



August 17, 2015

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

Dear Ms. Hoekstra:

On behalf to the Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce (MMAC), I am pleased to urge your favorable consideration of the City of Waukesha Water Diversion application. MMAC's vision statement calls for our organization to work to make the metro Milwaukee region "globally competitive in an innovation economy." There are few public policy proposals that more directly and positively serve that vision than this request to provide a safe, sustainable, water supply to an area that is a one of the key economic drivers of our regional economy.

Access to plentiful, safe water is one of the key economic advantages we boast as a region. In an effort to protect and maximize that advantage, the MMAC worked hard with local, state, and regional policy makers to ensure approval of a Great Lakes Compact that prohibited Great Lakes water diversions to counties outside of the Great Lakes Basin but allowed diversions within counties straddling the Basin.

The Waukesha water diversion request is a key test for the Compact. The City of Waukesha has followed the requirements of the Compact to the letter. Their diversion request follows a use, recycle, and return model that will result in a zero-loss impact on the Great Lakes. It not only benefits Waukesha, but provides a benefit for Oak Creek as well by providing a market for the excess capacity they have in their water treatment infrastructure. In short, the Waukesha diversion request is a model for how intra-basin diversions can be and should be responsibly and cooperatively executed. While there are individuals and organizations who will oppose any water diversion, for any reason, under any conditions, their opposition to Waukesha's request cannot be sustained by environmental rationale and is antithetical to both the letter and the spirit of the Great Lakes Compact. Indeed, if the Waukesha proposal is rejected, it is hard to imagine any future diversion of Great Lakes water ever being approved.

The Waukesha water diversion request before you addresses a serious public health threat in a way that does not threaten Great Lakes water levels or water quality and that does not deplete our deep or shallow groundwater aquifers. Further, the request strengthens our regional economy by deploying the economic advantage our abundant water resources give us in a responsible and sustainable way to facilitate continued job growth and development in Waukesha County. I urge your prompt approval of the City of Waukesha water diversion.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Steve Baas", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Steve Baas
Senior Vice President – Governmental Affairs and Public Policy.
Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Public Hearing on the City of Waukesha's Application for Diversion of Great Lakes Water
Comment Form

Hearing Location: WAUKESHA

Date of Hearing: 8-17-15

Name: Steve Baas

Address: 756 North Milwaukee St. Suite 400

Who you represent: MIMAC

Comments: _____

If you are unable to submit your comment today please send comments to:

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

All public comments must be submitted by August 28th, 2015.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Public Hearing on the City of Waukesha's Application for Diversion of Great Lakes Water
Comment Form

Hearing Location: RaLine

Date of Hearing: 8/18/15

Name: John Benke

Address: 1780 NEW ST Union Grove apt 208 53182

Who you represent: _____

Comments: What test has the DNR conducted
on the current water condition in
Waukesha.

What sort of conservation measures
has Waukesha taken to reduce thier
water use

If you are unable to submit your comment today please send comments to:

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

All public comments must be submitted by August 28th, 2015.

Opposed to Diversion:

- 1) - ↓ live on Marina (mouth of Root River) - flow would go from 2 cubic ft./sec. to 16-17 cubic ft./sec.
- 2) - 1st time Compact being challenged - dangerous precedent, high standard for reason - need to be extraordinary circumstances
 - cannot be other reasonable alternatives
 - has to be last resort
 - enough H₂O now + plenty w/ treatment
 - don't know consequences of other pollutants (ex: pharmaceuticals) in returned H₂O
 - Waukesha hasn't enacted conservation measures - which is required
 - BIG DEAL ~~for~~ for future of Great Lakes
- 3) impact on ratepayer - bills will go from \$260/yr to \$900/yr
- 4) opposed to urban + industrial sprawl + use of valuable resources when unnecessary
 - Waukesha's intent is to promote + fuel residential + industrial growth -
 - this is not permitted by Compact + is not in the best interest of the public ~~or~~ our planet

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Public Hearing on the City of Waukesha's Application for Diversion of Great Lakes Water
Comment Form

Hearing Location: Milw UWM

Date of Hearing: 8/18/15

Name: Vivian Corres

Address: 1707 N. Prospect Ave. #8D, Milw. 53202-1409

Who you represent: I am a concerned citizen.

