

Caroline van Schaik

The proposed feedlot revisions include practices that could go a long way to restore, protect, and prevent the damning contamination of drinking water caused significantly by Minnesota livestock management. Field inspections for and reporting of spill and discharge, spreading onto a growing crop, water samples because of a spill or excessive rain, and manure buyer permit compliance are excellent, essential additions to feedlot regulations.

And, they are gutless in this proposal, paperwork crumbs with no evident means of guaranteeing their application on the ground. Just who is going to tell tales on themselves? Your parents didn't think it was enough to say, "honey, now please clean your room." You can't possibly think the same now and more to my point, I don't, either.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) emergency intervention for nitrate contamination named the MPCA for failing to do its job. Yet without shame, you persist in safeguarding voluntary actions in feedlot permitting requirements – proposed and otherwise - as the order of the day. You can insert the word, "required," but it means a pass if there isn't also a "then what" and "according to whom."

Where is authoritative ground-truthing – not just paper monitoring - within these revisions? What are the consequences for the permit holder besides what we know: ongoing and further contamination of drinking water wells and the death and illness of perhaps your own grandma or child?

These revisions – they sound so good - are a refinement of the status quo cloaked in electronic paperwork and they are sure to make everyone mad. They confirm the MPCA as a pawn, not a leader. It is not restoring. It is not preventing, though these verbs all come directly from your water web page.

And for the record: Seed and equipment companies are well stocked and re-imagined, having responded in the past 15-20 years to the steady drumbeat for soil cover options because soil cover is soil health, money in the bank, and yes, good for surface and ground water. Water contamination is now. Prevention must be now; 2028 is not now.

Come on. Cut the propaganda, take back your crumbs, and make it clear to us that drinking water matters to you, too, just like you tout in your agency goals. Good ideas need determined, on-the-ground monitoring by someone other than the fox at the hen house. And good monitoring is a waste of time without serious, stated consequences for permit holder violation when it is the public good of safe drinking water at risk.