

LCCMR Draft Strategic Plan Public Comment

Public comment for the LCCMR draft strategic plan was accepted from November 15 – December 1, 2024. Submitters were given the option to provide comment on the draft strategic plan, the draft funding priorities for the M.L. 2026 Request for Proposal (RFP), or both. Comments were submitted by individuals communicating their personal opinions and individuals representing organizations. Comments are presented in the order received. Note that comments were edited for appropriateness.

See the [2024 LCCMR Strategic Planning page](#) of the LCCMR website for summaries of public input gathered throughout the strategic planning process.

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>Content related to critical minerals, including resource estimation, subsurface characterization, and innovative extraction methods, should be incorporated. These topics are becoming increasingly essential, as renewable energy systems heavily depend on critical mineral resources.</p>	
<p>Comments on the LCCMR Six-Year Strategic Plan for ENRTF Expenditures</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Six-Year Strategic Plan and the management of Minnesota’s Environmental and Natural Resources Trust Fund (ENRTF). This fund plays a critical role in preserving Minnesota’s natural resources for current and future generations. Below are comments and recommendations regarding the plan and the LCCMR’s processes:</p> <p>1. Alignment with Climate and Biodiversity Goals As Minnesota faces increasing challenges from climate change and biodiversity loss, it is vital that ENRTF-supported projects align closely with the state’s broader environmental and climate resilience goals. This includes prioritizing funding for projects that focus on maintaining our forests which is the ONLY sector which grows and stores carbon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigate climate change impacts, such as forest carbon sequestration, sustainable woodland management, and renewable bioenergy innovations. • Protect, manage and restore critical forest habitats to support biodiversity. • Strengthen community resilience to climate-related disasters such as wildland fire, flooding and drought. <p>2. Expansion of Community Engagement and Accessibility The addition of the community grant program managed by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is a promising step. To maximize its impact, you must ensure that community grants prioritize underrepresented sectors such as forest rural communities and tribal nations.</p> <p>3. Strengthening Accountability and Transparency The ENRTF is a public trust, and it is essential that its management remains transparent and accountable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue requiring regular reporting and work plans for funded projects but simplify requirements where possible to reduce administrative burdens. The current process funds primarily the DNR and the U of MN. Yet the private forest 	<p>Minnesota Forestry Association</p>

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>landowners see very little of that funding directly. Yet they represent 40% of the forest lands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide clear, publicly accessible summaries of funded projects, their outcomes, and their impact to demonstrate the fund’s effectiveness. <p>4. Increasing Flexibility for Emerging Priorities such as forestry. While the six-year strategic plan is critical for long-term vision, maintaining flexibility to address emerging environmental crises is essential. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reserving a larger portion of the annual appropriation for projects that respond to unforeseen environmental challenges or opportunities. <p>5. Promoting Innovation and Research The ENRTF has been a driver of innovative solutions for environmental conservation. Encourage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative research among academic institutions, government agencies, and private partners. • Pilot projects that can scale successful conservation practices statewide. <p>6. Ensuring Sustainable Fund Growth With the increase to 7% of the ENRTF market value available for appropriation starting in 2025, it is critical to maintain the fund’s long-term viability.</p> <p>7. Citizen Representation and Equity The inclusion of citizens in the LCCMR process is a strength. To further enhance equity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide training and resources to citizen members to maximize their ability to contribute effectively. <p>8. Outreach and Education Enhancing public understanding of the ENRTF and its impact is essential to sustain long-term support. Suggestions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing public education campaigns about the ENRTF’s successes. • Highlighting community projects and their contributions to Minnesota’s environmental and natural resources. <p>Thank you for your dedication to protecting and enhancing Minnesota’s natural resources. We appreciate the opportunity to provide input and look forward to seeing the impact of the ENRTF for years to come.</p>	
<p>This mission statement, "The mission of the Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund is to fund environmental and natural resource projects that best protect, conserve, preserve, and enhance Minnesota’s air, water, land, fish, wildlife, and other natural resources," is comprehensive and simply stated. The seven goals are well explained and concise, and are complemented by the implementation strategies. All are forward thinking with education as a focus.</p>	
<p>After reviewing the document, I observed that some sections present potential challenges with readability due to low color contrast. Ensuring accessibility is crucial, particularly for individuals with vision loss or other disabilities. I encourage the team to review the</p>	<p>Wilderness Inquiry</p>

