

APPENDIX B: STAKEHOLDER INPUT

- Table B-1: Stakeholder Workshop Comments
- Public Comments on the *Draft Water Supply Planning Report to the 2007 Minnesota State Legislature*

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
AV	Conserve	Promoting best management practices
AV	Conserve	*Grey water
AV	Conserve	Region-specific conservation guidelines (state)
AV	Conserve	Move large users off domestic (parks) grey water
MG	Conserve	Recharge/treat & inject
MG	Conserve	Incentivize behavior – consumption
MG	Conserve	Conservation
MG	Conserve	Conservation – lack of model for communities
AV	Conserve	Re: irrigation practices, efficient design & management
MG	Conserve	Lack of conservation
AV	Conserve	Reuse - gray water use. Link to limitations
AV	Conserve	Instill “sustainability” thinking
AV	Conserve	Reuse – put the water back to source
MG	Conserve	Conservation, BMPS
MG	Conserve	Infrastructure/shaved resources/partnering (Corcoran)
MG	Conserve	Conservation/green practices
MG	Conserve	Reclamation for landscape use
MG	Conserve	GW conservation – efficiency
MG	Conserve	Peak demands
Wb	Conserve	Altering irrigation use/quantity with education
AV	Conserve	Promote conservation (BMPs)
AV	Conserve	Promoting BMPs for landscape & turf
AV	Conserve	BMPs/Regs that can adjust to changes in good practice, technology (Existing Regs accommodate new ideas in spirit of reg.)
AV	Conserve	Grey water & reclaimed use
AV	Conserve	We’re not utilizing gray water with reuse
AV	Conserve	Landscape plans that encourage water waste
MG	Conserve	Understand ramifications of <u>not</u> conserving, etc.
MG	Conserve	What are we doing to conserve?
MG	Conserve	Look at good uses – waste vs. need? E.g. MNDOT medians
Wb	Conserve	Recycle/reuse wastewater for irrigation (costs)
Wb	Conserve	Opportunity for use of treated WW

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
Wb	Conserve	Do water utilities adequately encourage conservation? Is water too cheap?
Wb	Conserve	Increase in irrigated green space
Wb	Conserve	Conservation
Wb	Conserve	Adequacy of conservation plans (hard to assess due to lack of data)
Wb	Conserve/Data	Development incentives for decreasing use, increasing recharge
AV	Conserve/Educate	*Educating public
MG	Conserve/Educate	Public education
MG	Conserve/Educate	Stakeholders education/outreach forums/ Met. Council
AV	Conserve/Educate	Education – public (rebate program for zero scraping lawns, penalties for watering lawns, block rates)
MG	Conserve/Educate	Education, Young and old, On mis-using water, including officials & decision-makers
MG	Conserve/Educate	Education
Wb	Conserve/Educate	Public education and marketing
AV	Conserve/Educate	Public education on a regular basis
Wb	Conserve/Educate	User education re: water use/conservation
AV	Conserve/Fund	Educating communities on utility funds & conservation issues
Wb	Conserve/Fund	Water is inexpensive & doesn't affect usage
Wb	Conserve/Fund	Conservation resources for communities to offer to private well owners
MG	Conserve/Plan	"Region-wide" discussion on conservation, outreach & all water issues
MG	Conserve/Reg	Allocation of annual demand peak daily & seasonal demand
MG	Conserve/Reg	Regional requirement /standard for conservation/restrictions
AV	Conserve/Reg	Standardize conservation guidelines governed by sustainability criteria, not arbitrary measures
AV	Conserve/Reg	Regional reuse (projects, regs.)
AV	Conserve/Reg	Controlling water use – rates vs. regulatory; landscape approaches – water efficient
Wb	Conserve/Reg	Flexible regulations for new/innovative technology
Wb	Conserve/Reg	Disincentives to pump
AV	Data	**Data & info sharing
AV	Data	Ground water monitoring
AV	Data	Good science needed for policy
AV	Data	Uncertainty of supply availability
AV	Data	Ground water monitoring redundant
MG	Data	Data collection & secondary impact
MG	Data	Need regional information if plan

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
MG	Data	Sustaining for future in environmentally sensitive areas
MG	Data	*Recharge groundwater supplies & surface supplies
Wb	Data	Sharing info & data
Wb	Data	Need ID GW Recharge areas (better manage the resource)
Wb	Data	Will supplies be recharged?? Aquifers specific locations infiltration/quality issues arise if the recharge happens
Wb	Data	Need to identify GW recharge areas
Wb	Data	Lack of reliable quantity data (FW) (different models/different sources)
Wb	Data	Need data on surface & ground water interaction
AV	Data	Integrated water res.
AV	Data	Need to ID sustainability of water supply for entire region
MG	Data	Surface water effect from withdrawals (quantity)
MG	Data	Sufficient storage (river, aquifer contamination)
AV	Data	Redundant modeling & other studies is a waste of money
AV	Data	Strategic plan for data collection
AV	Data	Data and information sharing
AV	Data	Groundwater modeling requirements for each city are redundant
AV	Data	Uncertainty of adequacy of supply over the long-term
AV	Data	FIG aquifer (is there adequate supply? DNR forcing cities to go there) FIG aquifer is a low yielding well
AV	Data	Need more info about groundwater and how surface/GW interact
MG	Data	Regional data on quantity and quality
MG	Data	We're all drawing from the same resource, which threatens current capacity
MG	Data	3. PDC/J aquifer – evaluate capacity on regional basis
Wb	Data	Met Council can & should collect & share data
Wb	Data	Concern over sustainability (use vs. recharge)
Wb	Data	Threats to wetlands
AV	Data	Regional model doesn't have adequate funding to maintain data (e.g. PCA system)
AV	Data	For all types of gr. water data, the state needs to take the lead in standardizing & centralizing data collection & dissemination
AV	Data	Analyze data at a regional level
AV	Data	Centralize/maintain regional data and ways to share it
AV	Data	S: Impervious areas—adequacy of infiltration basins
AV	Data	Recharge & use of drift aquifers – use for irrigation

