

## Minutes of the

# REGULAR MEETING OF THE METROPOLITAN AREA WATER SUPPLY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, December 11, 2014

### Committee Members Present:

Sandy Rummel (Metropolitan Council); Barry Stock (Savage); Tom Furlong (Chanhassen); Julie Ekman (DNR); Jeff Berg (Department of Agriculture); Chuck Haas (Hugo); Jamie Schurbon (Anoka County Conservation District); Glen Gerads (City of Minneapolis); Katrina Kessler (PCA); Steve Schneider (St. Paul Regional Water Services); Jill Trescott (Dakota County)

### Committee Members Absent:

Mark Daleiden (Wright County); Michael Robinson (Chisago County); Susan Morris (Isanti County); Randy Ellingboe (Dept of Health); Lisa Volbrecht (Sherburne County); Georg Fischer (Dakota County)

### CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Sandy Rummel called the regular meeting of the Council's Metropolitan Area Water Supply Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m. on Thursday, December 11, 2014.

Introductions of committee members present were conducted.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

It was moved by Chuck Haas, seconded by Jaime Schurbon to approve the agenda of the December 11, 2014 meeting. **Motion carried.**

It was moved by Barry Stock, seconded by Chuck Haas to approve the minutes of the October 22, 2014 meeting. **Motion carried.**

### MASTER WATER SUPPLY PLAN UPDATE – Lanya Ross, MCES

- a. Consistency with Master Plan
- b. Review and feedback on Plan Chapters
- c. Summary of Technical forums
- d. Process, Schedules and next steps

*“The Council staff would like to share receive MAWSAC member’s feedback on the proposed contents, process and schedule of the updated master plan chapters. The staff will also summarize the technical forums to city and municipal staff and how feedback will be incorporated in the development of the master plan”*

Staff provided a summary of the community workshops that have occurred with a technical preview for city planning and utility staff. The purpose of the workshops were to focus on city planning and utility staff, provide technical preview of data used to update the Master Water Supply Plan, provide additional in-depth training on Metro Model 3 for interested stakeholders, and solicit feedback regarding technical projects. Workshops were held at Brookview Community Center in Golden Valley (December 4) and Eagan Community Center (December 10). Over 540 individuals were invited with 50 attending the morning sessions and 15 stayed to attend the 2-hour afternoon session. Topics included evaluating sustainability, subregional feasibility assessments, planning tools, and groundwater modeling.

Key concerns discussed included infrastructure, cost, enforcement, recharge, climate, treatment, graywater, impact of policies, and assistance. Given the scope of work used in certain subregions, top concerns raised were user’s rates, infrastructure, one size does not fit all, state, regional, city, and lack of group in western metro.

Review and feedback on draft chapters 1, 2, 3, 5, and 8 occurred with the following changes noted:

- Chapter 1 – the purpose of the chapter provides a high level description of the topic of the plan and values of the region’s water, the need for the plan that is mandated by the legislature, and the process to develop and update the plan. Additional content was included about benefits of and rationale for regional water supply planning, summary of changes made during update of the Master Plan, and what it means to be consistent with the Master Plan.
- Chapter 2 – This chapter outlines the Master Plan goal, guiding principles, and illustrates the regional vision for water supply. The goal and principles are the same as the 2010 Master Plan. This chapter includes a figure that is a new way of visually illustrating how the goal could be achieved following the principles. It introduces a quantifiable goal/target for the region and is based on optimum/sustainable use of the multiple water supply sources available.
- Chapter 3 – This chapter discusses the region’s water use and projected changes through time. By 2040, it is estimated the region will need more gallons of water per day than in 2010 if current water use practices continue. The need for additional water is still expected to be substantial. As the population grows, pressure increases on water resources in the region. The need to ensure water use is sustainable for future generations, while protecting the environment, becomes important.
- Chapter 5 – This chapter discusses the regional water supply issues and how they vary across the region including aquifer decline, surface water and ecosystem impacts and contamination. A subregional approach to water supply assessment is illustrated and criteria used to identify issues are also defined.
- Chapter 8 – This chapter was reviewed and revised based on comments from Council members, public officials, and MAWSAC members. The purpose of the chapter is to identify key players for water supply planning and management. It provides a high level description of entity roles and responsibilities. These are not new roles and responsibilities. They reflect current statutes and programs. Agency staff was thanked for providing information for the chapter.

