

National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
In cooperation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service



Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Analysis Report

**DISPOSITION OF BUREAU OF MINES PROPERTY,  
TWIN CITIES RESEARCH CENTER MAIN CAMPUS  
Hennepin County, Minnesota**

**Comment Analysis Report – Comments Received on the Draft EIS**

**January 8, 2007**

**National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
In cooperation with the  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION AND GUIDE.....</b>	<b>1</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
DEFINITION OF TERMS.....	1
THE COMMENT ANALYSIS PROCESS .....	2
GUIDE TO THIS DOCUMENT .....	2
<b>CONTENT ANALYSIS REPORT .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SUBSTANTIVE COMMENT SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>11</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	11
AL4019 SUGGESTED CONDITIONS ON TRANSFER .....	11
AL4021 SUPPORT TRANSFER OF CENTER TO A TRIBE .....	13
AL5018 QUESTION CONSERVATION EASEMENT ENFORCEABILITY .....	14
AL6000 RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES IS INADEQUATE .....	15
AL6002 EFFECT OF INDIAN TRUST LAND DESIGNATION .....	19
CI1000 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ANALYSIS.....	25
CR1000 CULTURAL RESOURCES: GUIDING POLICIES, REGS AND LAWS.....	26
CR2000 CULTURAL RESOURCES: METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS.....	26
CR3001 EXPAND GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF CULTURAL RESOURCE IMPACT ANALYSIS .....	29
CR4000 CULTURAL RESOURCES: IMPACT OF PROPOSAL AND ALTERNATIVES .....	29
CR4001 HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF COLDWATER SPRING NOT ADDRESSED.....	30
CR4002 IMPACTS TO SURROUNDING CULTURAL RESOURCES (FT. SNELLING, SIBLEY HOUSE) NOT ADDRESSED.....	31
CR7000 CULTURAL RESOURCE STUDIES INADEQUATE AND/OR FLAWED.....	33
ER1000 EFFECTS TO ETHNOGRAPHIC RESOURCES.....	38
GA1001 ALTERNATIVE A IMPACTS ANALYSIS .....	39
GA1002 ALTERNATIVE B IMPACTS ANALYSIS.....	40
GA1003 ALTERNATIVE C IMPACTS ANALYSIS.....	47
GA3000 IMPACT ANALYSIS: GENERAL METHODOLOGY FOR ESTABLISHING IMPACTS/EFFECTS.....	53
II1000 IRRETRIEVABLE IMPACTS: GENERAL COMMENTS.....	53
MT1015 ADDITIONAL/CORRECTED INFO REQUESTED TO BE INCLUDED IN EIS.....	54
ON1000 OTHER NEPA ISSUES: GENERAL COMMENTS .....	59
PN110001 PURPOSE AND NEED: RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND PLANNING DOCUMENTS .....	62
PN9000 PURPOSE AND NEED: ISSUES AND IMPACT TOPICS SELECTED FOR ANALYSES .....	65
VC13000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	67
VC16000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: ETHNOGRAPHIC RESOURCES.....	67
VC20000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: LAND USE.....	68
VC22000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: VISITOR USE .....	68
VC24000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: MNDNR REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT NATURAL RESOURCE AREA .....	70
VC25000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: HEALTH AND SAFETY .....	73
VC26000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: BUILDINGS AND OTHER STRUCTURES .....	74
VC5000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: WETLANDS .....	75
WL1000 WETLANDS IMPACTS .....	75
WQ7000 WATER RESOURCES: PROTECT NATURAL SPRINGS AND FRESH WATER SOURCE .....	76
<b>APPENDIX A: INDEX BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE.....</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: INDEX OF INDIVIDUAL COMMENTERS .....</b>	<b>136</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: INDEX BY ORGANIZATION .....</b>	<b>158</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: INDEX BY CODE.....</b>	<b>162</b>



## INTRODUCTION AND GUIDE

### INTRODUCTION

The draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) for the disposition of Bureau of Mines Property, Twin Cities Research Center Main Campus (the Center) was on public review between August 22 and November 27, 2006. In addition, four public meetings were conducted in an open house format at the Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge Visitor Center, in Bloomington, Minnesota, where oral comments were solicited. A total of 509 responses on the DEIS were received via oral comments, written letters, e-mails, and Web responses. During the public comment period, these responses were entered into the Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) system either from direct entry by the commenter, or uploading of emails, faxes, and hard copy letters by NPS staff.

### DEFINITION OF TERMS

Primary terms used in the document are defined below.

**Correspondence:** A correspondence is the entire document received from a commenter. It can be in the form of a letter, email, written comment form, note card, or open house transcript.

**Comment:** A comment is a portion of the text within a correspondence that addresses a single subject. By way of example, a comment could include such information as an expression of support or opposition to the use of a potential management tool, additional data regarding the existing condition, or an opinion debating the adequacy of an analysis.

**Code:** A grouping centered on a common subject. The codes were developed during the public comment period and are used to track major subjects of the comments received.

**Substantive Comment:** Agencies are required to respond to all substantive written and oral comments raised by the public or by commenting agencies as part of finalizing the EIS, and to make every reasonable attempt to consider the issues or alternatives raised. Substantive comments raise debate, or question a point of fact or policy. Comments in favor of or against the proposed action or alternatives, or comments that only agree or disagree with NPS policy, are not considered substantive. Substantive comments are defined as those that do one or more of the following:

- Question, with reasonable basis, the accuracy of information in the EIS.
- Question, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of environmental analysis.
- Present reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the EIS.
- Cause changes or revisions in the proposal.

## THE COMMENT ANALYSIS PROCESS

Comment analysis is a process used to compile and correlate similar public comments into a format that can be used by decision makers and the EIS team. Comment analysis assists the team in organizing, clarifying, and addressing technical information pursuant to *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) regulations. It also aids in identifying the topics and issues to be evaluated and considered throughout the planning process.

The process includes five main components:

- developing a coding structure to identify major subjects
- entry of all correspondence into the PEPC system
- identification of specific comments within pieces of correspondence
- reading and coding of public comments
- preparing a comment summary

A coding structure was developed to help sort comments into logical groups by topics and issues. The coding structure was derived from an analysis of the range of topics discussed during the planning process and the comments themselves. The coding structure was designed to capture all comment content rather than to restrict or exclude any ideas.

The NPS PEPC database was used for capturing all correspondence, and identification and management of the comments. The database stores the full text of all correspondence and allows each comment to be coded by topic and issue. Some outputs from the database include tallies of the total number of correspondences and comments received, sorting and reporting of comments by a particular topic or issue, and demographic information regarding the sources of the comments.

Analysis of the public comments involved the assignment of the codes to statements made by the public made via letters, email messages, written, and oral comment forms. All comments were read and analyzed, including those of a technical nature; opinions, feelings, and preferences of one element or one potential alternative over another; and comments of a personal or philosophical nature.

Although the analysis process attempts to capture the full range of public concerns, this content analysis report should be used with caution. Comments from people who chose to respond do not necessarily represent the sentiments of the entire public. Furthermore, this was not a vote-counting process, and the emphasis was on the content of the comment rather than the number of times a comment was received.

## GUIDE TO THIS DOCUMENT

This report is organized as follows:

**Content Analysis Report-** This is the basic report produced from PEPC that provides information on the numbers and types of comments received, organized by code. The first section of the report provides a summary of the number of comments that were coded under each topic. The second section provides general demographic information, such as the states where commenters live, the number of letters received from different categories of organizations, etc.

**Substantive Comment Summary-** This report summarizes the substantive comments received during the public comment period. These comments are organized by codes.

**Correspondence Index of Organizations-** This index provides a listing of all groups that submitted comments, arranged and grouped by the following organization types as defined by PEPC (and in this order): businesses; churches and religious groups; civic groups, conservation/preservation groups; federal government; NPS employees; non-governmental groups; recreational groups; state government; town or city government; tribal government; unaffiliated individuals; university/professional society. Each piece of correspondence was assigned a unique identification number upon entry into PEPC for future reference.

**Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters-** This index provides a listing of all of the individuals who submitted comments during the public scoping period. Like the previous index, each correspondence was assigned a unique identification number which can be used to assist individuals in identifying the way in which NPS addressed their comments. This list is organized alphabetically.

**Index By Organization Type-** This list identifies all of the codes that were assigned to each individual piece of correspondence and is arranged by organization type. Individual commenters are also included in this report and are identified as Unaffiliated Individuals.

**Index by Code-** This lists which commenters or authors (identified by PEPC organization type) commented on which topics, as identified by the codes used in this analysis. The report is organized by code. Under each code is a list of the authors who submitted comments that fell under that code, and the respective correspondence identification numbers. Those correspondences identified as N/A represent unaffiliated individuals.



## CONTENT ANALYSIS REPORT

(Note: Each comment may have multiple codes. As a result, the total number of comments may be different than the actual comment totals)

<b>Code</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Number of Comments</b>
AL4000	Alternatives: New Alternatives of Elements	0
AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.	19
AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.	14
AL4003	Support "Green Museum"	378
AL4004	Oppose tribal ownership of Center.	1
AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.	64
AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.	331
AL4007	Support partnership with Native American groups for appropriate development.	13
AL4008	Support special access for Native American use.	7
AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.	372
AL4012	Support creation of a Native American museum.	1
AL4016	Support the Center becoming part of MNRRA.	4
AL4017	Suggestions - Other	27
AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.	66
AL4019	Suggested conditions on transfer.	5
AL4020	Oppose other suggestions.	2
AL4021	Support Transfer of Center to a Tribe	4
AL5000	Alternatives: Response to alternatives/scenarios presented in EIS	1
AL5001	Support federal (including NPS)ownership of the Center.	513
AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.	95
AL5003	Oppose development of Center.	109
AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.	46
AL5005	Support alternative A - No-Action Alternative	9
AL5006	Oppose Alternative A - No-Action.	7

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

AL5007	Oppose Alternative B.	8
AL5008	Support Alternative C.	7
AL5009	Support Alternative D.	16
AL5010	Support restrictions placed on transfer.	12
AL5011	Support use as open space / park.	369
AL5012	Support interpretive/nature/history center scenario.	8
AL5013	Oppose training center/office park scenario.	5
AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.	21
AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.	21
AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.	387
AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.	36
AL5018	Question conservation easement enforceability.	1
AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.	387
AL5020	Support transfer to another non-federal government entity.	1
AL5021	Oppose Alternative C	1
AL5022	Oppose Alternative D	1
AL6000	Range of alternatives is inadequate.	8
AL6000	Recommend consideration of additional alternative(s).	4
AL6002	Effect of Indian Trust Land designation.	23
CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments	331
CI1000	Cumulative Impacts Analysis.	1
CR1000	Cultural Resources: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws	1
CR2000	Cultural Resources: Methodology And Assumptions	7
CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.	19
CR3001	Expand geographic scope of cultural resource impact analysis	1
CR4000	Cultural Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	2
CR4001	Historical importance of Coldwater Spring not addressed.	3
CR4002	Impacts to surrounding cultural resources (Ft. Snelling, Sibley House) not addressed.	3

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

CR7000	Cultural resource studies inadequate and/or flawed.	12
ED1000	Editorial	10
ER1000	Effects to ethnographic resources.	1
ER2000	Ethnographic Resources Impacts Analysis	0
GA1000	Impact Analysis: Impact Analyses	0
GA1001	Alternative A Impacts Analysis	5
GA1002	Alternative B Impacts Analysis	24
GA1003	Alternative C Impacts Analysis	14
GA1004	Alternative D Impacts Analysis	6
GA1005	Open Space/Park Scenario Impacts Analysis	0
GA1006	Interpretive/Nature/History Center Impacts Analysis	0
GA1007	Training Center/Office Park Scenario Impacts Analysis.	0
GA3000	Impact Analysis: General Methodology For Establishing Impacts/Effects	1
HS1000	Health and Safety Impacts	0
II1000	Irretrievable Impacts: General Comments	1
LU1000	Land Use: Impacts from proposal and alternatives.	0
MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments	69
MT1001	Native American Culture/History.	464
MT1002	Euro-American History.	389
MT1003	Minnesota History.	386
MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History	70
MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.	99
MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.	323
MT1007	Preservation for future generations.	52
MT1008	Minneapolis Parks & Recreation Board Management.	1
MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.	47
MT1010	Ecotourism.	3
MT1011	Public safety and security at the Center.	1
MT1012	Spiritual / religious beliefs.	11
MT1013	Preservation Education	61
MT1014	Legislative efforts.	1
MT1015	Additional/corrected info requested to be included in EIS.	16
ON1000	Other NEPA Issues: General Comments	8
PN1000	Purpose And Need: Planning Process And Policy	0

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

PN9000	Purpose And Need: Issues And Impact Topics Selected For Analyses	2
SL1000	Sustainability and Long-term Management.	2
SO1000	Soils: Impact of proposal and alternatives.	0
TE2000	Threatened And Endangered Species: Methodology And Assumptions	0
TE4000	Threatened And Endangered Species: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	0
VC5000	Affected Environment: Wetlands	1
VE4000	Visitor Experience: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	0
VR2000	Vegetation And Riparian Areas: Methodology And Assumptions	0
VR4000	Vegetation And Riparian Areas: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	0
WL1000	Wetlands impacts.	3
WL2000	Wetlands laws, regulations, policies.	0
WQ3000	Water Resources: Study Area	0
WQ4000	Water Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	0
WQ7000	Water Resources: Protect natural springs and fresh water source.	5
CR 2002	Cultural significance/importance of Coldwater Springs to American Indians.	4
VC10000	Affected Environment: Rare Or Unusual Vegetation	0
VC13000	Affected Environment: Cultural Resources	1
VC16000	Affected Environment: Ethnographic Resources	1
VC20000	Affected Environment: Land Use	2
VC22000	Affected Environment: Visitor Use	5
VC24000	Affected Environment: Water Quality and Hydrology	5
VC24000	Affected Environment: MNDNR Regionally Significant Natural Resource Area.	3
VC25000	Affected Environment: Health and Safety	3
VC26000	Affected Environment: Buildings and Other Structures	2
PN110001	Purpose and Need: Relationships with other Laws, Regulations, and Planning Documents.	10

### Correspondence Distribution by Correspondence Type

Type	Number of Correspondences
E-mail	86
Letter	114
Other	334
Park Form	17
Petition	1
Transcript	30
Web Form	37
<b>Total</b>	<b>619</b>

### Correspondence Signature Count by Organization Type

Organization Type	Number of Correspondences
Civic Groups	31
Conservation/Preservation	58
Federal Government	2
State Government	2
Town or City Government	2
Tribal Government	13
Unaffiliated Individual	508
University/Professional Society	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>619</b>

### Correspondence Distribution by State

State	Percentage	Number of Correspondences
CA	0.65%	4
CO	1.94%	12
DC	0.16%	1
GA	0.16%	1
IA	0.32%	2
IL	0.16%	1
MA	0.16%	1
MD	0.16%	1
MN	83.20%	515
MO	0.16%	1
MS	0.16%	1
NC	0.16%	1
ND	0.32%	2
OH	0.32%	2
TN	0.16%	1
Victoria	0.48%	3
WI	1.45%	9
none	9.53%	60
	0.16%	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>619</b>

## SUBSTANTIVE COMMENT SUMMARY

### INTRODUCTION

The following Substantive Comment Summary matrix contains the individual comments received that were identified as “substantive” according to policy contained in Director’s Order (DO) 12 (see Definition of Terms, above). The following substantive comments each consists of a smaller segment of the respective complete correspondence received by the National Park Service in response to the Draft EIS. In some cases, the reviewer may wish to refer back to the respective complete originating correspondence for a better understanding of the individual substantive comment (i.e., for context). This can be done using the “Correspondence ID” that is attached to each individual substantive comment. For example, the first substantive comment below (Comment ID 37342) originates from Correspondence ID 200010. Therefore, by referring to Correspondence ID 200010 in the PEPC system, the reviewer will have access to the complete correspondence for the individual substantive comment.

### AL4019 SUGGESTED CONDITIONS ON TRANSFER. (Substantive)

**Correspondence Id:** 200010    **Comment Id:** 37342    **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The title transfer must be subject to a well-defined perpetual Conservation Easement, which contains at minimum the following language: 1. North 1/4 of Coldwater area property: a. Complete removal of all buildings, except building #1, with all compliance of all legal requirements; b. The building #1 envelope shall be reduced in size to an area of no more than 1/2 of the area of the current building envelope; c. The building height (restored or new) shall be subject to current building height legal requirements, with no "grandfathering" under previous laws; d. The building use (new or remodeled) shall be as interpretative/cultural center, consistent with Native American spiritual heritage and the importance of Coldwater Springs; e. The building design (new or remodeled) shall be of the type that will receive "Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)" certification and enhances the natural landscape; f. The parking size is consistent with expected visitor use and is designed according to the most up-to-date stormwater treatment standards; g. All building activities are consistent with other applicable laws; h. The remaining land is restored to a pre-European settlement vegetation condition; and i. If the interpretative/cultural center described above cannot be built, then the north 1/4 of the property shall be restored to pre-European settlement vegetation condition. 2. South 3/4 of property a. buildings removed; b. The entire portion shall restored to a pre-European settlement vegetation condition; c. No permanent structure shall be allowed; temporary structures may be allowed for purposes of

conducting Native American ceremonial traditions; d. No motorized vehicles, except for emergency purposes; and e. A non-motorized access trail to Coldwater Spring is specifically allowed. 3. Language applicable to the entire property: a. All archaeological sites shall be protected. b. There shall be no removal of any water from the site by artificial means. c. The use of road salts and other de-icers shall be prohibited or restricted. d. The use of chemicals for fertilizer and pest control shall be prohibited.

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 200010 **Comment Id:** 37343 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** CONTINUED e. Exclusive access to Coldwater Spring shall be provided at various times to allow Native American religious practices. General public access is allowed the remainder of the time except that, if the property is owned by one or more Dakota communities, general public access shall be negotiated prior to the title transfer. f. A vigorous groundwater monitoring program shall be established to help protect Coldwater Spring from off-site and on-site impacts. g. Close attention shall be paid to land alterations and construction activities within 1/4 mile of the site. (See Exhibit 1 for discussion pertaining to the groundwater recharge area being % mile from Coldwater Spring.) h. The salvage and recycling of materials from the removed buildings shall be ensured to the extent possible.

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 200010 **Comment Id:** 37347 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The Draft EIS (page 97, paragraph 1) states: "Camp Coldwater Spring is fed by groundwater originating upgradient of the Center property. The exact source of the spring water is subject to some debate; however, it is not expected that any of the alternatives proposed in this document would affect the source of the spring." As stated in Section III.C.3.f. and g. above, the transfer of ownership should be subject to the requirements that groundwater monitoring be continued and close attention paid to land alteration and construction activities that may affect Coldwater Spring. Particular attention should be paid to the Highway 55/62 interchange area; it has been artificially lowered by highway construction and poses a significant risk to the Coldwater Spring in the event of infrastructure failure of that interchange. Also, Highway 55 roadbed has been raised from 54" Street to Highway 62 to remain above the groundwater flow to the Coldwater Spring. In the likely event of reconstruction of the road, this height modification must remain.

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 200010 **Comment Id:** 37349 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The Draft EIS (page 98, paragraph 1) discusses the poor water quality of Coldwater Spring. The National Park Service, in cooperation with other government agencies, should include a plan to address water quality issues as a condition of ownership transfer.

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203584 **Comment Id:** 37905 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** When the USBM site ownership is transferred, and/or if development occurs on the site, conditions need to be in place requiring the new owner/developer to address potential aircraft noise impact' for land uses. Such conditions need to address notification of prospective owners and tenants of potential aircraft noise and provide assurance that structures will have acoustical integrity through appropriate design or mitigation measures,

**Organization:** Metropolitan Council

**Commenter:** Phyllis Hanson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**AL4021 SUPPORT TRANSFER OF CENTER TO A TRIBE. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199726 **Comment Id:** 35431 **Coder's Initials:** SP

**Comment Text:** We believe that the original Native American occupiers and owners of the property should at this time be given due consideration for the disposition of the Center property. Their governmental status should not be disregarded by giving more consideration to other governmental bodies and their priorities should not be disregarded in favor of private or nonprofit entities. In this regard, the federally recognized tribes now representing the Dakota people whose ancestors allowed the United States government to use the Center should now be given due consideration for the return of the property. It has always and continuously been recognized as Dakota property. If not in the sense of fee ownership, always in the sense of right of use

**Organization:** Prairie Island Indian community

**Commenter:** Audrey Bennett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35512 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The proposal also asks that the federal government remove the buildings from the site and remediate any hazardous conditions before the land is conveyed into Trust for the SMSC.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199690 **Comment Id:** 37247 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The Mendota Mdewakanton Dakota Community Tribal Council supports the Lower Sioux Community in their resolution for the Bureau of Mines Property (Coldwater Springs or Camp Coldwater is located on this property). The Mendota Mdewakanton Dakota Community Tribal Council additionally supports the Coldwater Coalition letters of support for the Lower Sioux Community. We, MMDC, firmly believe the Dakota Communities should have a say in the future of the property as it is a significant sacred place for prayer and meditation for many native and nonnative peoples. Our ancestors gathered there. Our people are connected to this sacred land.

**Organization:** Mendota Mdewakanton Dakota Community

**Commenter:** Tiffany Eggenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199726 **Comment Id:** 35436 **Coder's Initials:** SP

**Comment Text:** Alternative D is leaving the site in federal management with modifications to the site and then with subsequent conveyance to a university or nonfederal government entity. This conveyance could be with or without conditions. While the modifications are a nice enticement for this alternative, they are not complete unless the property is conveyed to the Prairie Island Indian Community individually or jointly with other federally recognized Mdewakanton Dakota tribes, for the reasons above stated.

**Organization:** Prairie Island Indian community

**Commenter:** Audrey Bennett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**AL5018 QUESTION CONSERVATION EASEMENT ENFORCEABILITY. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 193159 **Comment Id:** 35321 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** The EIS suggests that a public or private body could take over the property and that the United States could ensure that it's historic, cultural and natural resources are protected by a conservation easement. However, I practiced law in a corporate setting for many years and found that the problem with restrictions in any long-term transaction is having a mechanism to keep the parties aware of their

responsibilities and a mechanism to enforce the restrictions. While conservation easements sound good, the problem is a practical one. Who is holding the big stick? Do they have the staff and resources to monitor the easement and make sure the parties know about the restrictions and that they are being obeyed? Do they have an easy way to enforce the restrictions? Can the restrictions be overridden by political pressure or changes in the law? If the Department of the Interior chooses to use an easement, they may decide to partner with a non-profit easement holding partner that has a long successful record of monitoring easements. Ideally the monitoring program would be funded with an endowment. Of course, the problem with this approach is that no matter how effective the group is now, it may be totally ineffective in 20 years. Therefore, the Department would need a way to monitor the partner and to replace them if necessary. Once again the practical aspect of this makes it difficult. Next, the easement has to provide for some easy low cost way of enforcement. An easement that has an expensive court action as the only enforcement mechanism will very seldom be enforced. The more parties that have the option of enforcing the easement will also give it a greater chance of success. In order for these parties to enforce the easement, they have to know about it. Ensuring that the appropriate parties know about the restrictions over a long period of time, perhaps hundreds of years, is very difficult if not impossible. While some legal protections seem attractive in the abstract, there is a high likelihood that they will be ineffective over the long term.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Edna Brazaitis **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**AL6000 RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES IS INADEQUATE. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 193124 **Comment Id:** 34974 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The number and range of alternatives considered in the EIS, as expression of public policy choice, do not adequately taken into account nor imaginatively consider how the deep Dakota spiritual and cultural interest in the site might be accommodated and protected.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Howard J Vogel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 193124 **Comment Id:** 34977 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The EIS lacks imagination in failing to consider how the site may be transferred to one of the recognized tribal governments as trust land held by the tribe in trust for the tribe.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Howard J Vogel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 193124 **Comment Id:** 34976 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** In the alternatives discussion, the EIS fails, to fully consider the possibility of transferring ownership and authority for the management of the site to one or more representatives of the Dakota Oyate.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Howard J Vogel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 202337 **Comment Id:** 37324 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The focus of preservation of Camp Coldwater should be not of just the disposition of the BOM property, but rather of the joining together of the BOM property with all of the land Camp Coldwater is on. Camp Coldwater lately is being described as just the BOM property. I believe the EIS of the property of BOM fails to address this major reason for the preservation of Camp Coldwater. Each of the landowners of the sections of Camp Coldwater are looking out for their own piece of the pie, and not seeing the whole picture. For example, at FT. Snelling, what if MNDot owned the Round Tower, MN State park owned the Commanders house, MHS owned the North Barracks, National Park Service owned the south wall Barracks and towers, and MPLS Park Board owned the Parade Grounds. How could anyone of these entities sell off or develop its own piece of the fort? Sheer nonsense!!!!!! With this in mind, someone needs to step up and put this Camp Coldwater puzzle together, as one, as this is the goal of the preservation of this Village of Camp Coldwater. BOM property cannot be separate from the rest of the Camp Coldwater Village.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Dave Fudally **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203581 **Comment Id:** 37894 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** In terms of the portion of the Bureau of Mines Property that includes Coldwater Spring, the Draft fails to address both the need for preservation and to provide safe access to all members of the public because of Cold Water Spring's historic connection to the building of Fort Snelling and ultimately to the creation of the State of Minnesota and the fact that Coldwater Spring is a sacred place for many Native Americans.

