

# Minutes of the REGULAR MEETING OF THE METROPOLITAN AREA WATER SUPPLY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) COMMITTEE

Tuesday, May 2, 2017

## Committee Members Present:

Kristin Asher, Scott Anderson (for Bob Cockriel), John Dustman, Dale Folen, Jennifer Levitt, Mark Maloney, G.H. Crystal Ng, Chris Petree, Lih-in-Rezania, James Stark, Jamie Wallerstedt, Bruce Westby and Ray Wuolo.

Dean Lotter, MAWSAC Liaison

Jason Moeckel, DNR Advisor

## Committee Members Absent:

Klayton Eckles and Lon Schemel (resigned – vacant position).

## CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, Chair Mark Maloney convened the meeting of the Council's Metropolitan Area Water Supply Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) at 1:05 p.m. on Tuesday, May 2, 2017.

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

The agenda was reviewed with those present and approved unanimously.

The minutes of the March 7, 2017 regular meeting of the Metropolitan Area Water Supply Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Committee were reviewed and approved unanimously with the following addition:

Add list of potential research topics, as discussed, under Business Item 4.

## BUSINESS ITEMS

### 1. MAWSAC Update – Dean Lotter, MAWSAC Liaison

A brief update from MAWSAC was provided and included concerns related to adequate funding for water supply issues and legislative developments. At their last meeting, MAWSAC was provided a presentation on groundwater contaminants in Washington County. Of primary concern are PFOAs related to 3M's activity in the area. It was noted that treatment with activated carbon has proven effective.

### 2. Update on Legislative Water Related Activities – Ali Elhassan, Metropolitan Council

A brief synopsis was given regarding current legislative activities related to water supply planning. Staff gave a presentation to the legislature on the North and East Metro Area's progress toward implementation of the Master Water Supply Plan. The Met Council's request for Clean Water Funds started at \$3 million and has been reduced to just under \$2.5 million. The matter has moved on to joint session and staff is hoping no further funding reductions are made.

### 3. Collaboration Presentation - Dave Brown, Metropolitan Council

In May of 2012 the AWWA published a report titled American Water Works Association Regional Collaboration Report: National Inventory of Regional Collaboration Among Water and Wastewater Utilities. Staff summarized the results of this report for the TAC. The presentation also included information of local relevance and staff noted that all hydrogeologic sub-regions are represented in the Twin Cities Metro Area Water Supply Working groups.

**4. Collaboration Discussion – Lanya Ross, Metropolitan Council**

Staff asked members to break out into small groups to discuss how collaboration can improve regional water supply planning. Visitors in attendance were asked to join with one of the TAC member small groups and take part in the discussion. A list of questions was provided and groups were asked to record their answers to share with the larger group. A summary of the discussion is included in the attached “Notes from group discussion, TAC meeting, May 2, 2017”

**5. Information to Provide to MAWSAC – Dave Brown, Metropolitan Council**

Staff asked TAC members what they would like to share with MAWSAC, based on the contents of this meeting. Members agreed that the report out of the main topics of discussion from the small groups should be shared with MAWSAC.

**NEXT TAC MEETING**

Staff indicated that according to the agreed upon schedule, the next TAC meeting will be held on June 27, 2017 (moved forward one week to accommodate the 4<sup>th</sup> of July holiday). The meeting will be held at the Shoreview Community Center and the main topic will be conservation. Staff will coordinate with Mark Maloney, who volunteered the City of Shoreview to host that meeting. Details will follow via email.

Staff stated that the meeting following the June 27 meeting is scheduled for September 6<sup>th</sup> and will afford another opportunity for members to host (so please consider doing so). The topic for that meeting will be funding. Staff asked members to watch their email for updates and that any suggested agenda items for those meetings be provided to Dave Brown via email.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Business completed, the meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

Jinger Pulkrabek  
Recording Secretary

# NOTES FROM GROUP DISCUSSION, TAC MEETING MAY 2, 2017

## Considerations for MAWSAC re: collaboration

### *Good examples of local collaboration*

Examples of collaboration in the metro area include: local, subregional, and interagency work groups; associations; guidance development; multi-community infrastructure studies/projects; source water protection; sharing information and advice on operations, methods, and technologies; and others.