Anticipated schedule and next steps will include review of chapters 4, 6, and 7 in January with a final draft completed for MAWSAC review. MAWSAC will review the final draft in February with public review anticipated in spring 2015. Review and incorporation of public feedback is anticipated Spring/Summer 2015 with the plan completion and approval anticipated for summer 2015.

Current activities that are occurring include coordination with the Water Resource Policy Plan writers to finalize water supply-related policies and strategies, integrate public input into draft Master Water Supply Plan chapters, and regional groundwater modeling.

To be consistent with the Master Plan a recommendation was made to keep the same definition that is in the current Plan described on pages 4-7 to 4-9. This information would be repeated in the updated Master Plan as well as in the Local Planning Handbook. An example of how the Master Plan will inform local city plans is located in the western metro using the TCW aquifer and the MTS aquifer as source, projecting a 76% increase in population by 2040, industrial water use accounting for 43% of municipal demand. The Master Plan identifies the following potential issues: significant aquifer decline, vulnerable DWSMA and potential impact to surface water by groundwater pumping. The city would then complete the DNR water supply plan template, demand should be consistent with Council population projections, acknowledge issues in Master Plan Appendix 2, acknowledge alternative sources available, outline actions to address the following issues:

- Monitor water levels
- Implement conservation programs
- Plan for water supply sources in one of three ways: plan to use source without identified issues, demonstrate no impact due to proposed source, and develop/implement a management plan.

This is accomplished by projecting water demand for the projected populations by using the local water supply plan template, use the community profiles to identify issues on the template, use community profiles and local expertise to identify alternative sources by completing this section on the template, and use part of the template to outline actions to address monitoring, demonstrate no impact, and develop/implement a management plan.

Lastly, staff reviewed Community Water Supply Profiles in dictating profiles have been shared at meetings and received feedback on them. Recommendations included adding information about non-municipal use and wells in each community, historical water use (not use showing projections), and how municipal use is divided among residential, industrial and commercial purposes.

Committee feedback and discussion included:

- Was there any discussion, other than immediate cost to do things, the savings that happen if we do them right now? Staff indicated discussion occurred about sustainability and aging infrastructures and considering water conservation and the challenge to reducing water use and having revenue.
- Could you refresh the meaning of sustainability? Water supply that does not degrade water quality, impact ecosystems, provides for our needs now and in the future. Staff will provide direction to the definition at a later time.
- Concern was expressed for including indicators in Chapter 5. Staff stated this will be stricken in the next revision.
- Chapter 5 - Concern was expressed that adding the trout stream and proximity to a calcareous event would cause a heightened awareness and level of attention that could slow down process by having it there. Was it someone's suggestion these be placed in there? Staff indicated it is in the current plan and is also listed in appendix 2. Context of why this is in there would be helpful. The reactive map tool is being developed. Chapter indicators will be revised and updated.
- Who uses this water supply plan and most direct user? Staff stated as the long range plan for the Metropolitan area is developed, we want to provide information on issues to expect so that when local governments are developing their comprehensive and water supply plans they can be aware of issues ahead of time. This would be the first document cities would use to reference during planning process. The general public and other entities could use it as an educational piece as well to learn about the water supply process.
- Chapter 8 – A question was raised regarding roles and responsibilities in community/public water suppliers on page 2. Water supply is not a system. The minimum requirements for consistency section do not address what happens if there is not consistency. Staff stated water supply plans are reviewed for consistency with Council policy, completeness with all planning information, and conformance with any systems plans. The Council does not review for conformance. State law states water supply plans must be consistent with the master water supply plan. What is the expectation for the City outcome? All area water suppliers need to be consistent with the plan in order to succeed. If a plan is presented that is not consistent, agencies will continue to work with the City to be consistent. If consistency does not occur, an approved water supply plan for that city will not be in place, eligibility for grants and funding may not available, and may not be able to increase water appropriation or add a well. Being consistent, changes to permits will more than likely be granted if details are in place.
- What is a water supply template? The previous water supply template is available on DNR's website. It walks communities through documentation required and how to complete the template that is approved by the DNR.
- The Master Water Supply Plan is a plan approved by the Metropolitan Council and the DNR. It provides guidance for local water supply planning processes. Communities look at subregional issues, guidance, and limits they deal with that need to be considered when developing their local water supply plans. The template is completed by the community, which was developed

by the Metropolitan Council and the DNR. It is then submitted to the Metropolitan Council first for evaluation and consistency with the Master Water Supply Plan then sent to the DNR for evaluation, final approval, and due diligence. The Master Water Supply Plan becomes part of the Comprehensive Plan the Council will approve.

