

Minutes of the

REGULAR MEETING OF THE METROPOLITAN AREA WATER SUPPLY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

Committee Members Present:

Sandy Rummel (Metropolitan Council); Barry Stock (Savage); Michael Robinson (Chisago County); Randy Ellingboe (Department of Health); Tom Furlong (Chanhassen); Susan Morris (Isanti County); Jamie Schurbon (Anoka County Conservation District); Lisa Volbrecht (Sherburne County); Glen Gerads (City of Minneapolis); Julie Ekman (DNR); Katrina Kessler (PCA); Jeff Berg (Department of Agriculture); Mark Daleiden (Wright County); Georg Fischer (Dakota County)

Committee Members Absent:

Chuck Haas (Hugo); Steve Schneider (St. Paul Regional Water Services)

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 10:05 a.m. on Wednesday, July 23, 2014.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

It was moved by Barry Stock, seconded by Randy Ellingboe to approve the agenda of the July 23, 2014 meeting. **Motion carried.**

It was moved by Randy Ellingboe, seconded by Katrina Kessler to approve the minutes of the May 28, 2014 meeting. **Motion carried.**

WATER RESOURCES POLICY PLAN UPDATE

"State law directs the Metropolitan Council (Council) to prepare a Regional Development Framework (Thrive MSP 2040) and four "system plans" for transportation, aviation, wastewater and regional recreation and open space and related policy statements, goals, standards, programs and maps describing how the Council will achieve its charge. The Water Resources Policy Plan (WRPP) contains specific goals, policies and strategies related to wastewater, surface water management and water supply. The WRMPP also includes the required wastewater system plan. The draft water supply policies have been presented to you at a previous meeting. Today's presentation will focus on the process and schedule for plan adoption as well as provide an overview of the proposed policy for the wastewater and surface water management section of the plan."

Staff member Kyle Colvin provided an update on the water resources policy plan originally on the agenda for May 28 but postponed due to time constraints. Judy Sventek was unable to attend as co-presenter due to a scheduling conflict.

Focus will be on the plan update as well as the draft policy for surface water management and wastewater. The draft policy for water supply was previously provided.

The WRPP update strives to continue to strengthen our role and efforts in water quality and surface water management, wastewater operations and water supply planning. The new changes for this update include the concept of a water sustainability policy that directs all of the other policy. We are working to sustain resources by strategically integrating water supply, wastewater and surface water functions. We are working hard at integrating what we do in water supply and surface water management with our role in wastewater. For example, we are investigating the reuse of wastewater in order to reduce pressure on our water supply sources. We are looking at how we can use storm water such as for irrigation of ball fields which also reduces the pressure on our water supply sources. Our goal is to protect and improve the quality of the water in our region so we can remain a viable economic hot spot for tourism and to maintain our citizen's quality of life. We have drafted a sustainability goal stating *"The region's water resources are sustainable, supported by a regional strategy that balances growth and protection to improve and maintain the quality and quantity of our water in our lakes, rivers,*

streams, wetlands, and groundwater.” Within each policy area, wastewater, water supply and surface water we have proposed sustainability policies and strategies specific to those areas. Our first proposed sustainability policy is in the surface water area. It takes the direction from the overall goal, and supports our efforts to maintain and improve quality and quantity to support habitat and ecosystem health while providing for a high quality of life in the region. Several strategies that we will use to meet the policy include providing technical assistance to partners on projects, development proposals, and issues that may be come up that may impact water quality and continuing to monitor and assess the condition of our water resources so we know when we need to take or suggest stronger actions. Our second proposed surface water policy is about the watershed approach. We will plan to work with our partners to develop and implement a regional watershed based approach that addresses both watershed restoration (improving impaired waters) and protection (maintaining water quality in unimpaired waters).

