



## League of Women Voters of Minnesota Records

### **Copyright Notice:**

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit [www.mnhs.org/copyright](http://www.mnhs.org/copyright).

Our mayor sent us This resolution  
adopted this January by the Hennepin  
County League of Municipalities  
Brooklyn Center

2. Metropolitan Sanitary District

WHEREAS, the problem of adequate sewage disposal in the Metropolitan Area is becoming increasingly urgent; and

WHEREAS, this problem is metropolitan in scope, and calls for a metropolitan solution,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Hennepin County League of Municipalities urges the Legislature of the State of Minnesota to enact appropriate legislation which would set up an areawide authority to handle sewage disposal.

The area to be served would be all or parts of the Seven County Metropolitan Area encompassing the counties of Hennepin, Ramsey, Anoka, Washington, Dakota, Carver, and Scott.

This authority shall have a governing body whose members shall be directly elected on a one man one vote basis with representative districts based upon legislative districts.

The authority would have full powers to operate a sewage disposal system, with the power to apportion capital and maintenance costs. The new authority should buy out existing facilities along the lines agreed to by the SSSC and the City of Minneapolis. Capital Expenditures should be met by a combination of ad valorem taxes, charges for design capacity requirements in the Year 2000, and charges for measured sewage flow. Type II Bonds shall be used and distance from disposal plants shall not be a factor in determining charges.

Regional sewage disposal plants can be built and operated by the sewage authority where deemed economically feasible and advisable.

Operational and maintenance charges, at least initially, should be based on measured sewage flow.

In the event that a Metropolitan Multi-Purpose Service District is created by the Legislature, the functions and power of this authority shall be incorporated into such a Metropolitan Multi-Purpose Service District.

December 1966

Report to LWV of MINNESOTA Office on  
Metropolitan Sanitary District Study conducted by  
LWV of Minneapolis, November 1966

I) "Did your League use this Sanitary District material? How did you use it?"

The Sanitary District study was sent to all those on the Minneapolis subscription list as well as to unit chairmen and water resource delegates from the units. Resource members from each of the city's 42 units were also sent discussion outlines similar to those provided by the State Office showing how they could combine discussion of the national incentives topic with discussion of the sanitary district. Unit chairmen and resource delegates were invited to the October 12 Forum held by the Minneapolis League on the topic of the Metropolitan Sewage District. Report forms were sent to each unit asking how much time the unit had spent on the District topic; which of the sub-topics they had discussed, and what the major concerns of the unit membership were following review of the District proposals.

32 of 42 units returned completed report forms: of these 25 spent between 1/2 hour and 45 minutes on the District topic; 9 spent over an hour on it. 365 members were in attendance at the 34 unit meetings for which we have reports.

II) "How did you use this Sanitary District material in your community?"

The study has been sent out to all members of the Metropolitan Affairs Committee of the Minnesota House, members of the City Council, members of the Mpls-St Paul Sanitary District Board and others whose professional concern or organizational interest have elicited their public interest in a Sanitary District.

On October 12, the Minneapolis League held a public forum on the topic of the "Future of the Metropolitan Sewage District," attended by State Board members as well as by 65 other guests of the Minneapolis League and by our own unit chairmen and resource members. Newspaper coverage in two metropolitan papers was given the forum.

On November 22, KUOM's "Listen with the League" radio program featured Mrs. Hively, Minneapolis chairman, interviewing Representative Howard R. Albertson on the topic of "The Future of the Metropolitan Sanitary District in the '67 Legislature." A tape of that program is available from Mrs. Hively.

III) "What are the major concerns of your members after reviewing the District proposals? Did your members reach agreement on solutions within the areas of concern?"

An overwhelming majority of the units expressed concern that some form of metropolitan district be established (24 of 34 units reporting--only 1 of the remaining 10 reported negative reaction).

"Forecasted increase of population with concomitant increase in volume and strength of sewage effluent demand present metropolitan action." "We doubt that small suburban groups can do the job." "Planning should include the 7-county area to the year 2000--deadlines should be given to local communities by which dates they may hook up to a plant or plants." "The district should decide the feasibility of a single plant versus regional plants the important

thing is that the single versus regional plant controversy not stall action and that standards be met by either alternative chosen."

Within this general agreement were reported the following specific comments:

- 7 units said that the Lake Minnetonka area should be included in the district
- 4 units said South St. Paul should be included
- 5 units said that a multi-purpose metropolitan district should be the long-run solution, with the Sanitary Board responsible to it
- 3 units said that the administration of a Sanitary District should be made up of a combination of professionals and laymen. Appointive officials preferable to elected (1 unit says elected preferred) between 11 and 16 delegates representing municipalities equally (?)
- 3 units favored full use of a user basis for financing. 2 favored use of a property tax for capital financing. 1 favored compromise plan of the Mpls-St Paul District Board reported in Nov. 28 Mpls papers--primarily favoring user fee
- 1 unit pro and 1 unit con "buy out" provision of past bills
- 1 unit pro use of all funds possible from state and federal sources while 1 unit says use local funds and control where possible
- 2 units for effluent charge
- 1 unit says district must have taxing power
  
- 3 units reported interest in further study of a) reuse of water; b) possibility of burning sewage to produce milorganite; c) use of salvaged effluent for nutrients.

Mrs. Wells Hively II  
Water Resources Chairman, Mpls.



COPY

FILE COPY  
COPY

Village of Brooklyn Center

Administrative Office  
7100 Osseo Road  
Brooklyn Center, Minnesota 55429  
Telephone 561-5440

December 2, 1966

Mrs. Martha Pryor, President  
Brooklyn Center League of Women Voters  
6231 Lee Avenue North  
Brooklyn Center, Minnesota 55429

Dear Mrs. Pryor:

As was indicated in his letter of November 29, 1966, Mayor Cohen has referred a copy of "A Metropolitan Sanitary District '67?" to me for my comments. I have reviewed the report and even though I have been quite familiar with the many elements contained within the report I was amazed at the concise, understandable manner in which these elements have been presented in the report. As Mr. Cohen indicated, I have been active for a number of years as a Brooklyn Center representative to the Suburban Sanitary Sewer Commission which Commission was recently successful in consummating a favorable two year sewage rate negotiation with the City of Minneapolis. As an integral part of such rate negotiations it was necessary to discuss and develop equitable principles related to sewage flow and disposal and it is my opinion that many of the principles which evolved from these negotiations can well be applied to a Metropolitan Sanitary District concept.

Since 1961 the Brooklyn Center Council and I, as Village Engineer, have concurred with and supported the concept of a Metropolitan Sanitary District. In 1963 we were active through our legislative representation and we made appearance in the halls of the Legislature to support Metropolitan Sanitary District because it is going to cost Brooklyn Center more than will the present contract system. However, it has been my view since 1961 that when we look beyond the specific matter of sewage costs, when we consider the degree of prosperity which the Twin Cities area has been enjoying and which we desire to perpetuate into the future, and if we accept the premise that prosperity is very closely allied with growth and development, then it is my opinion that it is essential that elements such as adequate and economical sewerage facilities be provided to sustain the growth and development upon which our prosperity partially depends. In other words if we obstruct the flow of construction and development monies in our metropolitan area by not providing necessary sewage facilities, it is my opinion we will adversely affect our prosperity.

There has been a great deal of bickering and self interest prevailing relative to a Metropolitan Sanitary District. The central cities have for years enjoyed the handsome revenue yielding aspect of the sewage contract system, while the suburbs have been seeking to terminate such subsidies to the central cities and at the same time have sought to protect their individual self interests. Because of these self interests, and because of the divergent opinions relative to buy-back of existing facilities, advalorem versus use type of financing, regional versus central disposal, representation on a district governing body, etc, it seemed to be the consensus of Brooklyn Center officials during the 1965 legislative session that we should support any reasonable Metropolitan Sanitary District legislation on the presumption

COPY

COPY

Mrs. Martha Pryor  
December 2, 1966  
Page 2

that once passed and established, many of the sanitary district details could later be ironed out within the framework. As indicated in the report, the 1965 Metropolitan Sanitary District legislation held promise of success but was not quite able to make the grade; as I recall, one of the elements contributing to the failure were the obstacles presented by the "local consent" laws of the State.

