

Robert Stodola

Listing impaired waters is a first step in acknowledging and cataloging impaired waters. The huge next step, a mission that I think you are committed to achieving is controlling impaired sites. That would involve establishing in-house baseline measurements as a first step.

MPCA (where the "C" in the abbreviation is just as important as the other letters is CONTROL. I don't think you have your heart in measurement if you don't have baseline pollution measurements done "in house". Hiring this step out doesn't satisfy any sense of scientific rigor, and says that your heart isn't in measuring pollution, that your attention can shift, and is really only an aperiodic, when-and-if the money is there, sort of pseudo-rigorous attempt at quantification. MPCA doesn't test/quantify baselines for the existing mining laws on the books, so you need to start there and establish nonpolitical scientific rigorous testing. Start with establishing routine year-by-year in-house baseline testing. That would be a good start. Unless this part is established with routine care, with budgeted expenses considered for the long haul you're just whistling dixie. And I might add, as I have been reviewing the UMD archive collection of MPCA's John Pegors (MPCA regional director in the '70s and '80s), you guys have a really long way to go to getting the science of control under your belts. I'm really disappointed in the incredible deviation from your supposed mission of controlling pollution for the state and the results of your efforts.