

Summary of Public Comments on Wastewater Reuse Alternative Policy Amendments

Table 1: State Representatives

Person/Organization	Representative Comments
Rep. Garofalo & Rep. Barr	<p>Both Representatives commented:</p> <p>(1) Potential cost share alternatives are prime examples of cost-sharing model between Council & local gov't project developers</p> <p>(2) Support for SKB-E project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits align with State's bi-partisan policy re: environmental development & economic stewardship • Jobs – construction & permanent • Cost share necessary to make wastewater reuse feasible • Enormous regional economic benefits • Without cost-sharing alternative, project would very likely be developed elsewhere

Table 2: Local cities (MCES wastewater customers) and Metro Cities

Person/Organization	Representative Comments
Minneapolis	<p>(1) Minneapolis is committed to sustainable growth.</p> <p>(2) Wastewater reuse projects would likely occur in areas other than the City, driven by difficulty in obtaining groundwater appropriation in those areas</p> <p>(3) Demonstrating regional benefit to the whole wastewater system is needed; more work needed to demonstrate there is sufficient economic benefit to the region from any reuse project</p> <p>(4) Municipal Wastewater Charge (MWC) rate payers should not subsidize unrelated activities for the benefit of an industry or one private entity</p> <p>(5) Alternative funding sources for reuse projects should be pursued</p> <p>(6) If Council pursues cost share alternatives, select one pilot project and comprehensively evaluate the benefits & report back to MWC ratepayers</p> <p>(7) Future maintenance of reuse facilities should be borne by user and not MWC rate payers</p>
City of Rosemount	<p>(1) No cost share (Alternative 1) is acceptable because it involves no cost to the City</p> <p>(2) Opposes Alternative 2 because it is unclear what metrics would be used to confirm a regional benefit</p> <p>(3) Cost share based on wastewater system impacts (Alternative 3) acceptable because of its direct tie to the system</p>
City of Lakeville	<p>(1) City would support Alternative 1</p> <p>(2) In order to maintain the integrity and intent of the MWC, City would not support Alternative 2</p> <p>(3) Could consider supporting Alternative 3 if cost share was fully vetted through a public process, as stated in the alternative description</p>
City of Burnsville	Same comments as City of Lakeville's

City of Hugo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Wastewater reuse is a responsible & forward-looking practice with multiple regional environmental & economic benefits, particularly in relation to groundwater use (2) Supporting industries with recycled effluent is preferable to using groundwater resources (3) In light of potential regional benefits, Hugo supports the "very minor cost share" for environmental or economic reasons
City of Cottage Grove	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Wastewater reuse provides environmental, water sustainability, and economic benefits (2) Wastewater reuse could foster the economy and economic development through job creation (3) Wastewater reuse may also facilitate development that otherwise would happen that may add to the region's industrial & business portfolio
Metro Cities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) MWC fees should fund only services or programs for which they are collected (2) Alternative 2 strays from the MWC's stated purpose (3) Metro Cities supports wastewater reuse partnerships and efforts that do not have a regional cost share (4) If Council pursues cost share based on wastewater system impact (Alternative 3) , proceed with caution by (a) careful evaluation of projects on a case-by-case basis; (b) appropriate analysis of regional benefits and costs; and (c) fully involve stakeholders in all of the above

Table 3: Labor-related organizations All labor-related organizations had similar comments:

Person/Organization	Representative Comments
North Central States Regional Council of Carpenters	(1) Potential cost share alternatives are prime examples of cost-sharing model between Council & local gov't project developers
St. Paul Building Trades	(2) Support for SKB-E project:
International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jobs – construction & permanent
Iron Workers Local 512	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost share necessary to make wastewater reuse feasible • Enormous regional economic benefits • Significant environmental benefits
IBEW Local 110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council should adopt alternatives 2 or 3

Table 4: Industry

Person/Organization	Representative Comments
SKB Environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Using reclaimed water would not be economically feasible without some form of cost share (2) There are enormous economic benefits to the region to the SKB-Enerkem project (3) There are cost savings to the region in delaying future capital investment (4) Without reclaimed water, the SKB-Enerkem project would not be able to proceed (5) Providing reclaimed water as a viable industrial water source is critical to preserving precious ground and surface water resources for their highest and best uses (6) SKB Environmental strongly encourages the Council to approve alternatives 2 or 3

Table 5: Regulatory

Person/Organization	Representative Comments
Mn Department of Natural Resources	Suggested modifications to the language referring to DNR in Alternative 3