

Form Email #1

Approximately 1123 Received

Dear Ms. Hoekstra:

I am writing to urge you to keep the Great Lakes Compact strong and reject the Waukesha diversion plan.

The Great Lakes contain 20 percent of the world's fresh surface water and provide drinking water to more than 40 million people. They account for an irreplaceable part of Wisconsin's \$12 billion outdoor recreation industry, connect Wisconsin to global trade, and generate thousands of jobs. The Great Lakes are a resource we can't afford to lose.

I want to ensure that future generations will have safe and bountiful drinking water. Waukesha's application has failed to meet critical requirements to justify a Great Lakes water diversion under the Compact. Specifically:

? Waukesha's application does not meet the definition of a community in need and contains inflated estimates for future water needs.

? Waukesha has an alternative option available that would use local water supplies and increased conservation methods. Not only is the suggested alternative safe from contamination and assures future growth, it also costs almost half as much.

? Waukesha has not implemented the necessary conservation measures to reduce their water use before seeking Great Lakes water.

? Waukesha's proposal to return water to Lake Michigan through the Root River will have negative impacts on the Root and surrounding areas.

Please reject the Waukesha diversion plan.

Sincerely,

Ashleigh Bearheart

Form Email #2

Approximately 360 Received

Dear Ms. Hoekstra,

I'm writing to ask that you deny the City of Waukesha's request for Great Lakes water.

Waukesha residents deserve clean, safe drinking water. However, the City of Waukesha has yet to prove that its plan to divert water from Lake Michigan is truly a last resort. The City's application should not be approved under the rules of the Great Lakes Compact.

The City of Waukesha has not disclosed vital pieces of information to the DNR and the larger public, all under the guise of sound science in order to make reasonable alternatives to Great Lakes water seem less reasonable.

Waukesha could save its residents over \$150 million over the next 50 years by simply investing in the infrastructure it currently operates. By treating its water for radium, Waukesha could continue to provide its residents with access to a clean, safe, sustainable and local water supply.

Additionally, although Waukesha will return almost all the water it diverts from the Great Lakes, its return flow plan will likely have significant environmental impacts to both the Root and Fox Rivers. The City will be dumping its wastewater into the Root River, which is already polluted, and Waukesha does not currently have the ability to treat the water to the standard required to even get a permit to do so. Waukesha's return flow plan endangers fisheries and aquatic life.

By not including an exhaustive list of alternatives to Great Lakes water in its application, Waukesha is not following the requirements under the Great Lakes Compact. Waukesha's diversion plan is a lose-lose situation for its residents and the Great Lakes.

With so much at stake across the region, I urge you to deny Waukesha's request for Great Lakes water.

Thank you,

John Olsan

Form Email #3

Approximately 388 Received

Dear Ms. Hoekstra,

I'm writing to ask that you deny the City of Waukesha's request for Great Lakes water.

Waukesha residents deserve clean, safe drinking water. However, the City of Waukesha has yet to prove that its plan to divert water from Lake Michigan is truly a last resort. The City's application should not be approved under the rules of the Great Lakes Compact.

More than 40 Wisconsin communities have faced the same radium problem as the City of Waukesha and have simply treated their water to meet safe drinking water standards. Waukesha has that same option available and is unfortunately ignoring this simple solution that will address its radium problem sooner than a Great Lakes diversion, while saving its residents money.

The City of Waukesha's proposal to divert water remains incomplete and inconsistent with the Great Lakes Compact, even after a 5-year application process. For example, the City includes towns in Waukesha County (Pewaukee and the Towns of Delafield and Waukesha, among others) that may not need water. To date, none of the communities in this "extended service area" have demonstrated that they are without adequate supplies of safe drinking water. In fact, some officials in these areas have indicated that they do not need any water either now or in the foreseeable future. Including these communities in the application is not consistent with the Great Lakes Compact.

The City of Waukesha has not done enough to put water conservation plans in place, nor have the surrounding communities Waukesha includes in its application. The City has missed out on at least 5.5 millions of gallons of water savings since 2012 by failing to establish rebate programs for high-efficiency toilets, showerheads, and spray rinse valves that would have helped to curtail water use AND save customers money. This is something many other cities around the country have done with great success — the City has no excuse for not implementing those programs.