Comments: "COALITION" USE UPDATE 2015

• There are more issues to be studied regarding wetlands. Waukesha Current Solution + Reverse Osmosis will give BETTER QUALITY WATER. And in the LONG RUN THIS WILL BE LESS \$\$\$. Still - Root River would be affected. Fox River* " doo" } Check other facts/info

• Let WAUKESHA and WISCONSIN be models of how water needs NOT be diverted from a Great Lake !! Go FORWARD!!

• It's good to do EIS of e.g. Fox River. Thank you.

* I am attaching Myth vs Reality from Compact Implementation Coalition. Please take their comments seriously!!

If you are unable to submit your comment today please send comments to:

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

very thank you!

All public comments must be submitted by August 28th, 2015.

• It would be cheaper to not do the diversion.

Send request back to City of Waukesha and state: Denied "If we "compromise standards now" - standards will continue to be compromised,

• Why is there disagreement between DNR and CTC (Compact Implementation Coalition)?

• I disagree that Waukesha extension area is within the Compact. (See attachment)

"Service Area" law conflicts with Compact.

"Long term needs" expands the area: Contrary to Compact!

I agree that City of Waukesha does not need more water (from L. Michigan). Do ~~not~~ make a very clear precedent by limiting the service area. The "water gated by the federal compact" law gets into fact.

I agree we have to protect the whole Web of Life - think 7 Generations: I agree w/ that commentator in Public Hearing. Limit our "expansionism" - wisely. DNR: Continue to ~~do~~ examine FIC, ~~the~~ Waukesha ~~from~~ city "expansion", etc. Go FORWARD, We can be a LEADER by UPHOLDING the Compact & not "convenience solutions".

Myth vs REALITY

The Compact Implementation Coalition (Coalition) collectively represents the voices of tens of thousands of Wisconsinites in advocating to protect the Great Lakes. We do this by maintaining the spirit and the letter of the federally ratified Great Lakes Compact. We are deeply concerned that all people and communities have access to clean, safe drinking water - including Waukesha, Wisconsin. When Waukesha's application is examined legally and technically by outside experts, it falls

far below the basic standards set forth in the Compact. The Coalition commissioned an independent study in response to the City of Waukesha's failure to thoroughly explore alternatives to diverting water from Lake Michigan, described as the Non-Diversion Solution. Waukesha Water Utility General Manager Dan Duchniak issued the following misleading statements regarding the Non-diversion Solution. Here are our responses:

Myth

"The positions [presented in the Non-Diversion Solution] are nothing new and are incomplete. [The Coalition has] repeatedly made these same suggestions to the DNR throughout its five-year review."

REALITY

The Non-Diversion Solution (NDS) is to treat groundwater for radium to supply the City of Waukesha's existing service area. **THE COALITION IS PROVIDING INFORMATION THE DNR DID NOT SEE IN WAUKESHA'S APPLICATION, INFORMATION WAUKESHA NEVER SHARED WITH THE DNR.** The Coalition's report was created by third-party engineering and economics experts and vetted by senior legal and technical staff at more than 10 local, state and regional environmental organizations. The NDS is available for the general public to read at any time.

REALITY

The NDS has never been analyzed before now because **WAUKESHA FAILED TO INCLUDE THIS ALTERNATIVE IN ITS APPLICATION.** Rather, Waukesha only included unreasonable water supply alternatives so it could make a Great Lakes diversion seem more reasonable. Waukesha's local water supply alternative involved foolishly drilling new wells near sensitive environmental areas. The NDS shows there will be **NO ADDITIONAL DRAWDOWN TO THE DEEP AQUIFER** (the deep aquifer would actually continue to rise), and **NO IMPACT TO SURFACE WATERS OR WETLANDS** because this alternative involves **NO NEW GROUNDWATER WELLS**, deep or shallow.

Myth

"[The Coalition's] water supply proposals were analyzed and found to be inadequate, causing significant adverse environmental impacts to groundwater, wetlands and surface waters."

Myth

"Although the Coalition...puts a heavy emphasis on costs, the DNR's conclusion that Lake Michigan is Waukesha's only reasonable water supply alternative is primarily based on environmental impacts."

