

Comment Number	Date	Name	Organization	Title	Region of State	Short Summary of Comment	Ch. 1	Ch. 2	Ch. 3	Ch. 4	Ch. 5	Ch. 6	Ch. 7	Generally relevant	Not relevant
01	12/25/2009	Virginia Jones				Points out lack of faith-based representation on working group; would like more consideration of natural community.	x	x							
02	12/27/2009	Gary Inch			Northwest Lower Peninsula	Contents that it is unfair not to allow owners of beachfront property to maintain their property.									x
03	12/28/2009	Jeri LeRoi				Disagrees with use of minority group data to determine when the EJ analysis is triggered; worries that Plan compensates people for moving to areas which are cheap because of proximity to polluting areas.				x				x	
04	12/28/2009	Kent A. McNeil				Refers to DEQ as Nazis who are eliminating private ownership of land in America.								x	
05	12/28/2009	Wayne Vermilya			Northwest Lower Peninsula	Describes problems encountered when state permitted dump in Presque Isle. Includes attachment.									x
06	12/31/2009	Gary Husted			Northeast Lower Peninsula	"The environment, is just that, the environment. It knows no minority or low income areas. What's fair for one should be fair for all. End of subject."	x			x					
07	1/3/2010	Veronica Rojas				Empty email.									x
08	2/6/2010	Jim Gurr			Northwest Lower Peninsula	Argues that the Plan would violate individuals' constitutional rights to property. Criticizes "seventeen points" document referenced in Ch. 1.	x								
09	3/13/2010	Heidi Phaneuf			Mid-Michigan	Health data should be collected in smaller geographic units and should be available on the web.		x	x	x			x		
09	3/13/2010	Clara Blakely			Mid-Michigan	Wants to be informed through public radio and TV about pending votes.		x					x		
09	3/13/2010	Brandon Jessup			Mid-Michigan	Supports ending disparate impacts.			x	x					
09	3/13/2010	Philip Downs			Mid-Michigan	Supports environmental impact consideration; vulnerable communities should not suffer from NIMBY effect.			x	x					
09	3/13/2010	Amrita Seehra			Mid-Michigan	Environmental justice is important and lifesaving and deserves more priority.								x	
09	3/13/2010	Shelley Seehra			Mid-Michigan	Environmental justice is great, inspiring, and changes lives.								x	
09	3/13/2010	Okola Nicholson			Mid-Michigan	Supports increased media exposure for EJ issues in Flint.		x					x		
09	3/13/2010	Anonymous at Flint Meeting			Mid-Michigan	Plan will encourage community participation and satisfaction.		x				x	x		
10	3/19/2010	Sally J. Kniffen	The Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe	Environmental Specialist	Mid-Michigan	States that the Plan is a good mechanism to provide outreach to communities in a fair and nondiscriminatory manner, but tribal communities need to be included. Recommends specific changes.	x	x		x	x	x		x	
11	3/25/2010	Sue Briggum & Wm. T. Horton	Waste Management	Vice President, Federal Public Affairs; Vice President, Public Affairs-Midwest	Southeast	Commends the DEQ for its efforts to develop the Plan. Recommends that the DEQ review the recommendations made in the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council's report regarding EJSEAT, and adopt the principles of collaboration and a proportional approach.		x	x	x		x			
12	3/29/2010	Anna Rahtz	Southwest Michigan Planning Commission	Associate Planner-Transportation	Southwest	States that simpler language may be necessary for public outreach and inclusion, and notes that the definition of EJ populations seems to be expanding beyond minority and low-income populations to vulnerable populations more generally.	x	x		x				x	

Comment Number	Date	Name	Organization	Title	Region of State	Short Summary of Comment	Ch. 1	Ch. 2	Ch. 3	Ch. 4	Ch. 5	Ch. 6	Ch. 7	Generally relevant	Not relevant
13	3/30/2010	Frank Szollosi	University of Michigan	Graduate Student	Southeast	Cites to an abstract to a Stanford paper on carbon pollution and says "carbon pollution should be included in the state EJ Plan."			x	x				x	
14	4/6/2010	Benjamin Johnson	University of Michigan	Graduate Student	Southeast	States that the Plan is an impressive first step, but is concerned about the lack of public awareness of the Plan, the use of limited resources as a reason not to address EJ concerns, and the political prospects of implementation.	x	x	x		x	x		x	