It is my opinion that the goals relative to a Metropolitan Sanitary District during the 1967 legislative session might well consist of agreeing upon and establishing a basic framework of financing and governing structure, and that further details be worked out by that governing structure, consistent with sociological goals and economics.

There seems to be wide agreement that a Metropolitan Sanitary District should eventually become an element of a larger metropolitan organization which might be responsible for coordination, budget review, and policy control over a number of area-type functions. Brooklyn Center officials and particularly Mayor Cohen generally endorse the concept of an area-type organization or "super" government which would provide those services which cannot be reasonably provided by individual municipalities and counties. It is my personal opinion that the function of such a metropolitan government should be limited to just services, and that the concept of metropolitan government should not be considered a panacea; size of governmental structure and magnitude of its control is certainly not synonymous with efficiency and economy as can be exemplified by Los Angeles County, California, Cook County, Illinois, and Dade County, Florida "super" governments. I think it is important also that metropolitan government should not be considered a prerequisite to a need as immediate as a Metropolitan Sanitary District; it is my opinion that a Metropolitan Sanitary District, if created prior to the development of a metropolitan government, can well be designed to ultimately submit to metropolitan government control.

Sincerely yours,

(Signature)

Donald G. Poss  
Village Administrator  
VILLAGE OF BROOKLYN CENTER

PLEASE READ THIS THROUGH FIRST!

**FILE COPY**

League of Women Voters of Minneapolis  
84 S. 6th St. Room 414 333-6319

WATER RESOURCES TOPIC, November 1966

THE TWO PARTS OF THE NOVEMBER WATER TOPIC:

The Water Resources topic is divided into two sections: the first is a consideration of financial incentives to industry for abating water pollution, a study directed by National to include the taking of a consensus; the second is a consideration of current proposals for a Twin Cities Metropolitan Sanitary District, a study prepared on the metropolitan level as background for League members interested in following the activities of the '67 legislature in this field. Consensus sheets on the first topic must be filled in and sent to the Minneapolis Office by December 1. Completed report forms with members' general comments on the Sanitary District should be filled in and sent with the consensus sheets to the Office.

MATERIAL INCLUDED FOR UNIT PRESENTATION:

The following material is included in this kit for use in presenting the material on industrial incentives:

CURRENT REVIEW OF WATER RESOURCES #3, August '66, "A Consideration of Federal Financial Incentives to Industry for Abating Water Pollution."

FACTS AND ISSUES, April, 1966, "Who Pays for a Clean Stream?" (sent out to local subscription list as well)

3 pages of ADDENDA TO INDUSTRIAL INCENTIVES MATERIAL prepared by the local resource committee to supplement the CURRENT REVIEW.

Consensus sheet (2 copies) on Financial Incentives to Industry (sent out to every member with her November LOG).

Every member has already received her August NATIONAL VOTER with its lead article on "Seeking New Waterways."

Make sure that your unit members are told in advance of the November meeting to bring their August VOTER and consensus sheets from the LOG with them to the meeting.

The following material is included in this kit for use in presenting the material on a Metropolitan Sanitary District:

A METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT IN '67?, A Review of Past and Present Proposals for a Twin Cities Metropolitan Sewage District (sent out to local subscription list as well)

Report form on member interest in and comments on the MSD presentation.

The Resource Committee strongly recommends that each unit have at least two people present the Water Topic. The first person could give the introduction, describe the forms of incentives under consideration for federal and state legislation, and argue the pro side for these incentives. The second person could argue the con side against such incentives, and present the Metropolitan Sanitary District material.

**BRIEFING:** OCTOBER 12, Open Meeting, 9:30 AM, Minneapolis Public Library, Room 253.

'What Future Does the '67 Legislature Hold for the Metropolitan Sanitary District?' Keynoted by Representative Howard R. Albertson, Chairman of the House Metropolitan Affairs Committee, a panel representing a wide range of viewpoints will discuss metropolitan



sewage needs. The panelists are Sam Hobbs, Bloomington City Engineer; Eugene Avery, Chief Engineer of St. Paul; Donald Thimsen, Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission; Verne Johnson, Citizens League.

Metropolitan Leaguers and representatives from the legislature, city council, and interested civic groups have been invited to attend our briefing.

Note: The topic of industrial incentives will not be discussed at the briefing. The material supplied by National seems to be very complete on this topic. There also is no expert on the subject in this area whose elaboration of the material would be worth briefing time. If, however, you have questions about the incentives material after reading through it, either 1) go through the book called INDUSTRIAL INCENTIVES FOR WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT prepared by the Institute of Public Administration, N.Y., 1965 available at the Minneapolis League office, or 2) call the local resource chairman, Janet Hively, 332-3608.

#### OUTLINE FOR UNIT DISCUSSION:

The unit discussion outline which follows has been prepared for the majority of the Minneapolis units which have one meeting a month, lasting between 1½ and 2 hours. Those units which meet twice a month would clearly handle the incentives topic at one meeting and the Sanitary District topic at the second.

#### (5 minutes) Background of the League in Water

It might go like this... "The League of Women Voters has been concerned with the problems of water management since the topic was first put on the national study agenda in 1954. In 1960 we decided upon the following consensus:

"Support of national policies and procedures which promote comprehensive long-range planning for conservation and development of water resources and improvement of water quality. Among these policies are: a) better coordination and elimination of conflicts in basic policy at the federal level; b) machinery appropriate to each region which provides coordinated planning and administration; c) cost sharing by government and private interests in relation to benefits received and ability to pay."

"Since 1960 we have worked on the national level for several effective pieces of legislation including the Water Research Act, the Water Resources Planning Act and the Water Quality Act of 1965. Large federal grants are now available for planning and construction of municipal treatment plant facilities and for regional river basin planning commissions. Stream standards are now being established for all the major waterways of the country; here in Minnesota the Water Pollution Control Commission has established standards for the Mississippi from Anoka to Hastings and for the Minnesota River and is holding hearings on standards for other of the state's waterways. A major problem throughout the country, however, is still created by industrial wastes.

"The topic of governmental incentives to encourage industry to clean up its effluent will take the first hour of tonight's discussion. We will answer consensus questions concerning which, if any, of those incentives we prefer so that the National Board can lobby according to our opinions on the many pieces of legislation before Congress proposing such incentives.

"On the local level, we did a background study last December on Water Resources Management in the Minneapolis area. A relatively large number of members reported interest in further study of Metropolitan Sewage District proposals, which have been coming before our state legislature unsuccessfully in each session since 1961. Since the metropolitan sewage problem has been described as 'one of the two major issues to come before

the '67 legislature' and since all of the forces concerned are now busily aligning themselves behind one or another proposal or compromise in preparation for the session, we will present information concerning the current District proposals during the last half-hour of the meeting. The information is derived from a study just published through the State LWV by an Ad Hoc Metropolitan Water Resources Committee of the League."

Questions.....

(10 minutes) What Methods have been proposed to motivate industry to reduce pollution?

The Resource Committee suggests that you make a list of methods on a large piece of poster board, dividing them into two categories as "carrots" (financial helps) and "sticks" (penalties for industrial polluters). Explain the meaning of each method listed. See page 4 of CURRENT REVIEW when compiling this visual aid.

"Carrots"

Grants  
Loans (interest-free, low interest,  
guarantee of private loans)  
Accelerated Depreciation or fast  
tax write-off  
Investment tax credit

"Sticks"

Stricter enforcement  
User charges  
Effluent charges

Questions.....

(30 minutes) The pros and cons

One of the resource people takes each side, using pro-con arguments listed in August NATIONAL VOTER, p. 2 and CURRENT REVIEW, pages 10-19.