Specific examples include:

- [Inflow and Infiltration \(I & I\) Task Force](#)
- Coalition of Northern Dakota County Cities (CONDAC)
- [Minnesota Suburban Utility Superintendents Association \(SUSA\)](#)
- [MnWARN](#)
- [Minnesota Stormwater Manual, Minimal Impact Design Standards \(MIDS\)](#)
- [CHS Field](#): stormwater reuse project
- [Watershed Management Organizations/Watersheds](#) – communication with public
- [Water supply work groups: southeast, southwest, northeast](#), Washington County Municipal Water Coalition
- Street reconstruction – engagement with public, coordinating infrastructure
- Source water protection (Rice Creek and New Brighton work that benefits the Mississippi River upstream of Minneapolis water supply intake, [Upper Mississippi River Source Water Protection Project](#))
- Interconnection studies (emergency interconnection agreements, local examples of design/operation such as Fridley-New Brighton)
- Joint Powers Agreements by public water suppliers
- Minnesota Stormwater Steering Committee (MPCA)
- [MN Cities Stormwater Commission](#) – League of Minnesota Cities
- Columbia Heights/New Brighton/Minneapolis/MDH – AOP plan shared operations, business resiliency, reliability
- International collaboration around St. Croix River (formal agreement)
- Road construction projects
- Road salt/chloride management
- St. Paul/Minneapolis Interconnection Study
- Contaminated drinking water projects (stakeholders, design and construction, defining roles)

### *Reasons for collaboration*

- There is common motivation/mutual understanding of emerging issues (example: well interference, contamination or some other hydrologic issue may drive people/organizations together, because it is too big for one to tackle alone)
- To address common needs/achieve common goals
- To create unity/provide a united front – there is more power in a shared message/bigger voice
- To provide consistency
- To gain the public's, partners' trust
- To address a water crisis (example: Victoria)
- To provide safe drinking water, where water is impacted – so that supply meets needs
- Perceived risks
- To respond to regulations
- Legal arrangements may compel collaboration

- To inform decisions
- For pilot projects to try new things, share risk
- To set an example for other projects
- To combine resources or seek funding, where funding is inadequate; money can keep things together and moving forward
- To band together around issues to shape legislative support
- A process was established for coordination
- To develop useful information

### *Factors for successful collaboration*

- Agreement on goals/desired outcomes
- Funding
- Good leadership
- Excited staff
- Defined and well-understood roles
- Public understanding
- Acceptance
- Trust (between collaborators, from the public), strong relationships
- Consistent message/voice
- Communication
- No blaming
- Work together
- The right resources are available
- Value, as defined by participants, is provided (example: cities are asked what is valuable)
- Mutual payoff

### *There is room for improvement*

- Provide enough time to understand interests
- Analyze
- Improve communication
- Acknowledge and address political barriers
- Draw conclusions
- Understand interests and benefits
- Develop and maintain a common goal
- Develop some conclusive solutions early in the process
- Define and communicate roles and responsibilities early in the process
- Work with the ebb and flow of groups
- Acknowledge local councils/political entities
- Don't force collaboration – it needs purpose, shared goals

### *Big challenges/barriers*

- Preconceived differences between facts and risks
- Defensive partners
- Busy people – quick information gathering
- Regulatory issues framework (example: appropriations vs. plumbing codes)
- Communication is tough – different styles, approaches
- Need public's trust, a pathway
- Time – so much ramp up is needed or sharing; meetings
- Funding constraints
- Competing interests – collaborators will find areas of non-alignment and shared benefit

- Relationships
- Regulatory hurdles
- Politics

### *Big opportunities for water supply collaboration in the metro area*

- Source water protection: wellhead, Mississippi River
- A vision for data collection
  - Leverage existing and new technologies
  - Pair with directing land use (example: forest replenishment, migration)
  - Regional monitoring well networks
- Everyone using the same data, using the same language, unifying our approach
- Updates of guidance (example: one stop shop of best management practices)
- Communication to the Legislative Water Commission
- Securing funds for projects with regional benefits
- Emerging contamination
- Remedy selections
- Reuse - stormwater and wastewater (example: [Wastewater Reuse Policy Task Force](#), interagency reuse team)
- Water reporting
  - Water use/metering
- Knowledge sharing – working groups
- Collaborative public education, engagement, and communication
- Pilot projects for collaborative process/opportunities (example: communities with similar concerns join together to try something like innovative treatment, processes)
- Technical assistance like working groups to shape guidance/regulations through research with funding to generate results
- Lead pipe management approaches
- Collaboration between WMOs, water supply, etc.
- Northwest subregional group is looking at recharge as an expectation by the “region” as a whole
- Where there is a long-term enemy or threat (different across the metro)
- Where threats differ among potential collaborators – need leadership
- Interconnections (example: MDH interconnect planning framework)
- Inflow and Infiltration
- Technology
- USGS updates
- Tours

### *Suggestions to improve subregional water supply work group collaboration frameworks*

- Learn why are some stakeholders are not participating
- Create a framework for planning – allow subregional areas to solve and implement
- Focus on outcome-based work
- Hold an annual meeting of all metro water supply work groups (summit)
- Provide more clarity about how subregions are identified and formed
- Document and communicate what goals or solutions each work group champions. How to focus?
- Build trust – address questions such as “would information we share be used against us?” Who holds the space for candid conversations? Who is trusted to facilitate for local ownership, to move forward?
- Identify a trusted organization to serve as a clearinghouse for resources to be shared

- Local ownership with Council facilitation has been working
- Keep informal
- Focus on outcomes
- Common, crystal clear goals

DRAFT