Negative impacts to wetlands, wild rice and water quality - ...today the South Bay of Star Lake contains one of the largest wild rice beds in the State of Minnesota. The proposed casino would seriously jeopardize the water quality, which would impact the wild rice and that would have a negative effect on waterfowl and other migratory birds who depend on the South Bay of Star Lake. Specifically, the developers propose to dredge and fill 8.41 acres of wetlands within Star Lake.	Comment noted, thank you for your comment.
51	Crowded, dangerous, narrow County roads - The idea of developing a casino on County Road 41 on the South Bay of Star Lake is deplorable. The Otter Tail County Road Map, the proposed casino location is notable because it cannot be much farther away from any community in the County. The impact to traffic on the County's roads, specifically County Road 41 and 35 will be large. There will be significant increases in traffic, in accidents potentially with fatalities, and there will be a greater need to make improvements to these roads to accommodate the increase in traffic. The County roads around Star Lake are circuitous because there are so many lakes and wetlands that roads cannot be constructed in a linear fashion. Improving and widening these roads will be very costly, and County taxpayers will be responsible for paying for these improvements.	See Response E, above All traffic information developed for the project is presented in the Traffic Study addendum that includes Otter Tail County current evaluation of a realignment of CSAH 41. Otter Tail County is conducting a Feasibility Study to review the potential of realigning County Road 41 from its current connecting point to MN Highway 108 in order to improve traffic flow and overall connectivity while mitigating existing issues along MN Highway 108. MnDOT is also conducting a study of the MN Highway 108 and County Road 41 intersection, with the section of roadway immediately adjacent to the intersection along MN Highway 108, in order to determine potential effects of modifying the MN Highway 108 design and intersection improvements. The timeline associated with the outcomes of these studies is not known at this time. Review of the County Road 35 intersection with County Road 41 has been recommended as part of previous study and will be conducted at a later date.
52	The EAW is woefully inadequate at looking beyond the footprint or essence it's area of influence.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Willdlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
52	This comment references the LSLCP in a way that lends it undue credibility and reference. By their own admission this document and process was 'not adopted as an official Comprehensive Plan by OTC nor was it accurate in many regards some of my peers will be or already have detailed. For instance, where are the hunters and fishermen or Biologists represented? The plan on addresses things on an assumption that this project will happen.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The plan was accepted by the board, not adopted by the board. You are correct that it was not adopted as a comprehensive plan and does not have the same weight as a comprehensive plan.
52	Please recognize this project in this reference and MANY others I don't have time to address in 2 minutes is entirely incompatible with existing land uses and people/wildlife who use it traditionally and currently. I can live with change, but we owe it to the wildlife, the water quality, and future generations to do our part to ensure that proper site selection and sound developmental practices take priority to shoe-horning and abomination on such a delicate shoreline. I wouldn't care if it were a Radisson or Hilton Project of this size, this IS NOT THE PROPER PLACE FOR THIS...	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
52	As far as non-game waterfowl of importance goes: o DNR identified the Red Necked Grebe as species documented to frequent the bay and recommended to the Proposer (& OTC) that they would warrant more study toward the project's effects on them, o Not only is not done, but the DNR called out the proposer recently in email correspondence for taking it upon themselves to modify the DNR opinion offered that this proposal would 'Likely cause the RL Grebe disturbance' to 'possibly'. If this was only noticed since the DNR drew attention to it, I ask you where else have future impacts been minimized or misrepresented in the developers favor? If ever there was a project in OTG that warranted an EIS, this is it...	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A
53	Project Location. The EAW identifies five parcels, (one of which is misidentified), and omits a sixth parcel. That being 12.4 acres located on the north side of 380 th St immediately north of the acquired fee land. The proposer acquired this land for \$350,000 (which equates to \$28,225/acre), yet has not provided any plans or information for its use. Since this land would provide the only access to the main body of Star Lake it seems highly unlikely that it would not be included in any plans for a "Resort & Casino".	The typo of the Tax ID number is noted and corrected. Although the concern over adjacent fee land is noted, the mere ownership interest does not contribute to the potential for environmental effect. The project does not identify the parcel as part of the project. Should the parcel become part of the project an evaluation regarding whether it was a phased or connected action would need to be conducted and appropriate decision on environmental review completed.
53	MN Rules 4410.4400 provide a lot of specifics related to "EIS Thresholds", one of which is subp 1 "An EIS must be prepared for projects that exceed the threshold of 250,000 square feet..." - However, in the EAW the proposer states the square footage planned as 277,000 square feet. Well, above the stated EIS Threshold, and in of itself, should warrant an Environmental Impact Statement.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
54	Range of Alternatives: Because of ALL the potential issues associated with this very large and complex project, an EIS would result in analyzing the data associated with a "Range of Alternatives to the proposed action. Alternatives are considered the "heart" of the EIS. Every EIS is required to analyze a No Action Alternative, in addition to the range of alternatives presented for study. The No Action Alternative identifies the expected environmental impacts in the future if existing conditions were left as is with no action taken." There are so many angles and considerations to this project; we owe it to all impacted people (residents, visitors, tribal members, taxpayers) and the environment to fully analyze all possible and reasonable alternatives.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
54	Social and Economic Impacts (to be addressed in EIS): I believe it is necessary to further analyze the short- and long-term social and economic impacts (out several generations) that may result from this proposed development on residents and visitors of Otter Tail County, as well as the people of White Earth Nation. Some aspects that are deserving of additional analysis are: available workforce, housing, economic impact to businesses, property values, aesthetics, noise, law enforcement, emergency services, and fire protection, just to name a few. While some of these have a cursory reference in the EAW, more analysis is needed (the information gathered for the LASLCP is inadequate). Possibly a "Social Impact Assessment" should be performed.	Your comment is noted. Should an EIS be deemed necessary and ordered, the socioeconomic impacts, costs and benefits will be considered.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
54	Submission of a Financial Plan: BEFORE this project even considers federal or state permits I believe it is critical that the proposer provide evidence that they have sufficient funding to see this project as outlined to completion. There have been mitigation strategies outlined for various environmental issues, but what about mitigation strategies due to funding inadequacies? What if, like the Bagley casino, it goes over budget? What would be the environmental impacts of starting this project and abandoning it before completion?	Comment noted. Your concern is socio-economic in nature, a topic that is outside the scope of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet.
55	Star Lake Township (SLT) recognizes that the proposed casino project is complex and controversial, with many stakeholders involved...to that end, it is our belief that our primary responsibility is to Star Lake Township residents (i.e. voters), the people & families that live and thrive here on a year-round basis, those that call Star Lake Township "home". Secondly, we must also do what we can to protect the rights of "alt" of our property owners/tax payers - those new and old. It is with these thoughts in mind, that the SLT Board of Supervisors respectfully requests that you insure that this matter receive the most stringent level of environmental review, as well as a review of the socio-economic and public safety concerns involved. It is our understanding that to do so, requires completion of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). We believe to do anything less would be a disservice to our citizens, property owners, and our stewardship of the natural resources of Star Lake Township. We thank you for your careful consideration.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
56	[Owns properties on west arm of Star Lake] Urges an EIS, as the EAW understates concerns of the project. The size of the project and potential impacts of the environment as currently proposed and cumulative effects of futures development; increased traffic; treatment of wastewater not fully considered; light pollution (partially addressed); and signage, which can be intrusive, has not been address; are some of these concerns. An EIS would mitigate some of the negative effects with better planning and/or alternatives.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A, above.
57	Cumulative impacts at Star Lake. Concern with WE purchase of land along North arm of Star Lake and potential changes to the existing peaceful culture with water recreation at the lake. Concern of WE so far being very evasive about their long term plans for the complex. There has not been clarity from WE about their long terms plans for the complex and potential recreational involvement from the project at the lake.	Thank you for your comment. See Response J, above.
57	"I think a project of this scope, and with this potential for environmental problems, absolutely warrants an EIS and I hope that will be put in the decision."	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
57	EAW states this project is compatible with rural area. Does not think it is compatible with the area and neither does any of the public representatives that have showed up at meetings to comment. Feels this is one area where local resident opinion should be quite important as they are the ones familiar with the area and who have to coexist with the Casino.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
57	This project is a gambling operation and that entails some unique social effects that should be considered. "If this casino is like other casinos (and I see no reason to think it will not be) it will make a good percentage of its profits off of gambling addicts, which it will create and cater to. Along with the problems this will cause for families, it will mean increased costs for treatment, counseling, legal proceedings, etc. Someone will have to pay for these costs and you can bet it won't be the casino."	Thank you for your comment. Your concern is socio-economic in nature, which is outside the scope of an Environmental Assessment Worksheet.
57	[Family owns land on Star Lake for nearly 90 years] Attended the June 15th meeting at Pelican Rapids; this written comment is not intended to reiterate the very effectively presented environmental concerns documented there. Public safety on local roadways, most specifically, for example from Pelican Rapids to Dent on Hwy 108: winding roads, hills, many entrances, some hidden. Public safety concern with additional traffic and potentiality for drivers traveling these local roads under the influence. Concern regarding local roadway capacity given the nature of the roads. Concern regarding 108 and also turning onto 41 from 108 (on the corner). Concern with additional traffic on Otter Tail Lake Road and Hwy 35. Even greater concern during winter conditions, as 35 and 41 are often slippery. Concern is nature of traffic and additional volume.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response E. Your comment regarding traffic and roadway safety is acknowledged and will be considered in the final decision.
58	What impact will the casino have on noise on the lake? On a quiet night, I can hear people talking in boats on the lake. I like to listen to the loons talk in the evenings.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. Noise impacts were addressed in Question 17, pg 38 of the EAW.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
58	The EAW indicates further development will occur but does not disclose what that is. Do we not deserve to know what development is in the plans to determine further impacts it will have on Star Lake? Is a marina proposed? Can our Public Accesses handle more boat traffic? Will we have adequate resources to patrol the water? What will the increased demand do to our fishery?	Thank you for your comment. See Response D and Response J, above.
58	Concern regarding taxpayer costs associated with the project. It is proposed the development will fill the wetland with 450,000+ cubic yards of fill. Concern regarding trucks hauling and traveling on local roads to construct the project. What impact will the truck traffic have on the roads?	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. Borrow sites within the project boundary are identified in the plans, so only hauling of sand bedding will be necessary for the construction of the project. This will total 2,238 cubic yards, or 150 truck loads. Typically, construction contractors are responsible for maintaining the integrity of public roadways during construction, and are required to repair roadways to their pre-construction condition at the time that construction is complete. This information is detailed during at the time that the final plans are prepared.