With so much at stake across the region, I urge you to deny the City of Waukesha's application.

Thank you,

Peter Doval

Form Letter # 4

Approximately 10 Received

To whom it may concern at the Department of Natural Resources:

I oppose the Waukesha Diversion Water Plan because:

- My home is in the flood plain of the Root River and the plan would cause an increased threat of flooding.
- I am concerned about unidentified pollutants in the river.
- Waukesha doesn't need the water. They have enough now if they stopped wasting it.
- This is not for the people of Waukesha because they have wells. It's for people who want to make money in the future.
- Waukesha can use different methods to get water but this is the cheapest.
- This plan could cause serious problems for the future of Lake Michigan and all of the Great Lakes.
- This is not a problem for Waukesha right now.
- The Waukesha Diversion Plan does not meet the criteria to be considered for an exception to the Great Lakes Water Compact.

Form Letter # 5

Approximately 67 Received

Dear DNR,

As a resident of the Great Lakes region, I support the protection of the Great Lakes as a vital natural resource and a national treasure. The Great Lakes provide the foundation of our identity as a region. The City of Waukesha's request for Great Lakes water threatens that identity. I urge the DNR to deny Waukesha's application to divert Great Lakes water for the following reasons:

- Waukesha's application does not pass legal muster under the federally ratified Great Lakes Compact.
- Waukesha has a safe, sustainable and treatable water supply available to its residents that does not require using water from the Great Lakes.
- Investing in existing infrastructure is the cheapest, fastest and safest option for Waukesha to meet radium and public health standards by 2018.

Sincerely,

PRINT NAME Gregory Dieck SIGNATURE Gregory Dieck
ADDRESS E 2326 CRANDALL CITY WONEGON
ZIP 53968 PHONE 608-415-9417 EMAIL G.DIECK@CENTURYTEL.NET

RECEIVED-DNR

AUG 28 2015

DRINKING WATER & GW

From Email #6

Approximately 32 Received

July 27, 2015

Ashley Hoekstra

DNR Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater

Box 7921

Madison, WI 53707-7921

DNRWaukeshaDiversionApp@wisconsin.gov

Ms. Hoekstra,

I submit this comment in support of the City of Waukesha's application for Lake Michigan water. Based upon the City's Application and detailed scientific evidence and extensive modeling studies, I believe that Lake Michigan water is the only reasonable water supply alternative for the City, because it the most protective of public health, the least likely to have adverse environmental impacts, the most reliable, and the most sustainable long-term water source.

☐ **Waukesha's proposal will have no impact on Great Lakes levels.** Waukesha has proposed returning no less than 100% of the volume of withdrawn water.

☐ **Waukesha is not a precedent for diversions that could threaten the Great Lakes.** If Waukesha is given access to water, that will *not* change the line on future diversions. The line was drawn in 2008, when the Great Lakes Compact became law. U.S. Congress ratified the agreement between the Great Lakes states and Canadian provinces that prohibits water from going beyond counties that straddle the Great Lakes basin divide.

☐ **Waukesha's return flow will improve the quality of the Root River.** Return flow water quality will meet all state and federal water quality limits. In some cases, return flow to the Root River will actually *improve* water quality in the river.

☐ **Adding to the flow of the Root River would improve the level of the Root River,** particularly during fall spawning runs of salmon and trout. Since 1966, the base flow of the Root River has been reported to be too low to support water quality, recreation, and fisheries goals in the watershed. The DNR and Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission have previously explored adding to the volume of water in the river, but until now have been unable to augment the river's flow because the costs were too high. During the summer and fall, some sections have very low flow, which does not support functional habitat and water quality for fish.

☒ There will be no risk of a sewer overflow to the Great Lakes from Waukesha.

☒ Continuing to pull water from the deep aquifer for Waukesha is environmentally irresponsible.