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>document for compliance with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1, specifically focusing on contrast ratios for text and background colors.</p> <p>For instance, utilizing contrast-checking tools during the design process can help identify and address areas where readability may be compromised. This would ensure that the final document is more inclusive and accessible to all stakeholders.</p> <p>Accessibility is a cornerstone of equity, and making these adjustments demonstrates a commitment to fostering an inclusive process that benefits everyone.</p>	
<p>It is so relieving to see a continued focus on habitat restoration/conservation and investment in assisting landowners with implementing practices that preserve the land and wildlife.</p>	
<p>I am all for the funding for acquiring public lands for all Minnesotans. I think there should be stipulations that any land acquired through this program Cannot be given away to any entities for reparations or any other purposes and then the people of Minnesota are locked out of this land that was once public. The trend I am seeing as of late (giving public land away) is a travesty to the people of this state. These lands should be open to all Minnesotans and never given away only to be locked out of these lands by the people of this great state.</p>	
<p>Education is essential for conservation and appreciating the intrinsic value of nature, and it feels like education is not a lower priority.</p>	
<p>Thank you to the Strategic Planning Subcommittee for your work on the six-year strategic plan. We applaud your work and believe it sets the appropriate direction for both the ENRTF and the LCCMR over the next six years.</p> <p>We particularly support Goals 1 and 6. We believe that ensuring that Minnesota’s lands provide long-term benefits to fish, wildlife, and people is an essential goal for the ENRTF and that restoring and enhancing land to provide high-quality natural resource, ecological, or recreational value is an important way to do that.</p> <p>We also support efforts to remove barriers to natural resource-based outdoor recreation, especially engaging young people. If we want to preserve Minnesota’s environment and natural resources for future generations, we need to engage more young people in outdoor recreation activities across the state.</p>	<p>Greater Minnesota Parks and Trails</p>
<p>I appreciate the use of ENRTF dollars used to invest in connecting Minnesotans with the great outdoors. I believe the most valuable investments the fund makes are in trails, trailheads, campgrounds, fishing piers, ski chalets, and other facilities that get people outside. We are fighting a battle to keep kids and adults off their devices and to get them outdoors. People need options and quality trails and facilities to make that connection to the outdoors. The LCCMR/ENRTF funding provides non-profits, communities, counties, and others a funding stream to make that happen.</p>	
<p>As a supporter of outdoor recreational facilities, trails (motorized and non-motorized), trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities, I thank the commission for recognizing these projects as funding priorities in the draft strategic plan. These activities</p>	<p>Minnesota Forest Zone</p>

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>should be a higher funding priority, as these lottery funds should be used to connect Minnesotans to the great outdoors - including projects and facilities that connect youth to the outdoors. These facilities and programs should be a high priority and weighted greater.</p>	<p>Trappers Association</p>
<p>As a trail supporter I would like to see the more remote areas of our state supported with more funding on trailheads, camping areas, and also trails multi - uses. We need to have big projects and small project support</p>	
<p>My family is a multi-recreational activity family. We enjoy both motorized and non-motorized recreational activities. Thank you for including the “(5.8) design and development of culturally relevant, accessible, resilient, and environmentally friendly outdoor recreation facilities and infrastructure — including recreation areas, parks, trails, fishing piers, or shelters — that create new natural resources-based experiences” as a priority, and for (5.9) supporting expanded trail development. We support the commission identifying all trails uses in the strategic plan: hiking, biking, skiing, ATV, snowmobile, and OHV trail development. LCCMR has been used in the past to develop all of these types of trails and should be in the future. Please consider making these types of activities a higher funding priority in the strategic plan.</p>	<p>Northwoods Regional ATV Trail Alliance</p>
<p>I believe the LCCMR has done a good job with the funding it has received in the past years that is why funding has been increased. Increased new funding should go to developing facilities that encourages public use of the projects that utilize successful results of previous investment dollars.</p>	
<p>Thank you for recognizing the importance of investing in outdoor recreation facilities and infrastructure including recreation areas, parks, trails, fishing piers, or shelters that create new natural resources-based experience, and for supporting expanded trail development. Minnesotans each enjoy the outdoors differently, which is why we support the commission identifying all trails uses in the strategic plan: hiking, biking, skiing, ATV, snowmobile, and OHV trail development. LCCMR has been used in the past to develop all these types of trails and should be in the future. Please consider making these types of activities a higher funding priority in the strategic plan.</p>	
<p>I strongly support the development of both motorized and non-motorized trails in Minnesota and the use of LCCMR funds to facilitate this growth.</p> <p>Minnesotans enjoy the outdoors in diverse ways, and our state's trail system should reflect this diversity. By investing in a wide range of trail options, we can ensure that people of all ages and abilities have opportunities to connect with nature.</p> <p>I advocate for prioritizing LCCMR funding for projects that enhance outdoor recreation, such as trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These investments not only improve access to the outdoors but also stimulate local economies and promote environmental stewardship.</p> <p>Let's make it a priority to fund both motorized and non-motorized trails through LCCMR. By doing so, we can create a more inclusive and vibrant outdoor experience for all Minnesotans.</p>	