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
AV	Data	GW sustainability/Recharge estimation
MG	Data	More aquifer info/sharing
MG	Data	Annual verification of growth
MG	Data	Data of regional assessment
MG	Data	Infiltration/volume reduction
MG	Data	Availability of deeper aquifer
MG	Data	Sustainability of GW use & drawdown
MG	Data	How can we maximize use of more sensitive sources? (future)
MG	Data	Coming detrimental environmental impact (trout streams, etc)
MG	Data	Global warming effects
Wb	Data	Include outside areas that impact communities within Met Council boundaries in discussions, etc.
Wb	Data	Imperv. Surface/maintaining adequate recharge (aquifer level data)
AV	Data	Lack of data, structure/organization that could do the above
AV	Data	Looking at different resources (surface water/quarries/gray water)
AV	Data	Limited GW knowledge
AV	Data	S: Water supply to fens
AV	Data	Maintaining fens/trout streams
AV	Data	Impacts of higher use, etc. on aquifers
AV	Data	Better data needed, more observation wells, more frequent measurements, would help estimate recharge rates. Stream gauging. Dataloggers.
AV	Data	So/SW data is weak for going into
AV	Data	No scientific data to support recharge of M-S aquifer
AV	Data	Need to consider recharge
AV	Data	Concern about defining current supply as surplus
MG	Data	Shallow aquifer running out
MG	Data	Capacity of gw?
MG	Data	GOOD documentation of all interlocal agreements & interconnection
MG	Data	Decreasing quantity
MG	Data	With competition & demand, is the water going to be there to tap?
MG	Data	Demand in future
MG	Data	Delicate balance between sw & gw
MG	Data	Renewability of gw supplies

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
MG	Data	Muni. Wells – specific focus
Wb	Data	Impact on private wells?
Wb	Data	Coordinate/develop regional water Q data
Wb	Data	Better mapping/quantification of supplies
Wb	Data	Use of deeper aquifers
Wb	Data	Opportunities to ↑ recharge where sensible
Wb	Data	Inaccuracies in DNR database (max. volume available vs. min. needed)
Wb	Data	Global warming
Wb	Data	Limited technical information
Wb	Data	Impact of impervious surfaces to recharge rates
Wb	Data	Act aquifers, beyond PDC/J
ZZ	Data	Concern: Effects of global warming on our water supply in our cities, counties, states, and country in the future.
ZZ	Data	With 2/3 of the metro 7 county on ground water supply and projected growth mostly on ground water supply and all the surface water supply (MPLS +) looking for some interconnectability to ground water supply for backup, <u>infiltration capacity standards</u> on new and redevelopment sites should target 2 yrs + storm events (vs. typical median event or no standard at all). <u>We must recharge our ground water!!</u>
AV	Data	Department of Agriculture/pattern tiling (4' checkerboard) effect on aquifer recharge; erosion; sw quality—more studies/info
AV	Data/Funding	*Storm water funding
AV	Data/Funding	Share in cost of protecting environmental resources
AV	Data/Plan	*Recharge & adjacent community impact
MG	Data/Plan	Infiltration consistency – region
AV	Data/Plan	Integrated resource management, integrate land use, water supply, water recharge and sewer plans
Wb	Data/Plan	Regional data/analysis to locate resources to determine logical places for growth
AV	Data/Plan	Coord'd planning for communities who all draw from any one aquifer – when do we need to go to other aquifers
AV	Data/Plan	Not looking at whole system, but city by city (quantity/supply) – need to look at system as a whole
MG	Data/Plan	Lack of models/resources for community partnerships
AV	Data/Plan	Need to better define region's future demands
Wb	Data/Plan	Areas appropriate for GW recharge? => Guidance/understanding/land use decisions
Wb	Data/Plan	Lack of state-wide/wholistic view of water
AV	Data/Plan	Supply adequacy in context of growth
MG	Data/Plan	Net loss to aquifers? Recharge areas limits for impervious surfaces

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
MG	Data/Plan	Depletion of aquifers – how does overall metro growth impact supply, costs
MG	Data/Plan	Do we have good enough of reliable data to plan regionally? –void to fill-
AV	Data/Plan	Understand impact of “community” wells (collaborative efforts)
AV	Data/Plan	Limited information sharing (water supply plans and other)
AV	Data/Plan	S: Aquifer limitations N & NW
AV	Data/Plan	S: Balancing natural amenities with dev.
AV	Data/Plan	Each system has different resources (adequate quantity with wells & storage)
AV	Data/Plan	Availability is not uniform
AV	Data/Plan	Aquifers and demands extend beyond Council jurisdiction
AV	Data/Plan	Inability to quickly adjust when conditions change (i.e. contaminant or reg.)
AV	Data/Plan	Different jurisdictions interpret data differently
MG	Data/Plan	Where’s the water to come from – low producer wells of??? Quality
MG	Data/Plan	Control of water source – limited by neighbor
MG	Data/Plan	New development impact on drawdown & cities’ supplies
Wb	Data/Plan	Regional “comp plan” for water (surface & GW) (optimize excess supply)
Wb	Data/Plan	Management planning by source/source water prot.
Wb	Data/Plan	Big dependence on private wells, with growth
Wb	Data/Plan	Need data on quantity/demand, especially NW metro
AV	Data/Quality	Agricultural practices (tiling)
AV	Data/Quality	Impact of chemicals
MG	Data/Quality	1. Adequacy of ground water supply (good quality)
Wb	Data/Quality	Rain gardens/GW recharge effect on water quality & increasing rate of return to GW source
Wb	Data/Quality	Contamination threat (KARST areas/east metro)
AV	Data/Quality	Q/S: Recharge & contamination in adjacent communities
AV	Data/Quality	Q: Agricultural practices
MG	Data/Quality	Recharge/raingardens, etc/maintaining quality
AV	Data/Quality	Need to respond to storm water management issues raised by impervious surface
AV	Data/Quality	Need to identify contaminated supplies, contaminated sources for the region
MG	Data/Quality	Public education to prevent surface water pollution
Wb	Data/Quality	Identifying contaminated areas
AV	Data/Quality	Nitrates from the edge...is TC water quality going to suffer (pesticides) within recharge area, GW (look at Hastings)
MG	Data/Quality	GW contamination