(15 minutes) Consensus

It might be a wise idea to take your coffee break between these sections.

(30 minutes) Sanitary District Proposals

The Committee decided that any attempt to cover the History section of the study was impossible in this time period. Please encourage the members, however, to read the whole paper themselves. The following order of presentation does not follow the order of the study, but, the Committee felt, was the simplest way of presenting the material to the uninitiated.

1. Geographical area. Using the outline of the regions shown on the front cover, describe the difference between the six regions of the Five-Year Study and the four regions of the present bills. Using inside map show them the comparative limits of service between the present and the year 2000. Suggest the South St. Paul and Lake Minnetonka problems.
2. Single versus Regional plant. Outline the present arguments for each, and the possibility of compromise.
3. Financing. Outline the two GENERAL methods of financing --- the differences between capital cost formulas of apportionment---and the arguments for each. Mention the two main proposals (St. Paul Sewer Study Committee and '65 amended Ashbach bill) supporting each of the methods.

4. Administration. You probably won't have time (or the members' patience) to get too specific in this section. I would mention the method of appointing Board in Ashbach Bill and Citizens League proposals and ask the questions asked by the material about these methods. Mention multi-district metropolitan government plans, and end on the note that each of the members will undoubtedly see much more in the papers both about the metropolitan government plans and the sanitary district proposals.

## Minneapolis LWV Water Resources Committee

Mrs. Wells Hively, Chrm.	332-3608
Mrs. Lawrence Conroy	336-0769
Mrs. David Kienitz	722-6153
Mrs. John Mason	377-5238
Mrs. Theodore Olson	722-6902
Mrs. Richard Purple	335-2722
Mrs. John Smiley	824-0606
Mrs. Hjalmar Storlie	926-5147
Mrs. Donald L. Swanson	339-5238



League of Women Voters of Minneapolis  
84 S. 6th St. Room 414 333-6319

**ERROR!** In Sanitary District resource paper, page 18, 3rd paragraph, last sentence, change the word "above" to below."

**FOR UNIT MEMBERS HANDLING THE NOVEMBER WATER RESOURCE TOPIC**

The future of metropolitan sanitary district legislation is affected by a **major court** decision made on October 20 by Anoka County District Court Judge Robert Gillespie. With reference to pp. 17 and 18 of the League's Sanitary District review, Judge Gillespie has declared that the prohibition by the Water Pollution Control Commission against sewage treatment plants on the Mississippi above Pig's Eye Island is invalid.

The Court stated that the WPCC prohibition is "not lawful, not reasonable and not warranted by the evidence....The Court has concluded that the WPCC has arbitrarily and capriciously exercised its will and not its judgment by insisting that no sewage treatment plant can discharge any effluent unto these public waters, regardless of the efficiency of treatment or the quality of the effluent."

"The evidence established that the obvious need for protection of public health, which concerns the Court as much as it does the Commission, is more than amply served by the remaining standards which the Court has affirmed." Gillespie said the North Suburban Sanitary Sewer District (NSSSD) should apply to the WPCC for a permit to build a proposed \$18 million plant in Fridley.

The ruling will undoubtedly have a major impact on the suit of Bloomington, Burnsville and Eagan against the WPCC's prohibition of permanent treatment plants on the Minnesota River.

When the NSSD initiated its case against the WPCC in 1963, it did so because it assumed that the cost of building a regional treatment plant would be less than that of joining a metropolitan district served by a single plant. The same assumption has been made by communities on the Minnesota River. A spokesman for the WPCC states that "If these regional plants are built, the communities discharging effluent to them would not wish to assume any additional expense by joining any form of metropolitan district. We would n probably continue serving the remainder of the suburbs on the present contract basis from Pig's Eye, and the future of a metropolitan district would be eliminated."

In the opinion of the WPCC, however, the NSSD will wait to apply for a permit to build a regional plant until it sees what the '67 state legislature does about a metropolitan district. The legislature may initiate a district plan which will prove itself to be cheaper in the long run than regional plant construction to the north and southwest suburban communities. Since long-range cost comparisons between regional and single plant plans are already disputed as to which is actually cheaper, it may well be that the legislature can still convince the outlying suburbs of the merits of a metropolitan sanitary district despite the impact of the Anoka Court decision.



**FILE COPY**

League of Women Voters of Minneapolis  
84 S. 6th St. Room 414 333-6319

November 1966

REPORT FORM ON WATER RESOURCES

Metropolitan Sanitary District Study

DATE DUE IN OFFICE: December 1, 1966

BOARD RESOURCE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Wells Hively 332-3608

Date of Meeting \_\_\_\_\_

Unit # \_\_\_\_\_

Number of members in unit \_\_\_\_\_

Number of members present \_\_\_\_\_

How much time did you spend on the Metropolitan Sanitary District presentation?

Were you able to touch upon each of the following sub-topics?

Geographical area?

Single versus regional plant?

Financing?

Administration?

What were the major concerns expressed by your members following review of the Metropolitan Sanitary District proposals?

WHAT WERE THE MAJOR CONCERNS OF YOUR MEMBERS AFTER REVIEWING THE SANITARY DISTRICT PROPOSAL? DID THEY REACH AGREEMENT ON SOLUTIONS IN AREAS OF CONCERN? WHAT WERE THEIR DECISIONS? HOW STRONG WAS THE AGREEMENT?

There was an almost total agreement that a Metropolitan Sewer District is or soon would become necessary and that our area should be included. Some of the reasons were; 1. Handling this problem at a municipal level would make it less likely that the state or federal government would have to assume control. 2. definite aesthetic advantages - cleaner streams. 3. existing facilities authorities are not strong enough to enforce standards and these standards may be lowered or ignored in the future. We would have better enforcement of entire area if it were governed by one agency.

REGIONAL VS SINGLE: There was general agreement that either a single or regional plant concept would be acceptable. Most members felt they were not able to decide which system would be best this should be decided by experts.

ADMINISTRATION: No agreement was reached on board representation. Strong concern was expressed for fair representation with these suggestions; Mpls-St Paul should not have a permanent no. of representatives. Representation should be reviewed periodically. Board should consist of both qualified professionals and laymen/ and be appointed by areas.

FINANCING: Members not convinced that 'buying out existing facilities' was necessary. Also not entirely willing to pay extra to include South St Paul and Minnetonka area. One group offered this solution regarding financing. Capital improvements within a sub-district, ie NESSD or NW, N, and SE, should be paid by special assessment to that area only. This could be a solution to the buying out problem and the inclusion of the Minnetonka area since each area would be responsible for their own cost of interceptors, etc. A combination of a service charge and a general tax should be used by the sub district to pay its assessment to the MSD. Each sub district could decide its own method of collection necessary funds.

MEMO TO: All Metropolitan Area Leagues  
FROM: Mrs. Grady Mann, State Water Resources Chairman

Metropolitan Sanitary District Study

Background: In July you received a copy of Minnesota's letter to the national Board concerning the possibility of action under the national Water position at the 1967 State Legislature. In August you received a memo quoting the national Board's answer to the effect that a specific consensus of the metropolitan Leagues would be necessary. At that time you were notified of a meeting of the Ad Hoc Water Committee on August 29.

Ten Leagues sent representatives to the meeting. Additional Leagues expressed interest in a Sanitary District study. It was decided at the meeting that neither time nor Program procedures would permit a consensus study. However, with the permission of the state Board, the Ad Hoc Metropolitan Committee is preparing a background study.

The Resource Publication: This publication will be available October 1. The length will be about 20 pages. The cost will be 50¢. One copy will be sent each League. For additional copies fill in the enclosed order form. To ensure your receiving your copies promptly, return the form by September 26.

Outline of the Paper: History of Sanitary District Proposals. Contrast of two major current proposals. Areas of legislative compromise (geographical area to be included, representation, regional vs. single plant, financing).

