Minutes of the
REGULAR MEETING OF THE METROPOLITAN AREA WATER SUPPLY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, August 21, 2018

Committee Members Present:
Sandy Rummel, Chair, Jeanne Daniels, Karla Peterson, Georg Fischer, Glen Gerads, Phil Klein, Catherine Neuschler, Susan Morris, Steve Schneider, Jamie Schurbon

Committee Members Absent:
Patty Acomb, Jeffrey Berg, Mark Daleiden, Todd Gerhardt, Dean Lotter, Michael Robinson, Lisa Volbrecht

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 10:08 a.m. on Tuesday, August 21, 2018.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES
It was moved by Jamie Schurbon, seconded by Phil Klein to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

It was moved by Phil Klein, seconded by Jamie Schurbon to approve the minutes of the May 23, 2018 joint meeting of the Metropolitan Area Water Supply Advisory Committee and Water Supply Technical Advisory Committee. Motion carried.

BUSINESS
Welcome of New MAWSAC Members:
Chair Rummel introduced Karla Peterson who is filling in for Randy Ellingboe who retired from the Minnesota Department of Health.

TAC Member Appointments:
Staff member Ali Elhassan stated two municipal members have resigned from the TAC and need to be replaced. Klayton Eckles, City of Woodbury, and Chris Petree, City of Lakeville, have nominated replacements.

Motion by Glen Gerads, seconded by Phil Klein to appoint two new Technical Advisory Committee members Jim Westerman, Utility Superintendent, City of Woodbury, and Matt Saam, Public Works Director, City of Apple Valley to the Technical Advisory Committee. Motion carried.

TAC Update:
Technical Advisory Committee Chair Mark Maloney shared that he has served with Jim Westerman on the NE Metro Groundwater Management Area Group with the DNR and has been an important contributor to that group. He further stated he knows Matt through APWA. Both will provide great perspective from different parts of the Metro area.

During the July 25, 2018 TAC meeting, a presentation was done by Greg Kruse from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources on the challenges surrounding data from the agency’s perspective.

The presentation covered topics such as:
• Reiterated the challenges with water conservation data as presented in Dave Brown’s presentation.
• Provided maps showing the locations of groundwater monitoring wells in the metro area. Also provided animations showing the changes in groundwater levels in various aquifers over time in the metro.
• Working on building out groundwater monitoring network to better understand current conditions in real time.
• DNR needs funding to build out monitoring network, with focus on Prairie Du Chien aquifer.
• DNR is getting SCADA data from various cities, but it is expensive for cities and DNR to connect to that data. Requires multiple software platforms.

Lih-in Rezania was invited to provide perspectives that she of the Minnesota Department of Health had on the data issue. Her comments included:

• MDH is seeing a great interest in more and different types of stakeholders wanting to see the data. Not just the raw numbers but turning values into visuals that tell stories.
• Stakeholders have a desire to access data using mobile devices.

The Committee discussed the preparation of a White Paper regarding data collection. A Question Burst exercise was done to collect ideas from the Committee. Further details will be available in the finalized minutes from the meeting.

Draft minutes from TAC will be approved at the next meeting.

Comments/Questions:

No comments or questions at this time.

One Water Summit Update:

Committee members summarized their experience at the One Water Summit held July 10-12, 2018 in Minneapolis. The video from the opening ceremony video, the State of Water, was shared with the Committee. Members who attended shared their feedback and take-aways from the Summit:

• We need to continue to be proactive and open to try new things and getting the word out on what we are doing for conservation.
• Minnesota is leading the charge. We need to continue to be proactive and not be afraid to step outside of the box and try new things.
• Some skepticism due to the number of trade organizations already involved with water.
• Interest in how the Summit addressed equity and affordability.
• Most interesting was the fringe areas that are hitting the market not being addressed by the trade organizations.
• Initial skepticism about the inclusion of “social justice topics” evolved as perspective on water topics broadened beyond about just water supply and dealing with people’s taps.
• Greater understanding of how unique the Twin Cities metro area water supplies are. Example: unlike many other areas, such as Jackson, MS, we don’t have a regional water supplier; we have many people working on water supplies who care about the future.
• Our kick-off was very well done and really set the stage for the one water movement.
• The radio interview was impressive to see the number of people showing interest.
• The Summit was well worth the time and effort that was put in to it.

Next year’s One Water Summit will be in Austin, TX.
Presentations: Considerations for Protecting Drinking Water Sources

Source Water Protection in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area:

Lanya Ross, Environmental Analyst in Environmental Quality Assurance shared high level information about source water protection in the Twin Cities, including regional policies and progress on the Master Water Supply Plan goals.

Minneapolis Water Works

Glen Gerads, MAWSAC Committee Member from the City of Minneapolis shared a summary of source water protection challenges for surface water providers.

Comments/Questions:

How long has the City of Minneapolis been developing partnerships? Committee Member Gerads stated since 2002.

How successful has this been? Committee Member Gerads stated the awareness is increasing. They could designate a full-time person to advocate for source water protection among the three communities.

A comment was made that we are benefited by the cleanliness of the Mississippi. Challenges are getting more attention. The more we can do, the cleaner our drinking water supplies will be. We do a good job of getting the word out but unfortunately, not everyone cares.

Is the biggest challenge experienced communicating with elected officials? Committee Member Gerads stated they are used to collaborating with the local communities.

2019 Legislative Recommendation Feedback Legislative Session

Jim Stark, Director, Legislative Water Commission was unable to attend the meeting. Lanya Ross provided a summary of what they are working on and requested feedback. His contact information was provided at the top of materials to share feedback. Lanya inquired if MAWSAC should send a joint response.