58	No one has even began to have the discussion of fire and police protection let alone health services. I can testify that the Dent First Responders do not have the manpower to take on this project.	EAW's do not study local fire, police, water patrol, EMT/First Responder resources. However, White Earth plans to partner with county law enforcement, local emergency services, as well as provide in house first responders.
58	The immense size and building it on wetlands. What happens if the project proposer runs out of money and cannot finish the project or the gaming industry goes bottom up and they are forced to close the casino. Would the neighboring community be left with a large building, parking lot and wastewater treat pond sit there as an eye sore?	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The WEN has completed a feasibility study that presumably shows the profitability of the proposed project. Economic viability of the proposed project is outside the scope of the EAW.
58	[Resident of Star Lake for past 36 years] Request for EIS for the proposed development on Star Lake. (see specific EAW comments)	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
58	This development is not compatible to the rural character of Star Lake. Star Lake is a quiet, peaceful, tranquil lake. The boat traffic of those on the lake for skiing, wake boarding, and jet skiing is minimal. Most of the people on the water are fisherman and if you fish you know the two are not computable. Several people fish the south arm for crappies and sun fish. This development will destroy the area where they spawn and the recreational boat traffic is sure to increase. No doubt rural character and the charm of the lake will be lost.	See Response D, above. Spawning for Sunfish and Crappies: Sunfish and Crappies require firm bottom to build their nests and the circulation of oxygenated water; neither of these conditions exist adjacent to the proposed project. The bottom adjacent to the proposed project is mostly soft unconsolidated muck with a high BOD (Biological Oxygen Demand) as the decomposing common cattail requires massive amounts of oxygen as decomposition happens. Sunfish and crappies might spawn elsewhere in the South Arm, but it is unlikely that it would be here.
58	Concern regarding odors from the wastewater treatment ponds. Perham was having problems with odors from their wastewater treatment ponds. I avoided the city because of the strong stench. What are we going to be dealing with having large wastewater ponds located across from the lake. We frequently get west winds. Are we going to be smelling this every time the wind blows from the west?	The wastewater treatment proposal includes aeration in concrete basins for 30 days, 15 days per cell, before it is discharged to the aerated secondary cell. Aeration removes odor by adding oxygen to the effluent so the ponds don't become anaerobic, which is an oxygen-poor condition that produces odors.
58	Why should the White Earth Nation be allowed to fill 8.41 acres of our wetlands and substitute this for 15 acres of wetland replacement in Becker and Roseau Counties? Tell me how this is of any benefit to the people on Star Lake and the residents of Otter Tail County. I think an EIS is needed to determine the impact that the loss of these wetlands will have on Star Lake over the next 100 years. This project will have a forever impact on Star Lake. ... Are there no other alternatives to filling in this wetland?	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response F, above.
58	Public safety concern with additional traffic on local roads. Biggest fear is deadly accident occurring at the corner of 41 and 108. This was pointed out to the engineering firm assisting in the development of the Star Lake Limited Comprehensive Plan. The intersection lies in a bowl and visibility is limited in both directions. Concern for larger vehicles like buses. Someone needs to study this in more detail. Concern also with traffic heading south on 41; properties on S 41 cross 41 to access the lake; concern with children and others crossing.	Comment noted, thank you for your comment. All traffic information developed for the project is presented in the Traffic Study addendum that includes Otter Tail County current evaluation of a realignment of CSAH 41. Otter Tail County is conducting a Feasibility Study to review the potential of realigning County Road 41 from its current connecting point to MN Highway 108 in order to improve traffic flow and overall connectivity while mitigating existing issues along MN Highway 108. MnDOT is also conducting a study of the MN Highway 108 and County Road 41 intersection, with the section of roadway immediately adjacent to the intersection along MN Highway 108, in order to determine potential effects of modifying the MN Highway 108 design and intersection improvements. The timeline associated with the outcomes of these studies is not known at this time. Review of the County Road 35 intersection with County Road 41 has been recommended as part of previous study and will be conducted at a later date.
59	This EAW seems incomplete or inaccurate. The seemingly minor mistakes in this EAW might seem picky to bring up, but they point to a lack of attention to detail that I think is necessary in the review of all the facts that need to be considered before any permits should be granted.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
59	There is no Proposer or RGU listed, just the contact.	The EAW lists both the proposer as White Earth Enterprises, LLC, and the RGU as Otter Tail County.
59	The parcels of land listed (see document) are owned by Central Minnesota Land Company, LLC.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
59	Whoever the Proposer is should have to get all the zoning of the land correct to make sure this land even qualifies to be commercially developed.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
59	There could be more wetland destruction with the potential expansion.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response J, above.
59	I think the MCT would be the "Unit of Government" that would have to approve this application not the WEN. Does WEN have permission from MCT to use the land "Held in trust for the MCT"?	Otter Tail County is the Regulatory Government Unit (RGU), not WEN. Please see Minnesota Chippewa Tribe Land Ordinance #3. This documents White Earth Nations right to govern the trust land.
59	We chose to live here instead of areas like Brainerd because it is non-urban/serene/not developed. While development might bring additional visitors to the area, it could drive away others that are looking for serenity.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
59	As a casino patron I've noticed Minnesotan casinos aren't as busy as they once were. A feasibility study of the casino's success is needed in an EIS. It would be a shame for a development to be built that is totally out of character with the area and fail within a few years. EIS should include funding to be sure it doesn't stop have way through development. Concerned about the crime that usually follows casinos.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
60	I do not see how this project can be allowed to continue without an EIS.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
61	I am a member of WEN and am totally against Star Lake Casino. Three of our council members made this decision without any input from tribal members. This project is hypocritical of our tribe's mission statement: To preserve, promote and enhance our quality of life	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
62	Served on the Star Lake Property Owners Association for two terms, believes they should be granted the permits to process with the development without additional studies. Has had multiple conversations with DNR officials, property owners, and USFW specialists, one theme that comes up is the development will not have a significant negative environmental impact of any magnitude on Star Lake. WEN is meeting or exceeding all laws, ordincances, regulations, and guidelines for a development of this size and are trying to create an environmentally friendly development. In the EAW they talk about their plans to prevent damage or restore wetlands, as well as to make it an attractive, fitting development. A survey was completed, a small group wants the casino and larger group does not want it. The largest group does not care one way or the other. A petition was sent for an EIS where his signature was included without his consent. Says they did this to make it look like a much larger group than it really is.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
63	We must keep our rural and lake country separate from city and economic development	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
64	How could a property that was being discussed gain approval to move forward near to such a delicate lake area	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
64	The impact to wildlife, dear, birds, fish must be obvious [...] expecting to see a decrease on wildlife activity is a HUGE concern.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
64	A full study must be done. An evaluation will consider light, noise, and traffic on the surrounding community.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
65	The SLT Board respectfully requests that you ensure this matter receives the most stringent level of environmental, socio-economic, and public safety concern review through the completion of an EIS.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
66	Otter Tail County should conduct an EIS	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
66	The marsh and wetland area's of Star lake are too valuable to the wildlife inhabitants	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
66	Otter Tail County is making a poor choice with this development	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
66	We request a full EIS be completed before any business venture begins in this area.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
67	If ever an EIS is required, this is it!	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
67	Migratory flow may be significantly impacted by the activity and light pollution	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
67	The impact of filling in the area on fish habitat and spawning has not been determined	No fill is proposed within the potential spawning and fish habitat areas of the bed of Star Lake. The project proposes a vegetated native buffer from the shore to the development area.
67	What system will ensure that Star Lake will not be subject to a cumulative effect of pollution to the water?	Stormwater from impervious surfaces will be directed through stormwater ponding system, which will treat water prior to discharge from the site. Additionally, precipitation not falling on impervious surfaces will infiltrate or sheet-flow through the 75-foot vegetated native buffer before intercepted by the lake.
67	Roads in the area of the proposed casiono are already in need of attention.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response E.
67	Noise, traffic, light pollution cannot be underestimated.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
67	Who will staff the needed positions for such a large project?	The commenter's concern is socio-economic in nature, a topic that is outside the scope of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet.
67	Who polices the area? Who will address gambling addiction problems?	See Response K, above.
67	We must do everything we can to minimize the long-term damage	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
68	The location and indoor activities of the casino conflict with the primary land use. Heavy weeded nature of the lake make it very poor for the water sports that are supposedly an attraction for the casino.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Willdlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
68	The assault of light pollution would scare off the majority of the waterfowl.	See Response L. The project proposes use of best practices for Dark Sky Lighting to reduce impact on night sky, adjacent properties by lighting trespass and nocturnal wildlife. Dark Sky practices included reduce lighting levels, downward directed lighting fixtures, lower mounting height, and lighting colors below 3,000 Kelvin. Additional site lighting information and photometric is part of the Conditional Use Permit and will be provided with that application.
68	There will be an increased runoff from tar based surfaces	See Response I. Stormwater ponding systems are proposed and are designed to treat the runoff from hard-surface areas, prior to discharge.
68	Casino owners are the only ones to financially benefit, not locals.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
68	Casino shouldn't be built here just because of wealthier property owners. Could easily fail because it's so far from cities/primary customers	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
69	Submitted three photos of Star Lake, Dead Lake, and project site. Says the south arm of Star Lake is a poster child for which should be administered and protected as a natural environment body of water. County has a say on what happens to Fee and Trust Lands when what happens on them doesn't stay on them. There are reasonable project alternatives that have not been considered that will have less impact on the environment.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
70	The Star Casino would seriously jeopardize the water quality which would impact the wild rice and have negative impacts on waterfowl and migratory birds.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
70	As a property owner in this area the rural character of the area is extremely important to me. The shoreland is not compatible with the large-scale developments, residential, commercial, or for a casino.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
70	The casino will forever negatively impact the water quality of the lake, rural character of the area, amazing night sky, and safety of the surrounding. It is very important that all potential impacts of the lake and surrounding landscape are studied through an EIS.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
71	Bill Marsh and WEN lied saying 50% of the workers will be from my people. We are 62 miles from my reservation to Star Lake and I don't see 50% of our people driving 124 miles a day for less than \$10 an hour.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
71	Keeping the land beautiful and the way it was given to us by the creator is very important. I do not believe that anything that happens with this casino is going to be good. What is this going to do to our communities and what is this going to do to the wetlands that are from the beauty of mother nature?	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
72	Page 12 says there will be no impact to the wetlands, then later the EAW says that no impacts to the wetlands will happen within 75 feet of the shoreline, so they were excusing anything beyond 75 feet that will still be impacted. I would like to know the data that proves that wetlands only have an impact if they're greater -- less than 75 feet from the shore. 75 feet isn't enough to protect the land, fish, habitats, etc., around the wetland.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.. The wetland impacts are discussed on page 26 of the EAW. There is no reference to wetland impacts on page 12. There are no wetland impacts within 75 feet of the shore, which will be a maintained vegetated buffer.