Use of the Publication: There will be no consensus. A cover sheet will be attached to the publication suggesting various possibilities for its use: for a single unit meeting in combination with the national study, as an extra unit meeting, as background for a legislative meeting, as background for Program-making. There will be a report sheet to be returned to the state Board by February 1. This report form will simply ask you whether or not you used the material, and if so, how and what were your reactions.

October 12: Open Meeting, 9:30 a.m., Room 253, Minneapolis Public Library:  
What Future Does the '67 Legislature Hold for the Metropolitan Sanitary District? Keynoted by Representative Howard R. Albertson, Chairman of the House Metropolitan Affairs Committee, a panel representing a wide range of viewpoints will discuss metropolitan sewerage needs. The panelists are Sam Hobbs, Bloomington city engineer; Eugene E. Avery, chief engineer of St. Paul, Department of Public Works; Donald Thimsen, Minnesota Water Control Commission; and a representative from the Citizens League. Water Resource chairmen will want to attend this interesting meeting. All other League members or their friends are welcome. Further notice will be sent to all metropolitan League presidents.

-----  
ORDER FORM: The LWV of \_\_\_\_\_ wants \_\_\_\_\_  
copies of Metropolitan Sewerage District - 1967?.

Send to:

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Return to the state office by September 26. For additional information phone Janet Hively, 332-3608.



## FILE COPY

Memo

To: Annette, Lois, Pat, Irene

From: Elc

Report of meeting held on August 29 to discuss the metropolitan water problem

Meeting was chaired by Janet Hively of Minneapolis. Leagues represented were St. Louis Park, Fridley, Brooklyn Park, Bloomington, Minnetonka, Columbia Heights, Robbinsdale and several people from Minneapolis's item committee.

19 Leagues had returned postcards. All who responded indicated interest in the topic....3 or 4 Leagues were somewhat dubious.

Janet presented three alternatives:

1. an ad hoc committee could prepare resource material and write consensus questions, evaluation to be done by the state Board.
2. material could be sent out to increase member understanding, but no consensus would be asked for. Possibility for lobbying open, but statements would have to be general and quite likely we would not be able to do anything at all.
3. the whole project could be dropped.

A general discussion followed: the general level of membership knowledge, the amount of time available to local Leagues, the amount of detail members could be expected to absorb, the level of member interest was explored.

Everyone present indicated high interest and desire for action. Reservations were expressed on whether members could reach a meaningful consensus, on whether we would be bypassing the normal program making process in asking for a consensus.

Sue Seymore, representing Bloomington, discussed the general position CMAL has on intergovernmental cooperation and its possible application to water. The concept of single-purpose special districts was tossed back and forth---as it may apply to transportation and sewerage.

The decision of the group was: 1. The resource committee will go ahead and prepare material, cost 50¢, to be sent to each League. 2. There will be a general briefing session on metropolitan sewerage sponsored by Minneapolis with all Leagues invited: speakers suggested included the attorneys for Bloomington and Fridley, someone from the MPC, someone from the water-pollution control board, several legislators. 3. The decision on whether there should be consensus questions, what these questions should be, whether there should be information questions designed to help the state in lobbying, or whether there should be no questions at all was deferred to the state Board and CMAL's executive committee.

The reasonings behind these decisions was that if they accomplished nothing else they would be increasing member-understanding of a major metropolitan problem, that the group was not representative enough to make a decision on consensus, that the state Board with its responsibility for lobbying and CMAL with its responsibility for metropolitan problems should have the final determination, that the legislature might not take action this session or might pass a very general kind of bill setting up a metropolitan commission but leaving real organization to the next session so more detailed action might be possible later and we would have laid the ground work for a second resource piece. CMAL is opposed probably.



2/8/65

As you know, water conservation has once more been elevated to an active item on our national agenda. "Water", both as a study item and as a substance does not seem to respect political boundaries. The problems created by water and its use are solved by local, metropolitan, state and national governments. Thus, the League of Women Voters finds itself working on a national item which frequently "runs over" onto other levels of government. (No pun intended.)

Five years ago the Minneapolis League of Women Voters asked permission of the state board of the LWV to lobby in favor of a bill which would have created a metropolitan sanitary district. The state board, in turn, requested permission of the national board for the Minneapolis League to go ahead with this lobbying. The national board replied that the Minneapolis League could not do anything with this item until they had the agreement of the suburban leagues and the "Concurrence" of the outstate leagues.

As a result, two of us were sent as "observers" to the legislature to hear about and watch over this bill.

The bill would have had the Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District sell their property to a Metropolitan Sanitary District. The new Metropolitan District would have included representatives from the suburbs and have pushed along planning for the expansion of the present district for the entire metropolitan area. (This is considerably cheaper than building cesspools for every house and putting in sewers later. Not so messy either.)

Needless to say, plenty of controversy arose over who would have how many representatives, how rates would be set, who would be included in the district (Shakopee wanted "out" one day and "in" the next), and how much should be charged for the present plant, built in 1930.

Further complications were created by certain northern suburbs who wished to build a disposal plant on the Mississippi River, which ran by their boundaries. Minneapolis understandably did not want their supply of water, drawn out of the Mississippi only half a mile upstream from the disposal plant, polluted. The sewage effluent would have emptied into the pool created by the St. Anthony Dam and could conceivably be stored and backed up very nicely under these conditions.

This bill for the Metropolitan Sanitary District finally cleared the House but failed in the Senate.

It was perfectly obvious that some sort of solution was overdue, and during the period between the 1961 session of the legislature and the 1963 session of the legislature many hearings were held. Some legislators came to conclusions of their own. The 1963 session of the legislature saw the introduction and passage of the "Rosenmeier Bill". The so-called "Rosenmeier Bill" created a plan by which the central cities, St. Paul and Minneapolis, became the permanent governing bodies of the sewage disposal system. They made all the decisions and set the rates. Suburbs were allowed to appeal through the courts regarding rates. The Water Pollution Control Board of the state set and enforced standards for water purity.

The Rosenmeier Bill did not take into account that the central cities were not planning far enough ahead to help some of the suburbs who were already bogged down with rather serious sewage disposal problems. Parts of Minnetonka Village, for example, had homes which could not get loans under the FHA or VA provisions. The local government had no plans for sewage disposal systems and of course, the city was also quite indifferent to their problems.

The "Ashbach" bill was drawn up by Representative Ashbach to take care of this planning deficiency. The cities were required to draw plans which would show how they planned to serve the suburbs. These plans were to be reviewed by the Water Pollution Control Board and submitted to the 1965 legislature. Thus we arrive at 1965.

Will the present Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District, with only St. Paul and Minneapolis representatives, continue to be the dominant members of this board? Will the district be expanded to a metropolitan district with all members represented? Will the northern suburbs be permitted to build a disposal plant on the Mississippi?

These problems may be answered during this session of the state legislature. In the meantime, another problem has arisen. Minnetonka and certain other western suburbs wish to build a disposal plant on the Minnesota River. The question also concerns us because there has been talk which says, "If Minnetonka can put a disposal plant on the Minnesota River why can't Bloomington and Richfield?"

Let us consider the disposal plant on the Minnesota River for a minute or two. The following thoughts come to mind:

Pro 1. A disposal plant on the Minnesota River is much cheaper than piping all sewage a distance of several miles to the plant on Pig's Eye Island.

2. The central cities would no longer control the sewage disposal of the suburbs. Rates and expansion could be taken care of locally.

Con: 1. Any disposal plant is only about 90% efficient. Chicago has about 4,900,000 people and one of the most efficient disposal plants in the world. However, they still dump the equivalent of the untreated sewage of 490,000 people into the Chicago Canal every day!

2. The Minnesota River is no rushing torrent. When I asked the head of the Army Corps of Engineers how they kept nine feet of water in this river, he replied that the bottom of the Minnesota River was cut down until it was nine feet below the top of the Hastings Dam. Thus, the nine foot navigational channel on the Minnesota is actually created by the backed up pool of the Hastings Dam.