A new area to highlight in the surface water section is about cost effectiveness. We know it will cost us about \$2 billion to makes improvements at our WWTPs to address new requirements and coming requirements for TP and nitrates. We need to work with partners and permitting agencies to develop strategies that allow us to balance point and nonpoint source reduction measures, where we may be able to offset improvements at our WWTPs by providing reductions to nonpoint sources.

For our policy on promoting water sustainability, we will continue to provide support and technical assistance to others on the work they do. We need to provide venue for easy access to water quality and quantity data and information. We need to support research and innovative best management practices (BMPs). We need to continue to install and monitor innovative BMPs at our own facilities to lead by example.

We have policies in the water supply and surface water areas on providing leadership. The policy suggests we need to facilitate discussions on topics of concerns. For example, we need to coordinate regional comments on new proposals and permitting requirements that impact our stakeholders to provide for greater support. We need to host training events and meetings on issues and topics such as we have done in the past for modeling tools and are doing for White Bear Lake.

Finally we have our draft policy on assessing and protecting regional water resources. We have a mandate for assessing water resources in the metro area as well as permit requirements. We need to continue to monitor our water resources, assess those resources, evaluate regional trends, and maintain easily accessible regional water databases.

The Council will strive to maximize regional benefits from regional investments. The Council will use the wastewater system plan to support the orderly and economic development and redevelopment of the Metropolitan area. A community’s comprehensive plan is expected to accommodate the forecasts and to meet the densities specified in the Council’s *Thrive MSP 2040*.

The Council will not provide additional capacity within its interceptor system to serve excessive inflow and infiltration. The Council will establish inflow and infiltration goals for all communities discharging wastewater to the regional wastewater system. Communities that have excessive inflow and infiltration in their sanitary sewer systems will be required to eliminate the excessive inflow and infiltration within a reasonable time period.

The Council will acquire municipally owned wastewater treatment plants in the rural area, based upon request through the comprehensive plan and comprehensive sewer plan processes, and based on upon criteria that ensure regional benefits.

The Council will operate and maintain its regional wastewater system to comply with all regulatory permits.

The Council shall conduct its regional wastewater system operations in a sustainable manner as economically feasible, not only related to water sustainability, but also by increasing energy efficiency

and using renewable energy sources, by reducing air pollutant emissions, and by reducing, reusing and recycling solid wastes.

The Council will continue to implement regional wastewater service fees and charges based on regional cost of service.

Communities that permit the construction and operation of subsurface sewage treatment systems and other private wastewater treatment systems within their communities are responsible to ensure these systems are installed, maintained, managed, and regulated consistent with MPCA rules. The Council will not provide financial support to assist communities if these systems fail.

The upcoming schedule for the WRPP:

We have been meeting since last year with advisory groups such as this group to get input on the plan. We met last year with Metro area watershed administrators, we are meeting this June with Metro Cities, we presented this information to our land use advisory committee, we received a great deal of input at the listening sessions for *Thrive MSP 2040* that has been incorporated into the plan. We will have a draft out for public review in the fall, with public hearing to follow and then adoption of a new plan in December or very early 2015. The plan should be finalized and adopted so new system statements can be circulated in the fall of 2015 in order for new comp plans to be submitted by end of 2018. Right now, these are draft policies, strategies and guidance. We have from now until early summer to make changes and fine tune those so any feedback on any of these items is welcome.

Committee Chair Rummel inquired if all three policy plans are being reviewed together or separately. Mr. Colvin stated the surface water management policy is what is being reviewed at this time. They are hoping for an integration of the three separate sections within the one plan. Comments will be sought on all three.

Committee Member Furlong inquired if the surface water management policy is being pulled in to the water supply policy. What has been the Council's plan on surface water/watershed area in the past? Mr. Colvin responded there have had three water elements contained within it. There has always been a water supply and surface water elements in the past. Is the surface water management a statutory requirement by the Council or an outgrowth of overall water resources? Keith Buttleman stated there is a statutory responsibility for the Council as the area-wide water management agency under Section 208 of the Clean Water Act. The plan and the purpose of the diagram shared reflects how more so than in the past we are taking the separate areas of responsibility and ensure they are working in the same direction and can complement each other where it makes sense.