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
MG	Data/Quality	Impact of U/S development of Mississippi River as a source
Wb	Data/Quality	Contamination of sources (affects supply)
Wb	Data/Quality	Need data/plans/studies on impact of contamination (accidents or not) at many points
Wb	Data/Quality	Variability of quality within region
Wb	Data/Quality	Expansion of metro into Ag. Areas leading to new/increased contaminant issues
Wb	Data/Quality	Storm water management impacts?
Wb	Data/Quality	High volume pumping creating reduced quality
AV	Data/Reg	Requirements for munis to take care of priv. redundant monitoring
AV	Data/Reg	Policy decisions connected to good science
MG	Data/Reg	Allocation (community vs. neighbor)
Wb	Data/Reg	Issuance of GW withdrawals without understanding consequences/impacts
MG	Data/Reg	Address the question of surface water runoff vs. recharge of GW through policy or std.-setting
AV	Data/Reg	Examine agriculture regulation
AV	Data/Reg	Paying to "test" to meet DNR requirements – if serves regional info; pay regionally
AV	Data/Reg	Everyone/every jurisdiction has a different opinion about what is a productive well
AV	Data/Reg	Concern about clash between protecting surface water (fens, trout streams, etc.) and water supply demand
Wb	Data/Reg	Continue & expand groundwater monitoring activities. Beyond permits (but we don't want more layers of regulation).
Wb	Data/Reg	Reg. decisions consider quantity and quality
Wb	Data/Reg	Consider SW/GW interaction/impacts
AV	Funding	Legis. - \$\$ needed
MG	Funding	Funding
MG	Funding	*Cost discrepancies
MG	Funding	Can we find the people & money needed?
Wb	Funding	Funding
MG	Funding	Time/people to run system (professionals)
AV	Funding	Legislature should finance this stuff
MG	Funding	Cost - Δ between river and groundwater
AV	Funding	Funding limitations (township) à centralize, authorize promote centralization
AV	Funding	Dedicated funds?
MG	Funding	City charter limits retail cost of water
MG	Funding	Retail costs of water
MG	Funding	Huge cost discrepancy across region's cities (need to assess data on this!)

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
Wb	Funding	Water is inexpensive here—we take it for granted
Wb	Funding	People are willing to pay more (taxes) for dr. water protection
Wb	Funding	Changing energy costs – water supply treatment/distribution requires energy
Wb	Funding	Economic sustainability for local utilities (scale)
AV	Funding	“Tax collectors” for state-wide
AV	Funding	state surcharge à where does it go
AV	Funding	How to appropriate utility & water rate funds within each city
AV	Funding	Not enough money
AV	Funding	Lack of funds—treatment, new supply
AV	Funding	If cities are required to share water supply – there should not be gouging (need pricing equity) – don’t hole
MG	Funding	limited money, infrastructure
MG	Funding	Need to identify regional funding options
MG	Funding	Existing fees – do they support water use/regulatory system
MG	Funding	Local = fund local
MG	Funding	Who pays for storage for others
MG	Funding	Fiscal
MG	Funding	Grants
MG	Funding	Future regional fees? Funding gap
Wb	Funding	Cost of WW water treatment – do we pay enough?
Wb	Funding	Variability in cost across the region
Wb	Funding	More expensive water supply alternatives
Wb	Funding	Retrofitting \$\$
Wb	Funding	Connection fees
Wb	Funding	Rates are purely a local issue (declining block rates?)
AV	Other	Prioritizing business needs
MG	Other	Environment will be felt (future)
MG	Other	Improvement of economic growth (future)
Wb	Other	Governance
AV	Other	Unequal treatment by interconnected cities (cost & quality drives this)
MG	Other	How to create a min. level of drinking water “equity” among new/old systems
MG	Other	How to maximize the utility of joint powers across cities?
AV	Other	Cooperation with agricultural industry when it comes to tilling

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
MG	Other	Unique to water mentality
MG	Other	Legislation to prevent privatization
MG	Other	Reach out to SUSA
MG	Other	Work/ involve other professional organizations like AWWA
MG	Other	Missed opportunities (Woodbury not using St. Paul's)
Wb	Other	Economic opportunities for areas that are water rich
Wb	Other	Reach upstream on Mississippi River to control "impaired" causes
Wb	Other	Are we planning to supply other areas (TX, NE)
Wb	Other	Privatization
Wb	Other	Public perceptions of inferior quality vs. bottles or due to aesthetics
Wb	Other	Improved engineering
Wb	Other	Bottled water impact to public supplies and water bodies?
Wb	Other	Consumer comparisons: community vs. community
Wb	Other	Perception that GW superior to SW/Mississippi
Wb	Other	Built in incentives to pump
AV	Plan/Conserve	*Planning/coordination – reuse
Wb	Plan/Conserve	Quantity/irrigation and peaks => ↑prod. Wells/frtmt. (growth)
AV	Plan/Data	Integrate water recharge & sewer planning
MG	Plan/Fund	Economics of scale to respond
AV	Plan/Fund	Manage pricing when sharing
AV	Plan/Fund	Cost-effective means of providing supply
AV	Plan/Fund	Don't hold others hostage if one location has excess
MG	Plan/Fund	Isn't it too costly to have totally independent utilities?
Wb	Plan/Fund	\$\$ to develop sewer/water in new suburbs as metro expands
MG	Plan/Quality	Growth of small communities vs. downstream protection issues
MG	Plan/Security	Talk/address "smart growth" policies & principles – address interconnected systems
AV	Planning	"Wholistic" approach
AV	Planning	Consistent plans for drought
AV	Planning	Wells for growing communities
MG	Planning	Subregional cooperation
MG	Planning	Consortium to encourage cooperation
MG	Planning	Intergovernmental planning/coordination – all stakeholders

