

Appendix K

Summary of Responses to Wellhead
Protection Newsletter Source Water
Assessment Questionnaire I

Summary of Responses to Wellhead Protection Newsletter Source Water Assessment Questionnaire I

The text of the questionnaire is below. The underlined text represents the responses or a summary of the responses for each question.

- Please check the most important way(s) the DNR should get technical input on the SWAP. If you think more than one way is important, number them with 1 being your top choice. The numbers listed below indicate the number of times each suggestion was chosen by the respondents. The numbers not in parenthesis represent the totals for those responses (37) received by the deadline. The numbers in parenthesis represent the totals for all (48) responses.

15 (24) short term technical workgroups
17 (24) long-term technical advisory committee
15 (21) statewide public meetings
19 (24) newsletter questionnaires
23 (30) presentations at association meetings
3 (4) conducting telephone surveys
____ other _____
____ other _____
- Besides public meetings and formation of a citizens advisory committee, are there other ways you think the DNR should get public input on the draft SWAP before it is submitted to EPA in February of 1999? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please describe what ways. Twenty one of those who responded by the deadline said no. Twenty eight of all respondents said no. The most common response by those who said yes was to make the information available through the media - newspapers, TV, and radio. Others suggested public service ads, putting the information on the internet, making information available to local governments and making presentations at meetings.
- Are there specific audiences or organizations that you think ought to be asked for input on the SWAP plan before it is finalized? The questionnaire asked what organizations or audiences we should target to get input on the SWAP. There were lots of suggestions for groups we've already contacted, including the American Water Works Association, Wisconsin Water Well Association, Wisconsin Rural Water Association, municipal water utilities and public health officials. Other recommendations included Wisconsin County Code Administrators, Wisconsin League of Municipalities, regional planning commissions, Cooperative Extension, lake districts, Wisconsin Association of Lakes, Wis. Towns Association, local sportsmens clubs like Ducks Unlimited and Trout Unlimited, county boards, the Wisconsin Onsite Waste Disposal Association, FarmASyst, Groundwater Guardian communities, Wisconsin Environmental Health Association and the Wisconsin Society of Professional Engineers.
- Do you agree with the delineation methodology for water supplies which rely on groundwater described on the previous page? Yes ____ No ____ If not, what suggestions would you make to improve it? Twenty five of those responding to the questionnaire by the deadline voted yes. Seven voted no (wanting more detailed delineations) and 5 didn't answer the question. The totals for all 48 votes were 33 yes, 9 no and 6 didn't answer.
- For surface water assessments of the Great Lakes and Lake Winnebago systems, we propose to divide the basins into watersheds and perform different levels of detail of potential contaminant source inventory depending on how close we are to the surface water intakes or other factors. Do you agree with this approach? Yes ____ No ____ Please provide any suggestions you have for subdividing the basins and conducting different levels of contaminant source assessments: Twenty eight of those responding by the deadline voted yes. Two voted no and seven didn't vote. The totals for all 48 votes were 36 yes, 4 no and 8 no responses.

6. Are there any comments or questions you have regarding the SWAP program? Only about 1/3 of those responding had a comment and/or question. Six of those responding had questions about SWAP. Among the questions asked were the following.
How will administration and enforcement be handled?
Is additional contaminant sampling to be completed within some water systems or watersheds?
What does it mean for the communities? Where does the money come for doing this? Who pays?
How will assessments be kept consistent between regions?
Seven of those who responded by the deadline and nine total had comments. Among the comments received were the following.
Any mining should provide cash bonds to cover all projected replacement costs of wells.
Private wells can and do provide safe water.
Agri-business community must be a partner.
Development that is newly constructed may have effects that have not been fully assessed.
Time span for development may be too short. Use UW System as tech support.
Sounds like a good way to inform the public about contamination sources
Have the county environmental health people do this for you. You can do the training and supervision
On the issue of protection, the SWAP should be clear
7. Check the box the best describes your affiliation:
 11 (15) public water supply
 6 (8) consulting firm
 5 (7) county
 1(2) regional planning commission
 6 (7) other local government
 1 (1) state government
 7 (8) other Six of the "other" were from well drillers or pump installers
8. Name and affiliation (optional) _____
Sixteen of those who responded by the deadline and twenty-two total provided their name and address or at least their name and affiliation. All but one of the questionnaires that were returned still had the original address label on them.

Thank you for answering these questions. Please return your questionnaire by June 30th. If you would like to be involved in the development of the SWAP plan preparation, please include your name, address, phone number and/or email address or contact Jeff Helmuth or Dave Lindorff.