

MISSISSIPPI RIVER CORRIDOR CRITICAL AREA (MRCCA) RULEMAKING
Ramsey Initial Stakeholder Meeting

Comment 1:

What is a visual intrusion? Who determines it is a visual intrusion? What is screening? What material is it? Who determines what needs to be screened? Part 6106.0130 Subp. 12 Plans.

Comment 2:

Tim,

In regards to the open meeting on MRCCA proposed [rulemaking], I am having a tough time formulating any real ideas for comments and input. Is there any place on line that I can find a general idea of what may be proposed [?] Without having some indication of restrictions that may be part of the new rules I'm guessing and shooting in the dark.

As I look around our neighborhood and also travel up and down this beautiful river by water I really don't see anything that I would consider changing. I think that most of us have been good caretakers of this resource.

Are we sure we really need to fix things that appear not to need fixing?

It is hard for me to believe that home owners located on the river and paying high taxes are not taking care of their property. We have a fairly modest home of less than 3000 sq ft and pay taxes of \$5000.

So far in looking on line I only see that MRCCA will have more information on proposed rules shortly.

Obviously not in time for putting our comments together.

Thank you for your time.

Comment 3:

September 12, 2013

Dear Mr. Gladhill,

Re: MRCCA

We have been Ramsey residents for 39 years and have been property owners on the Mississippi River for 24 years. We support the protection and enjoyment by all of this valuable resource, but we find many of the new rules too imposing, intrusive and far reaching for the DNR as well as other government agencies. Many of these rules that impact property owners have no environmental value, but are primarily aesthetic in nature.

We would encourage the City of Ramsey to oppose limits on homeowners on the Mississippi specifically regarding removal of their own dead or diseased trees, branches, plants or shrubs. We don't need a specialist to oversee these activities. If tree branches are overgrown in our yards and new rules prevent us from maintaining them they could harming us by poking us in the eye or causing an

accident on our mower. (That's if we're still allowed to mow our grass, if, we can keep it.) We should be able to trim them on our own as we have over the years. We don't need a tree specialist or a government agent to make that determination. Seriously, who is going to foot that bill, guess who? We also are users of the river and when branches on trees are allowed to be fully overgrown we cannot enjoy the view either.

Speaking of enjoying the view. Who discerns what is visually intrusive? The person going by in a canoe? Should peoples['] homes, garages, vehicles be screened from view? How again does that improve our environment? People live in houses everywhere, we all know that and do we really have to keep them out of view so as not to offend "the user"? [Doesn't] he or she live in a house too? Is there a conforming material for that? Will there be tax credits for those people who cannot afford to comply, will others be penalized on their real estate taxes? Personally, a **concrete** or **asphalt** parking lot full of vehicles is intrusive to look at from the water, but that is exempt. I think it contributes to run off but I am no expert on that. Doesn't run off have an ecological impact? So public exempt properties don't have to be aesthetic or environmentally safe? Only privately held properties?

Restoration of vegetation to a natural state is a great idea. In a perfect world. But we also would like to enjoy parts of our acreage that we pay those exorbitant real estate taxes for. The person using the river is not the only user here. Let's not forget that. There are many properties where lawns meet the river. Ours is not one of those. I think that educating the homeowner and encouraging incorporation of some natural vegetation is acceptable. Forcing people to do these things does not bring about a good outcome. I also don't believe the original intention of this plan is to return to the way it used to be years ago.

We are also concerned that someday when we sell our home there will be something nonconforming given all of the rules. A nonconforming property creates an exception in the title policy. The mortgage company will not underwrite a loan for the buyer. What protection or guarantees do we have for availability of mortgages for MRCCA nonconforming properties? Will the Commissioner create a rule for that?

There are many other issues that impact homeowners (i.e. set backs, heights, zones) and their rights to enjoy their properties that don't personally affect our property as far as we can tell. However, the rules should be more inclusive to allow enjoyment of this resource by all with more reasonable standards supported by **proven** ecologically beneficial results.

The money generated by the Omnibus Legacy Bill provided to the DNR might be better spent improving the quality of this body of water rather than its aesthetics. Zebra mussels have now found their way to our area and other species continue to threaten Minnesota lakes and rivers but the DNR recently rejected the idea of using legacy fund dollars for prevention. We have all contributed sales tax money towards that since 2008, but we don't know best how it should be spent. Really?

Thank you for your consideration of our input. I hope that a mutually beneficial plan incorporating fewer updated standards and less land controls can be created.

Comment 4:

Hi Tim,

My Wife and I have been property owners on the Mississippi River since 1987. We support the protection for all to enjoy this valuable resource, but we find many of these new rules that would impact property owners to have no environmental value. Our property has both natural vegetation, and an area we have landscaped to enhance the property. People floating by in canoe's etc. always comment how nice our

landscaped area looks but never say anything about the natural area. Also the natural area during high water (April-June) is very difficult to keep protected, shoreline erosion is significant.

The roots from the trees and vegetation are not enough to keep the soil from eroding. Since we have owned the property we have lost many feet of shoreline from the high water in the natural vegetation area, but none of the area we have landscaped has been affected by high water.

We feel the money generated by the Omnibus Legacy Bill provided to the DNR would be better spent on improving the quality of the water. Many of the small river and tributes that feed into the Mississippi river are running through farm land.

Every year more farm land is getting tiled and it is drained into these tributes. Studies have shown how the herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers are affecting the water quality. If the water continues to be contaminated no one will be able to enjoy the river.

We encourage the City of Ramsey to oppose limits on homeowners who live on the Mississippi River.