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
MG	Planning	Recognizing value of individual supply/storage
Wb	Planning	Link planning efforts
Wb	Planning	Regional planning
Wb	Planning	Link supply to growth planning
Wb	Planning	GW/SW interaction & land use/planning (aquifer)
MG	Planning	Consortium of water entities to encourage cooperation, understanding
MG	Planning	Promote inter-governmental planning/coordination for water supply management & use
Wb	Planning	Linking supply planning to growth plans
MG	Planning	Subregional
MG	Planning	Lack of plan for region's use of dw
Wb	Planning	Governance (resources vs. pol. boundaries)
AV	Planning	Planning & coordination
AV	Planning	More wells – growing communities
AV	Planning	Community plans should align with regional plan
MG	Planning	2. Inter-utility cooperation , energy supply, interferences, security
Wb	Planning	Link land use planning to water supply
AV	Planning	Communities working together on water supply issues
AV	Planning	Need to standardize balance environment & growth objectives
AV	Planning	Need to engage: dev. commun., builders
MG	Planning	Joint powers , some role for regional coord. & guidance
MG	Planning	Sharing infrastructure (e.g. treatment plan)
MG	Planning	Use more MS River water in region
MG	Planning	Parochial – people want it local (find out why)
MG	Planning	Look for regional examples for communities to consider a broader approach
MG	Planning	Allocation (growth vs. supply)
Wb	Planning	Met Council fill role as regional planner
Wb	Planning	Does Metro Area Growth Planning consider water availability
Wb	Planning	Need for coordination in supply planning/development
AV	Planning	Smaller communities lack resources (expertise) for mandated planning (e.g. emergency & conservation planning)
AV	Planning	More resources for workgroups
AV	Planning	Projecting demand for the future
AV	Planning	Plan for region (i.e. CA Ur. W. R. C.)

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
AV	Planning	How to balance local control and regional plans
AV	Planning	Lack of sub-regional work groups
AV	Planning	Don't take options "off the table" (i.e. regional system)
MG	Planning	Region-look: Consistency in agreements already in existence
MG	Planning	Interconnected trunk system
MG	Planning	Interlocal agreements (supply & storage)
MG	Planning	Overlap with other key government/utility services – to learn from them
MG	Planning	W. projected growth
MG	Planning	Development, but retain small town (rural, natural) character
MG	Planning	Little link to growth & growth plans
Wb	Planning	Cooperative efforts among communities (surveillance, mutual aid, etc.)
Wb	Planning	Coord. capital programs across jurisdictions
Wb	Planning	Cross-community coordination/planning: Sources, infrastructure, etc.; Incentives for communities to do this
Wb	Planning	Sub/regional advisory role
Wb	Planning	Planning at local level for land use/development
Wb	Planning	Sub-regional treatment facilities to deal with rising costs
MG	Plannig	Developing western suburbs
MG	Quality	*Quality concerns
MG	Quality	*Contamination
AV	Quality	Q: Impact of chemicals
MG	Quality	Ground water contamination
MG	Quality	Quality concern of too long storage
MG	Quality	Quality – radon? MDH standard & community preference
MG	Reg/Funding	Regulatory costs (increasing contamination regulation)
MG	Reg/Funding	With new SDWA std.s or contaminants, costs of treatment going up
Wb	Reg/Funding	Regulatory impacts to cost (unfunded mandates)
AV	Regulatory	One process for decisions (caveat – underground features to vary)
AV	Regulatory	One contact
AV	Regulatory	Agric.
AV	Regulatory	*Roles & partnership/spirit vs./ regulation (alternative partnerships)
AV	Regulatory	*Work together; no additional layer
AV	Regulatory	****Streamline permit process up front

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
AV	Regulatory	*Unnecessary limitation FIG
MG	Regulatory	Allocation – Annual, Seasonal, Peak
MG	Regulatory	<u>Permit enforcement (?) & fairness</u>
MG	Regulatory	Standard requirements
MG	Regulatory	Allocation – finite resource
MG	Regulatory	Coordinating regulation/consistency for DW, municipality
MG	Regulatory	(Storage) Is another agency needed?
AV	Regulatory	<u>One groundwater contact (one-stop shopping) at state without creating another layer.</u>
AV	Regulatory	Process needs to be streamlined up front, not at the end of the process
AV	Regulatory	Need to define roles/partnership of agencies: Met Council, DNR, MDH
AV	Regulatory	Streamling DNR/MDH/Met Council processes & timing requirements
AV	Regulatory	Who is in charge of groundwater (which state agency) & consistency within agencies (policies, etc.)
MG	Regulatory	Concern about more complicated processes
MG	Regulatory	If permits for water use. Are they equitably enforced?
MG	Regulatory	6. Regulatory process doesn't fit with regional priorities impede progress...
Wb	Regulatory	Met Council can & shuld consolidate & streamline regulatory activity between state agencies
AV	Regulatory	(Reg.) private failure assumptions for munis.
AV	Regulatory	Regulatory bottlenecks, speed up review
AV	Regulatory	Bottlenecks in DNR approp. process
AV	Regulatory	Allocation of Mt. Simon/Hink aquifer : No reward for lower per capita use; Blending of sources not allowed
MG	Regulatory	Streamline “allocation” policies - consistency
MG	Regulatory	Working relationships/streamlining of MPCA, MDA & DNR processes
MG	Regulatory	Concern about losing local control
Wb	Regulatory	How to minimize negative impact of (our) work with other water entities & agencies and maximize benefits
Wb	Regulatory	Finite resource & allocation-mechanism to determine who gets what first come, first serve vs. impact analysis)
Wb	Regulatory	Regulatory restrictions on use of supplies
AV	Regulatory	Streamline regs
AV	Regulatory	S: Private vs. municipal controls wells: inequities
AV	Regulatory	Regulate private wells (24 or less of community systems) – takes 2 permits-make 1 (health & DNR)
AV	Regulatory	Problems applying conservation mandate based on geographically inappropriate standards
AV	Regulatory	Unfunded mandates/additional regulations
AV	Regulatory	Equal opportunity for limited resources (well appropriations)

