3 Plans Coordination

Possible Changes based on Engagement Outcomes

These are *suggestions for possible changes* based on input received through external feedback. Our next step is to begin to evaluate and explore the options to better understand what is feasible or could lead to the greatest impact. **None of these are guarantees.**

At this time, we are requesting stakeholder input about which of these potential changes you would most like to see the working group explore in the coming months, or if there is anything you feel might be missing. We acknowledge that while some of these are small changes, others would require significant investment to further explore or implement, and not everything that does move forward would happen simultaneously. Furthermore, for things that do move forward for exploration, not everything will then lead to a change, or a change in time for the next planning cycle.

Potential change to consider	Rationale/Considerations
1. Move to electronic submissions when able, with any data that has already been reported to a state agency or Metropolitan Council already pre-populated in the plans. Would request verification of data for accuracy and/or change in vision, and addition of data not already received.	Less duplicative information given and received, staff time for reporting and analysis minimized, more secure data management.
2. Provide better explanation about the rationale and purpose of different plan requirements.	Increasing understanding by plan developers and implementers about how information is used locally and by state agencies
3. Consider pros and cons of changing the due dates for local water supply plans compared to the due date of local comprehensive plans, with any related changes to agency approval timelines and processes.	Adjusting plan due dates may lessen the burden on local (and state) planning staff who have limited staff and consultant resources to complete multiple plans simultaneously, or multiple related plans over time. Implications need to be understood before any proposed change could be made.
4. Agencies update and develop cooperative definitions and standard operating procedures for reviews and approvals.	This could support more effective communication and technical assistance to locals. It could also help agencies better understand one another's review criteria and prevent redundancies, contradictions, or gaps, as well as provide continuity with staff turnover.
5. Improve the information and technical assistance available to water suppliers to understand how surface water bodies are impacted by pumping.	Local stakeholders noted the challenge of completing Table 10 of the local water supply plan template without good guidance/information. Also, actions to address issues identified in Table 10 would be more effective if connected to watershed planning and implementation.

6. Understand details on system capacity alongside population forecasts and ask if (or how they plan to) to meet the need.	Stakeholders have requested more information about water supply system capacity versus planned growth/development. Comparing firm capacity, or some other metric of current water supply system capacity, against projected water demand to clarify the size and timing of water supply infrastructure sequencing, budget requests, and permit requests.
7. Continued coordination meetings of plan reviewers among the three agencies to ensure continued alignment and no new redundancies.	Stakeholders have repeatedly asked to see increased coordination between agencies and a reduction in conflicting or overlapping local water supply plan requirements.
8. Continue to iteratively improve existing modeling tools, and support ability for multi- and individual community planning.	Stakeholders have repeatedly asked for increased clarity around the amount of water available, or the ability to understand multi-community DWSMAs and wellhead protection areas. While not a way to give a definitive answer or number, a model could provide a regional or subregional context for individual water demand-related plan and permit decisions.
9. Provide more robust guidance for local comprehensive plans to acknowledge and address Drinking Water Supply Management Areas and private well users, through land use, watershed and/or other plan content.	Stakeholders have repeatedly requested tighter linkages between land use and water supply planning—both in requirements from agencies as well as guidance for actions. Regions with a large population of private well users are also concerned about drinking water quality.
10. Request information on implications of climate change and extreme weather on the well, aquifer, and water supply system.	Identified as a gap in source water protection and water supply resiliency by working group members.