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds. I live on the Iowa border and would like to see a statewide riding system like they have. They are an agricultural area like us and allow atv utv travel on most roads.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>I support using LCCMR funds for motorized and non-motorized trails</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>We need a master plan for all our Minnesota trails to assess the usage and maintenance in a comprehensive manner. The environment is as important as the economic impact of our trails.</p>	
<p>I think it quite important that the state invests in trail development for all residents and non-residents to enjoy</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These</p>	

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and the use of LCCMR funds to help make this possible. Minnesotans connect with and enjoy the outdoors in diverse ways, which is why I advocate for developing both motorized and non-motorized trails. Additionally, LCCMR funding should be used to build essential infrastructure such as trailheads. These Trail building projects provide opportunities for people of all ages to engage with nature and should be a top priority in the new strategic plan. By investing in both motorized and non-motorized trails, we can ensure that everyone has access to the outdoors in ways that suit their preferences.</p>	<p>Ranger Snowmobile/ ATV Club Hoyt Lakes, MN</p>
<p>Thank you for all the effort that has gone into this process! We as Minnesotans are blessed to have the ability to manage and care for the resources we have to the level shown here and I appreciate the opportunity to comment.</p>	
<p>I support using LCCMR funds to help build sustainable trails and facilities. All Minnesotans enjoy and use the outdoors differently. I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development and also using LCCMR funds to help construct facilities at trail heads, campgrounds, and boat ramps. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and should be a priority in the new strategic plan.</p>	
<p>I'm in favor of the LCCMR strategic plan</p>	
<p>We moved to Minnesota for the ATV trails. I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>Please continue to resist the political will of a few who continue to attempt to circumvent the will of the people of MN. These lottery dollars exist because of, and for, the voters....and therefore taxpayers, of MN. A small number of politicians trying to "money-grab" for pet projects should never over-ride the original intent of our lottery proceeds.</p>	
<p>Appears there was important information left out of the ballot amendment 1 verbiage voted upon on Nov. 5, 2024. That verbiage had to do with providing funding for Baseball fields, basketball courts, splash pads, playground equipment, and other recreational facilities and infrastructure which does nothing to improve or enhance natural resources or users' experience with natural resources and should not be eligible for lottery bucks...LCCMR committee members, do not let this happen. Had I known this verbiage was in amendment 1, I would have voted NO.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>I am concerned about the expansion of trail for off road vehicles and all-terrain vehicles. Minnesota does not have a master plan. I am in favor of not adding new trails until an inventory of all current trails be taken. I believe Minnesota now has 4,000 miles of trails.</p>	<p>Cook County Coalition of Lake Associations</p>