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
AV	Regulatory	Municipal water ban uniformity/dollars lost?
AV	Regulatory	Different & multiply reporting requirements – needs to be a single report for all
MG	Regulatory	Increasing regulated contaminants
MG	Regulatory	Opportunity; political boundaries ≠ supply availability => process reflects
MG	Regulatory	Address conservation √√√
MG	Regulatory	Preventing pollution
MG	Regulatory	Allowing growth while conserving DNR, MPCA
MG	Regulatory	Use by appropriation – how controlled
MG	Regulatory	DNR, AG, Met Council, others
MG	Regulatory	How roles coordinated/reconciled
Wb	Regulatory	Overlapping/inconsistent goals/objectives of agencies (storm water planes vs. well-head prot.)
AV	Regulatory	Some cities have roadblocks (fens, etc.), others don't – equity
AV	Regulatory	Quality – reevaluate agricultural BMPs – MSH prohibit industrial; use/save for DW
AV	Regulatory	Test all wells & septic prior to sale to meet ST quality standards (TBD)
AV	Regulatory	Order of permitting process permit AFTER!?!? Drilling well
AV	Regulatory	Need a more active MPCA (better funded) for better water supply
AV	Regulatory	Is appropriation permit appropriate role for Council (Health, DNR) (competing growth goals/directions) (new growth being dictated by Council)
AV	Regulatory	Disproportionate ratio hurts new communities
AV	Regulatory	Disagreements among watershed districts
AV	Regulatory	Enforcing E & C plans – education/landscaping/fountains
AV	Regulatory	Multiple jurisdictions involved (too many)
AV	Regulatory	Multiple agency review for permitting processes
MG	Regulatory	Region-wide” regulation/statutes
MG	Regulatory	If all forms/terms would be made similar among all agencies & utilities
MG	Regulatory	Additional regulations (Met. Council)
MG	Regulatory	No more layers; improved process
MG	Regulatory	Water utility representative on advisory council
MG	Regulatory	Metro wide conservation guidelines for consistency (restrictions)
MG	Regulatory	New laws
MG	Regulatory	What can be done to supplement (DNR, MPCA, Health)
MG	Regulatory	No coordinating agency regionally

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
MG	Regulatory	Limited cooperation
MG	Regulatory	Facing increasing demand for better quality (reg. or not)
MG	Regulatory	Reg. requirements will make it touch for small utilities to keep up/comply
MG	Regulatory	Local control vs. optimization
Wb	Regulatory	State agency-level coordination/communication
Wb	Regulatory	Irrigation policies
Wb	Regulatory	Streamlining reg. process can stimulate economic activity
Wb	Regulatory	Regulating water use (drainfields, etc.)
Wb	Regulatory	Regulations often at cross-purposes
ZZ	Regulatory	I'm concerned about the inconsistency of water management policies among local utilities and cities. The opportunity is to create more uniformity among water managers and regulators regarding water management. Developers benefit from consistent policies across communities regarding water allocations and extensions.
Wb	Security	Redundancy is currently not adequate
AV	Security	Drought study
MG	Security	Alternative supply
MG	Security	Preparation for drought
MG	Security	*Security & aesthetics
MG	Security	*Supply/alternate supply
MG	Security	*Redundancy
Wb	Security	Interconnection
Wb	Security	Need redundancy in supply
Wb	Security	Vulnerable supply sources
AV	Security	Planning for droughts – privatizing business vs. residential impacts
AV	Security	Plans needed for unexpected emergencies
MG	Security	Security of distribution systems/pump houses
MG	Security	Redundancy of supply √
MG	Security	Not prepared to deal with drought
Wb	Security	Lack of redundant supply
MG	Security	Emergency interconnection (lack of existing)
MG	Security	No back-up supplies for major portion of region
MG	Security	8. Emergency backup – regional role? Interconnections

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
Wb	Security	Protection from contamination
Wb	Security	Interconnections
Wb	Security	Act supply/not just interconnects
AV	Security	Water testing of private
AV	Security	Need contingency plan, esp. an event in Mississippi River including firefighting
AV	Security	Define "safety"
MG	Security	Interconnections between cities for emergency backup
MG	Security	Vulnerability assessments just done – keep them secure & secure system of trusted operators
MG	Security	Emergency response with supply
MG	Security	Safety/Security
Wb	Security	Source water protection concerns
AV	Security	Need inter-connections to be prepared for crisis/emergency & peaking
AV	Security	System for disaster recovery (WARN) including redundancy, but also personnel, equipment. Etc
AV	Security	Interconnects – problems with appropriately-sized trunk lines/water quality/pressures
AV	Security	ID susceptibilities regionwide
AV	Security	MSP Interconnect not well-defined
MG	Security	Mpls needing back-up supply (threat) in case of spills
MG	Security	Backup (viable) to surface water (Crystal)
MG	Security	Keeping source water safe
MG	Security	Limitations on use of security systems – cost and technical issues
MG	Security	Terrorism
MG	Security	Infrastructure – keep up with BIO issues
MG	Security	Easy to affect large population: -centralized, -large reliance, -1 river ("terrorist")/5 aquifers ("chronic")
MG	Security	Privatization (also security)
MG	Security	Security: desire for max. vs. cost, back-up power, water towers, inter-com
Wb	Security	Regional component to inform/take action in event of contamination event
Wb	Security	Back up (lack of St. Paul/Minneapolis interconnect) – extend to other communities
Wb	Security	Does the region have a drought supply plan? By basin
Wb	Security	Hype vs. reality?
Wb	Security	Security of distribution nodes/pumphouses
Wb	Security	Maybe not a bigger issue [1 ✓]
Wb	Security	Supply of treatment supplies (e.g. chlorine)