73	I see the claim that the casino is compatible with the surrounding land as false and inaccurate. Game and nongame waterfowl flock to Star Lake because of its secluded, rural character. The wetlands are in good condition, which attract more waterfowl and so more hunters.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
73	They are minimizing the impact the project will have on the environment by changing words the DNR said about the Red Neck Grebe. I have read through the correspondence between developer and the DNR and between the County and I think it's a little disingenuous too when you look into it and see what is corresponding there. The DNR said there is a likelihood, a probability of the disturbance happening to the Red Necked Grebe, yet the developer took the liberty to change that as a possibility. That's one word and that's an important change and it shows to me a little bit of the revealing technique what's going on here. This is minimizing, the word mitigation is overused. I think avoidance is one thing that is not used enough.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. Conversations with the DNR representatives indicated that impacts to the red-necked grebes and loons would be short-lived and during the construction phase only. The DNR did not find that the birds would be impacted by the development once construction was complete.
74	The EAW doesn't come close to covering what's necessary for that development (future expansion). You won't be able to stop the train if you have no control over what's happening now.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response J, above.
75	EAW identifies five parcels (one of which is misidentified) and omits a sixth parcel. That being the 12.4 acres located on the north side of 380 th St. The proposer has not provided plans for use though they paid \$28,225 an acre for the parcel. Seems unlikely they wouldn't build/expand on it after paying so much.	The noted parcel is not part of the proposed project. See Response J, above.
75	MN Rules 4410.4400 provide a lot of specifics, related to EIS thresholds, including subparagraph 1: An EIS must -- not shall, not can -- be prepared for projects that exceed the threshold of 250,000 square feet of gross floor space. However the EAW states the project is 277,000 square feet.	Comment noted. We concur. Thank you for your comment.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#

SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT

RESPONSE

76	The wild rice bed caps have historical meaning which in our tradition wild rice is the most important meal that we have. First meal we feed our young and last meal we feed our old. The land and water body have historical value and there needs to be more study done to preserve any artifacts that could be buried in the ground. Other options should be pursued.	The Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) and MN State Historic Preservation Office have been consulted. Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act applies to the project to assure that no effect to historic structures or archaeology occurs.
77	Consider the sustainability of the project, how have other casinos is rural MN been doing? Will the income from the casino payoff for the citizens?	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
77	13-14 million gallons of waste water will be held for a period of time before it can be put on the field.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. This is correct. Current engineering design standards have been applied to the project.
77	The impact on the fish, tualbies, and sunnies.	Comment noted, thank you for your comment. See Response B.
78	The fact that this is the largest development in Otter Tail County and that it will be placed on very sensitive wetlands means that an EIS is very much an important thing to consider and do at this point.	See Response A.
78	The RGU is obligated to review the impact of the actions that affect land outside of the Trust and Fee Lands.	The EAW covers the project in its entirety as a whole.
79	The document mainly states there are no predicted project environmental effects that will combine with any other known projects within the environmentally relevant area. That's what we call Cumulative Potential Effects. This assertion can only be true if you accept the state premise repeated several times in the EAW that state, county, and township governments have no jurisdiction over the Tribal Trust lots. This does not reflect controlling law. You have to consider the effects the project has on both sides of the land (public and Trust/Fee)	The project is considered as a whole regardless of regulatory jurisdiction.
79	You must order an EIS.	See Response A.
80	What happens to Star Lake is ultimately going to happen to Dead lake.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
80	An EIS is what I would refer to as cheap insurance. This needs to be an EIS.	See Response A.
81	Every time there's a big storm, runoff comes off the field (where the waste water system is proposed to be), over the road, and into the lake. That's what's got to be proposed as a high potential for impacting the quality and pollution of our lake.	The proposed stormwater management plan will treat all waters prior to discharge into Star Lake. This is intended to reduce the nutrient load currently discharging into Star Lake. The proposed stormwater treatment system is oversized to accommodate more intense rain events by providing storage for a 6.13" rain event over all impervious surfaces created on site. White Earth Nation will be responsible for maintenance of the ponding system. The stormwater ponding areas are sized large enough to handle extreme rainfall events. The sanitary system is designed to handle rainfall events that are multiple times larger than any rainfall event that has ever happened in this area.
81	The sand wells in our area could have impact on the type of irrigation and infiltration planned for this structure. Deep well concerns being that the lake in 90 feet deep and that's what they'll pump from. I think the study they have done is inqdequate for the potential of the drawdown from the Lake (example, White Bear Lake).	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. Current engineering design standards have been applied to the project.
81	We have to recapture wetlands in our watershed district. This project is going outstate, upper part using lands that are owned by the Tribe to mitigate wetlands. It's reasonable that if we want to retain water quality here, so we need to maintain the wetlands locally.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response F.
81	The storm water management system is design based on the 100-year flood event. The current trend in storms are frequent, heavy, and close to one another. I want to make sure this study has addressed the impact of the major storms sequencing within 24-48 hours of one another.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. Current design standards have been applied to the project
82	The EAW is missing a lot of information pertaining to fish spawning, wild rice, and nesting colonies. It is a top loon breeding lake in the country, the EAW doesn't mention the sensitive wetlands, nearby wildlife management are, or the two established hunting lodges. Doesn't indicate Star is a DNR deesignated wild rice lake that is still harvested and importantly feeds a host of migratory waterfowl. Wild rice will be destructed by human activity. Construction will likely disturb the breeding colonies of Red Neck Grebes. The EAW understates these concerns. Lights, noise, and human activities disrupt wildlife. A full EIS would help reassure us that every possible measure is being taken to protect these wetland areas.	See Response A and Response B.
83	The EAW answered the state requirement on future plans as "yes," they have future plans, but don't list them. This could lead to more destruction and impervious surface - which has detrimental impacts on waters in MN. The expansions will have a greater impact on wildlife, fish, wild rice, and other native vegetation.The EAW should be elevated to an EIS.	See Response J.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
84	General aspects that can be evaluated by an EIS: Social and economic impacts - Impacts on residents and visitors as well as the WEN. Submission of a financial plan. Propose evidence that there's sufficient funding to see the project to completion Range of alternatives	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
85	The destruction of the natural surroundings have made this an incredible waterfowl, migratory, and breeding grounds seems unthinkable. Why waste an area that has been so special for generations. Careful planning of future development should not be reactive to any proposed development, rather to be thoughtfully aligned with appropriate land use, compatibility, and measure by a variety of economic, social, and environmental standards. A study whose projections and conclusions are based on many assumptions has absolutely no merit as a document to support the developer's EAW (speaking about the Comprehensive Plan). In the absence of reasonable supporting documentation from original sources I respectfully urge the Commissioners to require the developer to complete an EIS.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See comment A
86	Runoff from roads, curbs, gutters, etc. has caused a lot of water quality issues on lakes in the OTC and it costs a lot to clean and maintain them. Really concerned with the amount of impervious surface on the casino area, parking lot, driveway, and building, roof top, everything that runs off that go into the water. In 2010 MPCA had an article about when phosphorous and sediment goes into a shallow lake, blue green algae grow and expand. It's poisonous, and this is something that could happen.	Comments noted. See Responses A, B, H, and I.
86	Concerned about the 24/7 lights. Concerned about the wild rice. Concerned about sanitary sewage. Buffer strips block agricultural runoff, not the same as this type of runoff.	Comments noted. See Responses H, I and L.
87	You don't build a casino on a wild rice bed. Push for the strongest EIS that you can get. What they're proposing to do is not being a good neighbor. Whatever money we already spent on other casinos, we will lose more for a small poor band that we are. AS a 25-year member of WEN I have not seen one dime of SHooting Star, so I don't need any more gaming on WEN or certainly on a wild rice patty. Gaming is on the decline, these RBC people are pushing this, so I guess please push for an EIS.	Comments noted. See Response A.
88	I've been a hog farmer all my life. If you consider yourself a good steward of the land I'd urge you to do whatever necessary to halt this project.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
89	I have not gotten a good answer about infrastructure - specifically with roads. Specifically on the intersection of 108 and 41.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response E.
89	What about our fire department, first responders (in relation to how many people they project will be coming). Who is going to pay for that?	EAW's do not study local fire, police, water patrol, EMT / First Responder resources. However, White Earth plans to partner with county law enforcement, local emergency services, as well as provide in house first responders.
90	Live five houses down from the corner of 108 and 41, every Friday night traffic through there is pretty crazy, people do not follow the speed limit. Someone from Detroit Lakes said they were going to do a study on that corner, but I haven't heard anything since. That's a red flag. The roads are curvy and in the winter they'll be icy.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response E. All traffic information developed for the project is presented in the Traffic Study addendum that includes Otter Tail County current evaluation of a realignment of CSAH 41. Otter Tail County is conducting a Feasibility Study to review the potential of realigning County Road 41 from its current connecting point to MN Highway 108 in order to improve traffic flow and overall connectivity while mitigating existing issues along MN Highway 108. MnDOT is also conducting a study of the MN Highway 108 and County Road 41 intersection, with the section of roadway immediately adjacent to the intersection along MN Highway 108, in order to determine potential effects of modifying the MN Highway 108 design and intersection improvements. The timeline associated with the outcomes of these studies is not known at this time. Review of the County Road 35 intersection with County Road 41 has been recommended as part of previous study and will be conducted at a later date.
90	You have a problem with the workforce. where are the people going to come from to run this place? The Bagley casino had to cut back hours because of this. They also halted half way through because they ran out of funds. Where is the money going to come from for this project? This is all going to cost a lot of money for the taxpayers.	See Response C. The commenter's concern is socio-economic in nature, a topic that is outside the scope of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet.
90	It's all going to be built on wetlands and cause runoff.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
91	WEN member. Didn't know there was a voting to do the casino, I don't approve of it. I don't see it's benefitting us and feels it's out in nowhere. Appreciate everybody's concern about the wildlife and environment.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
92	A social impact statement must be done along with an EIS.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
92	Honestly we don't see very many deputy sheriffs patrolling 108. 108 is already a very busy road, without the additional traffic coming through, and nobody is following the speed rules anyway. More time needs to be put into this to plan what the effects are and if we're going to have deputies available to patrol the roads with that much more traffic coming through.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response E.