REALITY

The NDS is the best possible solution in regard to cost AND environmental impacts. Ask any Waukesha ratepayer and they will tell you **COST IS IMPORTANT, ESPECIALLY WHEN THE PERSONAL DIVERSION COSTS ARE SO GREAT.** Most residents will see a \$900 average annual water bill by 2024 for a diversion "solution" that does more harm than good.

*Submitted as attachment by Vivian Corres
1707 N. Prospect Ave. #88
Milw 53202-1909*

Myth

"The DNR's draft technical review and environmental impact statement found that groundwater use is not reasonable, due to environmental impacts, even if Waukesha were to use less water than what is forecast."

REALITY

Continued groundwater use is a reasonable alternative and does not cause further drawdown of the deep aquifer when based on a reasonable estimate of future water use. **WAUKESHA CHERRY-PICKS DATA AND TWISTS THE DEFINITION OF A COMMUNITY IN NEED TO INFLATE ITS FUTURE WATER DEMAND.** The rationale driving Waukesha's entire application is backward. The city requested water from the Great Lakes BEFORE it had ever demonstrated need as a community. In an attempt to manufacture this need, Waukesha has twisted the definition of a community in need to include other communities outside of its municipal boundaries that have indicated that they do not need drinking water from the City of Waukesha.

REALITY

The City of Waukesha is trying to confuse the public. A highly regarded engineering firm developed the non-diversion water supply alternative. **THE ANALYSIS IS NEW, AND BASED ON MORE RECENT DATA.** Unlike our analysis, the City's analysis included a water supply area that is 40% larger than its current supply area, which is inconsistent with the Compact. Like our analysis, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission also concluded drawdown to the aquifer would stabilize, even with the expanded water supply area Waukesha included in its application.

Myth

"The Coalition's positions were examined and refuted in prior analyses by the City of Waukesha and by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission."

Myth

"[The Coalition's] push for Waukesha to continue using existing wells and depleted groundwater resources is inconsistent with Wisconsin's groundwater law, which puts Waukesha in one of only two groundwater management areas in the state. [The Coalition's] proposal does nothing to address the fact that the groundwater drawdown is hundreds of feet below the levels that require groundwater management."

REALITY

Waukesha's groundwater resources are not depleted. Recent data show that the water level in the deep aquifer has rebounded around Waukesha's seven deep groundwater wells by an average of 70-100 feet since the year 2000. Waukesha's assumptions about groundwater drawdown are based on reports that are 10 years old. **WAUKESHA IS RELYING ON OUTDATED MODELING.** We did not have adequate models at the time groundwater management areas were established; now we do. **GROUNDWATER LEVELS ARE RISING AND ARE SUSTAINABLE UNTIL AT LEAST 2050.**

REALITY

Waukesha is relying on certain provisions of state planning law **TO INCLUDE COMMUNITIES OUTSIDE THE CURRENT CITY LIMITS THAT DO NOT CURRENTLY NEED WATER FROM WAUKESHA.** This is in **DIRECT CONFLICT WITH THE FEDERALLY RATIFIED GREAT LAKES COMPACT.** The Great Lakes Compact does not allow for diversions based on possible future need of expanded service areas. The DNR has not made any final decisions regarding the Wisconsin water supply planning laws the City is referencing.

Myth

"[The Coalition's] position is also inconsistent with Wisconsin water supply planning laws, as the DNR has indicated on several occasions."

REALITY

Residents, businesses and entire communities can be connected to a sewer system without ever connecting to a municipal water supply system. **LIMITING THE WATER SUPPLY SERVICE AREA TO THE CITY OF WAUKESHA WILL NOT FORCE ANYONE CURRENTLY CONNECTED TO THE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM TO DISCONNECT OR PREVENT ANYONE FROM CONNECTING TO THE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM IN THE FUTURE.** If the diversion is approved, many residents and businesses will be pay thousands of dollars to hook up to the new municipal water supply infrastructure, something Waukesha never mentions in its application or reveals to residents living in the expanded service area.

Myth

"[The Coalition's] proposal would force area residents to be removed from sewer service areas that have been in place for decades."