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
Wb	Security	More secure – distributed producers AND we need redundancy
Wb	Security	How much system info should be public (vulnerability—vulnerable to compatibility)
Wb	Security	Sophisticated vandalism
Wb	Security	Disgruntled employees as potential threats
Wb	Security	Security – minor in comparison with contamination threat
MG	Security	Redundancy
MG	Security	<u>Security of distribution</u>
MG	Security	Interconnects
AV	Security/Educate	Education not working
AV	Security/Educate	Public awareness is low & holding. Education (current efforts) doesn't work well
Wb	Security/Educate	Upstream, public misunderstanding of flow/source they/we need to protect the supply
MG	Security/Funding	Alternate supplies (gw/sw) and infrastructure-costs
MG	Security/Funding	Contamination (& clean up money)
MG	Security/Funding	24/7 resources; electrical/energy costs interconnects
MG	Security/Funding	Unfunded quality reqmts/impacts
Wb	Security/Funding	Econ. development tends to “trump” source water protection in many cases
MG	Security/Funding	Increased security, it will cost more to have a secure system
MG	Security/Funding	How to fund for interconnections
MG	Security/Quality	*Source water protection
MG	Security/Quality	Protection of source, shallow ground water, surface water contamination, runoff, regulations (EPA)
MG	Security/Quality	Source water protection (river & groundwater) (chronic watershed issues)
AV	Security/Quality	Properly closing wells
AV	Security/Quality	Supplies vulnerable to hazardous waste, accidents
MG	Security/Quality	Shallow aquifer/runoff
Key		
AV	Apple Valley	
Wb	Woodbury	
MG	Maple Grove	
ZZ	Comments received outside workshops	
*	Mentioned more than once during summary	
Sum	Brought up during report back summary	

Table B-1: Metro Area Water Supply Workshop Comments

Workshop	Category	Comment
Dots		Used to determine priority for report back
Conserve		Water Conservation
Data		Data Collection and/or Analysis
Fund	Funding	
Reg	Regulatory	
Plan/Planning		Planning and/or Coordination

WATER SUPPLY MASTER PLAN

Questions/Answers

1. When will the master plan be completed?

A: The water supply master plan is anticipated to be completed in 2008. and the master plan will be updated every ten years which is the same timeframe as the required updates of the local comprehensive plans.

2. What time period and what region will be covered by the water supply master plan?

A: The water supply master plan will be based on the Metropolitan Council's Regional Framework which currently provides growth forecasts out to 2030. The resource analysis will also consider informal growth forecasts used to project sewer needs to 2050. Forecasts and water availability will be analyzed community by community within the metropolitan area. However, much of the resource evaluation will include area encompassing multiple communities. Resource evaluation will not necessarily be limited to the 7 county metropolitan area.

3. Is the master plan going to look into the concept of interconnections?

A: Yes, the master plan will include a variety of water supply alternatives to help communities adequately meet the demands of their customers. Interconnections will be one such alternative discussed in the master plan.

Comments

1. It should be made clear that the water supply planning process is an iterative process and that the water supply master plan is dynamic and will reflect new information about water resource availability and limitations as it becomes available.

2. The Council should clarify how a water "availability analysis" would differ from water supply "limitation analysis". It should not be assumed that there are limitations until availability is established.

- o One suggestion was to first establish availability and then look at the limitations for utilizing the water that is available. Limitations can include natural (drought/climate), resource limitations, political and legal (fens and trout streams), and Mississippi River headwaters release limitations.

3. The water supply master plan should also consider the following:

- o Importance of CLIMATE on both ground water, surface water and water use demand
- o Importance of public perception on the use of resources (and the need for water conservation
- o Relationship between watersheds the water supply planning process

Public Comments on the *Draft Water Supply Planning in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area: Report to the 2007 Minnesota State Legislature*

- o Discussion of water rights issues particularly for surface water suppliers
- o Discussion of water supply alternatives including interconnections
- o Determination of acceptable levels of impact on surface water features
- o Examination of the potential for well interference

WATER SUPPLY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Comments

1. Approve extending the term of the Water Supply Advisory Committee until Phase II of implementing the Legislature's directive is completed and the Master Plan is developed in 2008. Approve requiring a follow-up report be submitted to the Legislature by the time they convene in January 2009.
2. While it is an impressive group of Council, State, and local officials, the Committee lacks representation from water industry professionals understand the day-to-day challenges and opportunities.

WATER DEMAND AND AVAILABILITY

Questions/Answers

1. Was an Independent Technical Review (ITR) of the analyses performed? If not, suggest that Phase 2 be independently reviewed by experts in the field of interest.
A: The Council intends to seek stakeholder input throughout the next phase, this will include convening technical advisory groups.