93	Greatly concerned about the impacts the proposed Star Lake Casino would have on the area around the proposed building site. Family bought the land close to the proposed site 20 years ago because of the clear lake, as it pertains to fishing, water clarity, and undisturbed natural areas along the lakeshore. The fill needed to advance the construction project will destroy eight acres of spawning beds and wild rice. Even though these are proposed to be replaced elsewhere, this does not actually restore/replace what is lost. If construction is allowed to proceed, large paved parking lots will be construction near the lake causing polluted water in the form of runoff into the lake during rain events and snow melt. Waste management and disposal is the greatest concern. The proposed method of waste treatment is not an ideal situation. Sewage lagoons will not only affect water quality, but also air quality. A pungent odor will spread over most of the lake during the spring, summer, and fall months. The lagoons' proximity to a small, unnamed lake on the west side of 41 could cause that lake to be polluted in the event of heavy rainfall or it may leak, polluting the surrounding area. Do an EIS on this property.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Responses F, I, H, and A. No fill is proposed to potential spawning areas, wild rice beds, or to Star Lake.
94	How the environmental mitigation affects us directly as human beings. The 24-hour lights will affect duck fishing. This project will negatively influence the experience future generations have in the area. An EIS is necessary to look at this aspect of things and out in the future.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. There was a significant amount of effort made to design the facility in such a way that it would reduce the amount of light impact to the surrounding area. "The development will be using best practices for Dark Sky Lighting to reduce impact on night sky, to adjacent properties by lighting trespass and nocturnal wildlife. Dark Sky practices included reduce lighting levels, downward directed lighting fixtures, lower mounting height for lighting fixture, and lighting colors below 3,000 Kelvin. Additional site lighting information and photometric is part of the Conditional Use Permit and will be provided with that application.
95	Salt is really bad right now in our lakes and rivers and stream. I want to make sure no excess of salt is going into the lake.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
95	I don't see anywhere who is going to operate or maintain the systems/ponds.	The project proposer is wholly responsible for maintenance and up keep of the stormwater ponds, wastewater systems and all other infrastructure within the project limits.
96	Family-owned Star Lake Property for 100+ years. Bird and meteor shower enthusiast. Main concern is for impacts to fine water quality of Star Lake. Runoff will certainly come from development project and additional housing for those to work at casino. Parts of the lake are shallow, sensitive areas containing necessary vegetation for the lake. Question the likelihood that native people want to replace ricing area with casino--is it only the interest of a few who will gain from it? Rural casinos struggle long-term to attract people. Much to consider before saying "go ahead" with project.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. There was a significant amount of effort made to design the facility in such a way that it would reduce the amount of light impact to the surrounding area. The development will be using best practices for Dark Sky Lighting to reduce impact on night sky, to adjacent properties by lighting trespass and nocturnal wildlife. Dark Sky practices included reduce lighting levels, downward directed lighting fixtures, lower mounting height for lighting fixture, and lighting colors below 3,000 Kelvin. Additional site lighting information and photometric is part of the Conditional Use Permit and will be provided with that application.
97	Lived on Star Lake since 2005. Not in "accept or not accept" camps but vehemently opposed to moving forward without EIS. There is only one Star Lake. County can't move forward with process without a more detailed analysis. EIS would also examine alternative designs that would result in fewer environmental impacts. Purpose of environmental review is not to stop projects but collect information to avoid or mitigate effects. Environmental concerns: water quality, fishing, birds and wildlife, old wild rice beds, safety, AIS, noise and light pollution, threat to wetlands.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
98	Opposition based on: size of project is inappropriate to scale of rural Star Lake, threats to water quality, threats to wildlife (loons), boat traffic, light pollution, noise pollution. Believes money and power generally prevail over interests in preserving pristine nature. Special places of our earth rarely recover once desecrated.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
99	Speaker at public meeting (6/15): Cabin is right on the road, access to lake is across the street. Concerned about children needing to cross the street to get to the lake and the increase of traffic on the road caused by casino.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response E, above.
100	Speaker at public meeting (6/15): Fargo resident with family place in Star Lake Area (35 years). Varying background of jobs and believes public meeting speakers did great job providing a large degree of information for consideration. Hopes the comments will be considered seriously as he considers them all to be accurate.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
101	Speaker at public meeting (6/15): Seasonal home owner, he and wife Mary live in Maryland. Mentioned attempt to put casino near Gettysburg battle field. Position is that land is sacred ground. It's a bad idea, not just an EIS but no casino.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
102	Speaker at public meeting (6/15): John and wife built a house on Dead Lake. From Rochester, MN, which has no natural lakes. Is very appreciative of Dead Lake for its natural beauty and that of surrounding lakes. Tells County not to take a thousand lakes for granted. Cannot afford to waste these resources.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
103	Lived in Dent for 40+ years. Own 130-acre parcel immediately to west of fee land where developer is planning to construct two sewage lagoons. Concerns include, air pollution (from sewage pits specifically), Light pollution (they will be able to see the lights from their living room), Noise pollution (commercial operation with peak traffic), rural character. Relating to all points above, the casino does not fit with the north rural feel they have lived there for. Request EIS to ensure the most environmental review is completed.	Comment noted. See Responses A and L. The wastewater will be aerated in the concrete basins for 30 days, 15 days per cell, before it is discharged to the aerated secondary cell. Aeration removes odor by adding oxygen to the effluent so the ponds don't become anaerobic which is the type of pond that produces odor. There was a significant amount of effort made to design the facility in such a way that it would reduce the amount of light impact to the surrounding area. The development will be using best practices for Dark Sky Lighting to reduce impact on night sky, to adjacent properties by lighting trespass and nocturnal wildlife. Dark Sky practices included reduce lighting levels, downward directed lighting fixtures, lower mounting height for lighting fixture, and lighting colors below 3,000 Kelvin. Additional site lighting information and photometric is part of the Conditional Use Permit and will be provided with that application.
104	MN Historical Society: Conclude that there are no properties listed in the National or State Registers of Historic Places and no known or suspected archaeological properties in the area that would be affected by the project. If project is considered for federal financial assistance or requires a federal permit or license, the review will need to be initiated by the lead federal agency.	The project is subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, m via required federal agency coordination as a condition of the Section 404 Clean Water Act permit.
105	Permanent resident of County (not summer or hunting season only). Live on Lake Lida. In favor of the casino along with "many others spoken to". Work force issue: Fargo Labor Bus is closer to Star Lake than Mahanomen. Many people might retire early and move to the lake if there were full- or part-time jobs available. Many farmers and families would be available when it was not planting/harvesting season. Everyone thought the meeting was about environmental issues and not a "for" or "Against" meeting. With small towns and newspapers, many do not dare stand up and say they are for gambling and drinking (reference to "silent majority" who voted for Trump). Many would like places to meet friends and family and to eat. Pelican Supper Club has closed. Think how the casino affects everyone (economic development, taxes, relocation of people) and not just self issues ("my" lake, tribal checks, etc.)	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
106	We need a mandatory EIS to address our concerns.	See Response A, above.
106	Effects of stormwater runoff on Star Lake, birds, fish, and water quality (pollutants, filtration, temp changes to the lake, sediment runoff due to dredging, cutting trees, construction, parking lots, etc.). Runoff from impervious surfaces (what are they exactly?) and the golf course? We need to understand the total impact of the casino and future projects will be through studies.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response I. Impervious surfaces are any surface that does not absorb water such as asphalt, concrete, rooftops, gravel, etc. There is no golf course proposed with this project. The stormwater ponding areas are designed to hold nutrient and various pollutants so that they can be broken down or taken up through biological activity. Some nutrients are sequestered in the sediments, while others are taken up by plants and various other fauna. For decades, designed stormwater ponding areas have been effectively used in metropolitan areas to reduce the amount of nutrient that is flushed through lakes and river systems.
106	Request further study of social effects of gambling and casinos in a rural area. Includes crime rates, drug use, land values, additional government services costs, gambling rehab, and health needs. As a taxpayer I am concerned about the long-term costs of the casino and how much taxes will come in for schools and other needs.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The commenter's concern is socio-economic in nature, a topic that is outside the scope of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet.
107	Work in the WEN reservation for ten years and worried to see what impacts will happen in our area. Worried about the road he lives on being a short cut to the casino and if people will pollute his yard or damage it in some way. It will be a lower quality of life. Full support of an EIS.	See Responses A and E.
108	The EAW doesn't speak to impaired drivers coming from the bars.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. Driving under the influence is against the law presently and the project does not propose to change the DUI regulations.
109	Our primary responsibility is to the Star Lake Township residents. Must be good stewards to our natural resources by having an EIS.	Comment noted. See Response A.
110	108/41 is a hill where people drive too fast through. People are always fishing on the bridge over Star Lake, the increased traffic will be a safety issue. There are always pedestrians on 41 and 108, which will be another safety issue when traffic increases due to the casino.	Comment noted. See Response E.
111	Need to consider the distance between irrigation systems and Otter Tail River. There is human error, no matter what industry you're in, and this can cause problems with nutrients that should be removed from the water (i.e., metals). Runoff from the parking lots will cause issues as well if the irrigation systems don't do their jobs properly. Location, location, location is key to me. This is not a great site, not enough room, capacity, and buffer.	Comment noted. Thanks for your comment. The Otter Tail River is 7.8 miles from the site. NPDES Permits take into consideration impaired or special waters of the state with vicinity to the proposed projects. The stormwater ponding areas will hold nutrient and various pollutants so that they can be broken down or taken up through biological activity. Some nutrients are sequestered in the sediments, while others are taken up by plants and various other fauna. For decades, designed stormwater ponding areas have been effectively used to reduce the amount of nutrient that is flushed through lakes and river systems.
112	Guard what you already have accomplished with tourism. Don't throw away what you've already accomplished.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
113	The EAW doesn't address the resort aspect, future plans that are not on the table. They are not forthright with the entire scope of the project. It is not a replacement for the family resort. The skyline will forever be changes by the proposed massive water tower. Nothing has been addressed about the gas station convenience store that accompanies virtually all casinos in the state. Once again, there's more coming with this project. EAW doesn't come forward with the impact to the lake with the shoreland they own. This must be reviewed at the highest level.	Comment noted. See Response A and Response J.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#

SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT

RESPONSE

113	Driving down 41 will be like driving by a sewage treatment facility not a wonderful little natural unnamed lake west of 41.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
113	Considering the driving distance from the reservation, I would expect that the WEN allocation of 250 employees would be difficult to achieve. There are already Help Wanted signs around here, showing work force for that level of employment is very tight. New jobs for the community are great but upsetting the balance between employers and employees will have a major impact to the region, your neighbors, and fellow businessmen.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The comment pertains to socio-economic matters, which is outside the scope of the EAW.