REALITY

The NDS report explains that the regional aquifer has been rebounding since the year 2000. **THE NDS USES THE BEST DATA AVAILABLE FROM THE USGS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THIS TREND IS REFLECTIVE OF CURRENT AND PREDICTED REGIONAL WATER USE IN SOUTHEAST WISCONSIN AND NORTHERN ILLINOIS.** Recommendations in the NDS suggest re-running SEWRPC's regional models from 2005 in order to incorporate the newest and most complete data so we can take stock of our current situation and make better decisions going forward.

Myth

"[The Coalition's] proposal also does not address the impacts of regional water use. Waukesha's primary water supply is affected by the densely populated area of southeastern Wisconsin and northeastern Illinois. To not examine cumulative and future water use is environmentally irresponsible and inconsistent with effective planning."

Myth

"Water supply systems involve investments of hundreds of millions of dollars in infrastructure that must last for generations. Decisions should not be made on short-term trends or impacts, but on resources that are sustainable and reliable for the long term."

REALITY

More than 40 other communities in Wisconsin have had the same radium problem as Waukesha and chose to treat their water and sensibly invest their residents' money in the systems they currently have. **THESE COMMUNITIES HAVE NOT NEEDED A DIVERSION TO SUPPLY THEIR RESIDENTS WITH CLEAN AND SAFE DRINKING WATER.** Waukesha has ignored the example set by these 40 Wisconsin communities and has instead proposed a more costly and controversial alternative that violates the Great Lakes Compact.

REALITY

The NDS drills no new wells so there are no additional impacts to surface water, such as nearby wetlands. **Conversely, IF WAUKESHA TAKES WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN AND DUMPS ITS TREATED WASTE WATER BACK INTO THE ROOT RIVER, THERE WILL BE LIKELY IMPACTS TO WATER QUALITY AND AQUATIC.** Flows will decreased dramatically in the Fox River affecting aquatic life, recreation and water supplies. downstream Again, Waukesha is trying to confuse the public by setting up a false choice between having a clean water supply or harming the local environment to make the Great Lakes diversion seem more reasonable.

Myth

"Waukesha will return approximately 100% of the volume of water it withdraws back to Lake Michigan. There will be no impact on lake levels. Use of groundwater in the area, however, is proven to have adverse impacts on wetlands, streams and lakes. It is not a reasonable alternative, as several independent analyses have shown."

Myth

"Even if Waukesha would drop its lake water request, as recommended by the Coalition, it would be back with the same request in 10 years."

REALITY

IF WAUKESHA MANAGES ITS LOCAL WATER RESOURCES RESPONSIBLY, IT WON'T HAVE TO COME BACK IN 10 YEARS. The NDS even takes into account Waukesha's full build out plans, or the point at which all developable land will be developed, to the year 2050. Waukesha can supply its residents with clean, healthy drinking water without drilling new wells or constructing an incredibly expensive pipeline to move water from one Basin to another and back again.



The Compact Implementation Coalition, collectively representing tens of thousands of Wisconsinites, has a long history of working on the Great Lakes Compact. From ensuring the adoption and implementation of a strong Great Lakes Compact to aiding the WDNR in the promulgation of administrative rules to implement the Compact, it has consistently advocated for the strongest protections available for the Great Lakes, in keeping with the spirit and the letter of the Compact.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Public Hearing on the City of Waukesha's Application for Diversion of Great Lakes Water
Comment Form

Hearing Location: Milwaukee

Date of Hearing: August 18th 2015

Name: Karen Dings

Address: 1904 West Wisconsin Avenue

Who you represent: Self

Comments: _____

long term
This sounds like a public works project to employ workers and get the entire state of tax payers to pay the bill, rather than the City of Waukesha

If you are unable to submit your comment today please send comments to:

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

All public comments must be submitted by August 28th, 2015.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Public Hearing on the City of Waukesha's Application for Diversion of Great Lakes Water
Comment Form

Hearing Location: Zilber

Date of Hearing: 8/18/15

Name: Iris Gonzalez

Address: 1821 S. Layton Blvd. Muko WI 53215

Who you represent: _____

Comments: _____

opposition

If you are unable to submit your comment today please send comments to:

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

All public comments must be submitted by August 28th, 2015.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Public Hearing on the City of Waukesha's Application for Diversion of Great Lakes Water
Comment Form

Hearing Location: Milwaukee

Date of Hearing: 8-18-15

Name: Nell Noun

Address: 5511 W National Ave. B9

Who you represent: me / my family

Comments: Don't move where there is no

water people move away

from Milwaukee but want

all our services without

conting. Don't move if

there is no water!!!