**Organization:** Friends of the Sibley Historic Site

**Commenter:** Robert A Minish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35513 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The Draft EIS states that the legislation authorizing the Center's conveyance allows the Secretary to convey only to universities or other government entities. The Draft EIS fails to address adequately the possibility that an Indian Tribe is a government the Secretary could deem appropriate to receive the Center. For example, the Draft EIS repeatedly assumes that certain Minnesota laws and regulations would apply to a nonfederal government entity that receives the Center. This assumption is incorrect when applied to an Indian Tribe acquiring land in Minnesota to be held in trust by the United States Government for the tribe ("Trust Land"). The Final EIS should address the potential for an Indian Tribe to receive and use the Center as the SMSC proposes to do.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199760 **Comment Id:** 37605 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The FWS currently uses Building 11, which has 14,000 square feet, for storage of important equipment used in biological field work. Various federal, state, and county partners have indicated interest in using this building for similar purposes. If FWS loses the use of Building 11, we will be hard-pressed to locate and acquire a suitable replacement facility. Such space, even if available, would be very costly to lease or purchase. Building 11 is located on the periphery of the USBM property, and is conveniently accessed by an existing road skirting the southwestern edge of the property. The building itself lies near a busy highway, and is situated between the highway and Camp Coldwater Spring, such as to arguably provide some level of noise abatement for the spring site. Thus, we recommend consideration be given to retaining Building 11 and its existing access road in federal ownership, for continued use by FWS and its partners.

**Organization:** U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

**Commenter:** Tony Sullins **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 192604 **Comment Id:** 35669 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** I suggest that the Park Service and the FEIS consider another alternative for action: that Coldwater Spring be restored to the Dakota community. The Lower Sioux community could act in a representative function for Minnesota Dakota communities in taking control of the sacred site.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Barb Marmet **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199726 **Comment Id:** 35432 **Coder's Initials:** SP

**Comment Text:** As part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, several alternatives for disposition of the Bureau of Mines Property were included. However, the federally recognized Indian tribes did not receive consideration at all as a dispositional alternative. Based upon the location of the Center within original native lands, such lands being ceded to the United States by treaty and with such treaty providing a continuing right of access and use by Native Americans, the federally recognized tribes neighboring the site are the most logical alternative for disposition of the site. Being aware of the kind of minimal care and limitations on access and use of the site at the present time, the Prairie Island Indian Community as a representative of some of the Dakota peoples with a historical, cultural and religious connection to the site, would respectfully request an additional alternative be considered involving conveyance to the Prairie Island Indian Community individually or jointly with the other federally recognized Mdewakanton Dakota tribes.

**Organization:** Prairie Island Indian community

**Commenter:** Audrey Bennett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203571 **Comment Id:** 37752 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** In terms of the portion of the Bureau of Mines Property that includes Coldwater Spring, the Draft fails to address both the need for preservation and the need for safe and ADA-compliant access to all members of the public because of Coldwater Spring's historic connection to the building of Fort Snelling and ultimately to the creation of the State of Minnesota, and the fact that Coldwater Spring is a sacred place for many Native Americans.

**Organization:** Friends of Fort Snelling

**Commenter:** Dorothy S Waltz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 193124 **Comment Id:** 34990 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The limited range of alternatives considered in the EIS and the constricted view of choice available, taken by the NPS, considering the cultural significance of the site and rejection of the recommendations of the Terrell Study give every appearance as serving the hegemonic American Story, with its non-Indian worldview, as opposed to sympathetic accommodation of the Dakota worldview in the planning process for disposition of the Center.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Howard J Vogel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 193124 **Comment Id:** 34989 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** In this matter up for decision the unduly restrictive approach of the NPS, both in terms of the range of alternatives discussed in the EIS and the interpretation of the federal law applicable to its conclusions on whether the site includes a TCP, threatens to impair, and even destroy, rather than accommodate the cultural and spiritual significance of the site according to the master story and tradition of the Dakota people.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Howard J Vogel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**AL6002 EFFECT OF INDIAN TRUST LAND DESIGNATION. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35516 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 5: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws . . . , Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area . . . , p. 14. In discussing the Mississippi River Corridor Critical Areas statutes and regulations, the Draft EIS states, ". . . the executive order's interim development regulations would have jurisdiction of future land uses by any nonfederal owner." This conclusion is incorrect for an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. Laws of the State and its various political entities and subdivisions, with certain limited exceptions, do not have any force on Trust Land. Since the SMSC proposes to acquire the Center in trust, the Final EIS should discuss this important distinction.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35533 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 22: Chapter 2, Conceptual Land-use Scenarios, Interpretive/Nature/History Center, p. 42. The Draft EIS states that, under the Interpretive/Nature/History Center conceptual scenario, new construction would be limited by various State and local laws and regulations. This conclusion is incorrect for an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. Since the SMSC proposes to acquire the Center in trust, the Final EIS should expand this discussion to address this important distinction.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35538 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 27: Chapter 2, Alternative B, p. 47. The Draft EIS states that because there would be no restrictions on subsequent transfer or sale under Alternative B, any future owner would be free to sell or transfer the Center to a private entity for use or development. This conclusion is incorrect for land acquired and conveyed into trust for an Indian Tribe. Trust Land can only be removed from trust with the Secretary's approval. Since the SMSC proposes that the Center become Trust Land, the Final EIS should discuss this important distinction.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35543 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 29: Chapter 2, Alternative B, Laws, Regulations. . . , Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area, p. 47. The Draft EIS incorrectly concludes that the State's Mississippi River Critical Area statute and Executive Order apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. Since the SMSC proposes that the Center become Trust Land, the Final EIS should discuss this important distinction. See Comment 5.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35555 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 39: Chapter 2, Alternative C, Laws, Regulations . . . , Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area Legislation, p. 53. The fact that the Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area laws would not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land should be discussed. See Comment 5.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35554 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 38: Chapter 2, Alternative C, Laws, Regulations . . . , MNRRRA Enabling Legislation . . . , p. 53. In discussing the MNRRRA CMP the Draft EIS does not address the application of MNRRRA to the Center site if it were Trust Land. See Comment 6.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35553 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 37: Chapter 2, Alternative C, Conditions, Covenants and Easements, p. 51-52. The Final EIS should note that State laws governing easements and covenants do not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35552 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 36: Chapter 2, Alternative C, Conditions, Conservation Easement, p. 51. The Final EIS should note that the State conservation easement statute does not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35550 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 35: Chapter 2, Alternative C, p. 50. The discussion of Alternative C should indicate that an Indian Tribe would not acquire the Center site in trust under this alternative. The Bureau of Indian Affairs will not approve taking land into trust with conditions as proposed in Alternative C. See Comment 25.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35549 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 34: Chapter 2, Alternative B, Laws, Regulations... , National Historic Preservation Act, p. 49. The discussion of the NHPA's application should be expanded to address the extent to which an Indian Tribe acquiring the Center site in trust would be subject to the Act. See Comment 17.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35548 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 33: Chapter 2, Alternative B, Laws, Regulations. . . , Camp Coldwater Spring Protective Legislation . . . , p. 47-48. The Final EIS should note that the Camp Coldwater Spring protection legislation and the Minnesota Historic Sites Act do not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comment 5.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35547 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 32: Chapter 2, Alternative B, Laws, Regulations . . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport Zoning Ordinance, p. 48. The Final EIS should note that the FAA regulations governing land use and height limitations around airports would apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comment 15.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35545 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 30: Chapter 2, Alternative B, Laws, Regulations . . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport Zoning Ordinance, p. 47. The Draft EIS incorrectly concludes that any transferee of the Center would have to comply with the MSP Zoning Ordinance. This conclusion is incorrect as it applies to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comment 13.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35892 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 87 (con't): State and local laws and ordinances also require water quality treatment which typically includes

ponds to allow the deposition of particles carrying nutrients, fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides. Pond inlets have skimmers to address runoff from parking lots, and in some cases, sumps are required in the parking lots to trap vehicle fluids. The Final EIS should describe all potential sources of water quality impacts and the federal, State, and local laws that address them. The Final EIS should also note that State and local storm water quality laws would not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land, determine if any federal laws would apply, and if so, describe the application.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35559 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 42: Chapter 2, Alternative C, Laws, Regulations . . . , National Historic Preservation Act, p. 54. The discussion of the NHPA's application should be expanded to address the extent to which an Indian Tribe acquiring the Center site in trust would be subject to the Act. See Comment 17.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35558 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 41: Chapter 2, Alternative C, Laws, Regulations . . . , Camp Coldwater Springs Protection Legislation . . . , p. 53-54. The Final EIS should note that the Camp Coldwater Spring protection legislation does not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comment 16.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35557 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 40: Chapter 2, Alternative C, Laws, Regulations . . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport Zoning Ordinance, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/Nature/History Center Scenario, and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 53. The Final EIS should note that the MSP Zoning Ordinance does not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comment 13 and note that the FAA regulations governing land use and height limitations around airports would not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comments 13 and 15.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35539 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 28: Chapter 2, Alternative B, Laws, Regulations . . . , MNRRRA Enabling Legislation . . . , p. 47. Whether and how the MNRRRA CMP applies to Trust Land should be discussed. See Comment 6.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35536 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 25: Chapter 2, Alternative B, p. 47. The SMSC submits that the Alternative B analysis here and throughout the Final EIS should be expanded to discuss an Indian Tribe acquiring the Center in trust without conditions. Expanding the Alternative C analysis is not appropriate because the Bureau of Indian Affairs will not approve taking land into trust with conditions as proposed in Alternative C.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35530 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 19: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws . . . , p. 13-29. In this section on Relationship With Other Laws . . . , the Draft EIS makes no mention of the federal and State laws controlling activities in wetlands. They are presented and discussed in Chapter 3, Wetlands, on pages 99-100. Given the number of wetlands shown in the Center site wetland delineation, a review of the Clean Water Act, the Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act, and the applicable regulations under both should also be included in the Final EIS. This discussion should include an analysis of applicability to an Indian Tribe that acquires the Center in trust.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35517 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 6: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws. . . , MNRRA Enabling Legislation. . . , p. 14-16. In discussing the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area Comprehensive Management Plan ("MNRRA CMP), the Draft EIS does not address whether or how the MNRRA CMP would apply to the Center site if it were Trust Land. For federal laws of general applicability, the general rule is that, unless Congress expressly exempts Indian Tribes from their reach, those statutes apply to the tribes. Since the SMSC proposes to acquire the Center in trust, the Final EIS should discuss how Public Law 100-696 would apply under this general rule if the SMSC acquires the Center in trust.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35525 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 13: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws. . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport. . . Zoning Ordinance, Permitting Requirements, p. 20. The Draft EIS states, "Therefore, any future owner of the Center would have to comply with all applicable airport zoning ordinance and permit requirements." This conclusion is incorrect for an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land, since the MSP Zoning Ordinance is a local, not a federal, regulation. Since the SMSC proposes to acquire the Center in trust, the Final EIS should discuss this important distinction.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35526 **Coder's Initials:** SF

**Comment Text:** Comment 16: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws. . . , Camp Coldwater Spring Protection Legislation . . . , p. 22-23. In the Final EIS, the discussion of the Camp Coldwater Spring protection legislation should note that these State laws do not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**CI1000 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ANALYSIS. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35934 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 114: Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts, p. 230. Responding to our previous comments on Alternatives B and C will necessitate changes to the various the sections titled Archeological Resources, Historic Structures and Districts, Ethnographic Resources, Soils, Vegetation, Hydrology, Water Quality, Wetlands, Health and Safety, and Public use and Experience in the Final EIS under Cumulative Impacts. We will not repeat our earlier comments on those sections after this comment.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**CR1000 CULTURAL RESOURCES: GUIDING POLICIES, REGS AND LAWS (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 193124 **Comment Id:** 34979 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The interpretation of the federal law governing the planning process for disposition of the Center, by the NPS, that led the NPS to reject its ethnographic consultants' conclusions represents a policy choice within the range of the discretion of the agency rather than the mandated choice claimed within the explanatory statement of the agency entitled "Sacred Site and Traditional Cultural Property Analysis" dated October 4, 2006.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Howard J Vogel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**CR2000 CULTURAL RESOURCES: METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 203363 **Comment Id:** 37577 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** There appears to be a discrepancy between the EIS and the Archaeological Research report regarding Zone V. The EIS indicates that Zone V was found to contain no important cultural materials, while the Archaeological Research report indicates that Zone V includes a military railroad grade that is a contributing element of the Ft. Snelling Historic District.

**Organization:** Minnesota Historical Society

**Commenter:** Britta L Bloomberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203363 **Comment Id:** 37579 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** A Phase II archaeology survey should be completed for Zones I and II as part of this planning process, before any property

transfer takes place. Then, a comprehensive map of historic contributing properties including all identified archaeological sites, the spring, the reservoir, the spring house, and the military railroad grade can be prepared to serve as a basis for a specific treatment/mitigation strategy under any alternatives. In addition to the Phase II archaeology survey, an evaluation of the Camp Coldwater summer camp (1820-c. 1823) should be completed to assess if it is a contributing site to the Ft. Snelling Historic District (more associative significance than for archaeological information potential). If it is contributing, it should be included on the comprehensive map.

**Organization:** Minnesota Historical Society

**Commenter:** Britta L Bloomberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203363 **Comment Id:** 37580 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The Ethnographic Resources Study (Terrell et. Al., 2005) concludes that the Coldwater Spring meets the National Register criteria as a traditional cultural property (TCP). However the EIS indicates that the National Park Service has determined that the spring does not meet TCP criteria. We believe that it is important to consider the views of interested parties as well as more information on the NPS evaluation as part of our assessment of this aspect of the spring's significance.

**Organization:** Minnesota Historical Society

**Commenter:** Britta L Bloomberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203363 **Comment Id:** 37581 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** We have some concerns regarding the use of the three tables (pages 124-126) to assess effects for Section 106 purposes. The tables establish a relationship between impact intensity and effect determination/mitigation that is more specific than the effect definition in the Section 106 regulations. As a result, the effect determinations as proscribed in the table may not hold true in all cases. For example, a minor adverse effect on the overall integrity of a historic property could still be adverse (such as a case where certain elements of work on a historic building do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards). On the other hand, major adverse effects do not always result in a situation where a mitigation agreement cannot be achieved. Since these tables could be misleading, it may be less confusing to simply use the assessment of effect presented in 36 CFR 800. We note that the table for ethnographic resources is presented only for NEPA assessments. Should additional consideration of Coldwater Spring establish that it is eligible as a TCP (see comment 1.E., above), the table may need to be revised for 106 purposes.

**Organization:** Minnesota Historical Society

**Commenter:** Britta L Bloomberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203634 **Comment Id:** 37913 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** In regard to the conclusions of Robert Clouse in his archaeological report, the fact that soils in the north end of the Bureau of Mines property may have been waterlogged does not exclude their potential for containing archaeological resources, especially in an area once known for wetlands where Dakota people may have carried on ceremonies and harvested aquatic plants. Given the cursory nature of the Clouse archaeological survey at the north end of the property, further archaeological testing should be done to determine the adequacy of his survey in that area.

**Organization:** Minnesota Sacred Places

**Commenter:** Bruce M White **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203634 **Comment Id:** 37920 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** It is not my purpose here to engage in a argument about the adequacy or inadequacy of the National Register analysis in the Ethnographic Study or the TCP Analysis. I happen to believe that the Ethnographic Study presented a convincing case about the TCP eligibility of Coldwater Spring for the Dakota. But the proper arbiters for issues like this are the experts in the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office and in the office of Keeper of the National Register in Washington, D.C. Opinions and an eventual determination of eligibility should be sought from these agencies and it should be presented to the public prior to the finalizing of the BOM EIS, so as to provide an opportunity for public comment.

**Organization:** Minnesota Sacred Places

**Commenter:** Bruce M White **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203634 **Comment Id:** 37927 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** In the case of Native use of the Coldwater area, additional information relating to the Native use of Coldwater Spring might make a lot of difference in determining the National Register eligibility of the area as a TCP or as a place of historical importance. If additional historical information were able to demonstrate the satisfaction of even skeptical Park Service employees that Coldwater Spring and surrounding area was a TCP, it could make a great difference in the boundaries of the Fort Snelling Historic District, since the question of boundary of the Coldwater Spring TCP was expected to be determined during further consultation with the Dakota. It could also affect the nature of any mitigation required for use of the Bureau of Mines property.

**Organization:** Minnesota Sacred Places

**Commenter:** Bruce M White **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

### CR3001 EXPAND GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF CULTURAL RESOURCE IMPACT ANALYSIS (Substantive)

**Correspondence Id:** 202312 **Comment Id:** 37411 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Repeatedly in the DEIS the Coldwater campus was partitioned into significant (spring outflow) and other land. The Camp Coldwater Spring area begins uphill at the airport and ends at the bottom of the Mississippi River bluff. Coldwater Spring is the only natural spring of size in either Minneapolis or Saint Paul, and the last natural spring in all of Hennepin County. The 27.32-acre Coldwater property is already a "select portion" of the watershed. The spring is only as good as its groundwater source(s). The essence of Coldwater is not just Mississippi blufftop real estate, it's the water.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Susu Jeffery **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

### CR4000 CULTURAL RESOURCES: IMPACT OF PROPOSAL AND ALTERNATIVES (Substantive)

**Correspondence Id:** 203363 **Comment Id:** 37582 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** As we stated above, all four alternatives have the potential for adverse effects to historic properties. (Again, should additional consideration of Coldwater Spring establish that it is eligible as a TCP, the comments below may need to be expanded. A. Alternative B, or the version of Alternative D with no use restrictions, would seem to have the potential for the highest level of adverse effects, since the property would transfer out of the federal government, with no Section 106 review of future projects, and with no restrictions. Mitigation would focus on data recovery and recordation so that a record of the historic properties would be made before the transfer is completed. B. Alternative C, or the version of Alternative D with use restrictions, could offer much better protection of historic properties by including restrictions in the transfer. These could establish a process for review of future actions, maintenance thresholds, and other preservation measures. (We note that even under these alternatives it is quite possible that there would be some level of adverse effect. Certain uses may be more compatible with the historic properties from certain periods, leading to choices for removal of some elements. In addition, the cost of renovating all of the historic buildings associated with the Bureau of Mines is expected to be quite high.) C. Alternative A could result in continued deterioration of historic properties, with accompanying adverse effects. However, under continued federal ownership, the federal agency would presumably have responsibility for stewardship of the historic properties under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

**Organization:** Minnesota Historical Society

**Commenter:** Britta L Bloomberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203581 **Comment Id:** 37895 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The Draft is deficient in not addressing the historical importance of Coldwater Spring and the negative impact that Could occur if the disposition of the Bureau of Mines properly has an adverse effect upon Coldwater Spring itself as well as the ability of the public, and especially the Native Americans, to have access to it.

**Organization:** Friends of the Sibley Historic Site

**Commenter:** Robert A Minish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**CR4001 HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF COLDWATER SPRING NOT ADDRESSED. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 202315 **Comment Id:** 37317 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** HISTORY STUDY Your study is well written but so incomplete. For thousands of years natives from many cultures would have found there way to this spring and enjoyed the stunning waterfall that we all seem to forget about were. So in a comprehensive study we might learn more about the Natives and French traders here and the Spanish (evidenced by a large stele close-by) and see the many tribal groups that would have coursed by this area and stayed by the spring. And about Charlotte Clark and her brother Malcolm and the Snelling children who played about the spring and met Natives there . And how the Dakota ceded this land to Scott Campbell, our Irish kid with a Scottish and Dakota tinge, only to have Congress strike this part of a treaty. And they tried again to give it to his family in another treaty, and these efforts suggests the spring was of importance to them as was Pilot Knob that was granted to members of the Campbell family too - only to be struck down by Congress. And how the military built the Hotel/post for trade with the Ojibway and how the various traders lived in area, so a great many Ojibway and White and Mixed Blood people now trace their heritage to Coldwater. This trade was so very important in establishing American hegemony in northern areas from 1819 to well into the 1840s when Ojibway still favored the English. It seems sensible that the Post/Hotel was selected because Native people gather there and many Natives were about from various tribes as can be pieced together from sundry accounts, for example, the school there had English, French, Swede, Cree, Chippewa, Sioux and Negro brats in 1837. And Norman Kittson who lived there and brought James J. Hill the money to raise \$\$ for his railroads while acquiring a number of Ojibway wives. One Dakota lad said he was born at Coldwater and a map shows teepees there and on and on. Other folks of importance to Minnesota history lived here and visited too. I have much more history that I could regale you with, yet you need to select someone like Alan Woolworth to select scholars and oversee a proper study. Will you do this???? I have some information to share, and I assure you that there is much more information to be uncovered and codified that will change all of our opinions.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Richard P Mosedale **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203510 **Comment Id:** 37847 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** That's part of the story that we need to have told here because the evidence for that, I guess, isn't as widespread as someone would like it to be. But a lot of times our oral traditions and our stories essentially about spirits weren't told by our elders just to anybody. That probably wouldn't be something they would do. But now is a different time that we have to tell these stories as best we know to try to preserve them because if it isn't written down like you are doing for us they don't consider it as evidence and that's I think wrong but we still have to do it. So we have to name the specific spring and we have to name the specific deity for them to believe us which I think is wrong. There is not many other cultures that have to pour out what they think about every spirit and everything they believe in but we have to get them to listen. That is an important story because that spring don't have do be written about. It was used. There is an ancient village site there where I have an axe from right by that spring too and to us that's about all the evidence you need that our people had been using that spring as a sacred site for all these thousand of years.

**Organization:** Mendota Dakota Community

**Commenter:** Jim Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203571 **Comment Id:** 37753 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** There is extensive documentation about the historic importance of Coldwater Spring that can be found at [www.minnesotahistory.net](http://www.minnesotahistory.net). The Draft is deficient in not addressing the historical importance of Coldwater Spring and the negative impact that could occur if the disposition of the Bureau of Mines Property had an adverse effect upon Coldwater Spring itself as well as the ability of the public, and especially the Native Americans, to have access to it.

**Organization:** Friends of Fort Snelling

**Commenter:** Dorothy S Waltz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**CR4002 IMPACTS TO SURROUNDING CULTURAL RESOURCES (FT. SNELLING, SIBLEY HOUSE) NOT ADDRESSED.  
(Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 203571 **Comment Id:** 37746 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Fort Snelling State Park directly adjoins the Bureau of Mines Property. Any change in the Bureau of Mines Property would have an impact on the State Park.

**Organization:** Friends of Fort Snelling

**Commenter:** Dorothy S Waltz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203571 **Comment Id:** 37747 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The Draft is deficient in that it is limited to impacts that will occur only on the Bureau of Mines Property. There is absolutely no mention of potential impacts outside of that specific parcel of land. To ignore the surrounding area including Fort Snelling and Fort Snelling State Park is to ignore very significant aspects of the historical and recreational values of the State of Minnesota. The Draft needs to be revised to report in detail the impact that the ultimate disposition of the Bureau of Mines Property would have on the surrounding area including in particular the Fort and the Park. In addition, the Historic Fort and the Sibley Historic Site are linked because of their historic importance in the creation of the State of Minnesota. Because the disposition of the Bureau of Mines Property would involve the disposition of Coldwater Spring that would have a significant impact upon the ability of both the Historic Fort and the Sibley Site to provide a meaningful interpretation of the history of the creation of the State of Minnesota. Similarly; the ultimate disposition of the entire Bureau of Mines Property could have a significant impact upon the preservation of the area encompassed by Fort Snelling State Park and the recreational benefits that the Park provides.