3. The state is proposing to create a very costly park at the junction of the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers. It is unlikely that this would be a very attractive park with one or more sewage plants located upstream. At testimony before the Water Pollution Board the game warden from the Hastings area testified that when he had to take his boat out on the lake behind the Hastings Dam in 1954, he had to row because there were so many fishermen it was impossible to use the motor. By 1964 there were no fishermen at all on this lake because contamination had not only ruined the game fishing, it had

polluted the water so that even rough fish who survived tasted of oily residue. The Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District never intended to overload their plant this way. The city just grew faster than they had planned. Such growth does not seem impossible for the suburbs. The latest Metropolitan Planning Commission estimates suggest that our population will grow from the present 1.5 million to 4.0 million by the year 2000 -- only 35 years away.

In Representative Kirchner's column of January 14 in the Richfield News he says, "There is a great deal of conversation among House members in regard to major metropolitan bills. The Water Pollution question seems to be boiling down to two viewpoints. There is a strong willingness among Suburban Hennepin Co. legislators to accept most of the recommendations of the Water Pollution Control Commission. They advocate a metropolitan sewer district that would include a seven county area surrounding Minneapolis and St. Paul. However, the Commission had advocated one disposal plant at Pig's Eye Island. This is not acceptable. Financial considerations make at least one sewer plant on the Minnesota River absolutely necessary. It is difficult to understand why this is not reasonable if the plant's standards of purification are high. Many millions of dollars would be saved by such plants. It is unlikely that there will ever be a great amount of swimming done on the Minnesota. The Commission seems determined to set a standard so high that it would be acceptable for swimming and almost for drinking."

The Minneapolis Star says in an editorial January 14 entitled, "Here We Go Again on Sewers", "For the third consecutive legislative session we are assured a major battle over a metropolitan sewerage system for the Twin Cities area. The action Monday by the Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District, rejecting the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission's proposal for an area-wide district, makes such struggle inevitable."

"Minneapolis and St. Paul will, of course, insist that the suburbs' interest in an areawide solution is nothing more than a raid on the central cities' tax base -- in which the inner cities, which have the systems "in and paid for", will help pay for new facilities from which they will not benefit."

"The fact that the metropolitan concept persistently will not "down", however, suggests that it may have more merit than the central cities are willing to acknowledge."

"In truth, the last 40 years constitute one long series of policy decisions not to build, or to abandon, small treatment plants on the rivers in the heart of our built-up area, in favor of one central, downstream, disposal plant."

"Minneapolis made this decision when it came time to stop dumping raw sewage into the Mississippi River in the mid-1930's. Edina later abandoned a treatment plant in its Country Club addition which had been discharging into Minnehaha Creek. Hopkins abandoned a treatment plant on Nine-mile Creek in 1947. North St. Paul gave up its local plant in order to join the central system in 1954. White Bear Lake made a similar decision in 1963."

"And the northern suburbs, joined together in a separate sanitary district for the construction of a trunk sewer system, are, as well, disposing of their wastes downstream."

"It is in the light of this history of policy that the new proposal from the southwestern suburbs -- to discharge effluent upstream on the Minnesota River -- needs to be viewed. Cost-sharing problems complicate the effort to continue such a policy now. But they should not override it."

How about it League members? What should our policy be?



## OFFICIAL TESTIMONY

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

FILE COPY

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota

For Presentation at the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Hearing Concerning the Winona Treatment Plant - October 20, 1971, Winona, Minnesota.

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota finds it very difficult to testify in favor of the combined Goodview-Winona sewage facility for several reasons.

Mainly we object to the variance which has been granted to the city. We have always testified against the granting of any variance except for an extension of time for compliance when necessary. We feel the state standards are fair. We can not go along with a philosophy that says that because the river is wide and the current strong, it is all right to dump something in it - in other words that old worn out slogan "the solution to pollution is dillution." Is not this, in effect, what you are advocating in this case?

At a national level, both in Congress, and specifically, to the Honorable John Blatnik, Chairman of Public Works, the League is lobbying for user charges levied on all wastes treated in jurisdictions granted federal funds for construction. Along with this goes our strong conviction that standards once set, must be met and enforced. This should always be true of a facility using both federal and state grants for construction. If the Winona plant has the capacity to include Goodview, we must assume it also has the capacity to meet the state standards. If it does not have capacity for both, then we would believe that meeting the state standards must come first. If it can do both, why should the variance be allowed to continue?

The other aspect of this situation which concerns us, is that this plant will not be a regional one, nor has the area been incorporated into a sewer district. We believe that this would be the best solution. We understand that there are other small towns in need of sewer facilities, and feel they should also be included at this time; including Homer, Rolling Stone, Minnesota City, and Winona and Wilson townships. Certainly now is the time, if possible, to begin to include all small towns and unincorporated areas into regional systems to prevent any further pollution of streams and ground water tables. Is it not better to form a district now, rather than have Goodview in a landlord-rent paying situation for sewer service? We certainly sympathize with the financial burden this type of construction might place on the city. However, federal and state funds are available for this initial construction. Therefore we recommend that a large regional facility that will serve the total area be considered at this time.

Mary Brascugli



League of Women Voters of Minnesota, 555 Wabasha, St. Paul, Minnesota 55102

March 1971

Testimony Presented To The  
House Environmental Preservation Committee  
Thursday, March 11, 1971  
By Mrs. O. J. Janski, President  
League of Women Voters of Minnesota

I am Mrs. O. J. Janski, President of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota. There are at present 444 public sewage treatment plants in the state of Minnesota dumping approximately 300 million gallons of effluent a day into our lakes, rivers and streams. These treatment plants vary in type and function and efficiency depending on the number of people and types of industry they serve. Much of the drinking water in the state comes from these same lakes, rivers and streams.

The sewage treatment plants are managed by 1300 Sewer Treatment Plant Operators of which (as of June of 1970) only 465 were certified.

Sewage treatment plant operators must be able to perform quantitative lab tests. Since each treatment plant is unique in its function, the operator must have a basic understanding of the function of his plant so that its efficiency is not temporarily destroyed by poor operation.

Education is available through vocational-technical schools and through a Waste Water Treatment Operators Institute, held cooperatively by the University of Minnesota, the League of Minnesota Municipalities, the Minnesota Waste Water Treatment Operators Association and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. This Institute, which is held every spring, serves as both a refresher course and as basic instruction for new operators.

There are about 500 water supply treatment plants in the state providing drinking water to a large share of the population. We understand that at present there is no certification program for water supply treatment operators.

The League of Women Voters supports the position of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency that mandatory certification of both sewage treatment plant operators and water supply treatment plant operators is vital.

League of Women Voters of Minnesota 555 Wabasha St., St. Paul, Minn. 55102

Statement by Mrs. W. Brascugli, Water Resource Chairman  
League of Women Voters of Minnesota

December 29, 1969

Public Hearing of the Metropolitan Council on the Metropolitan Sewerage Plan

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota wishes to publically commend the Metropolitan Council staff and the Sewer Board for the vision with which the policies for the Sanitary Sewer System have been established.

We especially commend you for policies 10 - 12, restricting on-lot private sewer systems, policy 1, prohibiting discharge of sewage effluent to all lakes in the area, and 25 - 27, concerned with maintaining the esthetic quality of the environment and natural resource preservation.

One of our main concerns will be in how these policies will be assured of being carried out during actual implementation of the plan. We assume that the same far-sighted thinking which went into the plan will also be used in the decision making during construction.

We do have one question concerning the policy on sewage disposal - on page 5, "Present technology for sewage disposal requires discharging treated effluent into bodies of water so that their natural capacity can be utilized to assimilate the treated effluent.", and, "Major rivers are the best receivers for treated sewage effluent.". and on page 15, "The Mississippi River above Minneapolis must be preserved as a prime source of drinking water for the Metropolitan Area. Therefore, the quantities of even highly treated sewage and industrial wastes discharged to the river upstream of the intakes to the water treatment plants must be minimal. On page 19 there is a discussion of the possibility and desirability of the use of Spring Lake and the Hastings Pool for body contact recreational use although their location is directly "down-stream" from the largest sewage treatment facility for the Metro area. We believe this multiple use is highly desirable, but wonder how it could possibly be achieved under the plan as stated unless tertiary treatment is recommended.