If you are unable to submit your comment today please send comments to:

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

All public comments must be submitted by August 28th, 2015.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Public Hearing on the City of Waukesha's Application for Diversion of Great Lakes Water
Comment Form

Hearing Location: Waukesha

Date of Hearing: 8/17/15

Name: JAMES ROWEN

Address: 3107 N. Hackett Ave Waukesha, WI 53211

Who you represent: Self

Comments: I oppose the application. Diverting Great Lakes water to Waukesha contradicts everything we know about the GL Compact's goals and standards, about water conservation and sustainable development. The application is based heavily on a SEWRPC procedural overreach - the extended service area mapping without a hearing, and is also in violation of the state ^{compact} enabling laws because its requirement for creating an application's content and structure has not been drafted or adopted.

If you are unable to submit your comment today please send comments to:

James Rowen

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

All public comments must be submitted by August 28th, 2015.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Public Hearing on the City of Waukesha's Application for Diversion of Great Lakes Water
Comment Form

Hearing Location: Zilber School of Public Health

Date of Hearing: 8/18/15

Name: MIKE SANSONE

Address: 5300 SUTTON PL. SO, GREENFIELD, WI 53221-3228

Who you represent: _____

Comments: This is a dumb idea, DIVERTING WATER
FROM LAKE MICHIGAN WILL RESULT IN A
CALIFORNIA DROUGHT IN TWENTY YEARS
THERE IS NO WAY THAT ALL WATER TAKEN
CAN BE REPLACED IT IS A PHYSICAL
IMPOSSIBILITY.

If you are unable to submit your comment today please send comments to:

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

All public comments must be submitted by August 28th, 2015.

August 17, 2015

Suzanne Schalig

19565 Cromewell Ct. W.

Brookfield, WI. 53045

To: DNR Staff

I suspect the lines on whether the diversion of water takes place are already firmly in place. At this point the DNR has invested a great deal of time and energy in processing numerous revisions to the application submitted by the City of Waukesha. The net result has been that the city has made no genuine effort to compromise. There has been no commitment to the concept of meaningful water conservation and no real movement in the amount of water they are requesting to divert via a pipeline to the lake.

I suspect that litigation will take place and I won't presume to predict the outcome. Suffice it to say that the ultimate decision on the city's application for the diversion of water from Lake Michigan will set an important precedent. If the application is approved by the state and the members of the compact, I also foresee a great deal of activity in the area of annexation, rezoning leading to greater density and more urban sprawl.

At the end of the day I can only say we should have been able to forge a more positive outcome and it is the taxpayers who will live, and pay for, the failure to do so.

Sincerely,

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Public Hearing on the City of Waukesha's Application for Diversion of Great Lakes Water
Comment Form

Hearing Location: Zilber School - Milwaukee

Date of Hearing: 8/18/15

Name: Susan Seidelman

Address: 3306 N. Bremen St. Milwaukee, WI 53212

Who you represent: _____

Comments: I am opposed to Waukesha's application to divert water from Lake Michigan. Waukesha's application does not meet the legal requirements set forth in the Great Lakes Compact and as such, the DNR has a responsibility, legally, to reject it. There is better information available than what Waukesha included in their application, and the DNR has a responsibility to seriously consider it. Thank you.

If you are unable to submit your comment today please send comments to:

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

All public comments must be submitted by August 28th, 2015.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Public Hearing on the City of Waukesha's Application for Diversion of Great Lakes Water
Comment Form

Hearing Location: Zilber School - Milwaukee

Date of Hearing: 8/18/15

Name: Martha Spencer

Address: 6116 N. Sunny Point Rd, Glendale, WI 53209

Who you represent: Self

Comments: As a Wisconsin resident I believe we as a

state have a responsibility to the Great Lakes Compact

This means following the terms of the Compact.

The present matter has not fulfilled the terms

of the compact Because: 1. The latest scientific

alternative analysis to diversion has not yet been

considered by DNR. 2. The application has not

presented the data required to show the

necessity of diversion in the expanded area.