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>Trails for motorized and in motorized is important for our state. Economically and also to get people outdoors to enjoy mother nature.</p>	<p>Eagle Country Snowmobile and ATV Club</p>
<p>The strategic plan provides the ability to understand the utilization of Minnesota's natural resources as it relates to climate change, carbon sequestration, renewable energy and resilience while also protecting those lands best suited for preservation. The plan also highlights many ways to help people understand our natural environment through inclusive formal and informal education and experiences.</p>	<p>St. Louis County</p>
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in the state of Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund the development. These projects are so exciting to see. They give us destinations to find on our family trips. This state provides so many great opportunities for our non-motorized hobbies and it is so great to be able to now enjoy some of the expanding motorized opportunities.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>As a long-term student of ecology, an ecological observer and ardent guardian of nature, both professionally and privately it is difficult for me to understand how the LCCMR would consider motorized trails as consistent with the spirit and the intent of Trust Fund. Globally, ecologists have categorized the major threats to nature (ecosystems) in the following five groups:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land cover conversion; 2. Habitat Fragmentation; 3. Introduction of toxics/pollutants; 4. Invasive species; 5. Climate change. <p>Motorized recreation is unquestionably a major contributor to all five of these stressors on both public and private lands. And planning for or funding of the current level or any expansions of systems to increase this this activity is glaringly antithetical, not only to the Trust Fund's enabling amendment, legislation and LCCMR strategic goals (past and proposed) but is contrary to the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act. With regard to #5 alone, the current Minnesota Climate Action Plan calls for reducing all ICE vehicle miles traveled which means reducing essential vehicle miles for worker commutes, commerce and other societal necessities. Discretionary uses of fossil fueled for motorized recreation miles should therefore be unthinkable. A winking nod of approval for motorized trail expansion rather than reduction by state agencies (DNR & EQB etc.) is evidence of disproportionate political pressure from the motorized manufacturing community that has out-sized presence in Minnesota.</p> <p>The LCCMR must demonstrate a more clear-headed, unbiased understanding of this cognitive dissonance. Aside from climate impacts, motorized recreation's contribution to the first four of these stressors is significant in their own right. Yet sponsoring organizations and permitting/funding agencies have never allowed a comprehensive environmental assessment of adverse environmental impacts of the overall system. And only the positive economic impacts are informally used to justify their existence and expansion. Individual Statewide OHV Master Plans for three subsections of the overall motorized sports, ATVs, off-highway motorcycles and off-road licensed vehicles (jeeps and 4-wheel drive utility vehicles, etc.) have been in preparation by the MDNR for several years (at the direction of the Legislature). Publication of the drafts of these separate reports have been serially delayed (may be published in December 2024). Repeated requests by citizen groups that the whole statewide picture of already available motorized recreation "opportunities" in Minnesota be presented by combining these reports has been resisted by MDNR. Any claims by the industry or user groups that the motorized system is inadequate to meet "needs" (and therefore should be funded by LCCMR) cannot be supported unless this more comprehensive combined Master Plan discloses the scope, scale and condition of the entire system. A full assessment of the scope and scale of the current sanctioned trail system when added to the unsanctioned, user-created system of trails is very likely to reveal an "over-built" system that LCCMR funding could be used to decommission the excessive miles of trails that impact public lands.</p> <p>Therefore, the LCCMR should declare a moratorium on further funding of all motorized recreation trails in Minnesota pending these statewide assessments.</p>	