We would challenge this assumption that there is no alternative to the disposal of sewage than the "downstream concept", and refer you to the studies of Dr. John Shaeffer and the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, and technical report #4 - on page 157.

"The present "downstream" strategy needs to be expanded, where feasible, in to a more flexible strategy that includes closed-system or recycling concepts based on reclamation and reuse of water at local and metropolitan levels. Under this improved strategy, the solution to drainage and pollution problems becomes something more than disposal. Storm water runoff is detained in all types of surface and subsurface reservoirs for later beneficial use including water supply, recreation, and transport of used water. In such a strategy storm water is viewed as a "resource out of place"--valuable if properly used. Even pollutants in water are looked upon for possible reclamation." Refer to Chapter 4, page 110-120 Pollution source control, a discussion of various methods of reducing pollution at the source, including algae ponds,

holding ponds and reservoirs, deep wells for disposal of highly concentrated wastes, spraying of sewage used for fertilizer and over wet lands, irrigation of golf courses, and experiments to reduce sewage treatment plant sludge to an inert ash whose volume is approximately 15% of the unburned sludge, which could then be disposed of into sanitary landfills. Another program would allow the use of effluent by industries as an auxiliary water source, all along the collecting sewer route. Another industrial transfer technique involves the water used in wet scrubbers for air pollution abatement in central refuse incinerators. The use of sewage effluent or even raw sewage for this purpose would not only reduce the use from drinking water sources, but since virtually all the effluent or even raw sewage used in the wet scrubbers would be consumed, this would also reduce the quantity of water-borne wastes discharged into surface streams.

I would like to refer you also to a film available at the Minnesota State Health Department, "The Living Filter" reviewing work done at Pennsylvania State University on the use of sewage for fertilization and irrigation.

Perhaps many of these alternate solutions have been evaluated and disallowed--if so, we do not see evidence of it in the report.

The by passing of low flows containing large quantities of sewage effluent around recreational lagoons to improve their water quality and enhance their recreational potential is another possible approach to the Spring Lake situation.

Page 111 - "If feasible processes can be developed for removing and concentrating other potential pollutants, a major step in reducing pollution at the source will have been taken." Much depends, of course, on the development of treatment processes which are within the financial means of local governments and industries. Page 114 - "In some cases, many of the water quality problems reflect a lack of adequate funding and staffing of public agencies charged with maintaining water quality, or else a lack of public perception of the problems and possible solutions. Often, however, the principal deterrents to effective water-quality management efforts are legal or governmental rather than technical."

We certainly hope that the Metropolitan Council will look to the future, and evaluate in the long-range objectives, all of the alternatives to the "downstream" concept of water quality management.

**FILE COPY**

League of Women Voters of Minnesota, 555 Wabasha Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55102  
August 12, 1969

We thought your group would be interested in joining the League action.



## FILE COPY

League of Women Voters of Minnesota, 555 Wabasha Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55102

August 12, 1969

### TIME FOR ACTION

RE: League support for \$1 billion appropriation for federal grants for sewage facility construction in fiscal 1970

#### AIMS OF THE TIME FOR ACTION

- 1) To persuade the Public Works Subcommittees of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to recommend appropriation of a substantially larger sum than the President requested for construction of sewage treatment facilities in fiscal 1970
- 2) To convince Congress and the President that voters want a larger share of their federal tax dollar used to fight water pollution and that federal incentive grants for treatment plant construction are popular and necessary
- 3) To show the Secretary of the Interior that there is strong citizen support for a large item in the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration budget for the federal construction grant program

#### WHY THE LEAGUE SUPPORTS APPROPRIATION OF \$1 BILLION FOR FISCAL 1970

The League of Women Voters considers construction and improvement of public sewage treatment plants essential if any good is to come from setting water quality standards. Standards in themselves will not make a single stretch of waterway less polluted and more inviting.

Many towns and cities still discharge sewage raw or with only primary treatment. As population increases and a larger proportion lives in urban areas, more and more wastes pour into public sewers, forming one of the main causes of water pollution. Construction of interceptor sewers and improved treatment plants is imperative if water quality is to improve. Technology exists to do a far better job than is being done. Appropriations are the crux of the problem.

Sewage facility construction requires money. Some localities lack ability to raise the necessary funds. Other localities need the incentive of federal help to persuade citizens to vote the local share. All local governments are faced by many competing demands for capital improvements and tax supported services.

The great flaw in the federal water pollution control program is the gap between authorization and appropriation. This money gap is growing larger each year. Unless the federal government commits more federal funds, the stream cleanup program will collapse. In early 1969, municipalities were moving at about one-half the rate they were expected to move to meet water quality standard goals. Industries are reluctant to improve waste management until municipalities stop polluting rivers and lakes.

State officials say that while states have been passing bond issues to assume a share of the costs of local treatment facility construction, the federal government has gone back on its promise of federal help.

Organizations supporting clean water are convinced that water pollution and pollution abatement are at a critical point. Twenty-four organizations have agreed to make an extra and joint effort this year. Together we are launching a CITIZENS CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER to seek appropriation of the full \$1 billion authorized for fiscal 1970.

#### WHY LEAGUE ACTION IS NEEDED NOW

Congress, through the Public Works Subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, is deciding on appropriations for the treatment facility construction program in fiscal 1970. The Department of the Interior is preparing its budget recommendations for fiscal 1971. The Nixon Administration is shaping recommendations for financing waste treatment plant construction.

#### WHAT TO DO

- 1) Write from your League to
  - a) the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of both House and Senate Appropriations Committees, as soon as possible and before mid-June
  - b) your own Representative and Senator...if he is a member of the Appropriations Committee and especially if he is a member of the Public Works Subcommittee make a special effort immediately
  - c) President Nixon, whose mail is sent to appropriate executive agencies for reply, thus the FWPCA and Department of the Interior will learn that voters support federal appropriations for sewage facility construction grants
- 2) Help concerned citizens do something positive about water pollution. MAKE AN EXTRA EFFORT TO ENCOURAGE INDIVIDUAL LEAGUE MEMBERS AND OTHERS TO WRITE LETTERS OR SEND PUBLIC OPINION MESSAGE TELEGRAMS. Millions of communications are needed before the middle of June to bring the \$1 billion demand to the attention of the Appropriations Subcommittees. Letters to all Congressmen and the President are also needed now and in the following weeks. (The new League pamphlet When You Write to Washington, Pub. No. 349, 28 pp., 50¢, 1969, is available to help.)

League members are concerned about water pollution. Remind them that this is the time to show their conviction that money should be spent to get waters of our nation cleaner. Members of other organizations will be speaking out too. THIS YEAR LET'S HAVE A REAL OUTPOURING OF VOTERS' VIEWS as the first step in the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water. You are the ones who must reach your members!

- 3) Remind local and state elected officials and Agency heads that the Hill and the White House should hear from them concerning their need, and the use they would make of federal money for treatment facility construction.

Testimony from League of Women Voters of Minnesota

Re: Proposed Chapter Twenty Two: WPC 22

Proposed Classification of Underground Water of the State and Standards  
for Waste Disposal

State of Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

The League of Women Voters is vitally interested in MPCA efforts to safeguard our state's waters and we actively support proposals which we feel will contribute to better water management. We agree that the prevention and abatement of pollution of our groundwater supplies is important.

We would like to raise some questions.

Page 2 (b) Uses of Underground Waters

In this paragraph, the following statement appears: "In making this classification, the Agency considers the underground waters of the state as being basically one continuous system such that if sewage, industrial waste, other waste, or other pollutants enter the underground water system, it may spread both vertically and horizontally."