Committee Member Furlong asked which of the policies are new and which are being revised and is there an expansion. Mr. Buttleman stated there is not much being proposed that is new other than sustainability has appeared more than in the past, we are hoping to make them better. Committee Member Furlong evaluated the different layers within local government and inquired if it is difficult to find the right balance and be sure another plan is not layered on top of the other plans already in place. Mr. Buttleman stated we are aware of the local government challenges being addressed and juggling the requirements and the need not to add anything different, but where we can do something that can help in conjunction with either watershed district, management organization or local governments to provide assistance, we are seeking to help with the process. Leisa Thompson stated we will be providing leadership within the regions to help the communities.

Committee Member Kessler inquired who the best person at the Council to address nitrogen and phosphorus costs, permitting, etc. Mr. Colvin stated Bryce Pickart would be the person to inquire from at the Metropolitan Council. Chair Rummel stated there are several interagency teams coordinating the work and topics being addressed.

Committee Member Ellingboe stated he is part of the interagency groundwater drinking water team. The complexity of the water resource planning efforts and planning efforts is great. They are looking at

how to assist with local planning efforts and supply the information in an organized and efficient way to local government.

Committee Member Stock stated on the policy on wastewater service, control is already in place. Whose definition is economically feasible? It may not be consistent with overall strategy in terms of sustainability. How do we encourage when it is economically feasible and not? Mr. Colvin stated the challenges of designing and providing facilities that will have to treat to a higher standard in order to accommodate reuse contain many challenges. Retrofitting existing treatment facilities is expensive and can be cost prohibitive, have location challenges, as well as how to distribute the treated water. Need to identify areas in the region that can deliver the product.

Committee Member Daleiden inquired about the sustainable regional long term wastewater service area. Mr. Colvin stated there is a long term map past 2040 available on the Metropolitan Council website, will become part of the policy plan and will contain color coded locations of current and future facilities.

MASTER WATER SUPPLY PLAN UPDATE

- A. *Review and feedback on plan chapters*
- B. *Schedules, next steps and summary of public forums*

"In this meeting the Council staff would like to receive MAWSAC member's feedback on the proposed contents, process and schedule of the updated master plan"

Lanya Ross provided an update on the master water supply plan. Draft plan was circulated prior to the meeting. Ms. Ross shared feedback from the community forums and is helping to shape the master water supply plan. A forum for city staff was held on planning sustainable water supplies, focus included local planning and utility staff, information provided about the scope and schedule of the Master Water Supply Plan update and an opportunity to solicit feedback about the format of the Master Plan and recommendations to make the plan as useful as possible. Three forums were well attended in Shoreview, Golden Valley and Eagan. Over 350 participants were invited and over 100 attended. Key speakers included Chair Rummel from this committee, Julie Ekman from the DNR, MCES General Manager, Leisa Thompson, Shoreview Public Works Director Mark Maloney, Golden Valley Utility Supervisor Kelley Janes, and Eagan Public Works Director Russ Matthys.

Most important components of the Master plan were regional and subregional water supply issues, that Met Council review checklists for local plans and permits and tools on how to locate the plan. The preferred format is electronic, online, downloadable, bookmarked, as a presentation with maps and to hold individual meetings with stakeholders.

External outreach is planned on August 14 and 21 for elected officials. Invitations will be circulated. In fall 2014, city planning and utility staff with more technical information and how it fits within the plan. In spring 2015 formal public review could be rolled out to the general public. On an ongoing basis subregional water supply work groups, interagency work groups, ad hoc presentations as requested by interested stakeholders will take place.

Chapters 1, 2 and 8 were reviewed with the committee.