114	The lack of construction and architectural details makes the EAW challenging to assess. For example, additional details on what kind of curbing would be used, how many windows and which way the buildings face, and if storm drains would be open would be helpful in assessing impacts to birds, amphibians, and reptiles. Turtles and amphibians have a difficult time navigating some styles of curbing, open sorm drains are fatal for turtles, and bird strikes on windows are a concern.	<p>Comment Noted.</p> <p>The project development will make use of a number of types of curbs and road edges. The selection of these is based on the need to manage storm water. Standard curb and gutters are used along the perimeter of the parking areas to direct storm water in to landscaped areas that then lead to storm water ponds. Mountable curbs are not used internal to the parking area where storm water will travel over vegetated land to storm ponds and infiltration areas. At the fire truck access road around the building no curbs are used.</p> <p>Storm drains leading to subsurface pipe are grated to prevent the access from animals.</p> <p>The building is primarily oriented to the west, with windows located on all elevations above the first floor, and windows on the first floor oriented to the north west and south. Windows above the first floor are typical of a hotel in size at 6'-6" square and include intermit mullions. First floor windows are larger and also have intermit mullions. The project is reviewing options for bird safe glass or film for the limited areas with large expanse of glass with a desire to reduce the potential of bird strikes.</p> <p>Additionally, the type landscaping and trees adjacent to the first floor windows will be considered to reduce impact on birds.</p>
114	Recommends adding into the EAW the fact that Star Lake has been designated a lake of biological significance, ranked as "outstanding." Also have measures identified to protect the lake and water as well as the wildlife that live there.	Comment noted. Thanks for your comment.
114	Add how close the building will be to water and future development of the shoreline	For the Trust Land the buildings and equipment enclosures meet the recommended 112'-6" from Star Lakes OHWL. This includes the 50% increase for commercial projects as identified as one path of compliance by the Shoreland Management Ordinance. The fire truck access road/pedestrian path meets the 75' set back with the second path of compliance by the Shoreland Management Ordinance with the use of Vegetative screening. For Fee Land east of CSAH 41 there are no buildings. Parking in this area is approximately 225' from the OHWL, doubling the 112'-6" setback from Star Lakes OHWL. This includes the 50% increase for commercial projects as identified as one path of compliance by the Shoreland Management Ordinance. Additionally, the project will be screened by a berm at the parking lot and vegetation at both the parking lot and the fire truck access road/pedestrian path, as identified as a second path of compliance by the Shoreland Management Ordinance. For Fee Land west of CSAH 41 the setbacks are meet for the 200' from the Unnamed Lake's OHWL.
114	The sentence, "in addition, as the tribal trust parcel was landlocked, by purchasing adjacent properties, this allows great access to the rising vegetation for harvesting." This implies boat access to water from the property. When it is a casino, will there be a demand to launch boats to collect wild rice from the property? Where will the disturbance lead? This access will become more obvious and use will increase, potentially harming lakeshore vegetation. Later in the document it mentions that boating traffic may increase. Recommends further describing how much, where, if there will be a demand for a dock, and any plans to address these demands.	There will beno change previous usage. Access to the lake has existed since 1938 for ricing purposes. There are no future plans developed. The proposer's stated focus is on building and operating the gaming facility and amenities currently designed within the facility.
114	Information is lacking regarding ongoing management of the lands associated with the project. Recommends more detail on how landscaping and grass will be maintained, what type of vegetation would be allowed, how invasive species would be controlled, etc. Recommends including if any of the agricultural areas will be hayed.	All landscaping/grounds keeping will be completed by Shooting Star Groundskeeping Department as it is at the Mahnomen Shooting Star Facility. A list (with pictures) of non-native and invasive species such as Purple Loosestrife will be provided to the people who do the maintenance of the vegetation on the project to aid in identification of these species for eradication.
114	Recommends the use of wildlife friendly erosion control be included in the project. Also recommends the development of a plan for management of invasive species on the property. Any vegetation management on site should have plans to control invasive species.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The plans will include specifications for the use of wildlife friendly erosion control methods wherever appropriate based on site conditions. When silt fence is used to keep sediment within the construction area, there will be plans to remove it after the vegetation has become established. A list (with pictures) of invasive species such as Purple Loosestrife will be provided to the people who do the maintenance of the vegetation on the project.
114	Recommends describing how the Limited Star Lake Comprehensive Plan recommendations that are associated with this project will be implemented even though the County did not adopt it as a County Comprehensive Plan. Also recommends describing how the project is compatible with the OTC Local Water Management Plan and with the Star Lake Water Quality Assessment Program or LAP study completed in 2000.	Overall plan implementation is a section in the Limited Star Lake Comprehensive Plan. The plan outlines time ranges from short- to medium- to long-term goals and opportunities of implementation. These processes should be implemented by local government agencies outside of White Earth Nation (WEN). With regards to transportation plan implementation, local area roadways that are going to see increased traffic as a result of the proposed Star Lake development are proposed to receive increased safety features such as intersection realignments, intersection lighting, turning and bypass lane construction, and studies to be conducted on traffic patterns along the regional corridors. These improvements should be initiated by Otter Tail County and if prudent, there is a special assessment process in the Minnesota State Statute 429 procedures where governmental agencies can assess improvement costs to benefitting parcels of land if there are any shared costs to be considered by WEN due to the increased traffic being caused by this development. With respect to the Otter Tail County Local Water Management plan, the proposed project meets the shoreland regulations for development within 1,000 feet of the adjacent lakes. provides the 50' buffer requirement.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
114	<p>Recommends describing the Unnamed Lake NE classification as was done for the General Development Lake classification. Recommends the following language: "Natural Environment Lakes are generally small, often shallow lakes with limited capacities for assimilating the impacts of development and recreational use." Also recommends defining what the setbacks are for sewage treatment facilities for both the NE classification and the General Development classification.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Minnesota DNR defines a Natural Environment Lakes as "usually having less than 150 total acres, less than 60 acres per mile of shoreline, and less than three dwellings per mile of shoreline. They may have some winter kill of fish; may have shallow, swampy shoreline; and are less than 15 feet deep." The Natural Environment Lake "classification is used to determine lot size, setbacks and, to a certain degree, land uses on the adjacent land. The classification has nothing to do with surface water use of boats or motors, hunting and fishing or fish management. These are governed by other regulations." Sewage Treatment setback recommendation from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) is to follow the DNR Statewide Minimum Shoreland Standards and the local zoning laws. The DNR recommended setbacks are 150 feet for Natural Environment lake and 75 feet for a General Development lake, for proposed sewage treatment system. Otter Tail County's Shoreland Management Ordinance does not address a sewer system such as that being proposed for this project. Otter Tail County's Shoreland Management Ordinance only addresses un-sewered or septic systems. The Otter Tail County unsewered setbacks are a 10-foot setback for soil treatment areas and a 10-foot for septic tank structures on both Natural Environment and General Development lakes. The project is proposing to have all the Sewage Treatment located beyond the 200'-0". This meets the county's setback requirement for development on Natural Environment lakes and exceeds the DNR's recommendations.</p>
114	<p>The conclusion that the project is compatible with the surrounding area is not well supported in the EAW. The proposed structure within the shoreland district will be 85 feet high whereas the surrounding developments have a maximum structure height of 20 for commercial use and 25 feet for residential. DNR recommends further explaining how and why it is compatible given that the most prominent commercial use in the area is identified as a seasonal corner store.</p>	<p>Comment noted, thank you for your comment. The requirements cited here do not apply to Federal Trust Land. Tribal Trust Land is exempt from the shoreland management ordinance.</p>
114	<p>Per Pg 10, Question 9c. comment, recommends describing how the potential incompatibility would be mitigated. The mechanism is not identified.</p>	<p>Comment noted, thank you for your comment.</p>
114	<p>The EAW states that "According to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR)...or any outstanding resource value water." DNR recommends correcting according to the below information: MN DNR's NHIS letter states: According to the DNR Habitat and Population Evaluation Team (HAPET) Breeding Pair Accessibility Maps, approximately 21-30 pairs of waterfowl birds per square mile are present in the project area. Also, Star Lake has been identified by DNR as a lake of high outstanding biological significance. These lakes have an exceptional fishery, are important wild rice lakes, have high plant richness and quality, and may contain endangered, threatened, special concern, or several species of lake birds in greatest conservation need. Star Lake has been identified as being highly sensitive to the introduction of phosphorus. The EAW states "Star Lake is identified as by DNR Wildlife as a Wild Rice Lake..." DNR recommends adding information about wild rice lakes and [their] significance.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. Star Lake is rated a DNR Lake of Biological Significance. There are four components that are evaluated to determine that rating: aquatic plants, fish, amphibians, and birds. Only one of these components needs to be rated outstanding for the lake to be considered a Lake of Biological Significance. Star Lake is rated moderate for aquatic plants, outstanding for fish, unranked for amphibians, and high for birds. The outstanding rating for fish could be due to one or more factors including populations of walleye, northern pike, tullibee, overall native fish community, or fish-based Index of Biological Integrity (IBI). The high rating for birds is likely due to colonial water bird nesting areas, particularly the Red-Necked Grebe. Potential impacts to fisheries and water birds, and mitigation measures, are described in detail in the EAW. Wild rice is known to occur in the south and west portions of Star Lake. The majority of the remainder of the lake is likely too deep for the establishment of wild rice plants.</p>