**Organization:** Friends of Fort Snelling

**Commenter:** Dorothy S Waltz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203581 **Comment Id:** 37889 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Because of that historical perspective, the Friends has a vested interest in the ultimate disposition of the Bureau of Mines Property. It is with that background in mind that we submit these comments on the Draft. The Draft is deficient in that it is limited to impact that will occur only on the Bureau of Mines Property. There is absolutely no mention of potential impact outside of that specific parcel of land. To ignore the surrounding area, including Fort Snelling and the Sibley Site is to ignore a very significant part of the history of the State of Minnesota. The Draft needs to be revised to report in detail the impact that the ultimate disposition of the Bureau of Mines Property would have on the surrounding area, including in particular Fort Snelling and the Sibley Site. Fort Snelling includes both the Historic Fort and Fort Snelling State Park. The Historic Fort and the Sibley Site are linked because of their historic importance in the creation of the State of Minnesota. Because the disposition of the Bureau of Mines Property would involve the disposition of Coldwater Spring, that would have a significant impact upon the ability of both the Historic Fort and the Sibley Site to provide a meaningful interpretation of the history of the creation of the State of Minnesota. Similarly, the ultimate disposition of the entire Bureau of Mines Property could have a significant impact upon the preservation of the area encompassed by Fort Snelling State Park and the recreational benefits that the Park provides.

**Organization:** Friends of the Sibley Historic Site

**Commenter:** Robert A Minish **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**CR7000 CULTURAL RESOURCE STUDIES INADEQUATE AND/OR FLAWED. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 202315 **Comment Id:** 37317 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** HISTORY STUDY Your study is well written but so incomplete. For thousands of years natives from many cultures would have found there way to this spring and enjoyed the stunning waterfall that we all seem to forget about were. So in a comprehensive study we might learn more about the Natives and French traders here and the Spanish (evidenced by a large stele close-by) and see the many tribal groups that would have coursed by this area and stayed by the spring. And about Charlotte Clark and her brother Malcolm and the Snelling children who played about the spring and met Natives there And how the Dakota ceded this land to Scott Campbell, our Irish kid with a Scottish and Dakota tinge, only to have Congress strike this part of a treaty. And they tried again to give it to his family in another treaty, and these efforts suggests the spring was of importance to them as was Pilot Knob that was granted to members of the Campbell family too - only to be struck down by Congress. And how the military built the Hotel/post for trade with the Ojibway and how the various traders lived in area, so a great many Ojibway and White and Mixed Blood people now trace their heritage to Coldwater. This trade was so very important in establishing American hegemony in northern areas from 1819 to well into the 1840s when Ojibway still favored the English. It seems sensible that the Post/Hotel was selected because Native people gather there and many Natives were about from various tribes as can be pieced together from sundry accounts, for example, the school there had English, French, Swede, Cree, Chippewa, Sioux and Negro brats in 1837. And Norman Kittson who lived there and brought James J. Hill the money to raise \$\$ for his railroads while acquiring a number of Ojibway wives. One Dakota lad said he was born at Coldwater and a map shows teepees there and on and on. Other folks of importance to Minnesota history lived here and visited too. I have much more history that I could regale you with, yet you need to select someone like Alan Woolworth to select scholars and oversee a proper study. Will you do this???? I have some information to share, and I assure you that there is much more information to be uncovered and codified that will change all of our opmions.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Richard P Mosedale **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203634 **Comment Id:** 37919 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** One major unanswered question in the Clouse report has to do with the a map drawn by Lieutenant E. K. Smith of the Fort Snelling area in 1837 that showed the location of the settlers around Coldwater Spring. Many people have puzzled over this map for many years. When Clouse began his work on the survey he announced that he would find these locations on the modern landscape. He described plans to use ground-penetrating radar and other remote-sensing methods to help do this. Although the Smith map is mentioned in the Clouse report, no effort to locate the residences shown on the map is described, suggesting that Clouse was not given the resources necessary to carry out the examination.

**Organization:** Minnesota Sacred Places

**Commenter:** Bruce M White **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203634 **Comment Id:** 37918 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** In historical sections of his report Clouse puts the history of the site in the military context of Fort Snelling, as the place where soldiers first camped in 1819 and as the source of water for the soldiers throughout the 19th century. He also writes a little about the civilians who were living around Coldwater Spring in the 1830s. As to the Indian history of Coldwater, Clouse did not cover this aspect of the property in much detail. Clouse did state that "no material cultural assignable to an American Indian occupation was discovered." But this is a matter of interpretation. As I stated above, Clouse found a bone comb, and other manufactured goods. Many of the people who lived around Coldwater Spring were of Dakota and Ojibwe ancestry and as noted in the Clouse report (page 43), they described the Dakota as their "relatives and friends" and noted that the Dakota "have always found a friendly resting place at our firesides" when they came to Coldwater. In a document from 1835 not cited by Clouse, the settlers who lived in the area of Coldwater Spring stated that "they are all, with one exception, connected with the Sioux & Chippewa Indians, either by marriage or ties of blood," and that they were "friends of the Indians inhabiting this region. When they visit this Post they warm themselves and smoke by our fires, and share our scanty Stock of Provisions.,,2 Since manufactured goods were a common trade item with Dakota and Ojibwe people for hundreds of years, how would one know whether the bone comb, for example was used by Indians, people of mixed ancestry, or non-Indians?

**Organization:** Minnesota Sacred Places

**Commenter:** Bruce M White **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203634 **Comment Id:** 37917 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Available evidence suggests that the Henning report is neither complete nor accurate. It fails to make use of important historical information about Coldwater Spring and it draws faulty conclusions based on this incomplete information. The Henning Historical Study is an inadequate description of the historical record of Coldwater Spring. As shown in my attached Affidavit, one major source of information completely ignored in the report-the diary of Indian Agent Lawrence Taliaferro provides a wealth of additional information about the historical use and meaning of Coldwater for the Dakota and Ojibwe. The inadequacy of the historical record compiled by the Park Service must be remedied prior to the issuance of a final EIS, and a revised DEIS should be issued to allow comment by the public. Had the Historical Study been released to the public when it was finished, in 2002, the public would have informed the agency of the inadequacy of the report. As it stands now, until that inadequacy is remedied no conclusions whatever can justifiably be drawn from the historical record that the Park Service has assembled.

**Organization:** Minnesota Sacred Places

**Commenter:** Bruce M White **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203634 **Comment Id:** 37916 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The treatment by the Park Service of the testimony Reverend Gary Cavender a well known Dakota elder and expert on Dakota traditions-whose knowledge has already provided a basis for the nomination and placement on the Register of another Dakota traditional cultural property-raises many questions about the bias of the Park Service in regard to the TCP status of Coldwater Spring. To my knowledge, no one has until this moment questioned the cultural credentials of Gary Cavender as an expert on Dakota traditions. The questions posed by the Park Service in regard to Cavender raise important issues about just what testimony the Park Service would be prepared to accept as convincing in regard to the traditional cultural importance of Coldwater Spring to the Dakota people. If the testimony of such an important expert as Cavender is found to be suspect by the Park Service, just what testimony would it be willing to accept?

**Organization:** Minnesota Sacred Places

**Commenter:** Bruce M White **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 202315 **Comment Id:** 37320 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** INDIANS Your report does not qualify folks questioned about their backgrounds and ability to speak for Native people, alas. Will you do this?? Long ago I heard Reverend Cavendar speak about Dakota religion, and he made the hair stand up on my neck, and some days later I happened to meet while walking a teacher who had once lived close to him, who said she had never met anyone who had such a holy presence. As an American Native heritage is my heritage too now, somehow. In early days at the Fort until now nobody in white culture cared or recorded much of anything about Native spiritual practices that are far older than main stream religions now. We all should heed the words of Dr. Charles Eastman: Our religion is the last thing about us that the person of another race will ever understand. We Indians do not speak of these deep matters so long as we believe in them and those of us who have ceased to believe speak inaccurately and slightly" A large boulder with quartzite close to the spring also suggests sacred use, perhaps. Unktehi was recorded in Dakota tradition blocked the flow of River Warren/Minnesota River and then turned to a form caves; one under Pilot Knob where he stayed, one under Morgans Mound where he slept and his breath condensed and came out at the spring. These "stories" out lined in many volumes of the Golden Bough and elsewhere are important to all humans and guide their destinies, and so many "stories" have found to have some evidence of existence. Now, think of cave discovered when the LRT tunnel was dug at the airport. Before the great ado arose over Highway 55, I walked often with the great bloodhound Sherlock Holmes about Coldwater area and 1 day followed what appeared to be a deer trail to about where Seth Eastman kept his white Buffalo and there were several blue tarps and a number of water jugs and some other stuff and some cloth strips were tie on shrubs. I thought it might be a site for a homeless person, and I wondered why anyone would go thru a hole in the fence and get water from the "duck" pond. This site showed signs of presence for most of 2 seasons. I cannot prove sacredness of the spring, yet you cannot disprove - as is true for many sacred sites across the world, and you stop parsing rules and laws (that change) so you get an A+ in bureaucracy and accord Native leaders the respect that their position demands here .. So, what would Bishop Whipple do here?

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Richard P Mosedale **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 202337 **Comment Id:** 37323 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** I am the person who discovered the existence of the complete village of Camp Coldwater in May 1986. I am extremely disappointed that my 20 plus years of research documents and knowledge are not a part of this EIS report. My documentation and copies were given over a year ago to be a part of the EIS process. Whether or not it makes a difference, the full and complete use of all historical documents available should have been entered in this report as it was available! The historical study is thus declared flawed and inadequate at best. I am greatly disappointed that my 20 some years of research and knowledge on the Camp Coldwater site has been ignored numerous times not because of the possibility of my information may be incorrect, rather because it flies against the agenda of those being paid to write their archeology reports. How can all the archeology reports done on CCW not use the 1837 map in their reports? All reports done on CCW were done with knowledge of the map either by contacting me or me contacting them. Yet none of any archeological studies done on BOM property looked for structures that are on the 1837 map. Knowing of this great map and not using it to locate structures within the property is extremely unethical if not criminal. ALL ARCHEOLOGICAL REPORTS done on CCW BOM property are inaccurate and incomplete. Archeology. a. All References to any archeological studies done in this EIS are inaccurate and incomplete because of tainted paid outcome determined. A new independent arch. study needs to be done searching for structures etc., using the 1837 map within the boundary of BOM property! The missing history in this EIS is harmful to the preservation of Camp Coldwater. At least add the book known as the Bible of Camp Coldwater to this report. That book is, "A History of the City of Saint paul to 1875" By J. Fletcher Williams. Camp Coldwater stands on it's documented history. Let it not be tarnished, but do add the known history of this historic place.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Dave Fudally **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 202337 **Comment Id:** 37326 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The Old Village.! Artifacts etc ..( Nearby villages that may be associated with CCW) Old Village. See Aborigines of Minnesota. And Warren Upham. 1750 ,Dakota attacked at Lake Mille Lacs by Ojibway and fled down Rum River and then down Nine mile creek. Village at Minn River and Mile Mile creek junction. Battled Iowa Indians on Pilot Knob Hill same year. It appears that Indian village sites moved every few years or so according to all of the numerous maps I have seen. The common thread among all is the need for fresh water. The nearests springs south of Ft Snelling are the spring below the bluff( Ft Snelling Lake/ State Park) and Lands end just 30yards south of Old Post Road and hwy55. Small spring at the base of Dwelling place of the Gods hill was personally seen by myself until mid 60's. a. Paul Durand (famous Indian Historian) noted that as the freeway was being built by Old Post rd heading Northwards towards Ft Snelling, One of his history friends went daily to this area to pick up Indian artifacts plowed over by Mndot crew as they built the Highway. He described his friend as picking up shopping bags full each visit. b. Audrey Anderson lived at the Veterans Administration homes 1/4 mile W

from CCW Spring when they were first built. Her Father was the V.A.Head of Administrations. She was my QRC for work comp claim. When she read of CCW in Paper and the 1991 Marker she told me she thought her and her friends picked up all the arrowheads and artifacts when they played there as children in the 20's

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Dave Fudally **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203634 **Comment Id:** 37913 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** In regard to the conclusions of Robert Clouse in his archaeological report, the fact that soils in the north end of the Bureau of Mines property may have been waterlogged does not exclude their potential for containing archaeological resources, especially in an area once known for wetlands where Dakota people may have carried on ceremonies and harvested aquatic plants. Given the cursory nature of the Clouse archaeological survey at the north end of the property, further archaeological testing should be done to determine the adequacy of his survey in that area.

**Organization:** Minnesota Sacred Places

**Commenter:** Bruce M White **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 202337 **Comment Id:** 37327 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** CONTINUED c. Indian artifacts witnessed and given to/by Dave Radford State Park Archeologist. Feb 1998/40 yards due south of BOM fence property line. Next to 400 year old oak tree. This is where I located two stone axes among bones etc on wash out hill erosion. Notified Bob Clouse and Steve Osman at Ft Snelling to come and check site out. They told me to bring stone ax to them. I did, ONE. Steve said yes definitely an Indian stone ax. Told me to keep it, and maybe in future to use it to help preserve CCW. I gave stone ax to Dave Radford Feb 1998, he witnessed bones etc at site and told his assistant to mark site and give it a site number as required by law. Said they were to test dig within a year. I kept calling for his dig time. Said he didn't know when he could ever check it out. In other words he was told not to do test dig at this site? Hands were tied Meanwhile artifacts were taken every year by people who know of site. NO REPORT EVER MADE! THEN ,NO ARTIFACTS FOUND. Pretending all of this discovery never happened. d. Indian artifacts found at CCWA. Perry site 1986 ,By Dave Fudally. Pottery, copper piece, bones etc. See photos of A. Perry artifacts at MHS with artifacts, or photos from Dave Fudally. Bob Clouse had written a report saying nothing at CCW in 83. IF he acknowledged these or any artifacts anywhere on CCW site, it would go against his 1983 report of nothing there. However, in 1969 Clouse wrote a report to MHS of his possible discovery of the St Louis hotel site artifacts in CCW(stable site) which resulted in MHS buying all the land east of BOM property. Nothing there???? Also drained spring reservoir in 83 looking for artifacts, then denied he ever did. Verified by BOM property manager that he did. WHY LIE? Where is this report? e. Indian artifact/ CCW Louis Massey site. Arrowhead/spear point tip. Along with pioneer pottery and hand made nail. Indian artifact to Radford Mn State Archeologist. Feb 1998 Where is report? f. Indian skeleton found in 1820 on building of FT

Snelling site. Post surgeon noted bones were from Indian about 8 It tall. (Hanson's Old FT. Snelling) g. Indian Village site 1843 next to Minnehaha Falls. Half breed son of Peter Quinn. Telling of his life story and witness to his fathers death at Redwood Ferry battle 1862 Indian War. MHS article. SEE Fudally Papers.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Dave Fudally **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 202315 **Comment Id:** 37319 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** ARCHAEOLOGY Now we have 3 punk reports and holes dug everywhere but where common sense would direct one to look. The NPS has employed various contactors with GPR equipment looking for graves and artifacts and had good results. Will you provide their names??? Will you contact Hennepin County surveyor to get Seth Eastmans' line through the hotel checked??

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Richard P Mosedale **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 202315 **Comment Id:** 37318 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The NPS has authored some superb studies of historical sites ; this IS NOT ONE OF THEM. The various studies are flawed and incomplete and the over arching question is why and how they can be corrected.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Richard P Mosedale **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**ER1000 EFFECTS TO ETHNOGRAPHIC RESOURCES. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199726 **Comment Id:** 35434 **Coder's Initials:** SP

**Comment Text:** Alternative B is conveyance to a university or nonfederal government entity with no conditions imposed on future use. Except for a Minnesota state recipient, and even then with only limited restrictions on use, this alternative leaves available the opportunity for use of the property in a manner which is detrimental to the historical, cultural and designated rights of the Native Americans. This alternative is not acceptable.

**Organization:** Prairie Island Indian community

**Commenter:** Audrey Bennett **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**GA1001 ALTERNATIVE A IMPACTS ANALYSIS (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35801 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 62: Chapter 4, Alternative A, Historic Structures and Districts, Section 106 Assessment of Effect, p. 137. The Draft EIS states the structures at the Center would be mothballed to "ensure that the structures do not deteriorate through neglect." What maintenance activities would be undertaken to prevent deterioration, what is their expected cost, and will these activities, in fact, prevent deterioration of the structures? How will maintenance activities address the hazardous materials and mold at the Center? The Final EIS should address these questions. See Comment 21.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35808 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 63: Chapter 4, Alternative A, Ethnographic Resources, p. 137. Please refer to General Comment 3 concerning the significance of the area and in reference to the archaeological, historical, and ethnographic studies and surrounding issues.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35820 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 65: Chapter 4, Alternative A, Health and Safety, p. 140. On page 108, the Draft EIS describes the mold infestations at two buildings on the Site. Therefore, the Impacts section under the Health and Safety heading should discuss mold among the contaminants that could adversely affect workers or intruders.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35825 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 66: Chapter 4, Alternative A, Public Use and Experience, p. 141. Please refer to General Comment 3 concerning

the significance of the area and in reference to the archaeological, historical, and ethnographic studies and surrounding issues.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35815 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 64: Chapter 4, Alternative A, Hydrology, p. 139. Under Hydrology, the Final EIS should state the watershed district or management organization in which the Center lies. See Comments 51 and 52.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**GA1002 ALTERNATIVE B IMPACTS ANALYSIS (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35837 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 67: Chapter 4, Alternative B, p. 142. The Draft EIS incorrectly states that "any future owner under this alternative would be free to subsequently use, sell, and transfer the Center to a private entity for various uses or development." This is not correct with respect to Indian Tribes occupying Trust Land. Trust Land can only be removed from trust with the Secretary's approval. Since the SMSC proposes that the Center become Trust Land, the Final EIS should discuss this distinction. See Comment 27.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35843 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 68: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Laws, Regulations . . . , MNRRA Enabling Legislation . . . , p. 142. The Draft EIS states the NPS would review federally funded or permitted activities. The Final EIS should also discuss how MNRRA applies to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comment 6.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35849 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 69: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Laws, Regulations.. . , Mississippi river Critical Area, p. 142. The Draft EIS states that a new owner of the Center would be required to comply with the Critical Areas Act of 1973, State Executive Order 79-19. This is incorrect for an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. The Final EIS should address this distinction. See Comment 5.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35891 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 87: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Water Quality, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/ Nature/History Center Scenario, and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 160-162. In all three scenarios, the Draft EIS discussion is inadequate. First the discussion addresses only three of four potential water quality impacts - sedimentation from construction including demolition, fluid leakage on parking lots, and increased use of fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides at the Center. The fourth, increased nutrient loading from increases in impervious surfaces, is not discussed. Second the Draft EIS does not the federal, State and local laws designed to protect water quality. As noted in Comment 79, the Clean Water Act and State and local laws require erosion control measures to prevent sedimentation of surface waters due to construction including demolition.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35889 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 86: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Hydrology, Interpretive/Nature/History Center Scenario and Training Center/Office Scenario, p. 159-160. In both these scenarios, the Draft EIS indicates that an increase in impervious surfaces would lead to adverse impacts on hydrology due to increased runoff. However, under State laws and local ordinances, new development must address increases in impervious surface by controlling increased storm water runoff. Typically, runoff rates after development must not exceed pre-development runoff rates based on a specific storm event cited in the applicable law. The Final EIS should identify the applicable State and local storm water regulations in Chapter 1 and Chapter 4 and discuss their applicability to new construction at the Center. The Final EIS should also note that State and local storm water laws would not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land, determine if any federal laws would apply, and if so, describe the application.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35886 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 84: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Hydrology, p. 158. The Final EIS should note that an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land, like a private university, would not be required to comply with the Camp Coldwater Spring protective legislation or the Minnesota Historic Sites Act. See Comment 16.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35885 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 83: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Hydrology, p. 158. The Final EIS should state the watershed district or management organization in which the Center lies. See Comments 51 and 52.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35883 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 82: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Vegetation, p 153-155. If the biological study recommended in Comment 47 determines that any threatened or endangered plant species is present on the Center site, then the Vegetation discussion will need to be rewritten in the Final EIS. See also Comment 48.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35882 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 81: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Vegetation, Open Space/Park Scenario, p. 154. The Draft EIS states that a recipient might elect to allow disturbed areas to revegetate on their own. This would not be permitted under federal, State, or local regulations. The final EIS should correct this. See Comment 79.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35881 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 80: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Vegetation, p. 153. The Final EIS should note that an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land would not be required to comply with the MSP Zoning Ordinance as it applies to vegetation management and that the FAA regulations governing land use and height limitations around airports would apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comments 13 and 15.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35879 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 79: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Soils, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/Nature/History Center Scenario, and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 151-153. The Draft EIS for all three conceptual land-use scenarios assumes that a new owner could remove existing structures, construct new structures, and alter infrastructure "without regard to impacts to soils," that building sites could be left to revegetate on their own," or that owners "could elect to implement mitigation measures." The federal Clean Water Act and rules, State water quality laws and rules, the Critical Area rules, and local erosion control ordinances and rules all require that construction activities (including demolition of buildings) be conducted in a manner that minimizes soil erosion. Under these laws, building sites cannot be left to revegetate on their own, property owners do not get to elect whether they implement mitigation measures. Rather specific mitigation measures must be employed to protect surface waters. The Final EIS should discuss in Chapter 1 and Chapter 4 how these laws protect surface waters, how the Clean Water Act applies to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land, and why the State and local laws would not govern an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35878 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 78: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Ethnographic Resources, Summary, p. 150. The Summary will need to be rewritten in the Final EIS to describe the effect that various federal statutes of general applicability would have on an Indian Tribe occupying the Center site as Trust Land.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35897 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment #91: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Public Use and Experience, Summary, p. 170. Please refer to General Comment 3 concerning the significance of the area and in reference to the archaeological, historical, and ethnographic studies and surrounding issues.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35896 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment #90: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/Nature/History Center Scenario, and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 168-169. In all three scenarios, the Draft EIS states, "All existing easements, licenses, rights-of-way and leases, and other land interests could be honored while the land is being used as open space or a park." However, the Draft EIS on page 113 notes that the University of Minnesota leases part of Building 1 and all of Building 2 for research purposes. The Final EIS should address this apparent contradiction.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35895 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 89: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Health and Safety, Open Space/Park Scenario, Impacts, p. 167. On page 108, the Draft EIS describes the mold infestations at two buildings on the Site. Therefore, the Final EIS should discuss mold among the contaminants that could adversely affect workers or intruders. See Comment 65.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35894 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 88: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Wetlands, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/Nature/ History Center Scenario, and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 162-164. In all three scenarios, the Draft EIS correctly concludes no conditions

would be imposed by the Department of the Interior to protect wetlands and EIS indicates that wetlands could be adversely affected under all three scenarios. Missing, however, is a description of wetland protection under federal and State wetland laws, which are described in Chapter 3, Wetlands on pages 99-100. Chapter 4 should apply the laws to the three conceptual land-use scenarios, determine the degree of protection afforded by the laws, and reconsider the intensity of the probably impacts. This discussion should include an analysis of applicability to an Indian Tribe that acquires the Center in trust.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35877 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 77: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Ethnographic Resources, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/Nature/History Center Scenario, and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 148-150. The Final EIS should note for all three conceptual land-use scenarios that an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land, like a private university, would not be required to comply with the Camp Coldwater Spring protective legislation or the Minnesota Historic Sites Act. See Comment 16.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35875 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 76: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Ethnographic Resources, p. 148. Please refer to General Comment 3 concerning the significance of the area and in reference to the archaeological, historical, and ethnographic studies and surrounding issues.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35873 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 75: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Historic Structures and Districts, p. 146-148. The Draft EIS discussion for all three conceptual land-use scenarios assumes that, after conveyance, the new owner could take actions that alter or eliminate some or all the structures at the Center with consequent adverse effects. The Final EIS should discuss the application of the NHPA to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land where historic structures and districts are concerned. See Comment 17.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35872 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 74: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Archeological Resources, p. 144-145. The Draft EIS discussion for all three conceptual land-use scenarios states that, after conveyance, "the new owner could undertake actions that impact archaeological sites." The Final EIS should discuss the application of the NHPA to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land where archeological resources are concerned. See Comment 17.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35868 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 73: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Laws, Regulations . . . , National Historic Preservation Act, p. 144. The Draft EIS states that, once the Center is conveyed to a nonfederal entity, no federal protections under the NHPA would be available unless an action affecting the Center site was a federal action. The Final EIS should discuss the application of the NHPA to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comment 17.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35861 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 72: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Laws, Regulations. . . , Camp Coldwater Spring Protection Legislation . . . , p. 143-144. The Draft EIS states that any recipient of the Center must abide by the Camp Coldwater Spring protection legislation and regulations and the Minnesota Historic Sites Act. This is incorrect for an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. The Final EIS should address this distinction. See Comment 16.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35857 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 71: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Laws, Regulations. . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport Zoning Ordinance, p. 143. The Draft EIS states that because Buildings 4 and 11 are existing, "they could be rehabilitated or repaired . . ." This is correct under the MSP Zoning Ordinance but incorrect under FAA rules. Buildings must be removed from the FAA mandated Runway Protection Zone. The Final EIS should describe the application of FAA rules on existing buildings. See Comment 15.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35852 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 70: Chapter 4, Alternative B, Laws, Regulations . . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport Zoning Ordinance, p. 143. The Final EIS should note that the MSP Zoning Ordinance does not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land and that the FAA regulations governing land use and height limitations around airports would apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comments 13 and 15.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**GA1003 ALTERNATIVE C IMPACTS ANALYSIS (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35900 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 92: Chapter 4, Alternative C, p. 174. The Final EIS should note that conveyance with conditions does not work for an Indian Tribe asking to acquire the Center and place it into trust. The Bureau of Indian affairs will not approve taking land into trust with conditions. See Comment 35.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35902 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 93: Chapter 4, Alternative C, Laws, Regulations . . . , MNRRRA Enabling Legislation . . . , p. 174-175. The Draft EIS states the NPS would review federally funded or permitted activities. The Final EIS should also discuss how MNRRRA applies to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comment 6.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35904 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 95: Chapter 4, Alternative C, Laws, Regulations . . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport Zoning Ordinance, p. 175. The Final EIS should note that the MSP Zoning Ordinance does not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land and note that the FAA regulations governing land use and height limitations around airports would apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comments 13 and 15.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35911 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 98: Chapter 4, Alternative C. Ethnographic Resources, p. 180-84. Please refer to General Comment 3 concerning the significance of the area and in reference to the archaeological, historical, and ethnographic studies and surrounding issues.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35909 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 97: Chapter 4, Alternative C, Laws, Regulations . . . , National Historic Preservation Act, p. 175-176. The discussion of the NHPA's application should be expanded to address the extent to which an Indian Tribe acquiring the Center site in trust would be subject to the Act. See Comment 17.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35906 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 96: Chapter 4, Alternative C, Laws, Regulations . . . , Camp Coldwater Spring protective Legislation. . . , p. 175.