3 IF there is an alternative to diversion it is

required to be pursued. Thank you for your continued

work and analysis on this critical issue

If you are unable to submit your comment today please send comments to:

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

All public comments must be submitted by August 28th, 2015.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Public Hearing on the City of Waukesha's Application for Diversion of Great Lakes Water
Comment Form

Hearing Location: UWM School of Public Health

Date of Hearing: Aug. 18 2015

Name: Barry N. Stuart

Address: 1755 N. Cambridge Ave, Apt. 103 Milwaukee WI 53202

Who you represent: _____

Comments: ~~How~~ Will population growth in Waukesha County either affect or be affected by diversion? How?

Is there any threat of invasive species? How can we ensure that species like bighead, silver and grass carp will stay out of the Root River and Lake Michigan?

If you are unable to submit your comment today please send comments to:

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

All public comments must be submitted by August 28th, 2015.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Public Hearing on the City of Waukesha's Application for Diversion of Great Lakes Water
Comment Form

Hearing Location: Milwaukee

Date of Hearing: 8/18/15

Name: Paul Vandeveld

Address: 7017 Cedar Street, Wauwatosa 53213

Who you represent: _____

Comments: I feel that once a small diversion of water is approved this will lead to eventual large scale diversion and sale of Great Lakes water to other states or even other nations.

A similar situation took place about 20 years ago. Wisconsin was allowed to ~~that~~ vote on whether to approve a state lottery. I ~~that~~ voted yes never thinking that this would eventually lead to bingo and eventually to about a dozen of reservation Casinos. We never voted for that but several questionable court decisions lead to that. A similar situation may result

If you are unable to submit your comment today please send comments to: here

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

All public comments must be submitted by August 28th, 2015.

Date: August 18, 2015

TO: Department of Natural Resources

RE: Public Hearing

TOPIC: Waukesha Request for Great Lakes Water Diversion

FROM: Jean Verber, Member of Racine Dominican EARTH Committee
718 Lake Ave, Racine, WI 53403

I wish to speak urging the DNR to deny Waukesha's request for the diversion of water from the Great Lakes to meet water needs in Waukesha.

As a member of the Racine Dominican EARTH Committee, we worked very hard in 2007 and 2008 to advocate for the passage of the Great Lakes Compact. Realizing the Great Lakes represents about 20% of the fresh water on this planet, we along with many environmental groups and public officials of the eight surrounding states committed to passage of a document that promised to preserve and assure the sustainability of this treasure for many years to come. These past few years we have seen water resources in many parts of the world slowly drying up and fading away due to global warming and climate change. It is, therefore, mandatory that we stay committed to the terms of this Compact to preserve these Great Lakes.

As we understand this request, it does not meet the minimum requirements of the Compact. This kind of request can only be granted, e.g. if it is shown to be the last resort, not a preferred option for acquiring water for a region. Other requirements related to the area to be served, cost factors involved, adequately meeting the needs of a growing population, the questionable safety of return waters with treatment all point to reasons why we request the DNR deny this request.

Water preservation, assurance of purity of water return, sustainability for future generations are factors that support the basic tenants of the Great Lakes Compact; the Waukesha request, we believe, does not meet these standards, especially in light of other viable alternatives that are available for meeting the area's water needs. This is demonstrated by the fact that in 2009, a similar request by Waukesha was made and during these past 6 years there has not been any known crisis in responding to the water needs of the people in Waukesha. (See attachment).



Environmentalists question Waukesha water proposal

By [Darryl Enriquez](#)
Jan. 11, 2009

Environmental leaders are questioning how Waukesha's proposal to dump 9 million to 24 million gallons of treated wastewater daily into Underwood Creek would affect the quality of Milwaukee waterways and millions of dollars of flood-control and stream restoration projects.

In a meeting last week with Journal Sentinel reporters and editors, the group asked that the \$60 million proposal to ship Lake Michigan water via pipelines to Waukesha be slowed to allow time for more dialogue and study about the potential effects.

The group has submitted questions to Waukesha Mayor Larry Nelson that delve into technical details and show concern over the role of the state Department of Natural Resources in approving Waukesha's application to get lake water.

If Waukesha is allowed to receive lake water, it must return a like amount in the form of treated sewage to the lake, under new federal legislation that generally bans diverting Great Lakes water to areas outside their basins.