114	<p>DNR also recommends the document also clarify that Star Lake has been on MPCA's list of impaired lakes for mercury since 2008, and the lake has an EPA Category of 5, meaning that the lake requires a total maximum daily load (TMDL) plan by 2020. Recommends stating in the EAW how this project would meet a TMDL standard and reference that these are classified as public waters and under DNR jurisdiction.</p>	<p>It is stated that currently Star Lake has been listed on the MPCA's list of impaired waters for mercury. This designation by the MPCA does not currently have any additional treatment requirements. The stormwater ponds are oversized to provide a much greater level of treatment than what is required. Current MIDS standards state for additional removal of contaminants, it is recommended that a 1.1" rain event be designed for. The current pond designed to handle a 6.13" rain event. The oversized ponds are designed to provide additional treatment far beyond what is required to help meet future TMDL standards.</p>
114	<p>Recommends describing the depth to groundwater and groundwater aquifer under the proposed wastewater treatment ponds and measures to ensure those aquifers will not be polluted by the wastewater treatment ponds.</p>	<p>Actual design of the wastewater treatment lagoons has not begun and it is in a conceptual phase. The intent is to have 4' of separation as required by the MPCA between the groundwater and bottom of the lagoons. The ponds will be lined with a PVC liner and there will be a water balance test that the MPCA reviews prior to allowing wastewater in to the pond.</p>
114	<p>Recommends explaining how much wastewater would be put onto the agricultural lands in gallons per day, and any impacts that may be associated with the wastewater or stormwater to nearby wetlands, including those on both sides of the road and runoff effects from the wastewater application to fields to any wetlands adjacent to those fields.</p>	<p>The wastewater will be land applied through irrigation for a total cumulative depth of 12" over the irrigated area. This 12" will be applied during dry conditions where the vegetative growth is moisture deficient to assist in absorption by the vegetation of all irrigated wastewater. One example of irrigated amounts would be if there were 60 days of irrigation, applied evenly each day there would be just over 3/16 inches of irrigation applied. If it is applied over 30 days, it would be the equivalent of just over 3/8 inches of irrigation applied. It will all be weather dependent as to how many days the treated wastewater will be applied. The irrigation equipment will be programmed to not apply any wastewater on any wetlands and with this low amount of allowable discharge, there is not any anticipated runoff to adjacent wetlands or Star Lake. No irrigation is proposed for any area west of CSAH 41.</p>
114	<p>Discuss the potential for groundwater contamination from construction, there is a potential during construction for the project to reach groundwater. EAW discusses the water level but not contamination potential from oil spills and other construction contaminants.</p>	<p>There may be dewatering operations necessary to construct the foundation/pilings. The Contractor will be responsible for any permitting requirements of the dewatering activities. Additionally, in the areas where the stormwater ponds are to be constructed, it is possible that dewatering may be necessary as well for constructability purposes. The Minnesota Stormwater Manual states that there is a minimum horizontal distance of 35' between a water supply well and the ordinary high water level of a storm water retention pond. This distance is provided in the proposed design. Additionally, the project SWPPP has provisions included in the event of an illicit discharge of pollutants that are not stormwater related such as oil/hydraulic fluid, etc. Spill kits will be on site and immediate containment will be required.</p>
114	<p>Discuss how the project would avoid and/or minimize development and impacts on wetlands as a 75' setback does not seem adequate to protect wetland and ricing vegetation from construction impacts, operational impacts, and runoff from impervious surfaces. Also recommends describing the type of wetlands that will be disturbed and if the replacement of wetlands will be of the same type.</p>	<p>When the 1990s studies were completed to determine how wide of an upland buffer was needed to provide adequate protection of a wetland / water resource. With the stem density of an herbaceous plant community, the distance was shorter than with shrubs or trees. The high stem density of the herbaceous plant community provided protection to the wetland by slowing sheetflow enough to precipitate out colloidal suspended solids (that commonly carry PO4) and the plants uptake the nutrients in solution (including NH3/NH4). Most of the precipitation and nutrient uptake was completed within 25 feet. Current wetland regulatory standards were developed based around this study. This native upland buffer alongside Star Lake that replaces the previous cultivated land use. The stormwater ponds are designed to reduce the amount of nutrient that gets into Star Lake by precipitating out the colloidal suspended solids and holding the water thus allowing plants to uptake the nutrient in suspension; this will clean the water before it leaves the site. See Response F, above, pertaining to wetland mitigation.</p>
114	<p>Recommends clarifying DNR or respective committee's role in regulating wild rice harvesting</p>	<p>Even though it is not within reservation land, the MN legislature enacted a law last session which exempted tribal members from having to obtain a state ricing license. The proposer will continue to follow the MN wild rice harvesting regulations.</p>

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
114	The EAW states that invasive species have not been identified for Star Lake. Purple loosestrife was documented in an area along the east shoreline and adjacent land across the road from the lkae back in the early 1990's. There was some control effort done (pulling of plants chemical spraying, potential biocontrol), however it should be determined whether this still exists. DNR Fisheries has Star Lake as a managed purple loosestrife site in the Area Invasive Species Slte Plan.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. Purple loosestrife was not observed during the wetland delineation or other field work. Pictures and drawings of purple loosestrife will be shown to the workers on the project to keep an eye out for this harmful plant species. Hand pulling would be the most likely control method as there does not appear to be a significant population at this location.
114	Recommends strengthening the language as birds (such as red-necked grebe among others) will likely be disturbed during construction unless the project is not constructed during the time they are present.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
114	Encouraged that native vegetation is being considered. Recommends using a mix developed by BWSR. This would increase both diversity and likely success of establishment. Also recommends using MNTaxa to determine which native species have been documented in OTC and select appropriate species to use.	Comment noted. The final selection of seed to restore native vegetation has not been made at this time. The projects intent is to use native plantings based on current and historical vegetation, seeds and plants appropriate for the soils, and hydrology of the restoration areas. Multiple sources for these natives are available within northwestern Minnesota including Prairie Land Management, Inc. and Glacial Ridge Growers of Glenwood, Woodland Prairie Specialties of Waubun, and Prairie Restorations, Inc. of Princeton. The project intends to work with the landscape architect and growers to select the native plantings and develop an establishment and maintenance plan in conjunction with an experienced prairie restoration landscape contractor.
114	Recommends expanding BMP details in order for appropriate assessment of the impacts. EAW mentions "dark sky lighting" (pg 36) but does not provide a reference. DNR recommends adding a reference and explicitly stating what activities/actions are going to be taken, or at a minimum, provide a few examples of BMPs that are being considered because lighting can affect species and their interactions with the habitat. Recommends adding mitigation measures into project planning.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. There was a significant amount of effort made to design the facility in such a way that it would reduce the amount of light impact to the surrounding area. The development will be using best practices for Dark Sky Lighting to reduce impact on night sky, to adjacent properties by lighting trespass and nocturnal wildlife. Dark Sky practices included reduce lighting levels, downward directed lighting fixtures, lower mounting height for lighting fixture, and lighting colors below 3,000 Kelvin. Additional site lighting information and photometric is part of the Conditional Use Permit and will be provided with that application.
114	Recommends explicitly stating what bird species would be impacted during construction and ways to minimize harm to their nests.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
114	Expand the visual section. EAW states the casino and hotel will be visible, but there is no further information to assess the impacts. Because the EAW does not provide details or drawings, the DNR is unable to determine the impacts on the birds from building glass or structure visual effects.	See Response L, above.
114	Expand the information about generator noise associated with RV parks, such as decibels expected and possible time period. Generator noise can also impact wildlife, and DNR recommends discussing how this noise may disturb wildlife.	Generators used at RV parks normally emit about 60 decibels. The use of generators at the RV park will have limited hours of operation and noise limits. Emergency power generators to power the facility are typically exercised under load monthly for up to one hour to verify that they are in working order. Emergency generators typically emit noise between 80 and 105 decibels (unshielded, measured at the generator). The 2000 kW site generator will be located in an area that is shielded by buildings or an acoustic wall from direct line-of-sight to the lakeshore to minimize disturbance to wildlife.
115	Asking for a complete thorough EIS to be considered. If an already established dwelling on a lake needs to go through so much red tape (permits) for the well being of that lake, then a casino should most definitely need much more assessment than that. It is destroying nature, please seriously consider a full environmental study for this project.	See Response A, above.
116	The EAW is deficient because it does not identify the proposer of the Project. It is a required element of an EAW and an essential element in determining the completeness and accuracy of the EWA. Liz Foster-Anderson is listed as a contact person. A contact person may be in addition to, not in lieu of, identification of a project's proposer. As of June 20, 2017 White Earth Enterprises LLC is not, and has never been, registered with the Minnesota Secretary of State as a domestic or foreign company. Without a definite proposer, the Board of Commissioners cannot conduct the due diligence necessary to grant permits, contract for joint services, assess legal liabilities, extract financial assurance, or enforce performance.	White Earth Enterprises, LLC is organized under the White Earth tribal Limited Liability Company ordinance and is not required to be registered with the MN Secretary of State. Central Minnesota Land Company, LLC is active with the MN Secretary of State. White Earth Enterprise handles organization and follow through of many project annually, they are fully capable of seeing this project through to completion. White Earth Enterprises wholly owned by White Earth Nation is the owners representative on this project, not one individual.
116	The EAW is deficient in identifying the need for and status of required permits. The EAW states that an application for a federal permit to discharge fill material into wetlands was submitted on May 2016. This does not reflect the current status of the federal permitting process. By a letter dated March 24, 2017, the USACE request that the applicant respond within 60 to substantive questions raised by the public comments submitted on the federal permit and demonstrate its ability to meet criteria in the CWA. The unanswered questions establish the potential for significant environmental effects that warrant and EIS.	The permit status table correctly states that the initial application was submitted on 5-13-2016. The permitting process often includes several iterations of permittee submittals and regulatory responses. This is the typical process. The permitting process for this project is ongoing, which is reflected in the permit table.