The Final EIS should note that the Camp Coldwater Spring protection legislation and the Minnesota Historic Sites Act would not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comment 5.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35903 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 94: Chapter 4, Alternative C, Laws, Regulations . . . , Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area Legislation, p. 174-75. The Draft EIS states that a new owner of the Center would be required to comply with the Critical Areas Act of 1973, State Executive Order 79-19, including implementation of zoning ordinances and plans. This is incorrect for an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. The Final EIS should address this distinction. See Comment 5.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35912 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 99: Chapter 4, Alternative C. Soils, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/Nature/History Center Scenario, and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 182-84. The Final EIS's discussion of soil impacts in all three land-use scenarios should address the applicability of federal, State, and local critical area regulations and the mitigation measures that would be required by these regulations. See Comment 79. The Final EIS should then determine whether additional conditions are needed to protect soils given the existing laws.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35921 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 105: Chapter 4, Alternative C, Public Use and Experience, p. 196-198. Please refer to General Comment 3 concerning the significance of the area and in reference to the archaeological, historical, and ethnographic studies and surrounding issues.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35920 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 104: Chapter 4, Alternative C, Wetlands, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/Nature/ History Center Scenario, and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 191-193. In all three conceptual land-use scenarios, the Final EIS should describe the protection afforded wetlands under federal and State wetland laws. See Comment 88. The Final EIS should then determine whether additional conditions are needed to protect Center wetlands given the existing laws.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35919 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 103: Chapter 4, Alternative C, Water Quality, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/ Nature/History Center Scenario, and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 189-191. In all three land-use scenarios, the Final EIS should address all four potential water quality impacts, the federal, State, and local laws designed to protect water quality. See Comment 87. The Final EIS should then determine whether additional conditions are needed to protect Center water quality given the existing laws.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35917 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 102: Chapter 4, Alternative C, Hydrology, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/Nature/History Center Scenario, and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 187-189. In all three conceptual land-use scenarios, the Final EIS should indicate that State laws and local ordinances require new development to address increases in impervious surface by controlling increased storm water runoff. See Comment 86. The Final EIS should then determine whether additional conditions are needed to protect Center hydrology given the existing laws.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35916 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 101: Chapter 4, Alternative C, Hydrology, Description, p. 187. The Final EIS should state the watershed district or management organization in which the Center lies. See Comments 51 and 52.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35914 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 100: Chapter 4, Alternative C, Vegetation, Assumptions, p. 184. The Final EIS should note that the MSP Zoning Ordinance, and its attendant limitations on vegetation, is not applicable to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land, note that the FAA regulations governing land use and height limitations around airports would apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land, and determine if vegetation would be controlled in the federal Runway Protection Zone. See Comments 13 and 15. The Final EIS should then determine whether additional conditions are needed to protect airspace over the Center.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**GA1004 Alternative D Impacts Analysis (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35923 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 106: Chapter 4, Alternative D, p. 201. Responding to our previous comments on Alternatives B and C will necessitate changes to the various sections titled Archeological Resources, Historic Structures and Districts, Ethnographic Resources, Soils, Vegetation, Hydrology, Water Quality, Wetlands, Health and Safety, and Public use and Experience in the Final EIS under Alternative D. We will repeat some of our earlier comments where necessary.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35924 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 107: Chapter 4, Alternative D, Ethnographic Resources, p. 206-09. Please refer to General Comment 3 concerning the significance of the area and in reference to the archaeological, historical, and ethnographic studies and surrounding issues.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35931 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 112: Chapter 4, Alternative D, Wetlands, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/Nature/ History Center Scenario, and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 219-221. In all three conceptual land-use scenarios, the Final EIS should describe the protection afforded wetlands under federal and State wetland laws. See Comment 88. The Final EIS should then determine whether additional conditions are needed to protect Center wetlands given the existing laws.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35929 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 111: Chapter 4, Alternative D, Water Quality, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/ Natnre/History Center Scenario, and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 217-219. In all three land-use scenarios, the Final EIS should address all four potential water quality impacts, the federal, State, and local laws designed to protect water quality. See Comment 87. The Final EIS should then determine whether additional conditions are needed to protect Center water quality given the existing laws.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35927 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 110: Chapter 4, Alternative D, Hydrology, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/Nature/History Center Scenario, and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 214-217. In all three conceptual land-use scenarios. The Final EIS should indicate that State laws and local ordinances require new development to address increases in impervious surface by controlling increased storm water runoff. See Comment 86. The Final EIS should then - determine whether additional conditions are needed to protect Center hydrology given the existing laws.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35925 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 108: Chapter 4, Alternative D, Soils, Open Space/Park Scenario, Interpretive/Nature/ History Center Scenario,

and Training Center/Office Park Scenario, p. 209-211. The Final EIS's discussion of soil impacts in all three land-use scenarios should address the applicability of federal, State, and local critical area regulations and the mitigation measures that would be required by these regulations. See Comment 79. The Final EIS should then determine whether additional conditions are needed to protect soils given the existing laws.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**GA3000 IMPACT ANALYSIS: GENERAL METHODOLOGY FOR ESTABLISHING IMPACTS/EFFECTS (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 200010 **Comment Id:** 37341 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** No matter who takes title to the property, it is vitally important that protection responsibilities not be in the hand of just one entity. Again, an unfavorable change in tribal politics could jeopardize protection efforts for Coldwater Spring. Moreover, laws protecting the Coldwater Spring area can be weakened by subsequent politicians. Furthermore, "Section 110" of the National Historic Preservation Act, states in part; "Prior to the approval of any federal undertaking . . . the agency shall, to the maximum extent possible, undertake such . . . actions as may be necessary to minimize harm . . . (16 U.S.C. 470h-2(f))." A properly drafted conservation easement, with a well-financed "holder" and several entities with "third party right of enforcement", would maximize the protection of the property under the National Historic Preservation Act. Therefore, a revised draft EIS and the final EIS should analyze the various terms to be included in the conservation easement for the 27-acre Bureau of Mines property - and the entities capable of assuming the responsibilities of "holder" and "3rd party right of enforcement."

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**II1000 IRRETRIEVABLE IMPACTS: GENERAL COMMENTS (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35939 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 118: Chapter 4, Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitments of resources . . . , Alternative B, p. 287. The Draft EIS suggests the use of a conservation easement could require the salvage of materials from removed structures. The Final EIS should note that the State conservation easement statute does not apply to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. See Comment 36.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**MT1015 ADDITIONAL/CORRECTED INFO REQUESTED TO BE INCLUDED IN EIS. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35515 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 4: Chapter 1, Background On The Center, p. 4. This section should indicate that the land on which the Center is located was obtained from the Dakota people by treaty in 1805.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35519 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 14: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws . . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport. . . Zoning Ordinance, Airport Zoning and the Center, p. 20-21. The Draft EIS correctly states the "maximum height without a permit" for new buildings on most of the site is 30 feet. In later paragraphs, this changes to "maximum construction height" without the qualifying words "without a permit." This leaves the incorrect impression that some of the site is subject to a maximum new building height limitation of 30 feet. See Comment 12. For the Center, which is subject to two sloping surfaces - the Precision Instrument Approach Surface and the Transition Surface, this means that much of the property can accommodate buildings considerably over 30 feet in height provided a permit is obtained. This should be explained in the Final EIS.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35520 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 8: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws. . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport. . . Zoning Ordinance, Airspace Obstruction Zone, p. 17. In discussing the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport ("Airport") and the MSP Zoning Ordinance, the Draft EIS states, "The airspace obstruction zone identifies airspace lying beneath precision instrument approach zones for each runway, and the height at which this approach zone projects outward from the runway." The Draft EIS then assumes that the entire Center is subject to the height limitations related to the precision instrument approach zone for the 22-End of Runway 4-22 at the Airport. Both the statement and the assumption are incorrect. The MSP Zoning Ordinance establishes height limitations related to five airspace surfaces - the Primary Surface, the Horizontal Surface, the Conical Surface, the Precision Instrument Approach Surface, and the Transition Surface. Three airspace surfaces that project out from Runway 4-22 overlie portions of the Center - the Horizontal Surface, the Precision

Instrument Approach Surface, and the Transition Surface. Figure 4 shows and correctly identifies all three. The Draft EIS fails to distinguish among the three airspace surfaces and does not describe how each affects the portion of the center directly under that specific airspace surface. The Draft EIS only discusses the Precision Instrument Approach Surface. This oversight should be corrected in the Final EIS.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35522 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 10: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws . . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport. . . Zoning Ordinance, Land-use Safety Zoning, p. 17. It would be helpful if the Final EIS briefly described the portions of the Center site and acreages within each State safety zone and then referred to Figure 19, which accurately depicts the three safety zones established by the MSP Zoning Ordinance.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35524 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 12: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws. . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport. . . Zoning Ordinance, Permitting Requirements, p. 20. The Draft EIS uses the term "maximum construction height" from the MSP Zoning Ordinance without the qualifying words "without a permit." This leaves the incorrect impression that some of the Center site is subject to a maximum new building height limitation of 30 feet. The "maximum construction height without a permit" for any property subject to the MSP Zoning Ordinance was calculated using the lowest point of any airspace surface above that property minus a margin related to ground level mapping accuracy. Larger properties like the Center site, where the sloping airspace surfaces rise considerably across the property, may be able to build structures of much greater height than the "maximum construction height without a permit" simply by applying for the permit. This should be clarified in the Final EIS.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35528 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 17: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws . . . , National Historic Preservation Act, p. 23-27. The Draft EIS

discussion of the National Historic Preservation Act ("NHPA") makes no mention of its applicability to an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land. Since the SMSC proposes that the Center become Trust Land, the Final EIS should describe whether and how the NHPA, as a federal law of general applicability that applies to Indian Tribes, would affect activities at the site under those circumstances.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203634 **Comment Id:** 37926 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Perhaps the most glaring omission from this account is any use at all of the journal of the Indian Agent Lawrence Taliaferro, who was located at Fort Snelling from 1820 to 1839. As stated in my attached Affidavit, no study of the Fort Snelling area in that period is complete without making use of the Taliaferro journal. The information relating to Coldwater cited in my affidavit suggests the extensive record of the use of Coldwater by Dakota and Ojibwe during this period, for trade, diplomacy, and ceremony, contrary to some of the statements quoted above. This information and other information not found in the Historical Study must be made part of the EIS record for the Bureau of Mines Site.

**Organization:** Minnesota Sacred Places

**Commenter:** Bruce M White **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35795 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 61: Chapter 4, Alternative A, Laws, Regulations . . . , p. 135. The Draft EIS indicates a federal agency might not be required to comply with the MSP Zoning Ordinance pending a determination of the federal basis of such regulations. This response in the Final EIS should be expanded to indicate the federal agency would be subject to FAA land use and airspace rules.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35546 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 31: Chapter 2, Alternative B, Laws, Regulations . . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport Zoning Ordinance, p. 48. The discussion of maximum structure heights for new construction should be revised to accurately portray the impact of the MSP Zoning Ordinance and its permitting requirements. See Comments 13 and 15.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35537 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 26: Chapter 2, Alternative B, p. 47. The Final EIS should discuss the advantages of protecting Indian cultural and natural resources through tribal sovereignty. This allows an Indian perspective on the birth of the State at the confluence of the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers. Currently, the only historical perspective on this area as the birthplace of the State comes from the Fort Snelling historical site and the Minneapolis Park Board's preservation of early Minneapolis buildings at Minnehaha Park.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35535 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 24: Chapter 2, Alternative A, p. 46. The SMSC questions how long the Center could be maintained "as is" as proposed in Alternative A. Will maintenance costs escalate as the buildings age? Will the costs to contain hazardous materials and contaminants escalate as the buildings age? Can Building 9 with its severe mold problem remain indefinitely? Is there contamination at the Center that is migrating, or could migrate, onto more of the Center land or adjoining lands? The Final EIS should address the long term impacts of this alternative more completely and realistically.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35534 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 23: Chapter 2, Conceptual Land-use Scenarios, Interpretive/Nature/History Center, p. 42, and Training Center/Office Park, p. 42 & 43. In discussing the Interpretive/Nature/History Center and the Training Center/Office Park conceptual scenarios, the Draft EIS asserts that the Center buildings have reuse potential without discussing which buildings and for what uses in the context of each scenario. For example, it seems unlikely that Building 1, given its size and layout, would work for the interpretative/nature/history center scenario. However, it could be reused for the training center/office park scenario. The Final EIS should include a building reuse analysis for each scenario either in Chapter 2 or in Chapter 3 where the buildings are described.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35531 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 20: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws. . . , p. 17. Since the SMSC is proposing to acquire the Center and have the land placed in trust, two other statutes relating to Indian matters should be discussed in the Final EIS in this section on Relationship With Other Laws. First the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, which sets the criteria for what Indians groups will be considered sovereign tribes, should be presented. Second the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act controls whether gaming could be conducted on the Center if held in trust for an Indian Tribe. Under the Act, gaming can occur on land acquired in trust after October 17, 1988, only if the Indian Tribe for whom the land is acquired has been recently restored to federal recognition, does not have a reservation, has a reservation contiguous to acquired land, or receives state approval for gaming. In its proposal to acquire the Center, the SMSC states it will not conduct gaming on the Center site. And because the SMSC has a reservation, the Center is not contiguous to the SMSC's reservation, and the SMSC was not recently restored to federal recognition, it would require State approval before the SMSC could conduct gaming there.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35527 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 15: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws . . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport. . . Zoning Ordinance, Airport Zoning and the Center, p. 20. The Draft EIS discussion of the Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA) rules relating to navigable airspace around airport runways makes the blanket statement, "Any future owner of the Center must comply with the FAA notice requirements prior to beginning any alteration or construction project that may fall under FAA review authority." This is correct but falls short of a full discussion of FAA authority over an Indian Tribe occupying the Center as Trust Land. The Federal Aviation Act is a statute of general applicability that affects Indian Tribes. Thus, the FAA regulations that define a runway protection zone identical to State Safety Zone A in the MSP Zoning Ordinance would apply to an Indian Tribe occupying the Center as Trust Land. And the FAA regulations that define Horizontal, Precision Instrument Approach, and Transition Surfaces identical to those in the MSP Zoning Ordinance would also apply. The Final EIS should include a separate subsection on FAA rules and how they apply to and Indian Tribe occupying the Center as Trust Land.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35523 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 11: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws . . . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport. . . Zoning Ordinance, Land-use Safety Zoning, p. 17. The discussion of Safety Zone B in the Final EIS should emphasize the acceptable uses in terms of the three conceptual land-use scenarios used in the Draft EIS. For example, Safety Zone B would permit open space and parks but not a campground. An interpretive, nature, or history center would be permitted, but not an amphitheater. And a training center or office park would be permitted.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35521 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 9: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws.. . , Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport. . . Zoning Ordinance, Airspace Obstruction Zone, p. 17. In discussing the practical effect of the airspace height imitations, the Draft EIS concludes that new structure height on the Center site would be limited "to an elevation of no more than approximately 872 feet at the highest point of the building." The Draft EIS further concludes. "this - - translates to limiting new building construction to no greater than 40 to 60 feet depending on the existing topography." Both conclusions are incorrect. Both the Precision Instrument . . . Approach surface and the Transitional Surface are sloped surfaces that rise as they project out from the end of Runway 4-22. Figure 4 shows that the Precision Instrument Approach Surface crosses the westerly boundary of the Center site at heights ranging from approximately 872 to 885 feet above mean sea level ("MSL) and rises until it ranges from approximately 885 to over 895 feet MSL along the eastern and northern boundaries of the property. Figure 4 also shows that the Transition Surface ranges from approximately 872 to 970 feet MSL along the westerly boundary of the site and from approximately 885 to 990 feet MSL along the easterly boundary. A very small portion of the site's southeast corner lies under the Horizontal Zone whose height limitation is 994 feet MSL. The Final EIS should accurately discuss the height limitations and recalculate the allowable construction heights at various locations on the site under the MSP Zoning Ordinance.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**ON1000 OTHER NEPA ISSUES: GENERAL COMMENTS (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 193124 **Comment Id:** 34981 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The defects identified [in the DEIS] may be remedied by reopening the planning process in order to permit the application of a "narrative method" of inquiry in order to proceed in a way that faithfully and respectfully applies the principles of sympathetic interpretation in this matter as called for under the public policy set out in the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (AIRFRA),

the Presidential Executive Order 1307 of 1996, and the judicially developed principles of sympathetic interpretation developed by the federal courts in the context of treaty cases.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Howard J Vogel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 191842 **Comment Id:** 35457 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** First of all, on the CD you supplied containing the DEIS documentation, I do not find the comments and testimony of the others preceding me. This makes the DEIS inadequate. I should be able to comment on comments previously made. Second, I do not find references to sources of numerous assertions throughout the DEIS. You MUST document who said what and who interpreted what.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 200010 **Comment Id:** 37350 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** 40 CFR, Section 1502.14, subparagraph (0 requires the agency to ". . . include appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives." 40 CFR, Section 1502.9 states in part: " If a draft statement is so inadequate as to preclude meaningful analysis, the agency shall prepare and circulate a revised draft of the appropriate portion." Although the draft EIS mentions a conservation easement in name as a mitigation measure, the draft EIS lacks specific language to be included in the conservation easement and. therefore. precludes the opportunity for "meaningful analysis" to determine , . . . - whether the conservation easement can "appropriately mitigate" impacts to the property's cultural and natural features. Moreover, as explained above, the conservation easement sections of the draft EIS contains confusing language. Therefore, for these reasons, Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition requests that a revised draft of the EIS be prepared for the sections pertaining to the conservation easement, to enable my client and others to have a meaningful opportunity to comment on the conservation easement's adequacy.

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203489 **Comment Id:** 37757 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** In order to properly consider historic properties on this site, we believe remediation plans need to be integrated with historic preservation plans in a comprehensive plan. Alternative D is the most consistent with tills approach. for this reason, EPA has

identified Alternative D as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative would address the safety hazards associated with the existing structures, address remaining chemical and biological hazards (lead, asbestos, mold) associated with remaining infrastructure, and allow for restoration of sensitive resources such as wetlands, seeps, and streams. We believe that this alternative will allow activities to be done in a more comprehensively and integrative way than what might otherwise occur under the other alternatives. If another alternative is selected as a preferred alternative, the Record of Decision should include appropriate conditions protecting historic, cultural, and Natural resources.

**Organization:** United States Environmental Protection Agency

**Commenter:** Kenneth A Westlake **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203634 **Comment Id:** 37914 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The Park Service apparently does not consider its TCP analysis to be part of the its DEIS. If it had it would have included the analysis in the DEIS, or at least have provided it to all recipients of the DEIS or notified these individuals of its existence once it was released to the public on October II, 2006. The Park Service did none of these things. However, since the TCP analysis does amplify and explain the reasons why the Park Service chose to reject the findings of its own consultant, it does provide information missing from the DEIS. The release by the Park Service on October II, 2006 of its TCP Analysis must be considered a revision of the EIS, but one which the wider public was not properly informed about, thus interfering with the public's right to comment in an informed way during the DEIS comment period.

**Organization:** Minnesota Sacred Places

**Commenter:** Bruce M White **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203634 **Comment Id:** 37915 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The TCP-Ethnographic study provides a convincing case for the TCP status of Coldwater Spring. However, given the insistence of the Park Service in opposing TCP status, opinions and an eventual determination of eligibility should be sought from the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office and the Keeper of the National Register and this should be presented to the public prior to the finalizing of the BOM EIS, so as to provide an opportunity for public comment.

**Organization:** Minnesota Sacred Places

**Commenter:** Bruce M White **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203634 **Comment Id:** 37917 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Available evidence suggests that the Henning report is neither complete nor accurate. It fails to make use of important historical information about Coldwater Spring and it draws faulty conclusions based on this incomplete information. The Henning Historical Study is an inadequate description of the historical record of Coldwater Spring. As shown in my attached Affidavit, one major source of information completely ignored in the report-the diary of Indian Agent Lawrence Taliaferro provides a wealth of additional information about the historical use and meaning of Coldwater for the Dakota and Ojibwe. The inadequacy of the historical record compiled by the Park Service must be remedied prior to the issuance of a final EIS, and a revised DEIS should be issued to allow comment by the public. Had the Historical Study been released to the public when it was finished, in 2002, the public would have informed the agency of the inadequacy of the report. As it stands now, until that inadequacy is remedied no conclusions whatever can justifiably be drawn from the historical record that the Park Service has assembled.

**Organization:** Minnesota Sacred Places

**Commenter:** Bruce M White **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203634 **Comment Id:** 37922 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** As suggested by the Park Service letter to Stanley Crooks, the Park Service might be willing to accept the testimony of Cavender if the Stanley Crooks and the Shakopee Community if Shakopee or another Dakota community in Minnesota were willing to state that Gary Cavender speaks for them on this matter. On this point, it must be noted that the opinion of a tribal government about the cultural testimony of a spiritual leader is not a determining factor in relation to that testimony. In posing the question Park Service officials have confused the government-to-government relationship of the federal government to the tribes with the information-gathering under NEPA and under Section 106. In neither case is the validity of testimony a matter for exclusive tribal-government decision-making.