This statement seems in contradiction to the actual fact in Minnesota and therefore seems questionable to use as the basic assumption for the entire proposal.

Does not the use of qualitative terms in defining standards make it almost impossible to determine what is actually required of an individual or firm seeking to comply with its provisions? For example:

Page 3 (d) 2: "No sewage, industrial waste, other waste or other materials which may potentially cause pollution.... that the effluent or residue therefrom....may potentially materially impair.....nor shall any such discharge...be allowed which may preclude or limit the use..."

To what extent is "materially" or "potentially materially"? Written in this fashion, would it not have to be determined after the fact?

Page 4, #5: "...as prohibiting the use of chemicals and fertilizers...provided that such practices do not pose a significant pollution problem."

How would a farmer know whether or not what he was doing would pose a "significant pollution problem"?



FILE COPY

Statement made by Mrs. O. J. Janski, President, League of Women Voters  
of Minnesota at the reconvening of the Upper Mississippi FWPCA  
Enforcement Conference

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota would like to thank the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency for permission to state our views at this conference. Over 6,000 women in local leagues in Minnesota are asking questions, going on tours, and discussing water resource problems with families and friends and other league members. A majority of leagues have checked out their own communities to determine the status of local municipal and industrial waste treatment facilities. Some are pleased with the progress being made - others are not so happy. It is obvious that members are concerned that water quality standards be enforced, and that the several levels of government work out the most effective method for enforcing these standards.

Before any enforcement program, at any level of government can be successful, there must be public realization of the urgent necessity for strict enforcement, for no laws are enforceable without wide-spread public acceptance. Is there any doubt in anyone's mind, listening to the public opinions expressed at the Minnesota Pollution Control Hearings on April 8, 17, May 13, and 21, and June that the public backs strict enforcement of the standards? Now is the TIME FOR ACTION, not for the granting of more postponements, in the eyes of the Minnesota league members.

We recognize that state agencies are under strong pressures which make it difficult to carry out the pollution abatement program. Because the federal government is less affected by political and industrial interests powerful in a single state, the LWV is convinced that the federal government has an important role in strengthening enforcement of abatement proceedings when local and state efforts fail. We also feel that federal help is often needed when inter-state waters are involved. The problem of the laws regulating sanitation on boats in Minn. - Wisc. border waters is a case in point. Reciprocal agreements should result in the highest standards being maintained.

We know that local governments are often beholden to large employers with large tax contributions. We feel that pollution control is a cost of doing business. We are also aware that financially this is an impossibility for many small industries and municipalities without federal help. We are most concerned with the reduction in the request for federal funds. The gap between the \$1 billion authorized, and the \$214 million actually requested is the crux of the problem. Standards in themselves will not make a single stretch of waterway less polluted and more inviting. Technology exists to do a far better job than is being done. States have assumed a share of the costs of local treatment facility construction, but the federal government has gone back on its promise of federal help.

At the April 30, 1968 conference, Mr. Badalich stated that 64% of the offending industries and municipalities have corrected their disposal methods. 36% have not - including the 12 largest polluters.

The public waters belong not to a town, or an industry, but to all the people. In Minn. and Wisc. we have a unique situation. No other state is polluting our water. We receive it pure - we have no clean-up problem except for what we ourselves produce. There are increasing and varied demands for clean, open water that suggest far heavier demands in the years immediately ahead. There is a growing and deep-rooted concern about the quality of our environment and the threats to this quality from the waste of an expanding technology. There is also the movement of population to metropolitan areas which intensifies the rapidly growing pollution problem.

It is our belief that it is becoming increasingly important for industries to return water in as much the same condition as it was withdrawn as is possible. If we have made mistakes in the past, now is the time to rectify those mistakes. It is time for effective action. We can no longer treat water as a free good that is used but once and discarded.

FILE COPY

STATEMENT MADE BY MRS. O. J. JANSKI, PRESIDENT,

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

AT THE RECONVENING OF THE

UPPER MISSISSIPPI FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION (FWPCA)  
ENFORCEMENT CONFERENCE, July 22, 1969, Holiday Inn Central, Minneapolis

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota would like to thank the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency for permission to state our views at this conference.

Approximately 5,800 women in local Leagues in Minnesota are asking questions, going on tours, and discussing water resource problems with families and friends and other League members. Many of Minnesota's local Leagues have checked out their own communities to determine the status of local municipal and industrial waste treatment facilities. Some are pleased with the progress being made - others are not. It is obvious that members are concerned that water quality standards be enforced, and that the several levels of government work out the most effective method for enforcing these standards.

Before any enforcement program at any level of government can be successful, there must be public realization of the urgent necessity for strict enforcement. Laws are not easily enforceable without widespread public acceptance. The opinions expressed at the Minnesota Pollution Control Hearings on April 8, 17, May 13, and 21, and June 23, indicated that the public backs strict enforcement of the standards. We urge that you grant no further postponements.

We recognize that state agencies are under strong pressures which make it difficult to carry out the pollution abatement program. Because the federal government is less affected by political and industrial interests powerful in a single state, the LWV is convinced that the federal government has an important role in strengthening enforcement of abatement proceedings when local and state efforts fail. We also feel that federal help is often needed when inter-state waters are involved. The problem of the laws regulating sanitation on boats in Minnesota-Wisconsin border waters is a case in point. Reciprocal agreement should result in the highest standards being maintained.

We know that local governments can feel beholden to employers with large tax contributions. We feel that pollution control is one of the costs of doing business. We are also aware that without federal help this is a financial impossibility for many small industries and municipalities. We are most concerned with the reduction in the request for federal funds. The crux of the problem is the gap between the \$1 billion needed for federal sewage treatment facility construction grants-in-aid in fiscal 1970 and the 1970 budget request of the former administration which amounts to \$214 million. Thus far, the new administration has left unaltered this fiscal 1970 budget request. This sum, the same amount appropriated for fiscal 1969, is inadequate to accelerate water clean-up. Standards in themselves will not make a single stretch of waterway less polluted and more inviting. Technology exists to do a far better job than is being done. States have assumed a share of the costs of local treatment facility construction, but the federal government has gone back on its promise of adequate assistance.

At the April 30, 1968 conference, Mr. Badalich stated that 64% of the offending industries and municipalities had corrected their disposal methods. Thirty-six per cent had not - including the 12 largest polluters.

The public waters belong not to a town, or an industry, but to all the people. In Minnesota and Wisconsin we have a unique situation. No other state is polluting our water. We receive it pure - we have no clean-up problem except for what we ourselves produce. There are increasing and varied demands for clean, open water that suggest far heavier demands in the years immediately ahead. There is a growing and deep-rooted concern about the quality of our environment and the threats to this quality from the waste of an expanding technology. There is also the movement of population to metropolitan areas which intensifies the rapidly growing pollution problem.

It is becoming increasingly important for industries to return water in as much the same condition as it was withdrawn. If we have made mistakes in the past, now is the time to remedy those mistakes. It is time for effective action. We can no longer treat water as a free resource that is used but once and discarded.



**FILE COPY**

League of Women Voters of Minnesota, 555 Wabasha Street, St. Paul, Mn. 55102  
August 26, 1969

TO: Local Minnesota Leagues

RE: Further Action on CITIZENS CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER

It's time to put the heat on Representatives Langen, MacGregor, Nelson, Quie and Zwach for cool, clear, and clean water.

Congress has adjourned until September 2. The Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee will report out its bill shortly after Congress reconvenes. If the subcommittee recommends only the \$214 million proposed in the President's budget for sewage treatment plant construction, a move is expected on the floor of the House to increase the amount substantially. As of mid-August, 152 Congressmen including Blatnik, Fraser and Karth from Minnesota--65 less than a majority--have pledged to support a substantial increase. EVERY VOTE IS NEEDED.