The updated Master Water Supply Plan includes much of the same information as the original Master Water Supply Plan. A diagram comparing the current table of contents with the updated table was reviewed. For the most part, the content is the same. It has been broken into smaller chapters, though, to make information easier to find. In some cases, the order of chapters has been rearranged to make a more organized fit between Outcomes, strategies, roles & responsibilities. Over the next few months, you will be reviewing 9 chapters. Tentative MAWSAC review includes:

Time Period	Master Plan Update - Chapters to Review
July 2014	Chapter 1: Overview Chapter 2: Goal, Principles Chapter 8: Roles & Responsibilities
August 2014	Chapter 4: Water Supply Sources Chapter 5: Key Water Supply Issues
September 2014	Chapter 3: Water Use Chapter 6: Outcomes
October 2014	Chapter 7: Implementation Strategies Chapter 9: Resources/Tools
November 2014	Review & provide feedback on complete draft report
December 2014	Review & provide feedback on complete draft report
January 2015	FINAL DRAFT COMPLETED for MAWSAC
February 2015	MAWSAC review complete final draft
Spring 2015	PUBLIC REVIEW
Spring/Summer 2015	Review & incorporate public feedback
Spring/Summer 2015	Review & incorporate public feedback
Summer 2015	COMPLETE & APPROVE

Chapter 1: The purpose of this chapter is to set the stage for the document. It provides a high level description of the topic the plan addresses – and the value of the region’s water, the need for the plan – mandated by the legislature, the process to develop and update the plan. As you review this chapter, do you think the information provided in this chapter fulfills the objective of the chapter? If not sufficient, should anything be added?

Chapter 2: The purpose of this chapter is to clearly state the Master Plan goal, guiding principles, and illustrate the regional vision for water supply. The goal remains the same as the original Master Plan. The principles remain the same as the original Master Plan. The chapter includes a figure that is a new way of visually illustrating how the goal could be achieved following the principles. This new figure introduces a quantifiable sustainability goal/target for the region – based on optimum/sustainable use of the multiple water supply sources available. A question we heard multiple times at our public forums is: how much water is sustainably available from aquifers, from rivers, etc. Groundwater pumping is okay up to some limit. If we’re in the green zone, we’re okay. Where demand is greater than the sustainable groundwater amounts, we are not out of water – other sources are available to meet our needs: surface water, wastewater, storm water, and conservation. Good water supply management means finding the most cost-effective and reliable way to keep groundwater use within the sustainable limits and implementing alternative sources where needed.

Chapter 8: The purpose of this chapter is to identify the key players for water supply planning & management. It provides a high level description of entities roles & responsibilities. These are not new roles and responsibilities – they reflect current statutes and programs. Thank you to Agency staff who provided information for this chapter. Do you think the info provided in this chapter meets your needs? If not sufficient, should anything be added?

Committee Member Schurbon recommended adding the checklist to the table of contents. Ms. Ross stated it is located in Chapter 9, but will highlight in the table of contents.

Committee Member Gerads inquired if water supply and water source are one in the same or should be differentiated. Ms. Ross stated they are not the same to her but are related. The limit has not been clearly defined. Committee Member Gerads also commented on the roles of municipalities/water supply utilities. We need to be careful not to create new terms. Ms. Ross stated the decision to separate or not has been thought about. Committee Member Gerads recommended the first paragraph can be deleted referencing the autonomy.

Committee Member Ellingboe commented about references to statute regarding terminology. There are public water supplies and public water supply systems. Terminology at the Department of Health would be community public water supplies. Committee Member Ellingboe agreed it would be beneficial to use similar terms as in other programs. Committee Member Berg stated it also caught his eye on the roles and responsibility page Chapter 8. Need to create a context as to meaning and what the chart means.

Committee Member Ellingboe clarified in addition to the Department of Health being engaged in monitoring water quality for public water supplies we are the enforcement agency for the safe drinking water act and would add that to the role clarification.