The Legislative Water Commission's role is to review state agencies’ water policy reports and recommendations, gather data and comments, legislative recommendations to assist legislature in formulating legislation, share data and information upon request with the Legislative-Citizen Commission on Minnesota Resources (LCCMR), Clean Water Council, and legislative standing committees, and coordinate with the Clean Water Council.

Legislative Water Commission issues and recommendations for 2019 include:

- Wastewater
- Drinking water
- Groundwater
- Sustainable lakes
- Water retention
- Future state

MAWSAC Committee Members were requested to review the issues and recommendations for drinking water and groundwater, reflect on if there are any issues or recommendations missing, what stakeholders need to be engaged, and how they would rank recommendations.
Ms. Ross asked Committee Members to consider providing a response to the Legislative Water Commission.

Chair Rummel stated the Legislative Water Commission was potentially going to be disbanded in 2017. We should be sure to provide input on how important the Commission’s work is to the region.

Committee Member Klein agreed with the Chair and stated that we need to be participating.

An inquiry was made if anyone was able to attend the last Legislative Water Committee meeting. Dr. Ali Elhassan stated he attended. Most who attend were environmental groups. No representation from water practitioners and water suppliers. Not all of the stakeholders were in the room.

A question was asked how the two Legislative Water Commission documents were put together that the Committee would be reviewing. Staff clarified that they were compiled using policy documents prepared through the various government agencies.

_Land Use Advisory Committee_

Ms. Ross shared that the Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) has had a long-standing interest in water supply issues. Metropolitan Council Member Jon Commers, LUAC Chair was unable to attend to provide a summary.

Committee Member Klein shared his perspective on the LUAC meetings that he attends, regarding infrastructure projects being done. He noted that we need to take into consideration the impacts we have on water (urban flooding, drainage, stormwater ponds, cost, etc.). How do we provide equity, which is a big issue?

_Reflection:_

Committee members were asked individually to reflect on what they heard during the presentations. A worksheet was provided with prompting questions.

_Question Burst:_

Committee members shared questions around the challenge of protecting drinking water sources.

Committee member questions included:

- How do we monitor residential lawn fertilizer?
• Who is responsible for coordinating management strategies?
• How to protect without touch land use?
• How to get people outside ‘your’ area to care?
• What’s the highest risk without regulatory or controlling governance?
• Who pays for another entity’s damage?
• How to internalize external costs?
• How do we know we’re making progress?
• How to get cities off of groundwater?
• Are there other partners who should be at the table?
• What does success look like?
• How to address private wells?
• What is the role of water quality standards?
• How to prioritize limited resources?
• How to tackle non-point source pollution?
• Who should be engaged in source water discussions?
• What are the top things that we should do?
• How do we create a collective strategy?

Small Group Discussion:

See summary in the appendix of this document.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS:
The small groups reported out, followed by a full group discussion of recommendations to TAC, Metropolitan Council, LUAC, Legislative Water Commission and others as determined by MAWSAC.

PLAN FOR NEXT MEETING & HOMEWORK:
Members should look for follow-up emails about actions identified at this meeting. The next meeting is planned for Tuesday, October 16th from 10AM – 1PM. The topic will be conservation and efficiency.

Before the next meeting, consider taking one or more of these actions:

a) Follow up regarding the Legislative Water Commission’s groundwater and drinking water recommendations:
   • Contact Jim Stark, Director of the Legislative Water Commission at Jim.Stark@lcc.leg.mn or 651-284-6431
   • Provide input to the recommendations using the ranking sheet Jim provided

b) Learn more about the Land Use Advisory Committee and consider the benefits of working more closely together:
   • Explore some recent work by the committee – would any of this information be useful to consider as MAWSAC considers project or policy recommendations? https://metrocouncil.org/Council-Meetings/Committees/Community-Development-Committee/2018/August-6,-2018/Land-Use-Advisory-Committee-Report.aspx
   • Contact Jon Commers, Chair of the Land Use Advisory Committee at Jon.Commers@metc.state.mn.us

MEMBER TAKE-AWAYS
General Manager Thompson stated she learned more about source water protection.
Chair Rummel shared that the question burst was good.
ADJOURNMENT

Business completed, the meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Susan Taylor
Recording Secretary
Appendix

**MAWSAC August 21, 2018 Meeting – Small Group Discussion**

What follows is a summary of the responses provided at this meeting by the small groups to the questions.

When considering all the costs of water supply management and operation:

**Where are you most concerned with funding structures?**
**Funding sources? Where are there gaps?**

- Convince politicians to look long term
- Lack of Metro voice in funding legislative coalition
- Plan “B” for most communities
- Uncertainty in regulatory future
- Replenishment of aquifers
- No capacity for regional water planning (subregional issues aren’t consistent)

![Funding Concerns](https://example.com/funding-concerns)

**When funding isn’t adequate, what happens – what concerns you the most?**

- Lack of leadership leads to lack of funding
- All state legislators need to approve for state funding. Alternative for region-based funding.
- Build needs for improvements in rates
- Challenging to get funding to address new treatment needs
- No funds for operation and maintenance – can result in contamination issues
- Once bond paid, continue rates/funds
- Contaminants other than those regulated in Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA).
- Need to focus on regional planning, not projects.

![Impacts](https://example.com/impacts)
Are there collaborative approaches to funding gaps? - what are the most important funding gaps to address as a region?

- Educate the politicians
- More money for Drinking Water Revolving Fund (DWRF)
- Tie plans to funding of future projects
- Metro to charge specific fees then redistributed in the metro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of leadership leads to lack of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All legislators need to approve for state funding. Alternatives for region-based funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build needs for improvement in rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging to get funding to address new treatment needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No funds for OTM - results in contamination issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once bond paid, continue rate/fee fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contaminants other than SDWA cont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to focus on regional planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>