**Organization:** Minnesota Sacred Places

**Commenter:** Bruce M White **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**PN110001 PURPOSE AND NEED: RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND PLANNING DOCUMENTS. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 191842 **Comment Id:** 35458 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Second, the legislation authorizing the National Park Service (NPS) and Secretary of the Interior to consider transfer of this 27 acre site clearly states the intent to return it to "community" use. Thus, the NPS and Secretary of the Interior are charged with finding a way to ensure this future use. Clearly, this means NOT allowing future commercial or government uses of the land. However, I do not find assurance in the EIS process to date that the NPS nor the Secretary will ensure this result. It appears that NPS is looking for administrative

nullification its legal obligation, which violates the spirit of the law and constitutes a misuse of taxpayer funding of the agency. I encourage the NPS and the Secretary to seek instead the strongest possible protection of the natural environmental, Native American cultural and Minnesota historical values of the property for public use in perpetuity. The Secretary must not base a transfer decision on other criteria, but diligently and pro-actively create a secure means of designating this community use now and in the future.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** Yes

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35529 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 18: Chapter 1, Relationship With Other Laws . . . , p. 27-29. Please refer to General Comment 3 concerning the significance of the area and in reference to the archaeological, historical, and ethnographic studies and surrounding issues.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 200010 **Comment Id:** 37330 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** [Note: The final EIS should state that Chapter 101, Section 1 of the 2001 Session Laws was superceded by the "stipulation agreement" between the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District and MnDOT, cited in Chapter 364, Sec. 33 of the 2002 Session Laws. Because the "stipulation agreement" is not easily obtained by the general public, it should be attached as an exhibit to the final EIS.]

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 200010 **Comment Id:** 37340 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** the Draft EIS (page 52, paragraph 3) incorrectly states, ". . . any covenants or restrictions on real property, such as covenants or easements, may be disregarded automatically after 30 years . . ." Again, Minn. Stat. 5 500.20 does not contain the word "easement." (However, the draft EIS does state in the same paragraph that conservation easements are not subject to this law.)

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203584 **Comment Id:** 37897 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The DEIS states that the USBM site would be governed by Executive Order 79-19 Interim Development Regulations. The DEIS does not address how these regulations would be implemented or how proposed development would be reviewed and regulated.

**Organization:** Metropolitan Council

**Commenter:** Phyllis Hanson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203584 **Comment Id:** 37899 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Please be aware of potential changes to airspace rules. The DEIS preparers should review the Federal Register - Vol. 71, No. 113, of Tuesday June 13, 2006 for Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) by the U.S. Department of Transportation. This NPRM concerns regulations regarding "Safe, Efficient Use and Preserving Navigable Airspace." The potential changes to these rules (14 CFR Part 77) are found in FAA Docket No. 2006-25002; Notice No. 06-06. Aircraft noise impacts will need to be addressed if the site becomes privately owned or if the site is developed.

**Organization:** Metropolitan Council

**Commenter:** Phyllis Hanson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203584 **Comment Id:** 37898 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** MNRRA. The DEIS, p. 16, states that the Committee understands that Mississippi National River Recreation Area (MNRRA) ownership of land in the MNRRA corridor is inconsistent with the MNRRA comprehensive management plan (CMP). The CMP plan does not seem to exclude the possibility of MNRRA land ownership, but seeks to limit it. The plan states that the "NPS should own minimal land in the corridor." In addition, the CMP states that the "NPS will develop ?.. smaller interpretive centers in the Hastings area, at Fort Snelling State Park.. ." It does not seem inconsistent with the CMP that MNRRA own and/or manage the USBM Campus site.

**Organization:** Metropolitan Council

**Commenter:** Phyllis Hanson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203510 **Comment Id:** 37845 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** I think that another law applies here too. The American Indian Religious Freedom Act passed in 1978 and that would respect and honor and supposedly protect our sacred sites.

**Organization:** Mendota Dakota Community

**Commenter:** Jim Anderson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 200010 **Comment Id:** 37339 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The Draft EIS (page 52, paragraph 2) contains an incorrect legal statement: ". . . The use of conditions or restrictions in Minnesota such as covenants or easements is modified and limited by state statute. The relevant sections contained in Minn. Stat. fj500.20 . . ." Several other places in this paragraph also mention "easement" in the context of this statute. It must be clarified that a conservation easement is not subject to this statute. In fact, the word "easement" is not even found in this statute.

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 201077 **Comment Id:** 35665 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** For the disposition of the former Bureau of Mines Twin Cities research Center, I would suggest a 2 word phrase scire facias. Keeping it simple, the United States US Dept. of the Interior has a legal obligation to prove their legal rights to the title of lands of the late Ft. Snelling Reservation. Pushing the envelope of the law when enacting the legislation to reduce Ft. Snelling lands, MN made a practice of overstepping land laws to such as point, the added scrutiny of having the lands encompassing the inner boundaries of the Ft. Snelling Reservation to be ceded by the Sioux Nation, i.e. Dakota, lands within Indian Country & also within the Ft. Snelling have never been ceded by the Dakota nation. Treaties nor the act of congress Feb. 16, 1863 (12 Stat.L.,653) have no force on lands not ceded by First Nations (Dakotas)

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Brian Eggenberg **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**PN9000 PURPOSE AND NEED: ISSUES AND IMPACT TOPICS SELECTED FOR ANALYSES (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35532 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 21: Chapter 1, Impact Topics Dismissed From Further Analysis, Hazardous Materials and Waste Management, p. 38. The Draft EIS dismisses Hazardous Materials and Waste Management from further analysis based in part on its "previous efforts to identify and abate hazardous materials at the Center and the substantial reports produced incident to those efforts . . . ." The SMSC disagrees with the dismissal because the work done by the NPS does not: (a) analyze the implications and impacts of transferring buildings which contain or are constructed of hazardous materials to a new owner or occupier, including determining whether the hazards are likely to

increase (for example, more mold growth or increased friability of asbestos containing materials), estimating the costs to maintain the buildings, addressing potential liability to a new owner or occupant of leaving the buildings in their present state of disrepair (for example, the potential liability should people inadvertently enter Building 9 which has been determined unsafe for entry), assessing whether maintenance and removal costs would escalate over time, etc.; or (b) analyze the implications and impacts of hazardous materials and wastes if buildings are reused, including which buildings could and could not be reused, whether the costs to manage or remove hazardous materials and wastes would be higher than demolition costs, whether those costs would escalate over time, potential reuse liability, etc. The Final EIS should include the topic of Hazardous Materials and Waste Management to address these impacts.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 192604 **Comment Id:** 35668 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Furthermore, the treaty by which the United States acquired access to the land at the Coldwater Spring site guarantees unlimited access to the Dakota people. This treaty commitment has not always been honored, but it should be. In fact, the treaty only states that the land may be used by the federal government for the purpose of building a military base. Since the land is no longer being used for that purpose, there may be an obligation to restore the land to the heirs of the Dakota people. This treaty is still a valid obligation of our federal government today and should be considered relevant to decisions regarding the future of Coldwater Spring. It would appear to fall under the category of "Indian Trust Resources," which the Park Service describes as: "The federal Indian trust responsibility is a legally enforceable fiduciary obligation on the part of the United States to protect tribal lands, assets, resources, and treaty rights..." Yet the Park Service includes Indian Trust Resources in its list of Impact Topics Dismissed from Further Review. This is a mistake and should be reconsidered.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Barb Marmet **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**SL1000 Sustainability and Long-term Management. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35936 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 116: Chapter 4, Sustainability and Long-Term Management, Alternative A, p. 283-284. The discussion of Alternative A in this section does not analyze the long-term implications of the no-action alternative. What are the real maintenance costs as the buildings continue to deteriorate? What health and safety effects can be expected to result from leaving the hazardous materials on-site?

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35938 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 117: Chapter 4, Sustainability and Long-Term Management, Alternatives B, C, and D, p. 284-286. The SMSC does not agree that increased volume of use under the interpretive/nature/history center scenario under any alternative would result in impacts to long-term productivity through trampling of native vegetation, compaction of soils, and increased noise that would disturb and reduce the frequency of wildlife at the Center. Rather, combining an interpretive history center with restoration of the native ecology, as the SMSC proposes, would increase long-term productivity.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**VC13000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: CULTURAL RESOURCES (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35562 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 45: Chapter 3, Historic Contact, p. 73-74. Please refer to General Comment 3 concerning the significance of the area and in reference to the archaeological, historical, and ethnographic studies and surrounding issues.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**VC16000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: ETHNOGRAPHIC RESOURCES (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35769 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 46: Chapter 3, Ethnography, p. 81-82. Please refer to General Comment 3 concerning the significance of the area and in reference to the archaeological, historical, and ethnographic studies and surrounding issues.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**VC20000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: LAND USE (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35785 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 57: Chapter 3, Land Use, p. 111. The Draft EIS states, "Critical Area plans are required for communities that manage land within the Critical Area." The Final EIS should note that an Indian Tribe occupying Trust Land would not be required to produce a Critical Area Plan. See Comment 5.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35787 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 58: Chapter 3, Land Use, Easements/Licenses/Rights-of-Way/Leases, p. 112-113. The Draft EIS includes a list of applicable right-of-way, licenses, and leases with the statement that "Additional research on existing easements, licenses, rights-of-way, and leases may be necessary prior to conveyance of the Center." The SMSC submits that any conveyance should be with clear title, meaning a commitment for title insurance should be obtained and all title questions resolved before conveyance. The US. Department of Interior is in a particularly favorable position to resolve title questions with the other federal agencies, including the US. Air Force, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the US. Department of Veterans Affairs, who appear on the list.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**VC22000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: VISITOR USE (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35789 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 59: Chapter 3, Public Experience and Values, p. 114. Please refer to General Comment 3 concerning the significance of the area and in reference to the archaeological, historical, and ethnographic studies and surrounding issues.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35791 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 60: Chapter 3, Public Use And Experience, Public Experience and Values, p. 114. The Final EIS should discuss the advantages of protecting Indian cultural and natural resources through tribal sovereignty. The Final EIS should note that tribal sovereignty allows an Indian perspective on the birth of the State at the confluence of the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers. Currently, the only historical perspective comes from the Fort Snelling historical site and the Minneapolis Park Board's preservation of early Minneapolis buildings at Minnehaha Park. See Comment 26.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 200010 **Comment Id:** 37328 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The Draft EIS (page 114 - "Public Experience and Values") purports to provide a brief history of activism to protect Coldwater Spring. Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition has asked me to provide the following information from their records - to correct the draft EIS and to explain more carefully the activities of Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition to date. Please insert this information in the final Environmental Impact Statement. While it is true that the Highway 55 protests focused attention on the general area, the protests were almost entirely about the highway reroute. The protests resulted in virtually no protection for Coldwater Spring itself, especially since the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) gave repeated assurances from 1981 on that Coldwater Spring would remain unharmed by the highway construction. (Note: an especially strong statement that there "... will be No Impact on the springs ..." was given by MnDOT on record at the Lower Minnesota River Watershed District meeting on November 15,2000.) In fact, almost no protests occurred after the clearing for the Highway 55 reroute took place in December, 1999. Most of the Coldwater Spring legal protections occurred after that time. Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition formed entirely after the Highway 55 reroute protests and is the oldest of the active community groups dealing with Coldwater Spring. One of my client's first actions occurred in May of 2000, when they presented a 1000-signature petition to the Minnesota Board of Soil and Water Resources (BWSR) to secure watershed district protection for Coldwater Spring. As a result of my client's efforts, BWSR granted watershed district protection to Coldwater Spring and the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport - for the first time ever.

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 200010 **Comment Id:** 37329 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** CONTINUED Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition then put pressure on the Lower Minnesota River Watershed District and the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District, as well as the MnDOT, to begin studies of the area's hydrology. This three-year effort resulted in multiple independent hydrological studies of Coldwater Spring as well as a multi-million dollar redesign for the Highway 55/62 interchange, containing among other things, an unprecedented liner under a highway solely to protect Coldwater Spring. Almost solely

through the efforts of Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition, in alliance with legislators and watershed, the following laws were enacted by the Minnesota Legislature, much to the surprise of MnDOT and other state agencies who fought it: 1. The Coldwater Spring protection law, enacted in 2001 [Chapter 101; (S.F. 2049)]; and 2. Legislation enacted in 2002 that allowed for the Highway 55/62 re-design and affirmed the "stipulation agreement" between MnDOT and the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District [Chapter 364, Sec. 33; (Senate File 3298)]. Without these efforts, Coldwater Spring would have been largely rerouted down a storm sewer with the remaining water draining through sandstone, thereby completely drying up the spring. Furthermore, it is largely the actions of Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition that convinced Congressman Martin Sabo to obtain the \$750,000 appropriation for the Coldwater Spring area, which is why the EIS is being written now. These results didn't happen because of media attention or protests, as suggested in the Draft EIS, but rather by, quite literally, many thousands of volunteer hours spent by Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition members - often at the Minnesota State Capitol and meetings of the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District and Lower Minnesota River Watershed District.

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 200010 **Comment Id:** 37331 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** CONTINUED While Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition's efforts have been usually under the radar of other louder groups, no one else has had better results. Moreover, the Coalition's efforts have spun off other efforts that resulted in liners being constructed around the tunnels under the north-south runway at the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport to protect the groundwater - with the hope of helping to protect Coldwater Spring. Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition has a website at [www.preservecampco~dwater.org](http://www.preservecampco~dwater.org), which contains the largest single on-line library of history and information about Camp Coldwater. Given Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition's success and easy internet access to information about the Coalition and Camp Coldwater in general, it is a substantial omission that Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition wasn't even mentioned as a reference in the Draft EIS.

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**VC24000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: MNDNR REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT NATURAL RESOURCE AREA. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35770 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 47: Chapter 3, Natural Resources, Rare Plant Species, p. 93. The discussion under Rare Plant Species is inadequate. The central question that must be addressed is - are any federal or State threatened or endangered plant species present on the Center site? (See Draft EIS page 94 under Wildlife where the United States Fish and Wildlife Service answers this very question with

respect to fauna.) Given the presence of so many rare and native plant species within one mile, a biological survey to answer this question is needed for the Final EIS.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35771 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 48: Chapter 3, Natural Resources, Rare Plant Species, p. 93. Under Rare Plant Species, the Draft EIS states, "According to the Natural heritage Program, disposition of the Center alone should not affect any know occurrences of rare plant species." The Draft EIS does not contemplate "disposition alone." It also contemplates reuse under three conceptual land-use scenarios. The presence on the Center site of threatened or endangered species and the need to protect their habitat, if present, could affect how reuse can occur on the Center site. Based on the outcome of a biological study, this should he addressed in the Final EIS.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 200010 **Comment Id:** 37333 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The Draft EIS shows a fundamental lack of understanding of the connection between the Highway 55/62 interchange and Coldwater Spring. (Example: Draft EIS, page 95) The following are only two examples: 1. Instead of referencing a pre-construction flow rate of approximately 85 gallons per minute (as measured by my client and is consistent with many MnDOT measurements), the Draft EIS states that the Coldwater Spring flow rate varies from 27 to 161 gallons per minute. However there is NO reference that such low flow rates happened exclusively as a result of clogged flow meters and mechanical pumping by MnDOT at the Highway 55/62 interchange. Note also: Minnehaha Creek Watershed District's studies show a post construction measurement indicating a 30% diminishment in the ground water flow rate at Coldwater Spring as a result of construction of the Highway 55/62 Intersection. (See February 5, 2002 press release. of the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District, attached as Exhibit 1.) 2. The Draft EIS fails to mention that the high figure of 16 gallons/minute flow is also highly suspect, likely resulting from a combination of water from Coldwater Spring and rainwater flowing to the Coldwater Spring pool outlet -before the total outflow is measured. In other words, the final EIS must contain an accurate statement of groundwater flow rites, leaving aside the "bounce" derived from rainwater and the artificially low flow rate resulting from pumping or a clogged flow meter.

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35775 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 52: Chapter 3, Natural Resources, Water Quality, Groundwater Quality, p. 98. As in Surface Water Quality, the Draft EIS discusses water quality in aquifers underlying the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District even though the Center is not in that watershed. No mention is made of groundwater quality in aquifers under the Center's watershed or the Center. Either ground water quality in the Center's watershed should be discussed in the Final EIS, some connection should be made between groundwater quality in the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District and the Center or Camp Coldwater Spring, or some other reasons must be presented for using data only from the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35774 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 51: Chapter 3, Natural Resources, Water Quality, Surface Water Quality, p. 97-98. As in Surface Water Resources, the Draft EIS discusses water quality in the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District even though the Center is not in that watershed. No mention is made of surface water quality in the Center's watershed. Either surface water quality in the Center's watershed should be discussed in the Final EIS, some connection should be made between surface water quality in the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District and the Center or Camp Coldwater Spring, or some other reasons must be presented for using data only from the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35773 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Chapter 3, Natural Resources, Hydrology, Comment 50: Groundwater Resources, p 95-97. If the Center site has or had wells, this should be discussed. See Comment 44.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35772 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 49: Chapter 3, Natural Resources, Hydrology, Surface Water Resources, p. 94-95. The Draft EIS discusses the

Minnehaha Creek Watershed District in some detail. However the Center Site is not within that watershed as later stated, "Rain water that falls on the Center does not flow into Minnehaha Creek, but rather flows eastward. . . to the Mississippi River. The Draft EIS does not identify the watershed district or watershed management organization, if any, in which the Center lies. The Final EIS should determine if the Center Site is within a watershed district or management organization's jurisdiction and, if so, discuss the applicable regulations in Chapter 3 and in Chapter 1.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203584 **Comment Id:** 37900 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The USBM Campus site contains regionally significant natural resources identified for protection by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR). The northeast portion of the USBM Campus site is within an area identified by the MN DNR as a Regionally Significant Natural Resource Area, The greater parcel within which the USBM Campus lies (from the eastern property line of the USBM Campus site) is designated by the MN DNR as II Regionally Significant Ecological Area. These designations/resources do not appear to be noted in the DEIS, Chapter 3: Affected Environment Natural Resources, and should be added to the final EIS. It is the Metropolitan Council's policy (through the 2030 Regional Development Framework and the 2030 Regional Parks Policy Plan) to work with other regional partners to protect such regionally important natural resources.

**Organization:** Metropolitan Council

**Commenter:** Phyllis Hanson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**VC25000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: HEALTH AND SAFETY (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35779 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 54: Chapter 3, Health and Safety, Mold, p. 108. The Final EIS should repeat here the information on page 65 of the Draft EIS that Building 9 "has been determined unsafe for entry without protective equipment due to the presence of mold . . ."

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35780 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 55: Chapter 3, Health and Safety, Lead-based Paint, p. 110. If the last inspection of lead based paint was between six and ten years ago as suggested in the section on Lead-based Paint, a further inspection should be made to determine the current condition. The results of this inspection should be reported in the final EIS.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35782 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 56: Chapter 3, Health and Safety, Other Hazards, p. 110-111. The Other Hazards section states that break-ins at the Center "could expose individuals to hazards with serious potential injury potential." The Final EIS should discuss whether it is realistic to dispose of the Center with buildings and structures intact given these dangers. This discussion might be appropriate in connection with Alternative D.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**VC26000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: BUILDINGS AND OTHER STRUCTURES (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35560 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 43: Chapter 3, Buildings And Other Structures, p. 60-69. This section on Buildings And Other Structures is the alternate location for a discussion of each building's reuse suitability under the three conceptual land-use scenarios. See Comment 23.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35561 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** Comment 44: Chapter 3, Other Infrastructure, p. 70. No mention is made of current or past wells on the Center site. The Final EIS should indicate the history of any wells, including the locations, depths, aquifer tapped, past or present rates of draw, and, if any wells were closed, when and how.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**VC5000 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT: WETLANDS (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 199711 **Comment Id:** 35777 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Comment 53: Chapter 3, Natural Resources, Wetlands, Regulatory Background, p. 99-101. It appears that most of the discussion under Wetlands, Regulatory Background, should occur in Chapter 1 under Relationship With Other Laws . . . . See Comment 19. Either there or here, the Final EIS should discuss whether and how these laws and regulations apply to universities, nonfederal government entities, and Indian Tribes.

**Organization:** Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community

**Commenter:** Stanley R Crooks **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**WL1000 WETLANDS IMPACTS. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 193161 **Comment Id:** 35332 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** I question the conclusion in table 9 of Chapter 4 on page 292 which indicates that no-action would have major adverse impacts on wetlands when the no-action alternative does not appear to be addressed, presented, or documented in any detail or included in analysis of effects. This is supported by the fact that the report concludes that the main factor that would potentially impact wetlands on the Center would be construction work that would damage, alter or destroy wetland resources (Pages 250, 264, & 278.) Wetland stewardship by the National Park Service would most likely exceed that expected of or required by any other federal, state, and local agencies or regulations. I offer that all of the beneficial impacts identified by the Disposition of > Bureau of Mines Property, Twin Cities Research Center Main Campus Hennepin County, Minnesota Draft Environmental Impact Statement would be most likely realized under continued federal government control and management by the National Park Service.

**Organization:** North Star Chapter Sierra Club Wetlands Committee

**Commenter:** William F Barton **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 193153 **Comment Id:** 35455 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** I question the conclusion in table 9 of Chapter 4 on page 292 which indicates that no-action would have major adverse impacts on wetlands when the no-action alternative does not appear to be addressed, presented, or documented in any detail or included in analysis of effects. This is supported by the fact that the report concludes that the main factor that would potentially impact wetlands on the

Center would be construction work that would damage, alter or destroy wetland resources (Pages 250, 264, & 278.) Wetland stewardship by the National Park Service would most likely exceed that expected of or required by any other federal, state, and local agencies or regulations.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Tim Boyle **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 201025 **Comment Id:** 35661 **Coder's Initials:** SP

**Comment Text:** The wetland description on pp.88 ff in the draft booklet was inspiring, but the end of paragraph 2 on p. 286 seemed implausible ? that interpretive use would be "adverse" but training center use "beneficial"?!

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Diane Steen-Hinderlie **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**WQ7000 WATER RESOURCES: PROTECT NATURAL SPRINGS AND FRESH WATER SOURCE. (Substantive)**

**Correspondence Id:** 192614 **Comment Id:** 34994 **Coder's Initials:** sf

**Comment Text:** I have been active with the Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition, and I support their comments on the Draft EIS. However I want to impress upon the National Park Service the importance of including the liner under the Hwy 55/62 interchange. Not so much in maintenance and design, as that is the Minnesota Department of Transportation's (MnDOT) job, but in basic monitoring. The reason why is because when watershed protection was granted to the area, it wasn't granted on watershed boundaries, but rather political boundaries. Please see the Board of Soil and Water Resources decision of May 10th, 2000 if details are needed. But the main point I want to make is the source of the Coldwater Spring, and it's outflow are in two different watershed districts. Therefore whoever owns the Bureau of Mines/Coldwater Spring must be willing to work with both Minnehaha Creek Watershed and Lower Minnesota River Watershed with the understanding that the resource of Coldwater Spring will be greatly effected by actions taken outside of the Bureau of Mines land, and because of the political decision to separate the watershed, the watershed districts may or may not see the effect. This is simply because if a permit is pulled in one watershed distinct, the effect may not be known to the other. Whoever owns the Bureau of Mines/Coldwater Spring, must be willing to look 1000 feet beyond the boundaries of the land boarder to really see the total effect to the Coldwater Spring. The situation really needs to be known to the future land owners of the area what the real impacts are. The EIS is a primary tool to that end, and I don't think mentioning something that significant well under 1000 feet away is any big stretch or special request.

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas P Holtzleiter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 202321 **Comment Id:** 36727 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** While it is historically significant without the Spring, it is the Spring, the water, the flow that centers the land and makes it most significant. Protecting the flow-not destroying or reducing further the flow of the Spring-is the single most important component of any covenant (or condition) with the land.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Sue Ann Martinson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 200010 **Comment Id:** 37332 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** The draft EIS (page 95) states that MnDOT is required to monitor groundwater flows through May, 2006. As a condition of ownership transfer, it is very important that an appropriate government entity continue to assume responsibility to monitor the groundwater outflow from the Highway 55/62 interchange and its potential to adversely impact Coldwater Spring. The final EIS should discuss monitoring frequency and other parameters. (My client recommends groundwater testing on at least a monthly basis.)