Committee Member Fischer inquired the overview portion does not mention the other waterways. That should be mentioned as the DNR is looking at how it is affecting streams, rivers, lakes and wetlands. He recommends removing conservation as a source on the graphic. Comment on monitoring and assessment in Dakota County, we monitor and assess surface water, but ground water as well and have a dedicated well program. The jurisdictions will be different across the region. Ms. Ross stated it does vary from county to county. A question that came up is what role should counties play in the water supply given they can have a more active role. Ms. Ross will be asking more county staff as discussions continue.

Committee Member Furlong commented the overview will set the tone for the rest of the document. It begins discussing an "abundance" of supply, but there is not. The tone tends to discuss a possible crisis. This does not seem to be the case. There are pockets of concern. White Bear Lake is not indicative of other lakes around the Metropolitan area. Need to be careful with a negative tone coming across.

Committee Member Furlong also commented the characteristics of the document should also include flexibility in implementation. There is not a one-size-fits-all across the region. We have different needs, demands, sources, resources, and challenges.

Chair Rummel inquired if this will come back to this group again. Ms. Ross stated, yes. It will be brought back in pieces as well as the entire document prior to implementation. A recommendation was to bring comments to the committee to be heard so the group can benefit from the feedback.

Committee Member Gerads stated cost effectiveness and equity are in the equation. How? Ms. Ross stated the idea of equity was a big topic during the development of Thrive MSP 2040. The idea of everyone having access to the water and the resources to plan water effectively is important. Are we providing feasibility assessments in all areas of the Metro area rather than just the areas that need it?

Committee Member Volbrecht inquired if there is a value in prioritizing water use? Ms. Ross stated it is not in the detail at this time, but it might be worth considering. Prairie Du Chien is a drinking water supply. Is there a value to include how we use water? Ms. Ross is drafting the water use chapter and will address as part of that chapter.

Committee Member Ekman inquired if the reference is to water use allocation priorities? There is a statute that does prioritize water uses and has to do with how DNR allocates water through its permitting process. Is that something you would like to see reflected? Committee Member Volbrecht

stated agreed as a community water supply we use essential and non-essential and then you further define the non-essential. Not sure where the language comes from our standpoint, but I think there is a value in saying “drinking water” versus you have a water supply if you wash your car, but it is not essential. Ms. Ross stated she would put some language together and bring it back to this group.

Committee Member Fischer stated he has reviewed the allocation priorities and include domestic water supply, consumption of less than 10,000, agriculture, power production, uses other than agricultural, non-essential. They are outlined, but not entirely transferable to our discussion today because of how they are defined. (10323g61)

Committee Member Ellingboe can see the value in having the context as part of this document.

Committee Member Robinson encouraged continued work on the plan.

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.”

Dr. Ali Elhassan provided a technical projects update for the northeast Metro feasibility study. The draft report is being released to the public today July 23, 2014. Technical information, cost analysis and the Executive Summary was provided in the materials for this meeting. The goal of the study is to identify and evaluate subregional infrastructure needs to achieve water supply sustainability. Outcomes are to obtain an evaluation of feasibility as well as an implementation plan, regional targets, timelines and milestones. Tasks to accomplish this include engineering analysis of potential solutions, capital, operations, and maintenance costs, and funding mechanisms and equitable cost-sharing structures.

Staff member John Chlebek provided an overview of the three approaches. The first approach is the St. Paul Regional water services connection. It involves an optimized use of existing infrastructure as well as need and feasibility of expanding the St. Paul regional water system infrastructure. Approach two is a new surface water treatment plant which will draw from the Mississippi River via the chain of lakes source. Approach three is lake augmentation that involves direct lake augmentation of the surface water from the Mississippi River via the chain of lakes system.

Next steps include input from Northeast Metro Water Supply Work Group and stakeholders, evaluate the costs and impacts of continuing on the current path of relying on groundwater without change, complete the evaluation of all alternatives to identify those that best improve water sustainability and protect water resources in the northeast metro area, evaluate ownership and cost sharing models along with potential funding sources for the best alternative(s) identified, and assess use of both surface water and groundwater as a long term management strategy.