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>I appreciate the use of LCCMR funds for development of both nonmotorized and motorized trailheads and facilities. As everyone who enjoys outdoor activities enjoy them in different ways. I would like to encourage continued use of LCCMR funds to develop trailheads for motorized vehicles along with facilities for camping, fishing and boating. As I am among the growing group of older outdoor enthusiasts and am becoming more limited on my use of nonmotorized trails I would like to see continued and expanded investment in motorized trails and other outdoor facilities for camping, fishing, and boating.</p>	
<p>I am pleased to see the emphasis on climate resiliency and attention to minimal disturbance of wildlife habitat. Other strengths of this plan are its emphasis on accessibility to outdoor recreational experiences for all Minnesotans and focus on promoting clean water. My hope would be that funds are prioritized for improvement, maintenance, and signage of our existing trails. It would be helpful to see a master map of trails throughout the state so we can see where and what type of trails exist and how they interconnect. This would create a framework for planners and the public to better understand the current system and needs for maintenance and improvement. Signage could include information about critical habitat and users' role in caring for the trails and surrounding environment. There is also a need for strategically placed vaults and pet pick-up stations along trails and in recreational areas.</p>	
<p>Keep working to connect improve motorized and non-motorized trails and minimum maintenance roads available</p>	
<p>Thank you for recognizing the importance of investing in outdoor recreation facilities and infrastructure including recreation areas, parks, trails, fishing piers, or shelters that create new natural resources-based experience, and for supporting expanded trail development. Minnesotans each enjoy the outdoors differently, which is why we support the commission identifying all trails uses in the strategic plan: hiking, biking, skiing, ATV, snowmobile, and OHV trail development. LCCMR has been used in the past to develop all these types of trails and should be in the future. Please consider making these types of activities a higher funding priority in the strategic plan.</p>	
<p>Dear LCCMR members,</p> <p>I'm sending you my comments for investments in motorized and non-motorized trails projects in our state. I enjoy both motorized trail recreation and non-motorized trails including biking and hiking. My wife and I take our dogs hiking frequently and we enjoy the many great trails our state has to offer. I encourage the funds to be used to build trailheads, interpretive signage, campgrounds, restrooms and maps. These projects help connect people and families of all generations to enjoy Minnesota's great outdoors. No</p>	

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>matter which type of trails you choose to explore, it is healthy physically and mentally. Funding these trails projects should be given high priority.</p>	
<p>Due to historical losses of 99% of native prairie and 90% loss of prairie wetlands, which has had huge negative impacts on both wildlife habitat and water quality along with people’s quality of life, the LCCMR Strategic Plan should emphasize Prairie wetland and grassland wildlife habitat improvement and protection on both public and private land for both wildlife and people. The biggest challenge for prairie wildlife now is monoculture row crop agriculture in many prairie areas with few grassland grazing livestock and continued subsurface tile drainage. Widespread wind/solar energy easements and project planning without pre-project siting coordination with state agencies are also increasingly challenging conservation implementation in western Minnesota.</p>	<p>Ducks Unlimited, Inc.</p>
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>As a Minnesota Resident I would encourage funding considerations for both Non-Motorized and Motorized trail development. Myself and immediate family as well as close extended family enjoy many different types of recreation ranging from hiking, biking and running to snowmobiling, ATV'ing, boating, hunting and fishing. Minnesota is a great place to live and I would like to see all forms of outdoor recreation considered for funding! Thank You.</p>	
<p>To whom it may concern: the importance of investing in outdoor recreation facilities and infrastructure — including parks & trails, motorized and non-motorized recreation areas, is that I feel it creates natural enthusiasm for outdoors, camping and fishing experiences. Supporting expanded trail development should be at the top of the list for this commission. Each year Minnesotans enjoy the outdoors differently, that's why we support the commission in identifying all trails uses in its strategic plan: such as hiking, biking, skiing, All Terrain vehicles, snowmobile, and all Off Highway Vehicles for trail development. The LCCMR has been used in the past to develop all these types of trails that benefit all Minnesotans and it should be continued into the future. Please consider making these types of activities a higher funding priority in the strategic plan moving forward.</p>	
<p>I have lived my entire 63 years of my life in Minnesota. I have watched our trail systems grow into something fantastic. I use both snowmobile and ATV trails often. I have owned a business in this state for 41 years. Our trail system helps to keep local dollars here. It helps us all!</p>	
<p>The Strategic Plan should focus on funding projects that improve natural habitat such as woods, water, and prairie. It should not be used for projects that urbanize natural areas.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR</p>	<p>ATV Minnesota</p>

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.	
I agree with the majority and strongly disagree w/politicians who try to expand original intent of the LCCMR. "Capital projects should stay in capital investments".	
I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.	
I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.	
I support the goals for expenditures of the Trust LCCMR Trust funds - in particular it is extremely important to prioritize those projects that truly enhance our natural environments - waters, wetlands, forests, prairies, for wildlife to thrive. And to not fund projects that do the opposite.	
Comment #1 – I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.	
Please support Minnesota trails for ATVs.	
I would really like to see more atv trails in northern Minnesota. Specifically from Grand Rapids to Hibbing and Togo to Jacobson. Thank you for considering this area	Red Rock Riders Pengilly, Mn
I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development. I also support using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors. They should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan.	