**Organization:** Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition

**Commenter:** Thomas E Casey **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 202312 **Comment Id:** 37411 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Repeatedly in the DEIS the Coldwater campus was partitioned into significant (spring outflow) and other land. The Camp Coldwater Spring area begins uphill at the airport and ends at the bottom of the Mississippi River bluff. Coldwater Spring is the only natural spring of size in either Minneapolis or Saint Paul, and the last natural spring in all of Hennepin County. The 27.32-acre Coldwater property is already a "select portion" of the watershed. The spring is only as good as its groundwater source(s). The essence of Coldwater is not just Mississippi blufftop real estate, it's the water.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Susu Jeffery **Page:** **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**

**Correspondence Id:** 203575 **Comment Id:** 37736 **Coder's Initials:** S\_FRYE

**Comment Text:** Coldwater Spring is also a significant resource that should be protected for both cultural and ecological purposes. Public

access to the Spring for people of all abilities is also essential. The Minnehaha Creek Watershed District and the Minnesota State Legislature have both identified Coldwater Spring as a significant water resource. Flows from the spring and adjacent aquifers must be carefully monitored during any changes to the property, including demolition and ecological restoration.

**Organization:**

**Commenter:** Whitney L Clark   **Page:**   **Paragraph:**

**Kept Private:** No

**NPS Response to Comment:**



## APPENDIX A: INDEX BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Org. Type	Organization Name	Correspondence ID		Description
O	Longfellow Community Council	203583	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5006	Oppose Alternative A - No-Action.
			AL5007	Oppose Alternative B.
			AL5009	Support Alternative D.
			AL5010	Support restrictions placed on transfer.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5013	Oppose training center/office park scenario.
			AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.
	Metropolitan Council	203584	AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.
			AL4019	Suggested conditions on transfer.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5007	Oppose Alternative B.
			AL5009	Support Alternative D.
			AL5010	Support restrictions placed on transfer.
			PN110001	Purpose and Need: Relationships with other Laws, Regulations, and Planning Documents.
			VC24000	Affected Environment: MNDNR Regionally Significant Natural Resource Area.
	Minneapolis Park Watch	201359	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1008	Minneapolis Parks & Recreation Board Management.
	Nokomis East Neighborhood Association (NENA)	199768	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL5005	Support alternative A - No-Action Alternative
			AL5007	Oppose Alternative B.
			AL5008	Support Alternative C.
			AL5009	Support Alternative D.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5012	Support interpretive/nature/history center scenario.
			AL5013	Oppose training center/office park scenario.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
	Rockford Mjos	203192	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	St. Louis Park Historical Society	201227	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5022	Oppose Alternative D
	Wopida Training and Service Group	203111	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
P	Friends of Coldwater	193245	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		199540	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	Friends of the Sibley Historic Site	203581	AL5006	Oppose Alternative A - No-Action.
			AL5007	Oppose Alternative B.
			AL5008	Support Alternative C.
			AL5009	Support Alternative D.
			AL6000	Range of alternatives is inadequate.
			CR4000	Cultural Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives
			CR4002	Impacts to surrounding cultural resources (Ft. Snelling, Sibley House) not addressed.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
	Land Use and	193132	AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

	Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter			
			AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4016	Support the Center becoming part of MNRRA.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5005	Support alternative A - No-Action Alternative
			AL5008	Support Alternative C.
			AL5009	Support Alternative D.
			AL5010	Support restrictions placed on transfer.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
	Minnesota Native Plant Society	203585	AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1013	Preservation Education

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

	Minnesota Sacred Places	203634	CR2000	Cultural Resources: Methodology And Assumptions
			CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CR7000	Cultural resource studies inadequate and/or flawed.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1015	Additional/corrected info requested to be included in EIS.
			ON1000	Other NEPA Issues: General Comments
	North Star Chapter Sierra Club Wetlands Committee	193161	AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5005	Support alternative A - No-Action Alternative
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			WL1000	Wetlands impacts.
	Park River Alliance (no longer in existence)	199549	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	Parks & Trails Council of Minnesota	199786	AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.
			AL5010	Support restrictions placed on transfer.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.
	Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition	200010	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			AL4019	Suggested conditions on transfer.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5012	Support interpretive/nature/history center scenario.
			AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.
			ED1000	Editorial
			GA3000	Impact Analysis: General Methodology For Establishing Impacts/Effects
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			ON1000	Other NEPA Issues: General Comments
			PN110001	Purpose and Need: Relationships with other Laws, Regulations, and Planning Documents.
			VC22000	Affected Environment: Visitor Use
			VC24000	Affected Environment: Water Quality and Hydrology
			WQ7000	Water Resources: Protect natural springs and fresh water source.
	Sierra Club	200120	AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.
			AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4016	Support the Center becoming part of MNRRA.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5008	Support Alternative C.
			AL5009	Support Alternative D.
			AL5010	Support restrictions placed on transfer.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
	N/A	203543	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

				enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
		203575	AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4016	Support the Center becoming part of MNRRA.
			AL5005	Support alternative A - No-Action Alternative
			AL5008	Support Alternative C.
			AL5009	Support Alternative D.
			AL5010	Support restrictions placed on transfer.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			WQ7000	Water Resources: Protect natural springs and fresh water source.
F	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	199760	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5007	Oppose Alternative B.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL6000	Recommend consideration of additional alternative(s).
	United States Environmental Protection Agency	203489	AL5009	Support Alternative D.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5012	Support interpretive/nature/history center scenario.
			AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.
			ON1000	Other NEPA Issues: General Comments
S	Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board	203490	AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			AL5009	Support Alternative D.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
T	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	203491	AL5009	Support Alternative D.
			AL5010	Support restrictions placed on transfer.
			AL5012	Support interpretive/nature/history center scenario.
	Minneapolis City Council Ward 2	193163	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5005	Support alternative A - No-Action Alternative
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
Q	Lower Sioux Indian Community	203619	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
			AL4008	Support special access for Native American use.
	Lower Sioux Indian Community, Morton Minnesota	203508	MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	Mendota Dakota Community	203510	CR4001	Historical importance of Coldwater Spring not addressed.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			PN110001	Purpose and Need: Relationships with other Laws, Regulations, and Planning Documents.
		203525	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
			CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
	Mendota Mdewakanton Dakota Community	199690	AL4021	Support transfer of Center to a Tribe.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	Prairie Island Indian	199726	AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

	community			
			AL4007	Support partnership with Native American groups for appropriate development.
			AL4008	Support special access for Native American use.
			AL4021	Support transfer of Center to a Tribe.
			AL5006	Oppose Alternative A - No-Action.
			AL5007	Oppose Alternative B.
			AL5009	Support Alternative D.
			AL5021	Oppose Alternative C
			AL6000	Recommend consideration of additional alternative(s).
			CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			ER1000	Effects to ethnographic resources.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
			MT1012	Spiritual / religious beliefs.
	Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community	199711	AL4021	Support transfer of Center to a Tribe.
			AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.
			AL6000	Recommend consideration of additional alternative(s).
			AL6002	Effect of Indian Trust Land designation.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			CI1000	Cumulative Impacts Analysis.
			CR 2002	Cultural significance/importance of Coldwater Springs to American Indians.
			ED1000	Editorial
			GA1001	Alternative A Impacts Analysis
			GA1002	Alternative B Impacts Analysis

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			GA1003	Alternative C Impacts Analysis
			GA1004	Alternative D Impacts Analysis
			II1000	Irretrievable Impacts: General Comments
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1015	Additional/corrected info requested to be included in EIS.
			PN110001	Purpose and Need: Relationships with other Laws, Regulations, and Planning Documents.
			PN9000	Purpose And Need: Issues And Impact Topics Selected For Analyses
			SL1000	Sustainability and Long-term Management.
			VC13000	Affected Environment: Cultural Resources
			VC16000	Affected Environment: Ethnographic Resources
			VC20000	Affected Environment: Land Use
			VC22000	Affected Environment: Visitor Use
			VC24000	Affected Enironment: Water Quality and Hydrology
			VC24000	Affected Environment: MNDNR Regionally Significant Natural Resource Area.
			VC25000	Affected Environment: Health and Safety
			VC26000	Affected Environment: Buildings and Other Structures
			VC5000	Affected Environment: Wetlands
	Western Band of the Cherokee Tribe, Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma	199126	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
I	CHS SPEAK	191080	AL5012	Support interpretive/nature/history center scenario.
	Friends of Fort Snelling	203571	AL5006	Oppose Alternative A - No-Action.
			AL5007	Oppose Alternative B.
			AL5008	Support Alternative C.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL5009	Support Alternative D.
			AL5010	Support restrictions placed on transfer.
			AL6000	Range of alternatives is inadequate.
			CR4001	Historical importance of Coldwater Spring not addressed.
			CR4002	Impacts to surrounding cultural resources (Ft. Snelling, Sibley House) not addressed.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
	Green Party	191310	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
	Indigenous Peoples task Force	191331	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
	Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition	192614	AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5008	Support Alternative C.
			AL5009	Support Alternative D.
			WQ7000	Water Resources: Protect natural springs and fresh water source.
	sacred Sites International Foundation	203617	AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

				savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
	N/A	190050	AL4017	Suggestions - Other
		190969	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		191119	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		191125	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		191321	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		191323	AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		191326	AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
		191517	AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.
			AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			AL5000	Alternatives: Response to alternatives/scenarios presented in EIS
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
			MT1012	Spiritual / religious beliefs.
		191528	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1012	Spiritual / religious beliefs.
		191540	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		191548	AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		191622	AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5006	Oppose Alternative A - No-Action.
		191842	AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			Center.
		AL5005	Support alternative A - No-Action Alternative
		AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		AL5013	Oppose training center/office park scenario.
		AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
		AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
		AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
		CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
		MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		ON1000	Other NEPA Issues: General Comments
		PN110001	Purpose and Need: Relationships with other Laws, Regulations, and Planning Documents.
	192071	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
	192594	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	192604	AL4017	Suggestions - Other
		AL6000	Recommend consideration of additional alternative(s).
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		PN9000	Purpose And Need: Issues And Impact Topics Selected For Analyses
	192610	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
		AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
		AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
		MT1001	Native American Culture/History.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		192617	AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.
			AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		192620	AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
		193061	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
			AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
			MT1014	Legislative efforts.
		193122	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
		193124	AL6000	Range of alternatives is inadequate.
			CR 2002	Cultural significance/importance of Coldwater Springs to American Indians.
			CR1000	Cultural Resources: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws
			CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
			ON1000	Other NEPA Issues: General Comments
		193125	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		193150	AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
		193151	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
		193152	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		193153	AL4016	Support the Center becoming part of MNRRA.
			AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5005	Support alternative A - No-Action Alternative
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			WL1000	Wetlands impacts.
		193154	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
		193156	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
			MT1013	Preservation Education
		193158	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		193159	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5018	Question conservation easement enforceability.
		193162	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
		193164	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
		193166	AL4007	Support partnership with Native American groups for appropriate development.
			AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5020	Support transfer to another non-federal government entity.
		193167	AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		193168	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
			MT1012	Spiritual / religious beliefs.
		193169	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		193171	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		193172	AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
		193174	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
		193175	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		193176	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4007	Support partnership with Native American groups for appropriate development.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

		193177	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		193178	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
		193186	AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		193187	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		193231	AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
			MT1012	Spiritual / religious beliefs.
		193233	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4008	Support special access for Native American use.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		193234	MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		193236	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		193237	AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		193239	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		193240	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
		193241	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		193242	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		193243	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		193244	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		193246	AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
			MT1013	Preservation Education
		193247	AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			MT1013	Preservation Education
		193248	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		193249	AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
			MT1013	Preservation Education
		193251	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
		193252	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

				protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		193254	AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		193255	AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		193256	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		193257	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		193258	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1003	Minnesota History.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
		193259	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		193261	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		193262	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
		193263	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
		193264	AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
			AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		193268	AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		193271	AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
			MT1013	Preservation Education

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

		193272	AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.
			AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		193273	AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.
			AL4004	Oppose tribal ownership of Center.
		193275	AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
		193453	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		194349	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
			MT1013	Preservation Education
		195034	AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		195235	AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
			MT1013	Preservation Education
		199055	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
			MT1011	Public safety and security at the Center.
		199057	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

				Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
		199068	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
		199069	AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		199070	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
		199085	AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		199138	AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
		199173	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
		199177	AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		199178	AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
		199512	AL4017	Suggestions - Other

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

	199525	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
		AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
	199528	AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
		MT1003	Minnesota History.
		MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
		MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
	199529	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
		AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
	199539	AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
		AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
	200238	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
		AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
		MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
		MT1002	Euro-American History.
		MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
	200256	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
		MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
	200258	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

	200261	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
		AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
		AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	200262	AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
		AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		AL5009	Support Alternative D.
		AL5010	Support restrictions placed on transfer.
		AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		AL5012	Support interpretive/nature/history center scenario.
		AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
		MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
	200263	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		MT1012	Spiritual / religious beliefs.
	200265	AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
		AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
		MT1002	Euro-American History.
		MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
	200266	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
		MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	200267	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		200268	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		200269	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		200270	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
		200905	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
			MT1012	Spiritual / religious beliefs.
		201025	AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5012	Support interpretive/nature/history center scenario.
			AL5013	Oppose training center/office park scenario.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1013	Preservation Education
			WL1000	Wetlands impacts.
		201077	PN110001	Purpose and Need: Relationships with other Laws, Regulations, and Planning Documents.
		201220	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
		201293	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4007	Support partnership with Native American groups for appropriate development.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5010	Support restrictions placed on transfer.
			AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
			MT1012	Spiritual / religious beliefs.
			MT1013	Preservation Education
		201325	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
		201333	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
			MT1010	Ecotourism.
		201345	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		201351	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		201363	AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		201371	AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4008	Support special access for Native American use.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5010	Support restrictions placed on transfer.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
		201748	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		201756	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202234	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		202238	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		202241	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202243	AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		202259	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
		202261	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
		202301	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
		202302	AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL5005	Support alternative A - No-Action Alternative
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202306	AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5005	Support alternative A - No-Action Alternative
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202312	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			AL4020	Oppose other suggestions.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

				protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CR3001	Expand geographic scope of cultural resource impact analysis
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
			WQ7000	Water Resources: Protect natural springs and fresh water source.
		202315	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			CR 2002	Cultural significance/importance of Coldwater Springs to American Indians.
			CR4001	Historical importance of Coldwater Spring not addressed.
			CR7000	Cultural resource studies inadequate and/or flawed.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
		202318	CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202321	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			WQ7000	Water Resources: Protect natural springs and fresh water source.
		202331	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
			MT1012	Spiritual / religious beliefs.
		202332	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

				protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
		202337	AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL6000	Range of alternatives is inadequate.
			CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			CR7000	Cultural resource studies inadequate and/or flawed.
			ED1000	Editorial
		202339	AL4012	Support creation of a Native American museum.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
		202340	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
		202497	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202519	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202520	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		202521	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202523	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		202526	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202527	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202530	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202533	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		202536	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202543	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		202546	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202555	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202563	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

	202567	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	202571	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
	202585	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	202589	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	202698	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
	202720	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
	202722	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	202723	AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		MT1003	Minnesota History.
	202727	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	202728	AL5006	Oppose Alternative A - No-Action.
	202729	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	202730	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
	202731	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	202733	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
	202734	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	202735	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
	202736	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

		202737	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202859	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202860	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		202862	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202863	MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		202865	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202866	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202867	MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		202869	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202870	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		202871	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202874	MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		202875	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202876	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		202877	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202878	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		202879	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202881	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202882	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		202883	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202884	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		202893	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		202894	AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		202895	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202896	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		202898	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202900	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		202901	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202903	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202904	AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
		202905	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		202906	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			Center.
		AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
		AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
	202909	AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
		MT1003	Minnesota History.
		MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
	202910	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		MT1010	Ecotourism.
	202913	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
	202915	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	202916	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
	202917	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	202918	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
	202923	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	202924	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	202927	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
	202929	MT1010	Ecotourism.
	202930	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
		AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
	202932	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	202933	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	202934	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	202935	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		MT1012	Spiritual / religious beliefs.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

	202936	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	202937	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
	202938	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	202939	MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
	202941	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	202942	AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	202943	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	202945	AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
	202950	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	202955	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		MT1003	Minnesota History.
	202958	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	202960	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
		AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
	203096	MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
	203098	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
	203099	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
	203100	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
	203103	MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
	203104	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		MT1007	Preservation for future generations.

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

	203105	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
	203106	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
	203108	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	203109	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	203110	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
	203112	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
	203113	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	203115	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
	203116	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	203125	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
		AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
	203128	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	203130	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	203131	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	203133	MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
	203137	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	203142	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	203143	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	203144	MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
	203146	MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
	203148	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		203151	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		203152	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		203153	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		203156	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		203166	MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		203167	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
		203168	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		203170	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		203171	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
		203172	AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		203179	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		203180	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		203181	MT1003	Minnesota History.
		203183	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		203185	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		203186	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

				Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
		203189	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		203190	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
		203193	AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
		203194	AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
		203199	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
		203200	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
		203203	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		203204	MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		203206	AL4005	Oppose private ownership of Center.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		203207	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
		203208	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		203209	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		203210	AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
		203211	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		203236	AL4017	Suggestions - Other
		203238	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		203239	AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

	203245	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
	203246	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	203247	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	203248	MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
	203250	MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
		MT1003	Minnesota History.
		MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
	203251	AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
		AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
	203253	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
	203254	AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
	203256	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
	203257	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
		AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
	203258	MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
	203259	MT1012	Spiritual / religious beliefs.
	203260	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
	203262	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
		AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
		AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
	203263	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
		MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
	203264	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
	203265	AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
		MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
	203358	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
		MT1001	Native American Culture/History.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
		203492	AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5015	Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		203501	AL4018	Support public outdoor museum.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5019	Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1013	Preservation Education
		203506	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
		203507	AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1006	Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.
			MT1013	Preservation Education
		203512	AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		203513	AL4017	Suggestions - Other
		203521	AL5004	Support continued/expanded public access to Center.
			AL5011	Support use as open space / park.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
			MT1009	Availability of and access to spring water.
		203522	AL4003	Support "Green Museum"
			AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4009	Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.
			AL5001	Support federal (including NPS) ownership of the Center.
			AL5017	Support interpretation/education at the Center.
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		203523	MT1001	Native American Culture/History.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		203524	MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		203527	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
			AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.
		203530	AL4006	Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.
			AL4007	Support partnership with Native American groups for appropriate development.
			AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			CR 2002	Cultural significance/importance of Coldwater Springs to American Indians.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
		203532	AL4007	Support partnership with Native American groups for appropriate development.
			AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
		203533	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
			AL4002	Support state ownership of Center.
			AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			AL5003	Oppose development of Center.
			AL5014	Support removal of existing structures.
			AL5016	Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.
			CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1002	Euro-American History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

		203535	AL5002	Oppose sale of Center.
			MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1003	Minnesota History.
			MT1004	History of Dred Scott/African American History
		203557	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
		203562	AL4001	Support tribal ownership of Center.
			CR2001	Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.
		203564	AL4007	Support partnership with Native American groups for appropriate development.
			MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1007	Preservation for future generations.
		203565	AL4017	Suggestions - Other
			MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
			MT1013	Preservation Education
		203566	MT1000	Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments
A	Minnesota Historical Society	203363	CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments
			CR2000	Cultural Resources: Methodology And Assumptions
			CR4000	Cultural Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives
	Southwest Minnesota State University Indigenous Nation and Dakota Studies	203509	MT1001	Native American Culture/History.
			MT1005	Sacred Land/Sites.

**APPENDIX B: INDEX OF INDIVIDUAL COMMENTERS**

<b>Correspondence ID</b>	<b>Form Letter</b>	<b>Name</b>
203513	No	Olson, James J.
202452	Yes (202259)	Aasen, Pamela .
203562	No	Adams, Russel .
203523	No	Albrecht, Jim .
203126	Yes (202259)	Alm, Rebecca .
203301	Yes (202259)	Alt, Harold .
203300	Yes (202259)	Alt, Verna .
202922	Yes (202259)	Angell, Eric .
202443	Yes (202259)	Anglum, Beverly .
203246	Yes (202259)	Angulus, Rosalie B.
202558	Yes (202259)	Arner, Audrey .
202511	Yes (202259)	Aull, Lindsey .
202882	Yes (202259)	Avery, Elaine .
202736	Yes (202259)	Baca, Christina .
203245	Yes (202259)	Bailey, William H.
202950	Yes (202259)	Ball, Katherine .
203563	No	Bankovich, Beth A.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

202903	Yes (202259)	Barankovich, Amy .
202941	Yes (202259)	Barnett, William P.
202339	No	Bastien, Greg .
203532	No	Beane, Becky .
203530	No	Beane, Carly .
203527	No	Beane, Sydney .
202268	Yes (202259)	Beaner, Leonaro .
203107	Yes (202259)	Beaudion, Mary .
203210	Yes (202259)	Berekes, Bonnie J.
202727	Yes (202259)	Bergman, Elilizabeth .
202880	Yes (202259)	Berlowe, Burt .
193167	No	Bernard, Dick .
200258	No	Berneking, William B.
202422	Yes (202259)	Beseman, Roxanne .
203292	Yes (202259)	Beseman, Roxanne .
202870	Yes (202259)	Bicking, David .
203139	Yes (202259)	Billingsley, Brian .
201351	No	Bishop, Jennifer .
202728	Yes (202259)	Blank, Chad .
202259	Master (202259)	Blank, Don .
202863	Yes (202259)	Bliss, Alana .
193125	No	Bonk, Vicki .
199057	No	Bonniwell, Connie .

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

203262	Yes (202259)	Borginding July, Julie .
200256	No	Bottolene, Tom .
202262	Yes (202259)	Boutoy, Louise .
203298	Yes (202259)	Boyd, Lisa .
193153	No	Boyle, Tim .
202943	Yes (202259)	Braun, John J.
202271	Yes (202259)	Braunwarth, Zoa .
193159	No	Brazaitis, Edna .
202929	Yes (202259)	Brenner, Natalie .
191622	No	Brewer, Angela D.
199127	No	Brokering, Beth .
202873	Yes (202259)	Browning, Ann .
202330	No	Bruker, Michele .
202331	No	Bruker, Michele .
202894	Yes (202259)	Bruning, Corrine .
202444	Yes (202259)	Bruno, Laurie .
202909	Yes (202259)	Burkhart, B M.
203306	Yes (202259)	Burns, Daniel W.
202467	Yes (202259)	Burns, Robert R.
199529	No	Burt, Stephen .
202735	Yes (202259)	Carlson, Matt .
203112	Yes (202259)	Casey, Brent .
203564	No	Chadwick, Pat .

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

202514	Yes (202259)	Charborreaux, Franz E.
202463	Yes (202259)	Chell, John M.
199177	No	Christianson, Lyle T.
203255	Yes (202259)	Clabo, Richard .
203575	No	Clark, Whitney L.
193233	No	Clemens, Steve .
203358	Master (203358)	Cloutier, Patricia .
202450	Yes (202259)	Clovis, Clovis .
202496	Yes (202259)	Cobien, Steve .
202499	Yes (202259)	Corcoran, Allen .
203196	Yes (202259)	Corcoran, Marguerite .
202498	Yes (202259)	Corcoran, Rita .
193243	No	Corliss, Nan .
203287	Yes (202259)	Cottman, William J.
202960	Yes (202259)	Court, Janet .
202896	Yes (202259)	Cramer, Rebecca .
203198	Yes (202259)	Crews, Wendy .
203185	Yes (202259)	Crocker, Deborah .
202930	Yes (202259)	Cross, Amanda .
193234	No	Curtis, Helen .
202859	Yes (202259)	Cuthbertson, Roger .

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

203103	Yes (202259)	Darling, Pat .
203297	Yes (202259)	Dastych, Jerry .
202428	Yes (202259)	Davidov, Marv .
202446	Yes (202259)	Davis, Holly .
203172	Yes (202259)	Kept Private
191842	No	Kept Private
203131	Yes (202259)	Deierling, Rachel .
203100	Yes (202259)	Demeau, Mel .
193122	No	DeMuth, Scott .
193172	No	Devlin, Heather .
193164	No	DeVore, Carol .
202690	No	Dickman, Janice E.
202269	Yes (202259)	Dillon, Dennis .
202468	Yes (202259)	Dodey, Kristin .
203535	No	Donaldson, Patricia .
203174	Yes (202259)	Dooley, Lisa M.
202471	Yes (202259)	Dooley, Thomas .
202506	Yes (202259)	Downey, Jennie .
203207	Yes (202259)	Drier, Amy L.
202469	Yes (202259)	Duane, Addison .
202940	Yes (202259)	DuLac, Barbara .