Comments

1. Include statutory and regulatory water resource limitations in the water limitations analysis, such as the protection of trout streams and calcareous fens and Mt. Simon/Hinkley aquifer.
2. Develop Mississippi River low flow action plan that meets the needs of all those that rely on the Mississippi River for water supply, wastewater and general livelihood.
3. On page 16 under "4.2. Current and Projected Water Demand" – the assumption "will cause water use to increase at a slightly slower rate than population" may not be valid based on water use data and conservation advancements 1980-2005.
4. On page 20 - the following assumption may not be valid... "Since the extent and potential yield of unconsolidated aquifers is uncertain,

**Public Comments on the Draft Water Supply Planning in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area:
Report to the 2007 Minnesota State Legislature**

- areas where unconsolidated aquifers are not currently used were not considered as part of the aquifer productivity evaluation."
5. Reach a consensus on base data in order to eliminate competing analyses.
 6. Determine if there is a need for the development of a data clearinghouse. If a clearinghouse is developed, determine who will maintain and update it and if the clearinghouse will provide the data or information about where the data can be found.
 7. In Minnesota, decisions on water resource development, such as preferred water supply options, planning and design, construction and method/s of financing occur primarily at the local level.
 8. A figure illustrating the "seven special well construction areas" would be very useful in highlighting areas susceptible to groundwater contamination.
 9. Boiling Springs, which is on the National Register of Historic Places as a Traditional Cultural Property, should be mentioned in addition to Eagle Creek and Savage Fen.
 10. While approximately one third of the report (11 pages) is devoted to compiling existing technical information, an emphasis should be placed on:
 - a. Recognizing areas of potential supply limitations and available resources that are sustainable in nature, and
 - b. Identifying the data gaps/needs and ways of collecting, sharing and analyzing data as a base for better-informed water supply decisions
 11. While surface and groundwater sources should be managed conjunctively, sustainable growth requires prioritizing the use of renewable resources and preserving non-renewable ones for future generations.
 12. The issue of sustainability should be addressed through a water budget approach, where groundwater recharge must equal or surpass groundwater withdrawals (similar to Arizona's Safe Yield policy, for example). The state should re-assess the flat prohibition against injection wells. In cases where injected water quality surpasses State and Federal drinking water standards, injection wells could provide aquifer recharge and offset impacts of groundwater pumping.
 13. Page 16 states that between 2004 and 2030, MWW and SPRWS will have the largest increases in water use. Suggest a sentence or footnote explaining this (is it due to suburb growth?).
 14. Suggest clarifying the last sentence before Figure 8 (groundwater influencing surface water). List or footnote other factors.
 15. The next phase of this study needs to clarify the amount of river water that the Xcel Energy power plants consume. The 554 cfs minimum flow at Anoka includes a 2 cfs requirement for the Riverside Plant in

**Public Comments on the Draft Water Supply Planning in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area:
Report to the 2007 Minnesota State Legislature**

Minneapolis and the High Bridge Plant in St. Paul (Each uses approximately 1 cfs, Metropolitan Council, Feb. 1990). Some recent correspondence with Xcel indicates that the Monticello plant may require 2 cfs and the 1990 report suggests the Sherco plant may also consume water. On a related note, the Twin Cities Metro area will suffer from a critical loss of power generation during the next prolonged drought due to other restrictions related to withdrawals and water temperature.

REGULATORY PROCESS

Questions and Answers

1. What is the timeframe for implementing the proposed regulatory process?
A: The water supply master plan is anticipated to be completed in 2008. Any legislative changes that require local water supply plans be consistent with the master plan will not go into effect until after the publication of the master plan. Therefore, the local water supply plans due between 2006 and 2008 will not be required to be consistent with master water supply plan. Interim process changes will help to streamline the process in the interim.
2. Once a well is installed, will the appropriations permit/water supply plan be updated to reflect the installation?
A: Yes, the proposed regulatory process will be an iterative process. As more information about aquifer extent and productivity becomes available the local water supply plans will be required to be updated. The new information gathered from well pumping tests will also be included in updates of the water supply master plan.
3. The benchmarks outlined in the 10 year permit plan are not easily attainable by some communities due to variables such as rate of growth, lot sizes and soil types. What happens if a community does not meet the benchmark?
A: (Provided by DNR) The benchmarks are based on metropolitan area averages and national information, they were developed as goals for communities. A community can still be eligible for a 10 year permit if it demonstrates the use of best management practices related to the areas of the benchmarks.
4. Will communities still be able to appeal water appropriation permit decisions? If so, how will the process change?
A: Yes, communities will continue to be able to appropriation permit decisions and the appeals process will not change from its current format.

Public Comments on the *Draft Water Supply Planning in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area: Report to the 2007 Minnesota State Legislature*

Comments

1. The master water supply plan and the regulatory process should reflect how the process will work for communities where there are water supply uncertainties or known limitations. (i.e. does there need to be a parallel track for those communities where the DNR does not have enough information to approve a 10 year permit or will the DNR approve the 10 year permit but with specific stipulations)
2. The master water supply plan should be flexible enough to meet the unique situation in each community while protecting the water resources.
3. There should be criteria or thresholds that require communities to revisit/update their water supply master plan.
4. The connection and conflict between water resources and water use needs to be addressed.
5. For the 10-year permit, the benchmarks will be impossible to meet for many communities, it is up to the DNR reviewer to determine if the conservation measures are adequate and which may be somewhat arbitrary.
6. On page 27- a comment on how we arrived at the benchmarks may be appropriate.
7. While the report examines streamlining the Metropolitan Council, DNR and MDH regulatory regime, it does not incorporate the critical role that other major stakeholders (such as Watershed Agencies, County Water Planners and Local Water Suppliers) need to contribute to a well thought-out and more coordinated process.
8. MDH does not have an application per se. The initial discussion with them has been about unifying and clarifying the approval process related water supply system design and structure but without the expectation that there will be only one "application". The DNR needs to be involved early in the process and should work with MDH on this issue.
9. The actual language of M.S. 473.1565, subd. 4, refers to "streamlining and consolidating metropolitan area water supply decision-making and approval processes". Over the course of the recent metro-wide water supply planning committee's work, this phrase seems to have become "regulatory process". These are two very different concepts. Wording changes should be made throughout the document to reflect the actual legislative language.
10. The Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community, one of the stakeholders in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, is not governed by many state permitting requirements. The Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community is concerned with inconsistencies between state and federal programs. Injection well policies are an example of this.