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
I support using monies for ATV and snowmobile use for building and maintaining trails.	Ely Igloo Snowmobile Club
<p>Comment on draft LCCMR Strategic Plan:</p> <p>The draft strategies mention promoting research, evaluating BMPs and managing species and ecosystems effectively to protect and restore habitats and populations to attain the goals of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. protect and sustain Minnesota's environment, economy and quality of life 2. private and public lands provide long term benefits to wildlife, fish and people, <p>INCLUDE ANOTHER STRATEGY FACTOR- PUBLIC AWARENESS OF INHERENT IMPACTS FROM RECREATION ON HABITAT & WATER:</p> <p>One important factor omitted is ensuring through all forms of public media that the recreating public is aware of the impacts of our chosen forms of recreation on the environment which include habitat fragmentation from all trails, water degradation from our power sports such as off road vehicles and boating, the spread of invasives to varying degrees from all forms of recreation and the duty to take responsibility for reducing and avoiding these impacts to protect and restore our public lands, ecosystems and biodiversity.</p> <p>BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES- INEFFECTIVE-- REGULATIONS REQUIRED INSTEAD:</p> <p>BMPS are voluntary, arbitrarily followed and monitored, and not enforceable. BMPS are no longer enough to mitigate impacts in Climate Change. It is widely known and evidenced that BMP's are routinely ignored.</p> <p>LCCMR PROPOSALS SELECTED SHOULD BE VETTED TO ALIGN WITH ENVIRONMENTAL EFFORTS OF STATE, AGENCIES & USFS IN-STATE EFFORTS:</p> <p>The public is frustrated with the ongoing actions of agencies that are at cross purposes to one another. Proposals should be carefully vetted to confirm they are aligned with ongoing environmental efforts of the State, its agencies & USFS in-state efforts.</p> <p>SOME EXAMPLES:</p> <p>PROTECTING LYNX TERRITORY: The USFS is focused on closing logging roads in the north to help protect the Canada lynx, a state species of special concern. At the same time, the MN DNR is working on several recreational power sports trails, a totally discretionary use, that traverse known lynx territory.</p> <p>THE GOVERNOR'S CLIMATE ACTION FRAMEWORK / Reduce internal combustion engine mileage/ Protect Wetlands:</p> <p>The Climate Action Framework calls on all citizens and state agencies to actively reduce internal combustion engine, ICE, mileage to reduce emissions. However, the state</p>	

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>continues to allocate millions to expand power sports trail systems across the state. Off Highway Vehicles are known emitters of nitrogen oxides which are much more potent in their immediate harmful effects on air quality and human health than carbon dioxide.</p> <p>The Climate Action Framework also calls for protecting wetlands and yet the MN DNR recently approved a recreational power sports trail that will put down almost 7/8s of a mile of boardwalk over wetlands, without any outlined long term maintenance plans and without any secured sources of funding and cost estimate to prevent long term damage to wetland ecosystems.</p>	
<p>The Strategic Plan is great. Leave it as is.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>As a supporter of trails (motorized and non-motorized), trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities, I thank the commission for recognizing these projects as funding priorities in the draft strategic plan. I believe, though, that these should be a higher funding priority, as ENRTF dollars should be used to connect Minnesotans to the great outdoors. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR. In recent years, support of motorized trails has been minimalized compared to other comparative funded priorities. It is imperative we re-balance the funding to give motorized projects their fare share.</p>	<p>Twig Area Trail Riders ATV Club.</p>
<p>I support this plan.</p>	
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and using LCCMR funds to help fund this development. All Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors differently, which is why I support both motorized and non-motorized trail development, as well as using LCCMR funding to construct trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These projects connect people of all ages to the outdoors, and they should be a higher funding priority in the new strategic plan. We all connect differently with the outdoors, so investment in non-motorized AND motorized trails should be a priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>Our family is very involved in hiking, biking and 4 wheeling. We appreciate and strongly support development of trails for these activities- both single use trails as well as shared trails. It seems that more and more of our friends are joining in these activities as well especially as the trail systems begin to expand and more opportunities become available. Thank you for contributing to these recreational activities!</p>	
<p>support trail development in Minnesota using LCCMR funds. All Minnesotans access and enjoy outdoors differently, which is why I support non-motorized and motorized trail development.</p>	

