3 plans coordination: Possible changes based on engagement so far

These are suggestions for possible changes based on input received from local stakeholders so far. 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.
1. How much does this possible change resonate with you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move to electronic submissions when able, with any data already reported to a state agency or Met Council already pre-populated in the plans</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How much does this possible change resonate with you?

Provide better explanation about the rationale and purpose of different plan elements

3.9

Strongly agree

Strongly disagree
3. How much does this possible change resonate with you?

Consider pros and cons of changing the due dates for local water supply plans versus due date of local comp plans, including impacts to agency review.

Strongly disagree

3.3

Strongly agree
4. How much does this possible change resonate with you?

DNR, MDH, and MC update and develop cooperative definitions and standard operating procedures for reviews and approvals

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree
5. How much does this possible change resonate with you?

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Somewhat disagree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Somewhat agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

Improve the info and technical assistance to water suppliers, to understand how surface waters may be impacted by pumping
6. How much does this possible change resonate with you?

- Do not like: Provide details on water system capacity with respect to population and demand forecasts, and demonstrate how differences will be addressed
- Strongly support: 3.2
7. How much does this possible change resonate with you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do not like</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued coordination meetings among DNR, MDH, and MC plan reviewers, to ensure continued alignment and minimize redundancies</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8
8. How much does this possible change resonate with you?

Do not like:

Continue to improve existing modeling tools, and support multi- and individual community planning

Strongly support:

3.6
9. How much does this possible change resonate with you?

Do not like

Provide better guidance for local comp plans to acknowledge and address DWSMAs and private wells through land use, watershed or other plan content

3.3

Strongly support
10. How much does this possible change resonate with you?

- Include information on implications of climate change and extreme weather on wells, aquifers, and water supply systems

- Strongly support
Ranking

1st: Agency coordination
2nd: Guidance for comp plans
3rd: Electronic submissions & prepopulated plans
4th: Info & technical assistance
5th: Improve modeling tools
6th: Water system capacity
7th: Climate change
8th: Definitions and procedures
9th: Explain rationale & purpose
10th: Change due dates
Anything to add?

Nothing

No. Great workshop

Nothing to add.

Thank you MetC

Stronger partnership with MnDNR. Need this agency to be more accountable

Not at this time

How about a data system to manage all the data the 3 plans require

Private well users drink groundwater, any resources to help them or explain contamination or quantity and how aquifers work would be helpful
Anything to add?

Great process since first meeting. Amongst the most worthwhile meeting I go to.

Climate change should be not just tracked but try to enforce changes before problems affect the communities.

Wellhead protection plans on ground watershed scale vs political boundary.

We do a great job of collaborating on local education but sure could be more efficient and widespread if done by state and/or met council.

Not at this time

Thank you for being the regional facilitator...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anything to add?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This has been an enlightening day. Please continue these efforts.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If you’re not at the table, you’re probably on the menu. Thanks for the invite to the former.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good job!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Put in clear writing: No MC plan or intent to take over local water supply</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don’t screw this up. 😄, kidding. Great collaborative tone.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nothing to add</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thank you</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional approach and policy regarding private well permitting</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anything to add?

Thank you for the informative event. Well done. Appreciate the good food too – snacks are important!