Dr. ElHassan stated there is a great deal of direction from the legislature about tasks that need to be performed as a part of the studies. When the regional funding was obtained, there is direction to accommodate the issues in the north and east. The stakeholders were involved in developing and ranking options as well as agencies and the Met Council. That is why lake augmentation is an option being evaluated. An additional two options are being evaluated as well. Industrial water use and how to reuse as well as looking in to opportunities for use of storm water and identification of recharge zones groundwater recharge issues.

Committee Member Stock inquired if any of the six cities have a treatment plant currently? Mr. Chlebek stated most do not have a water treatment plant currently. Is the study looking at the growth needs and whether investment will need to be made in their infrastructure? Dr. ElHassan stated the evaluation of business as usual is being looked at for infrastructure changes and implementation is needed. Mr. Chlebek added in general for a community that is not treating groundwater currently, they are not being evaluated for groundwater treatment in those communities.

Committee Member Kessler stated funding and direction for groundwater management area work was obtained from the legislature and inquired how does this play in to the planning process? Dr. ElHassan

stated the Met Council and DNR have been in strategy planning over the past year since the development of the north and east groundwater management planning as well as the development of the master water supply plan and the feasibility studies feeding in to the master water supply plan. We are collaborating with the DNR. The scheduling for the two are challenging for analysis work.

Committee Member Gerads stated he would like to see more differentiation in the alternatives between option 1 and 2. The augmentation may need to be in the appendix of the report. Not clear on how it fits within the context of the report. Dr. Elhassan stated it is the direction received from the communities we are trying to serve and how they have asked for it.

Committee Member Furlong inquired if there is any sense if the results will be achieved the communities were looking for. Do you have any sense if you follow the other alternatives it will achieve the results the communities are looking for? Mr. Chlebek stated with the recovery of lake levels, it is difficult to ascertain at this time. Committee Member Furlong until you get the information you don't know. Mr. Chlebek stated, yes.

Committee Member Schurbon inquired how does the groundwater offset compare to the groundwater use from previous years. Does it get us to approach groundwater use levels from years ago? Dr. Elhassan the current groundwater pumping in that region for the communities is more than what was used for augmentation.

Committee Member Volbrecht inquired if looking at the communities being served and those being considered for phases the demand exceeds the supply. Is anything being done to address the limitation of funding resources? Mr. Chlebek stated we evaluated what it would take to consider and provide costs to the communities on where to allocate funding resources.

Committee Member Daleidon inquired with the wet spring, what affect did it have on the lake levels? It's up about 2 feet from its low in the fall. Is White Bear Lake dropping faster than the others? White Bear Lake watershed is smaller than others in the area. There is not a lot of runoff.

Chair Rummel inquired if the assumption that the status quo will reduce the sustainability of water if there is something behaving differently in the northeast Metro than other areas. Dr. Elhassan stated there is a difference in the geology in the area. White Bear Lake is considered groundwater fed. There is always a relationship between the groundwater level and the lake level. U.S. Geological Survey is currently evaluating the areas of seepage. Met Council is supporting this evaluation.

Chair Rummel stated the moment we are not in crisis given the amount of lead time we need to prepare for population growth and climate change, it is imperative we work on this initiative now. Dr. Elhassan said, "We are not running out of water." Our increased reliance on groundwater will have impacts in future years.

STORMWATER INNOVATIVE PRACTICES: EMPIRE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT

"The Empire Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is one of seven regional plants operated by MCES, serving the communities of Farmington, Apple Valley and Elko-New Market. The plant was expanded in 2007. During the expansion, a number of innovative storm water practices were installed, including bioinfiltration basins, swales, permeable pavers, and a green roof. No surface runoff has left the plant since the practices were installed. MCES is currently monitoring the practices for effectiveness as well as tracking maintenance costs."

Postponed to next meeting

REPORTS FROM MAWSAC MEMBERS

Due to time constraints, reports are postponed at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

Business completed, the meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Susan Taylor
Recording Secretary