The backlog of sewage treatment plant construction necessary to abate pollution is increasing annually as communities unable to get federal aid postpone action in the hope that help will be available in the future. In Minnesota, municipalities have asked for four times the \$3.9 million that will be available if Congress provides only the \$214 million requested by the Administration rather than the \$1 billion authorized by the Clean Water Act of '66. At the last Pollution Control Agency meeting only 3 out of 15 municipal requests for sewage plant improvement funds could be granted.

Recent League letters to the President have been answered by officials of the Bureau of the Budget stating that the Administration has promised to reduce federal spending and that 30-year contracts between localities and the federal government provide an alternative to authorized federal grants. Municipalities and counties are firmly opposed to the 30-year contract plan. High interest rates now asked on municipal bonds and possible reduced sale of them make the long-term contract proposal undesirable to municipalities that must build or improve plants to meet enforcement conference timetables or to do their part to bring the receiving waters up to state standards.

Your representative's vote for clean water is needed. Every member can help on this one . . . with letters and phone calls to her Congressman,---with letters to the editor, radio and TV time, speeches to local organizations (sample enclosed) . . . and whatever else she can think of to influence her Congressman to join our Citizens Crusade for Clean Water.

League of Women Voters of Minnesota, 555 Wabasha Street, St. Paul, Mn. 55102

Mrs. O. J. Janski,  
6500 - 2nd Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55423  
Phone: 869-7885 or 224-5445

August 26, 1969

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

SUBJECT: CITIZENS CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER

Here's a new tongue-twister. People plus production provide pollution; can people pushing promises abate pollution?

In 1966 Congress promised aid to local governments for sewage treatment plant construction in the amount of \$2.3 billion through 1970. Members of 38 volunteer organizations and 7 Congressmen including Minnesota Representative Blatnik are now pushing for a \$1 billion appropriation in 1970 to fulfill that promise. As of mid-August, 152 Congressmen have pledged to support the national Citizens Crusade for Clean Water. So far Blatnik has been joined by only two others, Minnesota Congressmen Karth and Frazer.

The Clean Water Act of 1966 authorized aid for sewage treatment plant construction at the same time as it told the states to set water quality standards and to enforce them against municipal and industrial polluters. Large numbers of cities, encouraged by the bait of at least one-third federal financing, began drawing cleanup plans. But then Congress proceeded to supply less than half the amount it had promised. President Nixon is requesting \$214 million for the current fiscal year, the same as last year. If that recommendation is followed, four years of appropriations for treatment plants will total about a third of the authorized \$2.3 billion.

Communities unable to get federal aid postpone action in the hope that help will be available in the future. In Minnesota, municipalities have asked for four times the \$3.9 million that will be available if Congress only meets the 1970 administration request. At the last Pollution Control Agency meeting, only 3 out of 15 municipal requests for sewage plant

construction plans could be approved because of lack of federal funds.

The Administration cites the need to reduce federal spending to support its appropriation request; on the other hand, the Gallup Poll reports 85 percent of all Americans are concerned about water pollution and 73 percent are ready to spend money to improve conditions. The Administration states that localities can sign thirty-year contracts with the federal government to receive long-term assistance allotments rather than immediate grants for construction. But municipalities and counties are firmly opposed to the contract plan because of high interest rates and possibly reduced demand for municipal bonds.

The Clean Water Crusaders argue that in this inflationary period the longer we put off the building of sewage disposal plants the higher the cost will be in money, and the longer we put off spending the money the greater the pollution problem will be. The force of their arguments will be heard on the floor of Congress when it reconvenes in September.

# # # # #

League of Women Voters of the U.S.  
1730 M Street NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036

August 12, 1969

### Sample Speech CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER

(This speech should be adapted to local conditions and used for five-minute appearances on the luncheon circuit of civic organizations as soon as possible. Or it can be adapted and used as a letter to the editor.)

I am here to talk to you about Water Pollution. But this isn't another "Isn't it awful" talks.

We all agree that the condition of our lakes and streams is not only awful; it is a national disgrace. And this includes (mention local condition here).

The day for hand wringing is long since passed. It is time for action. I have come to ask you to join in a Crusade for Clean Water -- a crusade to get the Congress of the United States to follow through on the promise to which it has long since been committed -- the promise to pay part of the costs of adequate sewage treatment plants for cities and towns across the United States.

These are the facts:

Many towns and cities still discharge sewage raw or with only primary treatment. We are all aware of the effect this has on our rivers and streams.

(Insert facts about local situation; if your own community has secondary treatment but you are adversely affected by up stream conditions make this clear.)

The construction of sewage treatment facilities and interceptor sewers costs money. As long ago as 1959 the Congress recognized the responsibility of the federal government to pay part of the cost of cleaning up the nation's water. And in 1966 Congress adopted a formula for sharing the cost of building water treatment facilities and authorized yearly grants in increasing amounts to finance a federal-state-local construction program. The federal government didn't offer to take over all of the responsibility; in effect they said "We'll pay part if you'll pay part." The Congress held out a carrot in the form of grants on a matching basis. But Congress has consistently failed to meet its commitments to the states and localities in the Clean Water Restoration Act. The Congress authorizes the expenditures of funds but then fails to appropriate the money it has authorized. Last year Congress authorized \$700,000,000 in treatment facility grants but appropriated only \$214 million. This year \$1 billion has been authorized but the administration has asked for only \$214 million. That is what the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water is all about.

Thirty-five citizen organizations -- including the League of Women Voters -- have banded together with a bipartisan group of Congressmen to form the Citizens Crusade. We believe that there is a very good possibility of raising the amount of the appropriation for clean water if we can get enough citizen interest communicated to Capitol Hill.

We know the citizen interest is there. A recent Gallup Poll showed that



85 percent of the people are concerned about polluted water. (If your state has recently passed a bond issue to meet the state share or appropriated money for this, mention it here.) What we have to do is to let our Congressmen know that we want a greater percent of our federal tax dollar spent in this way.

Every year that we spend less money at the federal level on the grant program, the effect is felt all the way down the line. These are incentive grants and they represent seed money to encourage local and state investment. In the last 11 years the Federal Water Pollution Administration reports investment of \$1,200,000,000 has stimulated construction of more than \$5 billion of waste treatment facilities in local communities.

This year in the state of \_\_\_\_\_ only \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ needed projects can go forward because of lack of federal funds.

The excuse that was given by the former administration, the present administration and many members of Congress for not following through on their commitment to clean water is the need to tighten up on spending. I am all for economy and I have no doubt that each of us can think of ways in which we would suggest that the federal government reduce spending but to say that there is not enough money in the federal budget to help clean up the rivers and lakes of the wealthiest country in the world is preposterous.

In fact there is a current proposal that the federal government come to the aid of the states by turning over to them for use at their discretion certain funds collected by the U.S. government. Neither the League of Women Voters nor the Crusade for Clean Water has any stand on this issue, but I submit that before the Congress discusses distribution of unrestricted funds, members would do well to review their present commitments -- especially their commitment to clean water.

In the inflationary period in which we live, the longer we put off the building of sewage disposal plants the higher the cost will be in money, and the longer we put off spending the money the greater the pollution problem will be. This is a program that can't be put in cold storage. Because the problem is getting worse all the time.

This is what you can do.

(If your Congressman is committed say:)

Congressman \_\_\_\_\_ has indicated his willingness to support increased funding for the Clean Water Restoration Act for fiscal year 1970. He should be thanked for his stand and encouraged to be present to vote for increased appropriations for this program. The vote may be a squeaker! Your letter will help.

or

Congressman \_\_\_\_\_ has not as yet joined the 152 members of the House of Representatives who have indicated their willingness to support increased funding for the Clean Water Restoration Act for fiscal 1970. It is possible that he is waiting for expressions of interest and concern from his constituents. This means YOU.

If you are worried about federal spending tell him where you would like to see the federal government cut down, but make clear that you want money spent on clean water NOW before it is too late. The appropriation bill is likely to be on the floor of the House in September. So it is imperative to get your letters off immediately.

Join the Crusade for Clean Water. You will be glad that you did.  
Thank you.