- The Metropolitan Council plan assures the activities of the Communities are orchestrated and part of the collective interest rather than their own interest. If Metropolitan Council didn't have a plan that was orchestrated Metro wide, would DNR create the plan? Only if legislative direction and funding was provided to do so.

## TECHNICAL PROJECTS UPDATE

*"In 2013, the state Legislature approved \$2,537,000 from the Clean Water Legacy Fund to evaluate the reliability and sustainability of the water supply throughout the seven county metropolitan area, including the northeast metro. This presentation summarizes the status of two main efforts taken by the Council."*

Staff shared a technical update with the Committee. The Clean Water Fund (M.L. 2013 Chp. #, Art. 2, Sec. 9) appropriations statute was reviewed that applies to the work being done. The work will help achieve water supply reliability and sustainability and includes:

- determination of a sustainable regional balance of surface water and groundwater, a feasibility assessment of potential solutions to rebalance regional water use,
- identify potential solutions to address emerging subregional water supply issues such as the northeast metro, and
- development of an implementation plan that addresses regional targets and timelines and defines short-and medium-term milestones.

Metro area subregional water supply work groups are located in multiple areas of the Metro area includes Northwest, Northeast, North & East , Washington County, and Seminary Fen.

It is important to note the work being done is studies and not plan development. They are developed collaboratively with cities. The six workgroups involve 54 communities. The studies provide a variety of choices to assist the cities to ensure sustainability and reliability of water supply. They will be incorporated in to the Master Plan as case studies, will identify available water supply sources and key implementation issues as well as identify subregional water supply profiles.

Status of the feasibility assessments reflects:

- Northeast metro - final report being released. New additions since draft released in July 2014.
  - analysis of "conjunctive use" alternative
    - use of surface water for base demand and wells for peak demand
      - Would require NE Metro communities to use chloramines for disinfectant, could change lead, copper, and iron chemistry and would need to monitor, will change taste and order and would require public education
  - analysis of option to continue developing groundwater supplies
  - cost sharing/financing evaluation, and
    - applied two cost sharing models to one alternative to offer cost sharing as a joint utility between cities served by the system and cost sharing over DNR groundwater management area (utility district)
    - for joint utility model, external funding for project capital costs expected to bring rates within the range of a typical surface water utility
    - for groundwater management area (utility district) model, a groundwater usage fee of \$.82/1000 gallons applied over district would bring rates within range of a typical surface water utility
  - completion of alternative evaluations
- Southeast metro (Dakota Co.) - final report after Jan. 1
  - Draft report is being reviewed by the work group with a goal to identify areas potentially suitable for recharge of bedrock aquifers

- Strategies include use of existing datasets and databases and GIS-based analysis
  - is a high level analysis at this point
- Northwest metro - 50% complete
- North and East Metro GWMA - finalizing scope of work
- South Washington Co. - finalizing scope of work

Next steps for the North and East groundwater management area is to provide information for BWSR to build on with implementation grants, conduct a region-wide groundwater recharge study, and continue work in the Northwest metro.

Committee feedback and discussion included:

- Clarification was provided pertaining to the groundwater usage fee of \$.82/1000 gallon of water.
- Who collects the money? This study does not address that level of detail. Models are provided of other districts that provide the work, but no recommendation is being made.
- Is there still discussion of treatment of surface water at a lower volume for the conjunctive use alternative? Yes, there is a substantial difference in cost.
- Is the SE metro study looking at quality and quantity? It addresses water quality, solutions are looking at quantity issues if groundwater use becomes unsustainable, what options are available, what is the cost and implementation considerations. Is unsustainable to much nitrate? It could be, however, the study does not address the problem that leads to the necessity to reduce groundwater use.

## **REPORTS FROM MAWSAC MEMBERS**

Julie Ekman stated that the White Bear Lake lawsuit had been settled and that there was a link to it on their website as well as frequently asked questions.

Sandy Rummel thanked Tom Furlong for being a part of MAWSAC. This was his last meeting.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Business completed, the meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Susan Taylor  
Recording Secretary