116	Authorization by the Minnesota Chippewa tribe for the Project on the trust parcel should be demonstrated in a complete social and economic review as part of an EIS.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
116	<p>The project does not comply with standards set forth in the OTC Shoreland Management Ordinance. It does not comply with the SMO vertical setback requirement or impervious surface area limit. The "building" complies with the vertical setback requirement, but the requirement applies to a "structure," not just a building. The parking lot is subject to the requirement.</p> <p>If each separated parts of the parking lots is considered by itself, there are several lots that clearly do not meet the impervious surface coverage limits of the SMO. The failure to meet the impervious surface area limits is presumptively an environmentally significant effect that warrants further study in an EIS.</p>	<p>The project does comply with the Otter Tail Shoreland Management Ordinance for all work located on the county regulated Fee land. While the Shoreland Management Ordinance does not apply to the Trust Land, the proposer has strived to meet these requirements. The EAW under question 9. Land use, b. Zoning Compatibility, address how the project complies with requirements as identified in the Otter Tail County Shoreland Management Ordinance. The buildings and equipment enclosures meet the Shoreland Management Ordinance's Vertical Separation for the Lowest Floor Elevation Requirements – elevation must be 3 feet above the OHWL or highest known water level – the lowest floor level of the development is at 1335 which is 3.8 ft above Star Lake's highest known water level (HKWL) (1331.2) and 5.5 feet above Star Lake's OHWL (1329.5.) The fire truck access road/pedestrian path, on Trust Land, is located above the highest known water level. For the Trust Land the buildings and equipment enclosures meet the recommended 112'-6" from Star Lakes OHWL. This includes the 50% increase for commercial projects as identified as one path of compliance by the Shoreland Management Ordinance. The fire truck access road/pedestrian path meets the 75' set back with the second path of compliance by the Shoreland Management Ordinance with the use of Vegetative screening. For Fee Land east of CSAH 41 there are no buildings. Parking in this area is approximately 225' from the OHWL, doubling the 112'-6" setback from Star Lakes OHWL. This includes the 50% increase for commercial projects as identified as one path of compliance by the Shoreland Management Ordinance. Additionally, the project will be screened by a berm at the parking lot and vegetation at both the parking lot and the fire truck access road/pedestrian path, as identified as a second path of compliance by the Shoreland Management Ordinance. For Fee Land west of CSAH 41 the setbacks are met for the 200' from the Unnamed Lake's OHWL. Based on the project team's confirming consultation with the Otter Tail County's Land and Resource Management staff, it is appropriate for calculation of impervious surface to be made based on the project area that do not have a physical separation such as a right-of-way or a hill, and not by individual parcels. This methodology divided the project into two areas within the Shoreland Management District; areas east of CSAH 41 and west of CSAH 41. The Fee Land is below the impervious surface maximum. When Fee and Trust Land are considered as a whole, based on this methodology, the impervious surface east of CSAH 41 is also below the impervious surface maximum. As a whole the impervious surface is below the allowed impervious surface maximum and does not have environmentally significant effect.</p>
116	<p>The EAW is deficient in its review of historical and archeological resources. Failed to account for a previously identified archeologically significant site in the "area of impact" - right in the center of the proposed casino project. Blondo, who did the archeological survey, did not identify a previously recorded site - site 21-OT-95 - that is located directly in the area of impact for the casino project. (Referenced a 2016 Merject report that identified this site)</p>	<p>Blondo prepared an addendum to their original report in December 2016 acknowledging previously-recorded site. Blondo continues to recommend no additional cultural resource work be required at the project site.</p>
116	<p>Environmental review of the project should include necessary improvements to public safety services that are connected actions. The EAW does not take into account the limited availability of local resources to provide emergency services or the environmental impact of the projected annual 200 to 275 calls for and trips to the Project area for such services.</p>	<p>EAWs do not study local fire, police, water patrol, EMT/First Responder resources. However, White Earth plans to partner with county law enforcement, local emergency services, as well as provide in house first responders.</p>
116	<p>The EAW does not take into account a number of roadway improvement projects identified by the Limited Area Star Lake Comprehensive Plan and their potentially significant environmental effects. Lists traffic increases from 2011-2020 as a comparison between building the casino and not building the casino (ex. traffic increase without the Casino 7.8%, with the Casino, 64.1%)</p>	<p>All traffic information developed for the project is presented in the Traffic Study addendum that includes Otter Tail County current evaluation of a realignment of CSAH 41. Otter Tail County is conducting a Feasibility Study to review the potential of realigning County Road 41 from its current connecting point to MN Highway 108 in order to improve traffic flow, overall connectivity, while mitigating existing issues along MN Highway 108. MnDOT is also conducting a study of the MN Highway 108 and County Road 41 intersection, with the section of roadway immediately adjacent to the intersection along MN Highway 108, in order to determine potential effects of modifying the MN Highway 108 design and intersection improvements. The timeline associated with the outcomes of these studies is not known at this time. Review of the County Road 35 intersection with County Road 41 has been recommended as part of previous study and will be conducted at a later date.</p>
116	<p>Anticipated increased use of the lake needs further study. The EAW states that no significant change in the number or type of watercraft is expected, yet the Limited Area Star Lake Comprehensive plan characterizes the project as lake-oriented, "The Star Lake development is intended to have more of a north woods lodge environment and an atmosphere that caters to families and lake enthusiasts."</p>	<p>See Response D. The description provided of the proposed project provided in the plan is describing the decor aesthetic of the indoor and outdoor spaces of the project. Motel/hotels in Greater Minnesota often decorate their lobby in a way that gives the aura of a North-Country Lodge so that patrons can feel like they are "at the lake" without actually being at a physical lake.</p>
116	<p>The DNR noted that the projected traffic attributed to the project needed more study. In particular, the DNR faulted the plan's trip generation methodology, noting that the "comparable" projects from which the Project's traffic projections were derived were not comparable because they were mainly from California, Oregon, and Washington (only one comparable project was from the Midwest). Even if the peak traffic estimates in the plan are valid, the EAW does not consider the impact of the estimated 200-plus vehicles an hour turning in or out of the Project's entrances to Hwy 41.</p>	<p>See Response E, above. All traffic information developed for the project is presented in the Traffic Study addendum that includes Otter Tail County current evaluation of a realignment of CSAH 41. Otter Tail County is conducting a Feasibility Study to review the potential of realigning County Road 41 from its current connecting point to MN Highway 108 in order to improve traffic flow and overall connectivity while mitigating existing issues along MN Highway 108. MnDOT is also conducting a study of the MN Highway 108 and County Road 41 intersection, with the section of roadway immediately adjacent to the intersection along MN Highway 108, in order to determine potential effects of modifying the MN Highway 108 design and intersection improvements. The timeline associated with the outcomes of these studies is not known at this time. Review of the County Road 35 intersection with County Road 41 has been recommended as part of previous study and will be conducted at a later date.</p>
117	<p>The Minnesota rules state that an EIS shall be ordered for projects that "have the potential for significant environmental effects." It is extremely clear to me that the proposed Casino development has the definite potential for significant environmental effects. I have read the report from USACE regarding the wetland alteration permit; I have read the DNR comments regarding the EAW; and I have read the recent detailed technical report on the EAW prepared by EOR. I urge you to take the step of calling for an EIS on this proposed project.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.</p>
118	<p>I have seen what Metro lakes have turned into. With restrictions on limits of fish a person may safely consume. Vast plumes of algae from street run-off. And, the proliferation of invasive species. Throughout central Minnesota, added human footprints on lakes like Mille Lacs and the chain lakes has again introduced over and over a proliferation of invasive species to our valued lakes and wetlands. The revenue generated by the casino to the county will be a short-lived boon before surrounding land will inevitably be depressed of value. Call for an EIS.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.</p>

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
119	There is a fifteen-acre lot on the project site that will be cut down. We know shoreline trees are vitally important to the health of the lake as they prevent erosion and keep run-off from going into the lake. Half of the land is agricultural, though the EAW characterizes the whole project area as agricultural.	The first project configuration had far less tree loss as more of the project was planned to be within the row cropped field and farmstead areas to the west of the current plan. It was considered by wetland regulators to have too much wetland impact, so the current alternative was provided. Based on the proposers plan, the shoreline trees will be replaced with a native prairie buffer, which is much more effective at providing lake protections.
119	The EAW states that "no known scenic views or vistas are located in proximity of the project and the surrounding area." I believe residents would strongly disagree. Both nearby roads MN-108 and CH-24 are designated as Scenic Byways.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response L. The proposed project will not be visible from either TH 108 or CSAH 24
119	The people who live here or own cabins came to get away from the business of the cities. We came to experience the absence of the noise and bustle that development brings. These are facts that contribute to the issue of compatibility. The EAW is inadequate in part because it doesn't consider the connected actions or cumulative effects related to the casino proposal.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
119	The EAW references only one connected action - the cumulative environmental impact of the whole project must be considered. Any anticipated action on the fee land parcel north of 380th street is a connected action. The EAW glosses over other anticipated future projects on the fee lands mentioned at the public meetings; a golf course, marina, and waterpark, which would have major environmental consequences.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response J.
119	The developer completely fails to demonstrate the assertion that the project is compatible with the existing land uses. The examples given in this section that cite regional resorts of more or less similar scale are not comparable either. Maddens is on a sand bottomed lake, not a sensitive wetland, and it is in an are that is already fully developed. Homestead RV Park is much much smaller. None of these examples demand an extrodinary wetland fill of 450,000 tons.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
119	The intended purpose of the Star Lake Limited Comprehensive Plan is to ensure that the public need is being incorporated into the planning process for this area. Without the implementation portion of the plan, it falls short of that purpose. At the first public input meeting, we were not allowed to make statements about our concerns, but limited to asking questions. This format meant that very little public input was gathered, as only four or five people were able to ask questions, and the developer team took up most of each questioner's time. At the second one we could put red dots next to concerns predetermined by the developer. None of the data collected from the public is included in the EAW. The developer did have this information as is noted in a preliminary study area review that was written by SRF for the Limited Star Lake Comprehensive Plan and EAW process.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
119	The EAW fails to mention that Star Lake is ranked by the DNR as a lake of Outstanding Biological Significance.	Star Lake is rated a DNR Lake of Biological Significance. There are four components that are evaluated to determine that rating: aquatic plants, fish, amphibians, and birds. Only one of these components needs to be rated outstanding for the lake to be considered a Lake of Biological Significance. Star Lake is rated moderate for aquatic plants;,outstanding for fish, unranked for amphibians, and high for birds. The outstanding rating for fish could due to one or more factors including populations of walleye, northern pike, tullibee, overall native fish community, or fish-based Index of Biological Integrity (IBI). The high rating for birds is likely due to colonial water bird nesting areas, particularly the Red-Necked Grebe. Potential impacts to fisheries and water birds, and mitigation measures, are described in detail elsewhere. The project is not expected to have negative impacts on the natural resources that contribute to Star Lakes rating as a Lake of Biological Concern.
119	The application doesn't mention that there is existing land use of the south bay by recreational hunters and fishermen.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The proposers plan will not change the land use, or inhibit recreational use of the south bay.
119	That Star is a DNR designated wild rice lake that is still harvested and, more importantly, feeds a host of migratory waterfowl is a reason for careful further study. Paul Radomski from the dNR told me in an email that while a wild rice inventory has recently been done, more study would be needed to link the signficance of rice beds to the migratory birds that use this part of the lake. According to the DNR, Star is one of the top loon breeding lakes in the County. Looking at the loon inventory, if I am reading correctly, we'd be number two. What happens to the south bay affects the whole lake, and will affect loons and other wildlife. There is osprey on the lake. Trumpeter swans that were at Unnamed Lake last year have not returned - suspects the construction/electrical work putting in that infrastructure may have disturbed the. The EAW deliberately understates the DNR's concerns that construction would disturb breeding colonies of the red-necked grebes. Even though the parking lots will have downward facing lights, the signage will still affect wildlife.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment
119	Light pollution will ruin the brillant night sky. In Otter Tail County we value our rural heritage, and especially the abundant wildlife and scenic beauty.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
119	The issues of compatibility in these sections is a key issue in both ecological terms and aesthetic terms.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Willdlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
119	There may be solutions that would mitigate these factors, but analysis of those alternatives will not happen without an EIS. Elevating this process to an EIS would reassure us that every possible measure is being taken to protect these valuable natural assets, our wildlife, and our sensitive wetland areas.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response A.