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

203494	Yes (203492)	Dunn Brown, Mary .
202519	Yes (202259)	Dzink, Peter M.
202520	Yes (202259)	Dzink, Theresa C.
200262	No	Eaves, Paul .
191125	No	Eddy, Todd .
202234	No	Effinger, Eli .
201077	No	Eggenberg, Brian .
201086	No	Eggenberg, Kody .
203524	No	Eggenberg, Tiffany .
193241	No	Engman, Katie .
202737	Yes (202259)	Falk, Tamara .
202419	Yes (202259)	Farnham, Nancy .
193231	No	Fei, Linda .
202589	Yes (202259)	Feldman, Richard and Anne .
193187	No	Fieldseth, Henry .
200263	No	Fitzgerald, Kathryn .
203173	Yes (202259)	Ford, Frances .
200268	No	Frank, John .
202337	No	Fudally, Dave .
202266	Yes (202259)	Fyfe, Robert and Susan Youngdahl .
202424	Yes (202259)	Gabel DVM, Christine L.
199178	No	Gallagher, Dorie .
203522	No	Galloway, Ann .
193174	No	Gardner, Madeline .
203166	Yes (202259)	Garetz, Diane .

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

202522	Yes (202259)	Gibbes, Frederic M.
193256	No	Giesen, Bob and Susan .
203303	Yes (202259)	Giesen, Daniel J.
200269	No	Giles, Melvin .
202423	Yes (202259)	Gips, Terry .
200238	No	Glister, Becky J.
192071	No	Goody, Penny .
202508	Yes (202259)	Granse-Bowman, Michelle .
202512	Yes (202259)	Grant, David W.
203289	Yes (202259)	Green, Kristin .
201325	No	Gresser, Karol .
202869	Yes (202259)	Griesse, Liz .
203316	Yes (202259)	Grina, Terri .
202913	Yes (202259)	Guerrero, Patty .
203199	Yes (202259)	Guneratne, Prassana .
203200	Yes (202259)	Guneratra, Rebecca .
202879	Yes (202259)	Gustafson, Carrie .
202876	Yes (202259)	Habernas, Rev. Myoo .
202698	No	Hadawa, Lenea .
202243	No	Hadaway, LInnea .
202731	Yes (202259)	Halsnen, Teresa .
202877	Yes (202259)	Hansen, Llyod .

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

202916	Yes (202259)	Hanson, Jessica .
199070	No	Hanson, Josefina .
203142	Yes (202259)	Hanson, Kay .
203143	Yes (202259)	Hanson, Mina .
201293	No	Harmon, John .
193237	No	Harris, David L.
202536	Yes (202259)	Haslett-Marroquin, Amy .
203263	Yes (202259)	Heidelberg, Frank H.
203260	Yes (202259)	Heidelberg, Rebecca M.
202723	Yes (202259)	Heimendinger, Jed .
202238	No	Hempel, Drew .
202429	Yes (202259)	Henke, Trudy .
202261	Yes (202259)	Herbert, Trish .
202502	Yes (202259)	Herman, Christine .
202862	Yes (202259)	Hess, Sheryl .
201345	No	Hilgemann, James .
203307	Yes (202259)	Hilgendorf, Dhaivyd .
203179	Yes (202259)	Hillsdale, Cheryl .
202509	Yes (202259)	Hirsch, Nancy A.
203149	Yes (202259)	Hock, Alex .
203148	Yes (202259)	Hock, Susana .

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

202437	Yes (202259)	Holdridge, Earl .
201220	No	Hollingsworth, Jeanne .
203181	Yes (202259)	Holt, Lisa .
193453	No	Holupchinski, Greg .
193589	No	Holupchinski, Greg .
202414	Yes (202259)	Hork, Sandee .
203110	Yes (202259)	Howell, Lydia .
199539	No	Hufschmidt, Ellen .
193176	No	Hutchins, Michelle .
202527	Yes (202259)	Indiga, Hiyala .
203208	Yes (202259)	Iverson, Kathryn J.
199085	No	Iwen, Jean .
202312	No	Jeffery, Susu .
202734	Yes (202259)	Jobelius, Justin .
202948	Yes (202259)	Johnson, Bruce .
202946	Yes (202259)	Johnson, Charlotte .
202958	Yes (202259)	Johnson, Dakotah R.
191326	No	Johnson, David C.
193239	No	Johnson, Doreen .
202878	Yes (202259)	Johnson, John .
193162	No	Jones, Kathy .
193249	Yes (203501)	Jones, Ruth .
195235	No	Jones, Ruth .

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

203507	No	Jones, Ruth .
202730	Yes (202259)	Jubelius, Sherri .
192620	No	Kaasa, Deborah A.
203258	Yes (202259)	Kallestad, Kimberly .
203096	Yes (202259)	Kawahara, Masanmari .
202510	Yes (202259)	Kildegaard, Lise .
194349	No	King, Elli .
202263	Yes (202259)	Kirchhoff, Sue .
203186	Yes (202259)	Klave, Gregory L.
202864	Yes (202259)	Kline, Joseph .
202945	Yes (202259)	Kline, Joseph .
203115	Yes (202259)	Klingberg, Bob .
203290	Yes (202259)	Klingberg, Robert .
199528	No	Klopp, David .
202875	Yes (202259)	Klyschik, Carolyn .
203183	Yes (202259)	Kosel Lundgren, Karen .
203302	Yes (202259)	Kotka, Kim .
203104	Yes (202259)	Kranz-McGuire, Megan .
203257	Yes (202259)	Kratz, Carol .
203239	Yes (202259)	Kratz, Gregory .
202441	Yes (202259)	Kroncke, Francis .

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

202332	No	Lacy, Deneece C.
202722	Yes (202259)	LaForge, John .
193271	No	Lamb, S. .
203099	Yes (202259)	Lanning, Louann .
190969	No	Larkin, Colles B.
193247	No	Larson, Susan .
193240	No	Laughlin, Kathleen .
203133	Yes (202259)	Lawrow, Vanessa .
193252	No	Ledwidge, Lisa .
193150	No	Ledwidge , Lisa .
203138	Yes (202259)	Lee, Nancy E.
203506	No	Lemke, Paul .
203248	Yes (202259)	Lether, Kathleen .
203180	Yes (202259)	Levin, Margaret .
203565	No	Levine, Ellen .
202318	No	Levine, Lynn .
202867	Yes (202259)	Levy, Dawn and Chris .
199525	No	Lewhe, Paul .
203105	Yes (202259)	Lewis, Ann D.
202701	No	Lilja, Bernard A.
193171	No	Lincoln, Christina .
203128	Yes (202259)	Lineweaver, Joe .
202924	Yes (202259)	Livingston, Claire .
203236	Yes (202259)	Livingston, James .
202543	Yes (202259)	Livingston, Melody .

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

192617	No	Logan, Dee .
193264	No	Lokensgard, Dr. Thomas and Jan .
203493	Yes (203492)	Lokensgard, Dr. Thomas and Jan .
203109	Yes (202259)	Long, Peter D.
203146	Yes (202259)	Looney, Timothy .
202507	Yes (202259)	Lourey, Becky .
199138	No	Lovestar, Jim .
193166	No	Luger, Cheryl .
202475	Yes (202259)	Lynch, David .
202874	Yes (202259)	Lyschik, Julia .
202881	Yes (202259)	Lyu, Karen .
200266	No	MacDonald, Katie .
203144	Yes (202259)	MacDonald, Roderick .
193272	No	MacGillis, Pierre J.
202449	Yes (202259)	MacRunnels, LJ .
202241	No	Madland, Drew .
201756	No	Maki Jones, Angela .
202465	Yes (202259)	Malles, Robert C.
202955	Yes (202259)	Manley, Kathy .
193242	No	Mann, Maureen .
203108	Yes (202259)	Markle, Renate .
192604	No	Marmet, Barb .
202321	No	Martinson, Sue Ann .

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

203543	No	Martinson, Susan A.
202923	Yes (202259)	Mathews, Joan .
202430	Yes (202259)	Mattai, Mary Ann .
193236	No	Mayer, Elaine .
203171	Yes (202259)	Mayo, Jynn .
203195	Yes (202259)	McDonald, Kathleen M.
203197	Yes (202259)	McDonald, Rita .
202935	Yes (202259)	McDonald CSJ, Brigid .
201371	No	McDonald, CSJ, Sister Jane .
193273	No	McGuire, Pat .
202942	Yes (202259)	McKenzie, Betty .
193255	No	McNamara, James .
203193	Yes (202259)	McPartwan DDS, Don .
202563	Yes (202259)	Mecerotto, Joan .
201333	No	Mees, Patricia .
203296	Yes (202259)	Menzel, Mike .
193257	No	Meredyk, Angela .
202555	Yes (202259)	Milan, Patrick .
203130	Yes (202259)	Miller, Bernadette .
201748	No	Miller, Cindy .
202933	Yes (202259)	Mills, Judy .
191540	No	Milos, Karyn .

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

203521	No	Mlnske, Joan .
190050	No	Mitchell, Carol .
202306	No	Moe, Marne .
202918	Yes (202259)	Mohamed, Maryan .
202917	Yes (202259)	Montain, Andrew .
203113	Yes (202259)	Moore, Emily .
202301	No	Moore, Timothy K.
202503	Yes (202259)	Morrison, Natalie .
202453	Yes (202259)	Morson, Betty .
202315	No	Mosedale, Richard P.
203512	No	Mosio, Jaqueline .
202910	Yes (202259)	Mosio, Samuel .
203101	Yes (202259)	Mott, Cerejory W.
203312	Yes (202259)	Multiple, Multiple .
203501	Master (203501)	Murray, John .
200267	No	Myers, Dan .
193268	No	Myers, Diane .
203495	Yes (203492)	Myers, Diane .
193246	No	Myers, Diane and Andrew .
202571	Yes (202259)	Myers, Dyann .
202530	Yes (202259)	Mystboon, Mystboon .
202420	Yes (202259)	Neal, Alec .

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

203299	Yes (202259)	Neal, Sara and Charles .
199512	No	Nelson, Bruce C.
202883	Yes (202259)	Newhart, Anne .
202466	Yes (202259)	Nickitas, Peter J.
199173	No	none, none .
199174	No	none, none .
203156	Yes (202259)	Noven, Patricia .
199069	No	Nustvold, Mary Ann .
202937	Yes (202259)	Nye, Janet .
203178	Yes (202259)	O'Brien, Felicia E.
203137	Yes (202259)	O'Brien, Theresa .
202302	No	O'Connor, Jayne .
203190	Yes (202259)	Oakes, Doris .
202567	Yes (202259)	Oldfather, William .
202938	Yes (202259)	Olinger, Dorothy .
193152	No	Olson, Alan .
202470	Yes (202259)	Olson, Debra .
193275	No	Olson, Phyllis .
193262	No	Olson, Sarah and Jeff .
203254	Yes (202259)	Olson and Christensen, Dan and Patricia .
193263	No	Olson-Linde, Nels and Judith .
191528	No	Kept Private

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

193168	No	Osterhoudt, Melissa .
203206	Yes (202259)	Ostrowski, Judy .
202936	Yes (202259)	Ott, Eugene C.
202427	Yes (202259)	Ott, Mary L.
203557	No	Ottem, Fred .
193178	No	Padilla, Marianna .
203203	Yes (202259)	Palamjami, Makilam .
191517	No	Parsley Starnes, Teri L.
201363	No	Passi, Sage .
202451	Yes (202259)	Paulson, Chad .
203238	Yes (202259)	Pepperwolf, E A.
200261	No	Perkins, Jerome .
203187	Yes (202259)	Perkins PhD, RN, Joyce .
202533	Yes (202259)	Peterka, Kate .
193151	No	Peters, Jolene .
193154	No	Peterschmidt, Kathleen .
202523	Yes (202259)	Peterson, Dr. Stanley G.
199055	No	Peterson, Joan .
193177	No	Philipson, Joyce .
203264	Yes (202259)	Pickard Stuurmaus, Paulette .
193261	No	Plunkett Latham, Dianne .
202939	Yes (202259)	Poehler, Gaius .

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

202474	Yes (202259)	Pokarve, Hindolo .
203533	No	Pollack, Robert .
202513	Yes (202259)	Poucher, Nancy .
202497	Yes (202259)	Powell, Adam .
203243	Yes (202259)	Powers, Jane .
203251	Yes (202259)	Prokott, Tony .
202521	Yes (202259)	Rakou, Neal .
203125	Yes (202259)	Rauch-Kacenski, Lylee .
193254	No	Reed, Dorinda .
203492	Master (203492)	Reed, Dorinda .
202872	Yes (202259)	Regan, Timothy W.
200905	No	Reindl, Leslie .
203098	Yes (202259)	Reinehr, Judy .
202457	Yes (202259)	Renner, Pat .
202459	Yes (202259)	Renner, Pat .
202900	Yes (202259)	Rirard, Mary .
202415	Yes (202259)	Rivkin, Eric .
202421	Yes (202259)	Robbins, Holly .
192610	No	Roberts, Glenn T.
191321	No	Kept Private
202418	Yes (202259)	Rochte, Matthew .

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

202462	Yes (202259)	Rock, T M.
202264	Yes (202259)	Rodke, Carolyn .
203167	Yes (202259)	Rossman, Michael .
202433	Yes (202259)	Rothman, Marilyn .
203502	Yes (203501)	Rowser, Margaret R.
193248	No	Rozycki, Margaret .
203566	No	Ryan, Tom .
203191	Yes (202259)	Sadler, Barbara A.
202585	Yes (202259)	Sainsbury, Breanne and David .
202579	Yes (202259)	Sainsbury, Marianne .
202729	Yes (202259)	Sanders, Barbara .
202546	Yes (202259)	Sandok, Florence .
202898	Yes (202259)	Satterlee, Lauren .
202265	Yes (202259)	Schendler, Marion P.
202949	Yes (202259)	Schmid, John .
202915	Yes (202259)	Schuett, Brian .
202927	Yes (202259)	Schurr, Carolyn .
193258	No	Schutz, Linda .
202432	Yes (202259)	Sears, Marie .
202464	Yes (202259)	Seastone, Karlo .
193169	No	Sehl, Joe .

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

202932	Yes (202259)	Shatz, Erika .
203189	Yes (202259)	Shepperd, Dina .
200265	No	Sherburne Nyquist, Rhea .
203247	Yes (202259)	Shiva, Joan .
193186	No	Simon, Madeline .
202442	Yes (202259)	Sirois, Christine .
203102	Yes (202259)	Sisson, Bernice .
202577	Yes (202259)	Skelly, Laurie .
193156	No	skelly, maureen .
191548	No	Skujina, Guna M.
202434	Yes (202259)	Smilanich, Ellen .
203211	Yes (202259)	Smith, Nancy .
202733	Yes (202259)	Sorensen, Soren .
203170	Yes (202259)	Sotak, Brian .
202957	Yes (202259)	Spieler, Sandy .
193158	No	Stanski, Kristine .
203295	Yes (202259)	Stark, Matthew .
201025	No	Steen-Hinderlie, Diane .
192594	No	stenwick, maurine .
202893	Yes (202259)	Storbakken, Amy .

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

203293	Yes (202259)	Sturzl, JoAnn .
202865	Yes (202259)	Suchy, Robin .
193244	No	Sudman, Sharon .
202270	Yes (202259)	Sullivan, Roxanne .
202860	Yes (202259)	Suzanne, Linton .
191119	No	Svien, Karen O.
203106	Yes (202259)	Swenson, Lois .
203168	Yes (202259)	Swenson, Lois .
203204	Yes (202259)	Tauring, Kari C.
193251	No	Tazzioli, Jeanne .
202416	Yes (202259)	Telorm, Adiel .
203152	Yes (202259)	Templeton, Virginia .
202904	Yes (202259)	Tiller, Anne M.
203116	Yes (202259)	Tiller, Charles .
194520	No	Tovar, Kurtis .
202906	Yes (202259)	Troschinetz, Alexis .
193175	No	Two Shoes, Minnie .
202448	Yes (202259)	Tworzyanski, Darlene .
203361	Yes (203358)	Vaik, Barbara .
202884	Yes (202259)	Varghese, Shiney .
203294	Yes (202259)	Vaughan, Mary .

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

202526	Yes (202259)	Vermilyea, Gina .
202329	No	Villegas, Jarrod .
193124	No	Vogel, Howard J.
202866	Yes (202259)	Wachs, Dianne .
202473	Yes (202259)	Walker, Carol J.
203151	Yes (202259)	Walschinski, Bridget .
203153	Yes (202259)	Walschinski, Dan .
202340	No	Warfield, Kristin .
202895	Yes (202259)	Weber, Pat .
191323	No	weigum, jeanie .
203209	Yes (202259)	Weiland, Mary R.
203256	Yes (202259)	Weiland, Mary R.
193061	No	Weitz, Mary .
202905	Yes (202259)	Welch, Liz .
202267	Yes (202259)	Wells, Margery .
203250	Yes (202259)	Weston, Winifred .
203259	Yes (202259)	White, Anita .
202934	Yes (202259)	White, Clarence .
199068	No	White, Dr. Jim and Mary S. .
202901	Yes (202259)	Wiegand, Michele .
203194	Yes (202259)	Wieland, Ronald .
193259	No	Wielinski, Liz .

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

200270	No	Wildberger, Richard .
203309	Yes (202259)	Willand, Lois C.
202720	Yes (202259)	Wilson, Amy .
195034	No	Wittmer, Alan .
203265	Yes (202259)	Wocelka, Nicole .
203511	No	Wolfchild, Sheldon P.
202501	Yes (202259)	Wolff, roy .
202868	Yes (202259)	Woodwall, Randy .
203253	Yes (202259)	Wright, Bob and Marion .
202871	Yes (202259)	ZumBahlen, David Austin and Kara .

**APPENDIX C: IDEX BY ORGANIZATION**

<b>Correspondence ID</b>	<b>Form Letter</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Name</b>
203510, 203525	No	Mendota Dakota Community	Anderson, Jim
193161	No	North Star Chapter Sierra Club Wetlands Committee	Barton, William F.
203617	No	Sacred Sites International Foundation	Becker, Leonard and Nancy
199726	No	Prairie Island Indian community	Bennett, Audrey .
203363	No	Minnesota Historical Society	Bloomberg, Britta L.
200010	No	Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition	Casey, Thomas E.
199711	No	Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community	Crooks, Stanley R.
191331	No	Indigenous Peoples task Force	Day, Sharon M.
191080	No	CHS SPEAK	DeAtley, Alexandra H.
199690	No	Mendota Mdewakanton Dakota Community	Eggenberg, Tiffany .

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

201359	No	Minneapolis Park Watch	Fried, Arlene
193163	No	Minneapolis City Council Ward 2	Gordon, Cam
199786	No	Parks & Trails Council of Minnesota	Grilley, Dorian
203490	No	Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board	Gurban, Jon
193245	No	Friends of Coldwater	Hansen, Tim
203584	No	Metropolitan Council	Hanson, Phyllis
192614	No	Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition	Holtzleiter, Thomas P.
193132	No	Land Use and Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter	Jossi, Frank
200120	No	Sierra Club	Jossi, Frank
199126	No	Western Band of the Cherokee Tribe, Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma	Kinney, Brent
203192	Yes (202259)	Rockford Mjos	Larson, Margaret
203585	No	Minnesota Native Plant Society	Milburn, Scott
203581	No	Friends of the Sibley Historic Site	Minish, Robert A.

Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report

203310	Yes (202259)	Residents of 2615 Park Ave. Association	Multiple, Multiple
203315	Yes (202259)	Friends of Artistic Urges	Multiple, Multiple
199549	No	Park River Alliance (no longer in existence)	Murphey, Bernice L.
203509	No	Southwest Minnesota State University Indigenous Nation and Dakota Studies	Nunpa, Chris M.
201227	No	St. Louis Park Historical Society	Olson, John
191310	No	Green Party	Olson, Nancy J.
199540	No	Friends of Coldwater	Rich, Jennifer C.
203583	No	Longfellow Community Council	Storey, Elizabeth
199760	No	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Sullins, Tony
199768	No	Nokomis East Neighborhood Association (NENA)	Ulrich, Rita
203571	No	Friends of Fort Snelling	Waltz, Dorothy S.
203111	Yes (202259)	Wopida Training and Service Group	Weaver MD, Thomas G.

*Draft EIS Comment Analysis Report*

203489	No	United States Environmental Protection Agency	Westlake, Kenneth A.
203634	No	Minnesota Sacred Places	White, Bruce M.
203491	No	Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	Wisker, James
203508, 203619, 203622	No	Lower Sioux Indian Community, Morton Minnesota	Wolfchild, Sheldon P.