CONSERVATION

Comments

1. The Green Industry has been working closely in recent years with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency which will soon launch the “watersense” program of certification. WaterSense (like Energy Star) will implement quality and conservation standards for water-using products. Going further, WaterSense will take the bold step of establishing criteria for certifying programs to help industry segments improve outcomes related to product application decisions and methods of delivering services. This Green Industry perspective will be critical to the Committee as it moves forward with the creation of a conservation guide.
2. There is a need for a single regional water conservation message. The Metropolitan Council should take on the responsibility of implementing this message and providing educational materials to communities throughout the metropolitan area.
3. Proposed conservation efforts should allow flexibility by communities (eg water rates are designed different ways in different communities and shouldn't have to be the same for all).

SAFETY AND SECURITY

(NOTE: Discussion primarily focused on the proposed recommendation that the legislature should support funding for the Minneapolis Water Works (MWW) and St. Paul Regional Water Services interconnection (SPRWS). There was agreement that the interconnection was a good first step at offsetting water supply limitations from the Mississippi River.)

Questions and Answers

1. How much of the cost to develop the MWW and SPRWS interconnection would the state cover?
A: The Minnesota Department of Health's request in 2005 was for \$10 million of the \$33.8 million estimated project cost; the two systems would split the remaining amount based on a risk analysis percentage.

Comments

1. While the Minneapolis Water Works (MWW) and St. Paul Regional Water Services (SPRWS) interconnection is a good first step in offsetting short-term water supply emergencies, other alternatives will need to be established to deal with longer-term water supply limitations.
2. Since the MWW and SPRWS interconnection will be setting precedence for the development of interconnections, more explanation is needed

Public Comments on the *Draft Water Supply Planning in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area: Report to the 2007 Minnesota State Legislature*

as to how other sub-regional and regional backups and interconnections will be supported or evaluated for support.

3. Criteria for receiving state or regional funding for interconnections needs to be established.
4. Identification of legal indemnification for supplying water to another municipality in an emergency. Also concerns of blending waters of different quality and the potential for violation of regulations by the blended water.
5. While the report makes one recommendation relative to sub-regional Cooperation and Security, it falls short of promoting best management practices (BMP) for both conservation and sustainability – The recent Benchmarking of “conjunctive” ground and surface water management, and of 0% (zero percent) for unaccounted-for water are only a few examples. Others include:
 - a. Where competition among water users occurs, higher priority should be given to meeting human needs
 - b. To the maximum extent possible, higher quality water should be assigned to domestic use
 - c. Each water source should be developed and managed with careful attention to the hydrologic and ecologic systems of which the particular source is a part
 - d. The degradation of the quality of water supply sources has damaging effects on health, welfare, the economy, and the environment
 - e. Every effective means to prevent and minimize waste and promote wise use should be employed by all entities, public and private, engaged in water resource activities
6. Consider recommending the Department of Public Safety, Office of Homeland Security putting in place a Regional Response Plan component to immediately address emergency water supplies in case of a major system outage that can threaten the Twin Cities metropolitan communities’ health and safety.

GOVERNANCE AND FUNDING

Comments

1. Concern surrounding where the money is going to come from to support long-term water supply planning (specifically are communities going to be surcharged to cover the costs?).
2. Under current policy the Association of Metropolitan Municipalities does not support water supply becoming a metropolitan system.
3. While the report provides an inventory of standard existing funding mechanisms, it does not make an initial attempt at:
 - a. Quantifying the cost of closing the current data gaps, or

Public Comments on the *Draft Water Supply Planning in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area: Report to the 2007 Minnesota State Legislature*

- b. Estimating the rapidly increasing cost of Metro Council's role in various sub-regional development water competing needs
4. Recommend the approval of additional funding for the Minneapolis/St. Paul water system interconnection. The additional funding can also be utilized to: a) coordinate emergency planning, b) conduct a Regional Risk Assessment, and c) fund needed improvements and/or equipment.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comments

1. It should be noted that the original development in the "growth centers of Minneapolis and St. Paul" preceded European settlement. Camp Coldwater and the Minnesota and Mississippi river valleys were settled by Dakota and other native people generations before European settlement.
2. An overarching state approach (beyond the metropolitan area) with a goal to institute a "Regional approach to water supply management", which brings together often-disparate interests to identify policy issues/recommendations that improve the process of managing the state's water resources to meet the immediate and long-term needs should be adopted.
3. Source of sewer water is nowhere in the document.
4. A bibliography/reference list should accompany the report listing the various studies that are cited (e.g. DNR Drought Response Plan etc.).
5. The figure on Page iii benefits from the inclusion of counties, townships and other landmarks. Other figures (e.g. Figures 4, 5 etc.) are hard to digest due to the lack of reference points/labels.
6. The first bullet (Data and Analysis) under Section 2 (Stakeholder Input) mentions defining resource availability and sustainability. In support of this; Robert Glennon's presentation at the 2006 MN Water Resources Conference (Groundwater Pumping and the Fate of America's Fresh Waters) illustrated the need for defining the carrying capacity of aquifers. It is noted that "understanding the water supply sustainability" is listed under Next Steps in Section 8.2. However, is the funding available to conduct this important study (which would seem to trump all other efforts)? Suggest adding this as Recommendation No. 3 to the legislature. How many additional wells can the aquifer handle?