120	I am opposed to the whole project. However, if it is going to happen, I would like to make sure it has as little impact on the environment as possible. It is really concerning when you are talking about filling in wetlands and developing on almost three hundred acres. This would destroy wildlife habitat and putting in such a large development is shocking. The water treatment facility is very concerning. Where could it possibly go? The water runoff alone from the parking lots and RVs is going to have a huge impact on the lake and wildlife around it.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The runoff from impervious surfaces to be constructed will be routed through stormwater ponding system to prevent contamination of the environment from stormwater runoff pollutants. The design of the stormwater ponding system exceeds the sizing requirements outlined by the MPCA. The discharge rate of the ponds will be released at a very reduced rate as shown in the stormwater modeling of the ponds. All wetland mitigation standards are being met, both federally and at the state level.
120	If you have ever driven on the roads leading to Star Lake, you can clearly see that it is scary driving those roads at night. There is no room for expansion. There are parts of the road that is subject to flooding. So clearly there is no space to expand into a four lane. But if it cannot be expanded, then how will the roads hold up to 500-600 people traveling on a weekly basis?	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response E. Your comment regarding traffic and roadway safety is acknowledged and will be considered in the final decision.
121	Primary concern is the irreversible change to the natural habitat and the fish and wildlife that inhabit it today. This will be caused by the building process, the huge amounts of landfill to be brought in, stormwater runoff, and the presence of large numbers of people in a sensitive area.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
121	Concerned about traffic congestion and resulting danger to anyone using the existing road system, which is full of blind spots, curves, animals after dark, and cabins close to many of the roads.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
121	Resulting traffic increases on both roads and lake will have negative long term impacts on residents. Why purchase all the shoreline on the North side of their property if they do not have long range plans to put in a marina? Not considering those impacts as well ignores the possible impact to that shoreline and fish hatchery.	See Responses E and J.
122	As the elected leaders of OTC, I am sure you realize the decisions that you make concerning this project will affect many lives for years to come. While the project may generate revenue for OTC, I fear the damage done to Star Lake, the surrounding area, and the residents of not only the Star Lake area but all of OTC will outweigh any benefits.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
123	The circumstances surrounding the development can hardly be construed as benefitting the involved tribe or the local community. Nor is the development likely to present a positive image for tribal gaming moving ahead.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
123	Minnesota's tribal gaming market is already widely considered to be saturated, with more than 20 casinos in a state of 5.5 million people. The area is sparsely populated except during the summer months. The proposed site is literally in the middle of nowhere. The location raises the obvious questions of where the gamblers will come from and how they will get to the casino. There are other, better-located convention resorts in the county with more local cachet that are having difficulty staying afloat as it is. Is there even room in the market for a newer and flashier property that offers gambling?	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. The WEN has completed a feasibility study that presumably shows the profitability of the proposed project. Economic viability of the proposed project is outside the scope of the EAW.
123	Where will the employees come from? The surrounding area has a shortage of blue-collar workers, with many local businesses currently running under capacity for that reason. The site is also a 90-minute drive south of the WEN Reservation. That's a long drive or bus trip for tribal members looking to make the commute each day. Finally there is the question of if this project is a good use of the tribe's limited financial resources.	The commenter's concern is socio-economic in nature, a topic that is outside the scope of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet.
124	Based on the fact that the proposed Star Lake Casino is the largest commercial development of its kind in OTC and has great potential for significant environmental impacts, this project should require an EIS.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
124	One significant shortcoming of the EAW is the project description which describes this as being one project. However later in the EAW it is discussed as two projects, one on trust land and one on fee land. Which is it, one project or two?	The project was listed this way due to the unique nature of the land. This is one project however, the characteristics of fee land and tribal trust land provide a unique situation which deemed it as two separate projects and two jurisdictions.
124	The only way to truly protect the OTC Board of Commissioners, the OTC taxpayers, the People of WEN, and most importantly, the entire Star Lake watershed, would be to order an EIS.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
125	The answer to the question of if there were future stages of the development was "yes" yet there is no further description of future stages. The State law requires all stages be considered one project to be reviewed at the same time, not reviewed once they've decided to build on them.	See Response J, above.
125	These expansions could lead to more destruction to wetlands that are vital to Star Lake. There is already 7.4 acres of wetlands being destroyed and being replaced in another county in the current proposal.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response J, above.

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

REVIEWER ID#	SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONSE
125	They are well above the impervious surface allowance on the Trust Land. It is well documented that impervious surfaces have detrimental impacts on the waters in the State of MN.	There is not a restriction on the imperious surface for the Trust Land. Regardless, the project is considering the imperious surface in total of both the Trust and Fee land and the combined impervious surface is below the allowed maximum. This is identified in the EAW, under Question 7. Cover Type and Question 9. Land Use, B. Zoning Compatibility.
125	The cumulative effects these expansion have will only exacerbate the negative environmental impacts to Star Lake and therefore this EAW shall be elevated to an EIS. The County Commissioners alone cannot properly evaluate the total impact. By elevating this to an EIS, the proposer should develop their plans to include all possible phases and be evaluated as ONE project.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Response J, above.
126	Concerns about water quality and fishing being impacted by construction. The fill needed to advance the construction project will destroy 8 acres of spawning beds and wild rice. These acres will cease to exist, putting wetlands somewhere else doesn't replace them. Runoff from the parking lots will impact water quality. This will further negatively impact the lake by introducing oil, antifreeze, gas, and other hazardous chemical to the lake in much larger quantities than are presently found there.	<p>Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. Rerouting stormwater through stormwater ponds is designed to reduce nutrient load and sequester/break down pollutants. The stormwater ponds will be as effective, if not more effective, at attenuating storm runoff flow rates and removing nutrients/pollutants than the existing condition, as there are longer retention times for the water. The acreage of the stormwater ponds is a little less than the impact acreage, but is not claimed as "wetland credit."</p> <p>Wetland mitigation follows the State and Federal guidelines and rules. See Response J.</p> <p>Within the stormwater ponds, there are zooplankton called Archaea that break down petroleum products. Stormwater treatment ponds are surprisingly effective at precipitating, sequestering, breaking down, and extracting nutrients and pollutants.</p> <p>There are no impacts proposed to the lake shore, lake bed, or potential spawning areas or wild rice beds. All wetland impacts are proposed in lands adjacent to Star Lake.</p>
126	Greatest concern is for waste management and disposal. The proposed method of waste treatment is not an ideal solution. Lagoons will affect water and air quality. The location means pungent and unwelcome odor will be spread over most of the lake during the spring, summer, and fall months, when the winds come from the southwest (where lagoons are proposed to go). A drain field would have much less impact on the air quality. The lagoons proximity to the unnamed lake could cause that lake to be polluted and would spread pollution to the surrounding area.	Comment noted, thank you for your comment. A Rapid Infiltration Basin method of discharging treated wastewater was explored and it was found that the soils were inadequate to take the amount of effluent that will be produced. The waste will be pretreated with aeration before it is discharged to the lagoons which will also be aerated. This aeration provides oxygen to the water to avoid anaerobic digestion of the waste which is what produces odors. There will be back up power generation to the blower building to ensure that the treatment process is aerating the waste from the site without fail. The lagoons will be lined with a PVC liner and a water balance test will be conducted and submitted for approval to the MPCA for permitting and no wastewater will be allowed to discharge to the lagoons until they have analyzed the data and issued the permit. An additional 3' height of the diking around the ponds will be provided to prevent any potential overtopping of the lagoons and there is no watershed for the lagoons so no stormwater runoff will be allowed to enter them. The treated wastewater will be irrigated across CSAH 41 from the unnamed lake so no waste will enter in to the untreated lake.
127	Concerned about the noise, lighting, traffic, and pollution effects on Star Lake. Currently, Star Lake functions like a habitat refuge for wildlife and fish where human impact is minimal. However, the area of lake on which the Casino is to be built is shallow. It is very productive for breeding of fish and wildlife, but it is sensitive due to its shallow waters. Any light, noise, water, and boat traffic or construction activity will have an unusually strong impact on the lake temperature and suitability for wildlife. Heat and salt from the parking lots will eventually enter Star Lake, I don't think the EAW adequately addresses the cumulative and long-term effects of this change in water flow.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. See Responses A, D, E, H, I, and L.
127	The light pollution from traffic and buildings and advertising will diminish the night time experience of solitude for residents and visitors for miles around and forever change the character of the Star Lake experience for children of the future. It will become just another urban lake.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
127	Traffic will increase and likely include many people who have no knowledge or interest in the natural resource of Star Lake. This will change the character of the community and move wildlife habitat to low priority, while earning money off the traffic with adjacent services will become the top priority. This will tip the balance into a cascade of development which will end with loss of a fine natural resource.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
127	We at least need a full EIS for us to understand what we will be forfeiting when we choose gambling over the natural environment of Star Lake.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
128	We truly believe that when the EIS is conducted, there will be proof the influence of a huge casino-resort complex will destroy the immediate and surrounding areas of land and lakeshore habitats. A completed EIS identifying the entire environmental, infrastructure, social, medical, emergency service, security, transportation, and tax implications of such a major development is what we feel is needed. We ask you approve a full EIS for the future of Star Lake.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
128	We chose Star Lake for our home because we were lucky enough to spend our summers on Star. It's the serenity of a peaceful, quiet lake that drew us to become full-time residents. We believe this type of development does not mesh with the rural character of the Star Lake Area.	Comment noted. Thank you for your comment.
128	Environmental concerns with water runoff/wastewater, light pollution, and critical habitat for migratory birds and fish are a few of the many reasons we have [for] such a large proposed development.	Comment noted. Thank you for the comment

CATEGORIES:

GEN General	EIS Environmental Impact Statement	WF Fish & Wildlife	LU Land Use	TL Transmission Line	TR Transportation	WL Wetlands	WQ Water Quality	SE Social
-----------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------