15	4/6/2010	Emily Chi	University of Michigan	Graduate Student	Southeast	Comments on virtually every aspect of the Plan. Believes the Plan has many strengths, but recommends that it be improved, for example by supplementing the data in EJSEAT and expanding the petition process.		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
16	4/6/2010	Cybelle Shattuck	University of Michigan	Graduate Student	Southeast	Comments on virtually every aspect of the Plan. States that the Plan is a pragmatic document with good ideas, although it will face numerous obstacles due to difficulties inherent in community relations, institutional resistance, and the state's economy.		x	x	x	x	x	x		
17	4/7/2010	Bunyan Bryant	University of Michigan	Director of the Environmental Justice Initiative, School of Natural Resources & Environment	Southeast	Suggests a different, broader definition of environmental justice.	x								
18	4/7/2010	Virginia King	Marathon Oil	Group Counsel, Environmental Safety & Security	Southeast	Raises four concerns about the Plan, including that the state does not have the legal authority to implement the petition process and the disparate impact requirements are too vague. Supports the Plan's commitment to meaningful stakeholder engagement.	x	x	x	x		x			
19	4/8/2010	Jean Gramlich	Sierra Club	Michigan Chapter Chair	Statewide	Supports a strong pro-active EJ program, preferably with regulatory authority. Recognizes the Plan as a start up program to begin implementing the Governor's Directive, but is concerned about its effectiveness, particularly with regard to the petition process and staff resources.		x	x	x	x	x			
20	4/8/2010	Lael Goodman	University of Michigan	Graduate Student	Southeast	Praises the Plan, but states there is a lack of specificity about the mechanisms involved in implementing the Plan. For example, the grant application process and the methodology of the permitting process should be more clearly defined.		x	x	x		x	x		
21	4/8/2010	David Yanochko		Environmental Consultant	Southeast	Disputes the assumption that proximity to certain facilities will cause a disproportionate impact. Focuses on issues of air quality and air permits.	x		x	x		x		x	
22	4/9/2010	Brian Kandler	Detroit Regional Chamber	Director, Government Relations	Southeast	States that the Plan is confusing at best to implement and would not effectively address environmental justice. For example, the Plan is in conflict with the DNRE transition report and does not provide a predictable regulatory outcome. Existing staff resources should be focused on facilitating enhanced public outreach.	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	
23	4/9/2010	Kyle Powys Whyte	Michigan State University	Visiting Assistant Professor	Mid-Michigan	Contends that the Plan should commit to future engagement with Tribal communities and take certain unique characteristics of the Tribes into account.		x		x			x	x	

Comment Number	Date	Name	Organization	Title	Region of State	Short Summary of Comment	Ch. 1	Ch. 2	Ch. 3	Ch. 4	Ch. 5	Ch. 6	Ch. 7	Generally relevant	Not relevant
24	4/9/2010	Martin giiwegiizhigookway	Ketegitigaaning Ojibwe Nation	Tribal Historic Preservation Officer	Upper Peninsula	Notes that the Plan does not mention Native American Tribes. A formal consultation process should be followed and protection of tribal cultural resources and sacred places should be addressed.								x	
25	4/9/2010	Kathryn R Ross	Consumers Energy	Senior Environmental Planner, Environmental Department	Mid-Michigan	Supports the development of a state EJ plan, but the Plan is not specific enough, is duplicative of already enforceable statutes and regulations, and does not provide process timeframes.	x	x	x	x	x			x	
26	4/9/2010	Randall G Gross	Michigan Manufacturers Association	Director of Environmental & Regulatory Affairs	Statewide	Raises a number of concerns with the Plan, including economic constraints on the State, regulatory uncertainty, and stifling economic growth and redevelopment. Urges the DNRE to reevaluate the proposed Plan and focus on a voluntary, incentive-based program.	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	