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>I support trail development in Minnesota and advocate for the use of LCCMR funds to help finance this development. Since Minnesotans enjoy and access the outdoors in diverse ways, I back both motorized and non-motorized trail projects. Additionally, I support utilizing LCCMR funding for the construction of trailheads, campgrounds, and boating/fishing facilities. These initiatives are essential for connecting people of all ages to the outdoors and should be prioritized in the new strategic plan. Given our varied connections with nature, investments in both motorized and non-motorized trails should be a top priority for LCCMR.</p>	
<p>Three Rivers Park District thanks the LCCMR and staff for its work on developing a Strategic Plan for use of ENRTF funds for the next six years. The plan lays out a clear vision and multiple strategies needed to reach that vision. It is an excellent plan and framework for the use of ENRTF funds.</p> <p>The LCCMR plays an important role in helping fund land acquisition in the metropolitan area for the metropolitan regional parks and trail system. These acquisitions meet several of the strategic goals, including providing long-term benefits to people, improving water quality, improving wildlife habitat, improving resilience, and improving opportunities for Minnesota’s young people to connect to nature.</p> <p>As written, the draft Strategic Plan focuses its acquisition efforts in strategy 1.3: <i>1.3 Acquire and conserve minimally disturbed lands that provide the greatest capacity for multiple conservation benefits to humans, fish, wildlife, and water resources.</i></p> <p>Strategy 1.4 addresses restoration and enhancement of lands, but does not address acquisition: <i>1.4 Restore and enhance lands to provide high-quality natural resource, ecological, or recreational value.</i></p> <p>To help meet the Strategic plan’s goals within the metro area, greater flexibility is needed for allowing use of ENRTF funds for land acquisition, as most metro lands have structures and/or are not “minimally disturbed.” A simple but effect solution would be to add “Acquire,” at the beginning of Strategy 1.4. This addition recognizes that acquisitions of lands in need of restoration and enhancement are part of the LCCMR’s strategies to meet its goals.</p>	<p>Three Rivers Parks District</p>
<p>As a grant applicant, a failed applicant perspective, I found my nose a bit out of “joint” when having succeeded thru the initial review, only a very short period of time to present.</p> <p>Other than that selfish push back, I am over-all pleased with LCCMR the work, over-sight board and staff.</p> <p>Oops, one more thing. I would like to see a conscious effort to encourage more applied research vs the amounts / proportion that presently go into pure research.</p> <p>For example, I am working on a project that attempts applying the social sciences to enable the gifts from our natural sciences to be applied in far greater amounts. The</p>	

Submitted public comment on the draft strategic plan:	Organization
<p>purpose-greatly accelerate the transformation of farming from domination by two crop rotations creating negative env side effects.</p> <p>Our MN River -our namesake river is currently listed as impaired. It was impaired when Arnie Carlson was Gov. He declared restoration one of his legacy goals as governor. Guess what? It is still impaired.</p> <p>That is inexcusable. We have the tools to be in a much better position than we are. We fail because our people skills (human dimension-social sciences lag the appropriate application of the natural sciences).</p> <p>Meanwhile, we spend a lot of money on the next soybean hybrid. I am not anti-pure research, quite the contrary—I do think we may be out of balance?</p>	
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on LCCMR funding. Our comments focus on our ability to utilize this funding source. It is our understanding that this funding can provide indirect costs for projects awarded to the Minnesota DNR, but not for us as an inter-tribal organization (and I believe also for tribes themselves). We are unable to proceed with grants without the indirect costs for things it applies to such as staff time. In addition to addressing this restriction, perhaps more thought should be put into what are appropriate requirements for tribes to submit financial reports and audits. Maybe tribes as sovereign nations could be a separate category of recipient instead of “political subdivision applicants” to address these issues.</p> <p>These limitations make it difficult for us (and perhaps tribes) to apply for and utilize LCCMR funding. Changes would be beneficial to increase opportunities for tribal partners. Please share our comments with other appropriate contacts working on LCCMR funding planning. Thank you.</p>	1854 Treaty Authority