## APPENDIX D: INDEX BY CODE

### **AL4001 - Support tribal ownership of Center.**

Green Party - 191310

Lower Sioux Indian Community - 203619

Mendota Dakota Community - 203525

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010

*N/A* - 191321 , 192610 , 193061 , 194349 , 201220 , 201293 , 202903 , 203527 , 203533 , 203557 , 203562

### **AL4002 - Support state ownership of Center.**

Land Use and Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter - 193132

Metropolitan Council - 203584

Parks & Trails Council of Minnesota - 199786

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 192614 , 200010

Sierra Club - 200120

*N/A* - 191517 , 192617 , 192620 , 193061 , 193272 , 193273 , 202302 , 203533

### **AL4003 - Support "Green Museum"**

Friends of Coldwater - 193245

Land Use and Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter - 193132

Minneapolis City Council Ward 2 - 193163

Sierra Club - 200120

Western Band of the Cherokee Tribe, Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma - 199126

*N/A* - 191119 , 191125 , 191528 , 191540 , 193122 , 193152 , 193154 , 193156 , 193158 , 193162 , 193164 , 193168 , 193169 , 193176 , 193177 , 193178 , 193187 , 193233 , 193236 , 193239 , 193240 , 193241 , 193242 , 193244 , 193248 , 193251 , 193252 , 193256 , 193258 , 193262 , 193263 , 193272 , 199055 , 200238 , 200256 , 200269 , 201325 , 201333 , 201345 , 201748 , 201756 , 202234 , 202238 , 202241 , 202259 , 202261 , 202301 , 202312 , 202331 , 202332 , 202340 , 202533 , 202737 , 202876 , 202878 , 202884 , 202918 , 202927 , 202955 , 203100 , 203106 , 203110 , 203125 , 203171 , 203180 , 203186 , 203190 , 203208 , 203209 , 203238 , 203253 , 203256 , 203358 , 203522 , 203543

### **AL4004 - Oppose tribal ownership of Center.**

*N/A* - 193273

**AL4005 - Oppose private ownership of Center.**

Minnesota Native Plant Society - 203585

Prairie Island Indian community - 199726

N/A - 192617 , 193246 , 193247 , 193251 , 193255 , 193258 , 193268 , 193271 , 195235 , 199539 , 201025 , 202301 , 202306 , 203186 , 203206

**AL4006 - Support joint ownership/management/rights of enforcement of Center.**

Minneapolis City Council Ward 2 - 193163

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010

sacred Sites International Foundation - 203617

N/A - 191540 , 191842 , 192617 , 193122 , 193154 , 193162 , 193178 , 193239 , 193252 , 193258 , 193263 , 199138 , 200262 , 201293 , 201345 , 201371 , 202259 , 202261 , 202301 , 202302 , 202312 , 202331 , 202332 , 202337 , 202340 , 203522 , 203530 , 203543 , 203575

**AL4007 - Support partnership with Native American groups for appropriate development.**

Prairie Island Indian community - 199726

N/A - 193166 , 193176 , 201293 , 203530 , 203532 , 203564

**AL4008 - Support special access for Native American use.**

Lower Sioux Indian Community - 203619

Prairie Island Indian community - 199726

N/A - 193233 , 201371

**AL4009 - Support protection and preservation of contiguous green space along Mississippi Blufftop.**

Minneapolis City Council Ward 2 - 193163

Minnesota Native Plant Society - 203585

sacred Sites International Foundation - 203617

N/A - 191540 , 191842 , 193122 , 193154 , 193162 , 193172 , 193178 , 193186 , 193239 , 193249 , 193252 , 193275 , 195034 , 201345 , 201363 , 202259 , 202261 , 202301 , 202312 , 202331 , 202332 , 202340 , 203194 , 203492 , 203522 , 203543

**AL4012 - Support creation of a Native American museum.**

N/A - 202339

**AL4016 - Support the Center becoming part of MNRRA.**

Land Use and Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter - 193132

Sierra Club - 200120

N/A - 193153 , 203575

**AL4017 - Suggestions - Other**

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board - 203490

North Star Chapter Sierra Club Wetlands Committee - 193161

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010

*N/A* - 190050 , 191517 , 192604 , 193153 , 193166 , 193231 , 199055 , 199512 , 201293 , 202301 , 202312 , 203236 , 203513 , 203527 , 203530 , 203532 , 203543 , 203565

**AL4018 - Support public outdoor museum.**

Minnesota Native Plant Society - 203585

*N/A* - 193237 , 193246 , 193247 , 193249 , 193254 , 193264 , 193271 , 193275 , 195235 , 200265 , 201025 , 203492 , 203501

**AL4019 - Suggested conditions on transfer.**

Metropolitan Council - 203584

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010

**AL4020 - Oppose other suggestions.**

*N/A* - 202312

**AL4021 - Support transfer of Center to a Tribe.**

Mendota Mdewakanton Dakota Community - 199690

Prairie Island Indian community - 199726

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**AL5000 - Alternatives: Response to alternatives/scenarios presented in EIS**

*N/A* - 191517

**AL5001 - Support federal (including NPS)ownership of the Center.**

Friends of Coldwater - 193245

Land Use and Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter - 193132

Metropolitan Council - 203584

Minneapolis City Council Ward 2 - 193163

Minneapolis Park Watch - 201359

Minnesota Native Plant Society - 203585

North Star Chapter Sierra Club Wetlands Committee - 193161

Sierra Club - 200120

St. Louis Park Historical Society - 201227

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service - 199760

sacred Sites International Foundation - 203617

N/A - 190969 , 191517 , 191528 , 191540 , 191842 , 192594 , 192610 , 192617 , 192620 , 193061 , 193122 , 193151 , 193152 , 193153 , 193154 , 193156 , 193159 , 193162 , 193164 , 193166 , 193171 , 193172 , 193174 , 193176 , 193178 , 193186 , 193187 , 193233 , 193237 , 193239 , 193240 , 193241 , 193244 , 193246 , 193247 , 193249 , 193252 , 193254 , 193258 , 193259 , 193263 , 193268 , 193271 , 193275 , 193453 , 194349 , 195034 , 195235 , 199055 , 199057 , 199068 , 199070 , 199138 , 199173 , 199525 , 199529 , 200256 , 200258 , 200261 , 200262 , 200265 , 200266 , 200270 , 201025 , 201325 , 201345 , 201351 , 201363 , 201371 , 202259 , 202261 , 202301 , 202312 , 202315 , 202321 , 202331 , 202332 , 202340 , 202520 , 202523 , 202527 , 202530 , 202543 , 202546 , 202563 , 202567 , 202571 , 202730 , 202731 , 202733 , 202734 , 202735 , 202736 , 202737 , 202860 , 202866 , 202870 , 202883 , 202884 , 202893 , 202896 , 202900 , 202901 , 202903 , 202905 , 202906 , 202910 , 202913 , 202916 , 202924 , 202937 , 202950 , 202960 , 203098 , 203099 , 203104 , 203105 , 203106 , 203112 , 203125 , 203131 , 203148 , 203151 , 203152 , 203153 , 203167 , 203168 , 203170 , 203171 , 203179 , 203186 , 203200 , 203206 , 203211 , 203238 , 203245 , 203257 , 203492 , 203501 , 203506 , 203507 , 203522 , 203543

**AL5002 - Oppose sale of Center.**

Green Party - 191310

Minnesota Native Plant Society - 203585

Western Band of the Cherokee Tribe, Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma - 199126

N/A - 191321 , 191323 , 191540 , 193150 , 193151 , 193164 , 193171 , 193176 , 193177 , 193178 , 193187 , 193236 , 193239 , 193240 , 193252 , 193259 , 193275 , 199069 , 200238 , 200256 , 200261 , 202301 , 202306 , 202312 , 202894 , 202904 , 202906 , 203125 , 203210 , 203254 , 203257 , 203492 , 203501 , 203507 , 203533 , 203535

**AL5003 - Oppose development of Center.**

Minnesota Native Plant Society - 203585

N/A - 191125 , 191326 , 191622 , 192610 , 192617 , 193164 , 193166 , 193167 , 193171 , 193176 , 193177 , 193178 , 193187 , 193239 , 193240 , 193244 , 193246 , 193247 , 193251 , 193255 , 193258 , 193268 , 193271 , 193275 , 195235 , 199070 , 199173 , 199178 , 199525 , 200238 , 200261 , 200270 , 201293 , 201371 , 202301 , 202306 , 202312 , 202339 , 202906 , 202909 , 202945 , 203125 , 203148 , 203171 , 203186 , 203193 , 203239 , 203251 , 203265 , 203492 , 203501 , 203507 , 203533

**AL5004 - Support continued/expanded public access to Center.**

Green Party - 191310

Indigenous Peoples task Force - 191331

Longfellow Community Council - 203583

Nokomis East Neighborhood Association (NENA) - 199768

North Star Chapter Sierra Club Wetlands Committee - 193161

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 192614

*N/A* - 191125 , 191517 , 192594 , 192617 , 192620 , 193153 , 193168 , 193169 , 193176 , 193242 , 193257 , 193261 , 193262 , 193263 , 199529 , 199539 , 200261 , 200267 , 200905 , 201748 , 202332 , 202720 , 202900 , 202930 , 202960 , 203115 , 203199 , 203200 , 203207 , 203251 , 203262 , 203263 , 203506 , 203521 , 203543

**AL5005 - Support alternative A - No-Action Alternative**

Land Use and Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter - 193132

Minneapolis City Council Ward 2 - 193163

Nokomis East Neighborhood Association (NENA) - 199768

North Star Chapter Sierra Club Wetlands Committee - 193161

*N/A* - 191842 , 193153 , 202302 , 202306 , 203575

**AL5006 - Oppose Alternative A - No-Action.**

Friends of Fort Snelling - 203571

Friends of the Sibley Historic Site - 203581

Longfellow Community Council - 203583

Prairie Island Indian community - 199726

*N/A* - 191622 , 202728

**AL5007 - Oppose Alternative B.**

Friends of Fort Snelling - 203571

Friends of the Sibley Historic Site - 203581

Longfellow Community Council - 203583

Metropolitan Council - 203584

Nokomis East Neighborhood Association (NENA) - 199768

Prairie Island Indian community - 199726

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service - 199760

**AL5008 - Support Alternative C.**

Friends of Fort Snelling - 203571

Friends of the Sibley Historic Site - 203581

Land Use and Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter - 193132

Nokomis East Neighborhood Association (NENA) - 199768

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 192614

Sierra Club - 200120

*N/A* - 203575

**AL5009 - Support Alternative D.**

Friends of Fort Snelling - 203571  
Friends of the Sibley Historic Site - 203581  
Land Use and Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter - 193132  
Longfellow Community Council - 203583  
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District - 203491  
Metropolitan Council - 203584  
Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board - 203490  
Nokomis East Neighborhood Association (NENA) - 199768  
Prairie Island Indian community - 199726  
Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 192614  
Sierra Club - 200120  
United States Environmental Protection Agency - 203489  
N/A - 200262 , 203575

**AL5010 - Support restrictions placed on transfer.**

Friends of Fort Snelling - 203571  
Land Use and Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter - 193132  
Longfellow Community Council - 203583  
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District - 203491  
Metropolitan Council - 203584  
Parks & Trails Council of Minnesota - 199786  
Sierra Club - 200120  
N/A - 200262 , 201293 , 201371 , 203575

**AL5011 - Support use as open space / park.**

Green Party - 191310  
Land Use and Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter - 193132  
Longfellow Community Council - 203583  
Minneapolis City Council Ward 2 - 193163  
Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board - 203490  
Nokomis East Neighborhood Association (NENA) - 199768  
Parks & Trails Council of Minnesota - 199786  
Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010  
United States Environmental Protection Agency - 203489  
Sacred Sites International Foundation - 203617

N/A - 191125 , 191321 , 191323 , 191528 , 191540 , 191548 , 191842 , 193122 , 193154 , 193156 , 193159 , 193162 , 193164 , 193167 , 193172 , 193174 , 193178 , 193187 , 193236 , 193239 , 193242 , 193257 , 193258 , 193259 , 195034 , 199057 , 199068 , 199069 , 199085 , 199177 , 199525 , 200262 , 200267 , 200905 , 201363 , 202243 , 202259 , 202301 , 202302 , 202306 , 202312 , 202321 , 202331 , 202332 , 202339 , 202340 , 202723 , 202918 , 202930 , 202942 , 202955 , 203104 , 203148 , 203172 , 203211 , 203262 , 203512 , 203521 , 203543 , 203575

**AL5012 - Support interpretive/nature/history center scenario.**

CHS SPEAK - 191080

Minnehaha Creek Watershed District - 203491

Nokomis East Neighborhood Association (NENA) - 199768

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010

United States Environmental Protection Agency - 203489

N/A - 200262 , 201025

**AL5013 - Oppose training center/office park scenario.**

Longfellow Community Council - 203583

Nokomis East Neighborhood Association (NENA) - 199768

N/A - 191842 , 201025

**AL5014 - Support removal of existing structures.**

Minneapolis City Council Ward 2 - 193163

North Star Chapter Sierra Club Wetlands Committee - 193161

N/A - 191517 , 191528 , 192620 , 193152 , 193153 , 193176 , 193231 , 193247 , 193258 , 193271 , 195235 , 199178 , 199528 , 200266 , 201371 , 202301 , 202960 , 203533 , 203543

**AL5015 - Support removal of structures/remediation prior to transfer.**

Longfellow Community Council - 203583

Parks & Trails Council of Minnesota - 199786

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

United States Environmental Protection Agency - 203489

N/A - 193246 , 193249 , 193264 , 193268 , 193275 , 201293 , 203492 , 203575

**AL5016 - Support restoration of native species / prairie oak savannah.**

Minneapolis City Council Ward 2 - 193163

Minnesota Native Plant Society - 203585

North Star Chapter Sierra Club Wetlands Committee - 193161

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service - 199760

sacred Sites International Foundation - 203617

N/A - 191540 , 191842 , 192620 , 193122 , 193152 , 193153 , 193154 , 193162 , 193178 , 193239 , 193249 , 193252 , 193258 , 193263 , 193275 , 199057 , 199529 , 200262 , 201333 , 201345 , 201363 , 201371 , 202259 , 202261 , 202301 , 202306 , 202312 , 202331 , 202332 , 202339 , 202340 , 202896 , 203492 , 203533 , 203543 , 203575

**AL5017 - Support interpretation/education at the Center.**

Minneapolis City Council Ward 2 - 193163

North Star Chapter Sierra Club Wetlands Committee - 193161

sacred Sites International Foundation - 203617

N/A - 191540 , 191842 , 192610 , 192620 , 193122 , 193153 , 193154 , 193156 , 193162 , 193172 , 193174 , 193178 , 193186 , 193239 , 193244 , 193252 , 193258 , 193263 , 195034 , 199138 , 199178 , 201025 , 201345 , 202312 , 202339 , 203167 , 203245 , 203262 , 203522 , 203543 , 203575

**AL5018 - Question conservation easement enforceability.**

N/A - 193159

**AL5019 - Support enforcement of Minnesota State Law protecting flow of Camp Coldwater Spring.**

Minneapolis City Council Ward 2 - 193163

Minnesota Native Plant Society - 203585

sacred Sites International Foundation - 203617

N/A - 191540 , 191842 , 192620 , 193061 , 193122 , 193154 , 193162 , 193164 , 193172 , 193174 , 193176 , 193178 , 193186 , 193239 , 193244 , 193249 , 193252 , 193258 , 193263 , 193264 , 193268 , 193275 , 195034 , 199068 , 201325 , 201345 , 201363 , 202259 , 202261 , 202301 , 202312 , 202331 , 202332 , 202340 , 203492 , 203501 , 203543

**AL5020 - Support transfer to another non-federal government entity.**

N/A - 193166

**AL5021 - Oppose Alternative C**

Prairie Island Indian community - 199726

**AL5022 - Oppose Alternative D**

St. Louis Park Historical Society - 201227

**AL6000 - Range of alternatives is inadequate.**

Friends of Fort Snelling - 203571  
Friends of the Sibley Historic Site - 203581  
Prairie Island Indian community - 199726  
Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711  
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service - 199760  
N/A - 192604 , 193124 , 202337

**AL6002 - Effect of Indian Trust Land designation.**  
Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: General Comments**

Minneapolis City Council Ward 2 - 193163  
Minnesota Historical Society - 203363  
Nokomis East Neighborhood Association (NENA) - 199768  
Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711  
sacred Sites International Foundation - 203617  
N/A - 191540 , 191842 , 193122 , 193154 , 193172 , 193174 , 193178 , 193186 , 193239 , 193244 , 193252 , 193258 , 193263 , 201345 ,  
201363 , 202259 , 202261 , 202301 , 202312 , 202331 , 202332 , 202340 , 203190 , 203522 , 203532 , 203543

**CI1000 - Cumulative Impacts Analysis.**  
Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**CR 2002 - Cultural significance/importance of Coldwater Springs to American Indians.**  
Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711  
N/A - 193124 , 202315 , 203530

**CR1000 - Cultural Resources: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws**  
N/A - 193124

**CR2000 - Cultural Resources: Methodology And Assumptions**  
Minnesota Historical Society - 203363  
Minnesota Sacred Places - 203634

**CR2001 - Disagree with NPS conclusion regarding the cultural resource studies and TCP status/recommendation of Camp Coldwater Spring.**  
Mendota Dakota Community - 203525

Minnesota Sacred Places - 203634

North Star Chapter Sierra Club Wetlands Committee - 193161

Prairie Island Indian community - 199726

N/A - 192620 , 193124 , 193153 , 202312 , 202318 , 202337 , 203533 , 203543 , 203562

**CR3001 - Expand geographic scope of cultural resource impact analysis**

N/A - 202312

**CR4000 - Cultural Resources: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives**

Friends of the Sibley Historic Site - 203581

Minnesota Historical Society - 203363

**CR4001 - Historical importance of Coldwater Spring not addressed.**

Friends of Fort Snelling - 203571

Mendota Dakota Community - 203510

N/A - 202315

**CR4002 - Impacts to surrounding cultural resources (Ft. Snelling, Sibley House) not addressed.**

Friends of Fort Snelling - 203571

Friends of the Sibley Historic Site - 203581

**CR7000 - Cultural resource studies inadequate and/or flawed.**

Minnesota Sacred Places - 203634

N/A - 202315 , 202337

**ED1000 - Editorial**

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

N/A - 202337

**ER1000 - Effects to ethnographic resources.**

Prairie Island Indian community - 199726

**GA1001 - Alternative A Impacts Analysis**

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**GA1002 - Alternative B Impacts Analysis**

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**GA1003 - Alternative C Impacts Analysis**

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**GA1004 - Alternative D Impacts Analysis**

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**GA3000 - Impact Analysis: General Methodology For Establishing Impacts/Effects**

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010

**II1000 - Irretrievable Impacts: General Comments**

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**MT1000 - Miscellaneous Topics: General Comments**

Friends of Coldwater - 199540

Park River Alliance (no longer in existence) - 199549

Wopida Training and Service Group - 203111

N/A - 193124 , 200238 , 200266 , 200268 , 202331 , 202497 , 202519 , 202521 , 202555 , 202585 , 202589 , 202698 , 202722 , 202727 ,  
202729 , 202859 , 202862 , 202865 , 202866 , 202869 , 202871 , 202875 , 202877 , 202879 , 202881 , 202882 , 202917 , 202923 , 202932 ,  
202934 , 202936 , 202943 , 202958 , 203109 , 203113 , 203116 , 203130 , 203137 , 203142 , 203143 , 203156 , 203185 , 203189 , 203203 ,  
203239 , 203246 , 203247 , 203260 , 203264 , 203507 , 203512 , 203522 , 203532 , 203535 , 203543 , 203565 , 203566

**MT1001 - Native American Culture/History.**

Friends of Fort Snelling - 203571

Friends of the Sibley Historic Site - 203581

Lower Sioux Indian Community, Morton Minnesota - 203508

Mendota Dakota Community - 203510 , 203525

Minnesota Native Plant Society - 203585

Minnesota Sacred Places - 203634

Prairie Island Indian community - 199726

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

Southwest Minnesota State University Indigenous Nation and Dakota Studies - 203509

N/A - 192610 , 192620 , 193061 , 193164 , 193186 , 193240 , 193246 , 193247 , 193249 , 193252 , 193259 , 193264 , 193268 , 193271 ,  
193275 , 194349 , 195235 , 199070 , 199173 , 200238 , 200265 , 200905 , 201025 , 201333 , 201345 , 202259 , 202261 , 202301 , 202312 ,

202315 , 202332 , 202339 , 202340 , 202896 , 203250 , 203358 , 203492 , 203501 , 203507 , 203522 , 203523 , 203524 , 203530 , 203533 , 203535 , 203543 , 203557 , 203564

**MT1002 - Euro-American History.**

Friends of Fort Snelling - 203571

Friends of the Sibley Historic Site - 203581

Minnesota Native Plant Society - 203585

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

*N/A* - 192610 , 192620 , 193061 , 193164 , 193186 , 193244 , 193246 , 193247 , 193249 , 193264 , 193268 , 193271 , 193275 , 195235 , 200238 , 200265 , 201025 , 201333 , 201363 , 202259 , 202261 , 202301 , 202312 , 202315 , 202331 , 202332 , 202339 , 202340 , 202896 , 203358 , 203492 , 203501 , 203507 , 203522 , 203533 , 203543

**MT1003 - Minnesota History.**

Friends of Fort Snelling - 203571

Friends of the Sibley Historic Site - 203581

Land Use and Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter - 193132

Minnesota Native Plant Society - 203585

Sierra Club - 200120

*N/A* - 192610 , 193171 , 193177 , 193186 , 193231 , 193246 , 193247 , 193249 , 193252 , 193255 , 193258 , 193259 , 193264 , 193268 , 193271 , 193275 , 195235 , 199070 , 199173 , 199528 , 200905 , 201025 , 201333 , 202259 , 202261 , 202301 , 202312 , 202315 , 202723 , 202909 , 202955 , 203181 , 203190 , 203250 , 203358 , 203533 , 203535

**MT1004 - History of Dred Scott/African American History**

Minnesota Native Plant Society - 203585

*N/A* - 193246 , 193247 , 193264 , 193268 , 193271 , 193275 , 195235 , 202261 , 202301 , 202312 , 202331 , 202332 , 202340 , 203250 , 203358 , 203492 , 203535 , 203543

**MT1005 - Sacred Land/Sites.**

Indigenous Peoples task Force - 191331

Lower Sioux Indian Community, Morton Minnesota - 203508

Mendota Mdewakanton Dakota Community - 199690

Prairie Island Indian community - 199726

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010

Rockford Mjos - 203192

Southwest Minnesota State University Indigenous Nation and Dakota Studies - 203509

Western Band of the Cherokee Tribe, Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma - 199126

N/A - 191125 , 191517 , 191528 , 191540 , 192071 , 192594 , 192604 , 193125 , 193152 , 193167 , 193168 , 193169 , 193175 , 193176 , 193177 , 193187 , 193233 , 193237 , 193239 , 193241 , 193243 , 193244 , 193252 , 193258 , 193453 , 195034 , 200258 , 200261 , 200263 , 201333 , 201351 , 201748 , 201756 , 202241 , 202243 , 202302 , 202306 , 202312 , 202318 , 202321 , 202331 , 202526 , 202527 , 202530 , 202536 , 202546 , 202555 , 202563 , 202567 , 202571 , 202698 , 202731 , 202734 , 202737 , 202883 , 202895 , 202898 , 202901 , 202903 , 202905 , 202910 , 202915 , 202924 , 202933 , 202935 , 202938 , 202941 , 202942 , 202950 , 203108 , 203128 , 203131 , 203168 , 203183 , 203248 , 203521 , 203522 , 203523 , 203524 , 203527 , 203543

**MT1006 - Natural Resources, Natural History and Geology.**

N/A - 193164 , 193171 , 193231 , 193246 , 193247 , 193249 , 193258 , 193264 , 193268 , 193271 , 193275 , 195235 , 199528 , 201333 , 202259 , 202261 , 202301 , 202312 , 202331 , 202340 , 203492 , 203507 , 203543

**MT1007 - Preservation for future generations.**

Land Use and Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter - 193132

Sierra Club - 200120

N/A - 191119 , 191517 , 192610 , 192617 , 193152 , 193156 , 193168 , 193175 , 193177 , 193243 , 193255 , 193259 , 193261 , 193272 , 193453 , 194349 , 195034 , 199055 , 199528 , 200238 , 200256 , 200262 , 200265 , 201333 , 201363 , 202243 , 202533 , 202571 , 202698 , 202863 , 202867 , 202874 , 202876 , 202894 , 202896 , 202900 , 202939 , 203096 , 203103 , 203104 , 203110 , 203133 , 203144 , 203166 , 203183 , 203204 , 203564

**MT1008 - Minneapolis Parks & Recreation Board Management.**

Minneapolis Park Watch - 201359

**MT1009 - Availability of and access to spring water.**

Indigenous Peoples task Force - 191331

Land Use and Transportation Committee Sierra Club North Star Chapter - 193132

Prairie Island Indian community - 199726

N/A - 191125 , 191842 , 192071 , 192610 , 192617 , 193061 , 193156 , 193169 , 193171 , 193177 , 193186 , 193187 , 193234 , 193252 , 193259 , 193264 , 193268 , 194349 , 199055 , 199528 , 200258 , 200262 , 200265 , 200905 , 201293 , 201333 , 201345 , 202860 , 202893 , 202900 , 202909 , 203146 , 203204 , 203258 , 203260 , 203263 , 203265 , 203492 , 203521

**MT1010 - Ecotourism.**

N/A - 201333 , 202910 , 202929

**MT1011 - Public safety and security at the Center.**

N/A - 199055

**MT1012 - Spiritual / religious beliefs.**

Prairie Island Indian community - 199726

N/A - 191517 , 191528 , 193168 , 193231 , 200263 , 200905 , 201293 , 202331 , 202935 , 203259

**MT1013 - Preservation Education**

Minnesota Native Plant Society - 203585

N/A - 193156 , 193246 , 193247 , 193249 , 193271 , 194349 , 195235 , 201025 , 201293 , 203501 , 203507 , 203565

**MT1014 - Legislative efforts.**

N/A - 193061

**MT1015 - Additional/corrected info requested to be included in EIS.**

Minnesota Sacred Places - 203634

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**ON1000 - Other NEPA Issues: General Comments**

Minnesota Sacred Places - 203634

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010

United States Environmental Protection Agency - 203489

N/A - 191842 , 193124

**PN110001 - Purpose and Need: Relationships with other Laws, Regulations, and Planning Documents.**

Mendota Dakota Community - 203510

Metropolitan Council - 203584

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

N/A - 191842 , 201077

**PN9000 - Purpose And Need: Issues And Impact Topics Selected For Analyses**

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

N/A - 192604

**SL1000 - Sustainability and Long-term Management.**

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**VC13000 - Affected Environment: Cultural Resources**

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**VC16000 - Affected Environment: Ethnographic Resources**

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**VC20000 - Affected Environment: Land Use**

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**VC22000 - Affected Environment: Visitor Use**

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**VC24000 - Affected Environment: MNDNR Regionally Significant Natural Resource Area.**

Metropolitan Council - 203584

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 200010

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711 , 199711

**VC25000 - Affected Environment: Health and Safety**

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**VC26000 - Affected Environment: Buildings and Other Structures**

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**VC5000 - Affected Environment: Wetlands**

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community - 199711

**WL1000 - Wetlands impacts.**

North Star Chapter Sierra Club Wetlands Committee - 193161

*N/A* - 193153 , 201025

**WQ7000 - Water Resources: Protect natural springs and fresh water source.**

Preserve Camp Coldwater Coalition - 192614 , 200010

*N/A* - 202312 , 202321 , 203575