Waukesha's primary water source, the deep aquifer, is already down 400 to 600 feet and as the aquifer continues to decline, the water becomes brackish, like salt water. Contaminants such as radium, a known carcinogen, also increase with declining water levels. Continued pumping until the resource is exhausted is environmentally irresponsible and not sustainable for the long term.

☒ Waukesha is not requesting Lake Michigan water to fuel development. In Waukesha's service area approximately 70% of the land is developed; 15% is designated as environmentally protected; and only 15% is available for new development.

☒ The City of Oak Creek, Wisconsin, a community with an established water utility and excess water pumping capacity, has agreed to sell water to Waukesha. By selling water to Waukesha the ratepayers of Oak Creek can realize lower rates and increased inter-governmental cooperation. The Oak Creek/Waukesha agreement is an excellent example of how governments can work together to efficiently utilize taxpayer assets.

The Boerke Company, Inc. Commercial Real Estate 731 N Jackson Street, Suite 700 Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202 (414) 347-1000 • Fax (414) 347-1606 • www.boerke.com

☒ Waukesha needs a reliable water supply for the long term. Waukesha examined many water supply alternatives. All the others have greater adverse environmental impacts and are less protective of public health. A Lake Michigan supply would sustainably provide a reliable water supply for the long term.

As a commercial real estate professional, I can attest to the importance of a robust economy in Waukesha County. This is not only a pressing concern for the long term economic viability of the City of Waukesha, but to a greater extent, the region as a whole. I urge for the approval of the City of Waukesha's application for Lake Michigan water and I can think of no greater challenge that the community of Waukesha needs to overcome.

Please feel free to contact me with any further questions at jhoffman@boerke.com or (414)203-3038.

Sincerely,

Jeff Hoffman

Principal

Cushman & Wakefield | The Boerke Company, Inc.

Form Email #7

Approximately 1068 Received

Aug 12, 2015

Ashley Hoekstra
Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921

Subject: Deny the Waukesha Diversion

Dear Ms. Hoekstra Ashley Hoekstra,

The Great Lakes Compact was signed in order to protect one of our country's most important resources - the Great Lakes. The Compact ensures that all Great Lakes states and provinces work together to manage and protect the lakes. One of the requirements of the Great Lakes Compact is that water is not diverted unless there is a need that meets very strong requirements. The City of Waukesha's application does not show this critical need.

The Great Lakes Compact also requires the City of Waukesha show that there is no alternative, including water conservation efforts, to taking Great Lakes water. The City of Waukesha's application does not meet any of these conditions in the following ways: First, the City of Waukesha has requested an excessive amount of water and included a number of communities in its proposal in order to justify the request. Additionally, a combination of a local water supplies and water conservation efforts would provide enough water for the City--there is no reason to approve a diversion from the Great Lakes for this purpose. Finally, the proposal to return the water through the Root River poses a number of concerns, including elevated levels of phosphorous--so much so that it could violate the Clean Water Act.

While I do think it is important to ensure the City of Waukesha has a reliable, clean and safe drinking supply - the City has an alternative to the Great Lakes that it needs to use first. For these reasons, I do not believe the application meets the requirements in the Great Lakes Compact and urge you to deny the diversion request. Thank you for taking the time to listen to my comments about the request.

Thank you for your time,
Ms. Elizabeth Ward

Form Email # 8

Approximately 223 Received

Aug 13, 2015

Wisconsin DNR
WI

Subject: Please Oppose Waukesha Diversion

Dear Wisconsin DNR,

I love our permanent puddle here in Wisconsin, and strongly support the protection of the Great Lakes as a vital natural resource and a national treasure. The Great Lakes provide the foundation of our identity as a region. The City of Waukesha's request for Great Lakes water undermines that identity. I urge the WIDNR to deny Waukesha's application to divert Great Lakes water for the following reasons:

1. Waukesha's application does not pass legal muster under the federally ratified Great Lakes Compact.
2. Waukesha has a safe and sustainable water supply available to its residents that does not require using water from the Great Lakes.
3. Investing in existing infrastructure is the cheapest, fastest and safest option for Waukesha to meet radium and public health standards.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Brown