27	4/9/2010	Cynthia Zwick	Michigan Chemistry Council	CEO	Statewide	Comments on numerous aspects of the Plan. States that the DNRE should guard against undertaking those projects and programs which do not support or advance a department's primary mission, and raises several concerns about the impact of the Plan on industry.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
28	4/9/2010	Mona Younis	University of Michigan	Graduate Student	Southeast	States that the Plan is a sincere good faith effort to address environmental justice, but has a number of weaknesses, including loopholes that favor industry interests and convenient noncompliance by state agencies. Gives various recommendations on a number of specific issues.	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	
29	4/9/2010	Emily Baker	University of Michigan	Graduate Student	Southeast	Offers four unrelated recommendations relating to community involvement, protected classes, corporate responsibility, and adverse impacts.		x		x			x	x	
30	4/9/2010	Rashida Tlaib	Michigan House of Representatives	Representative, Detroit District 12	Southeast	States that the Plan needs to ensure accountability and transparency, and should reinforce the importance of funding. The petition process is vital and should be clear and accessible to the lay person.	x	x	x			x		x	
31	4/9/2010	Doug Roberts	Michigan Chamber of Commerce	Director of Environmental and Energy Policy	Statewide	Urges the DNRE to reject the proposed Plan. The commenter asks to have his name removed from the list of members. The Plan will slow the permitting process contrary to the executive order creating the DNRE, and slow economic growth in urban areas.	x	x	x			x		x	
32	4/9/2010	Ahmina Maxey	East Michigan Environmental Action Council	Associate Director	Southeast	Supports a strong EJ program for Michigan, including a strong IWG, a petition process that ensures the inclusion of all, and a full-time staff position to carry out the Directive.		x	x		x	x		x	
33	4/9/2010	Sidney Brown	University of Michigan	Graduate Student	Southeast	Reviews the strengths and weaknesses of the Plan. Comments on a number of issues, including the formation of a permanent task force, the needs of the limited English speaking populations, and the definition of environmental justice.	x	x	x		x		x	x	
34	4/9/2010	Jeanne Englehart, Troy Cummings, Andy Johnston	Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce	President & CEO; Chair, Environmental Affairs Committee; Director of Legislative Affairs	West	Opposes the Plan because it imposes undue burdens on approval processes, requires increased state resources that are not available, and otherwise lacks clarity on important issues.	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	

Comment Number	Date	Name	Organization	Title	Region of State	Short Summary of Comment	Ch. 1	Ch. 2	Ch. 3	Ch. 4	Ch. 5	Ch. 6	Ch. 7	Generally relevant	Not relevant
35	4/9/2010	Robin Clark	Inter-Tribal Council of Michigan	Environmental Specialist, Environmental Services Department	Statewide	Recommends better inclusion of and coordination with Tribal governments and rural Tribal populations with regard to the Plan.		x	x	x				x	
36	4/9/2010	Dawn Nelson	University of Michigan	Graduate Student	Southeast	Reviews the strengths and weaknesses of the Plan. Discusses building trust between government officials and the public, recommends sample action plans for different types of communities, and suggests an effective evaluation process.		x			x			x	
37	4/9/2010	Susan E. Harley	Clean Water Action	Michigan Policy Director	Mid-Michigan	States that the Plan contains a number of excellent policy suggestions, but what is most critical is the proper infrastructure for implementation of the Plan. Supports a permanent and well-developed IWG, an active advisory council, full-time EJ Coordinator and Advocacy positions, and an effective petition process.			x		x	x			
38	4/11/2010	Debbie Fisher	Community and Economic Development, Focus: Hope		Southeast	Suggests recommendations to strengthen the Plan, including that public meetings should be held in close proximity to projects, the language on incentive programs should be strengthened, and DNRE should consider the location of other facilities.		x	x						