The group included Doug Cherkauer, a geoscience professor at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; Val Klump, director of the UWM Great Lakes WATER Institute; Steve Schmuki, president of the Waukesha County Environmental Action League; Jodi Habush Sinykin, a lawyer for Midwest Environmental Advocates; Cheryl Nenn, executive director of Milwaukee Riverkeeper; and Peter McAvoy, a vice president for the Sixteenth Street Community Health Center.

Waukesha is contemplating depositing its returned wastewater into Underwood Creek, near the Milwaukee County Grounds, largely because it would be less costly than building a return pipe to the lake.

That plan contains an important detail as yet unanswered by Waukesha, Cherkauer said: If Waukesha's design to return wastewater to the creek encounters problems, who pays to correct them?

And Nenn raised questions about the impact the dumping would have on restoration efforts in Underwood Creek and the downstream Menomonee River.

"We are also concerned about what the impacts will be on aquatic and natural resources," she said.

Nenn warned about the risk of compromising expensive restoration projects.

The Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District is spending \$100 million to build a tunnel and detention basin to prevent flooding and to remove concrete to naturalize the creek near the Milwaukee County Grounds. MMSD is also spending \$48 million on flood-control measures around Hart Park in Wauwatosa.

Goal to improve creek

Waukesha Water Utility Manager Dan Duchniak said the city's goal is to improve and enhance Underwood Creek with its return flow. The increased flow would improve water quality in the usually low-flowing creek, he said.

During high flow or flooding, Waukesha would stop sending wastewater to Underwood Creek, diverting it to the Fox River, he said.

Duchniak said he had reviewed the questions and would respond. Most were answered during the city's application development, which will be a public record, he said.

The city now averages about 8 million gallons of water use daily, going as high as 10 million gallons during peak demand periods. Duchniak projects that by 2035, the city's peak demand would be about 20 million gallons daily, with a daily average of about 12 million gallons.

Todd Ambs, the DNR's water division administrator, said his agency was ready to accept and review applications for water diversions.

Ambs said the Great Lakes compact already details in depth what is and is not acceptable, and the DNR would follow those guidelines.

Habush Sinykin said much of the compact is vague and needs to be fleshed out with more precise language before a diversion application should be allowed for review or to move forward.

Sinykin questioned how the other Great Lake states - all eight must approve Waukesha's request - would respond when some still lack their own legal measures for diversion inquiries.

Regardless of the concerns, Nelson, the Waukesha mayor, said he would press forward with the application. The Waukesha Common Council and Water Utility Commission must approve the application and financing for the project.

Nelson has said Waukesha would submit an application that could be used as a model for communities around the Great Lakes.

Find this article at:

<http://www.jsonline.com/news/waukesha/37424424.html>

Check the box to include the list of links referenced in the article.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Public Hearing on the City of Waukesha's Application for Diversion of Great Lakes Water
Comment Form

Hearing Location: Zilber School of Public Health, UW-Milwaukee

Date of Hearing: 08/18/2015

Name: Kathleen Westover

Address: 2745 N. 70th Street Milwaukee, WI 53210

Who you represent: Myself

Comments: I attended this hearing to learn more about the issue regarding the "City" of ^{Waukesha's} application for diverting water from the Great Lakes. I found the meeting very informative, not so much from the DNR, but from those who addressed their concerns, issues + feelings regarding the application. After hearing many of the comments, I am strongly opposed to granting Waukesha's request for diverting water from Lake Michigan. My concerns are: ① that the application includes areas currently outside the City of Waukesha, areas that are not in need of water from Lake Michigan; ② that Waukesha will return water to the Lake Michigan basin that is not free from pharmaceuticals + possibly, invasive species; ③ that Waukesha has not done all that it could to conserve water + may have access to clean water via it's lakes + the water table; ④ that environmental concerns have not been thoroughly examined (I found it interesting that so many environmental/conservation groups are opposed to this application); and ⑤ that
If you are unable to submit your comment today please send comments to:

Ashley Hoekstra
DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

All public comments must be submitted by August 28th, 2015.

RECEIVED-DNR

AUG 21 2015

DRINKING WATER & GW

a dangerous precedent will be set opening up the Great Lakes
to numerous similar applications.

I also want to note my concern that the DNR
seems to have no problems with this application.

Kathleen Weston