

Minutes of the

REGULAR MEETING OF THE METROPOLITAN AREA WATER SUPPLY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 6, 2015

Committee Members Present:

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

Committee Members Absent:

Randy Ellingboe (Dept of Health); Lisa Volbrecht (Sherburne County); Greg Anderson (Isanti County); Michael Robinson (Chisago County); Jill Trescott (Dakota County); Mark Daleiden (Wright County); Susan Morris (Isanti County); Dan Stoddard (Department of Agriculture)

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 10:09 a.m. on Wednesday, May 6, 2015.

Introductions of committee members present were conducted.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

It was moved by Glen Gerads seconded by Steve Schneider to approve the agenda of the May 6, 2015 meeting. **Motion carried.**

It was moved by Steve Schneider, seconded by Glen Gerads to approve the minutes of the February 25, 2015 meeting. **Motion carried.**

WATER CONSERVATION IN THE TWIN CITIES: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES – Brian Davis, MCES

"The Council staff will share information regarding industrial water conservation efforts in the metro area, the newly revamped Water Conservation Toolbox, and an overview of a recently completed study of water billing rates across the metro area. The presentation will highlight some water conservation opportunities, challenges and potential future targets. Policy makers, industries, residents, and utilities can each play a part in increasing the water efficiency of the region."

Staff shared information about water conservation in the Twin Cities. The timeline of activities back to 2007 was reviewed. A water conservation toolbox was created in 2007 followed by the storm water reuse guide in 2011. Private well industrial water conservation projects started in 2013 followed by industrial water conservation in the north and east ground water management area. The Green Line Operations and Maintenance Facility /CHS field rainwater harvesting project started in 2015 as did a revamped water conservation toolbox.

The Twin Cities regional water billing analysis, finalized June 1, 2015, is collaboration between CDM Smith and the Metropolitan Council. Contents of the analysis reflect how water is inexpensive relative to other large metropolitan areas. It was stated the average Metro area residential household utilizes about 270 gallons of water per day or about 8,200 gallons per month. The Twin City communities evaluated were billed on average \$29.10 per month (range minimum was \$8.60, maximum \$123.91) compared to Chicago (\$26.48), San Diego (\$66.36), Milwaukee (\$27.74), and Indianapolis (\$44.01).

Rate structures showed 33 (out of 126 utilities) had a uniform rate structure. The amount of water to be paid does not increase or decrease if you use more or less. Of the utilities that had rate structures, for 8,000 gallon per month average household use, 31% of the utilities have this volume fall within the first

tier (low volume with average winter use and often a discounted rate) of the structures, 55% fall within a second tier (includes average volume use with a rate that covers the full cost of service, including summer use), and 14% fall within a third tier (usually contains higher rates to discourage excessive water use; also called higher tiers). More wealthy households reflect more water use in the summer versus in the winter months. Lower prices are also associated with greater water use.

Findings:

- 31% of tiered rate structures have 8,000 gallons per month in the first tier.
- Greater per capita water use in most communities with tiered rate structures versus flat rate structures.
- Inclined block rate structures are not necessarily water conservation rate structures.

Staff reviewed the layout of the water conservation toolbox that is available on our website. Created first in 2007, revisions were recently made to make it more user friendly, better organized, and more visual. Eight info-graphics are available that link to a water conservation method. Twin Cities monthly water use is shown for informational purposes to show the volume of water being used.

The toolbox is also divided in to user groups (residents and businesses, suppliers, communities, and learners). A series of topics are available in each group that helped address water conservation topics.

Staff then addressed an industrial water conservation assessment. Partnering with Minnesota Technical Assistance Program (MnTAP), we were tasked by the Legislature approximately 1 year ago to conduct an industrial groundwater conservation study in the North and East groundwater assessment area. Groundwater use within the GWMA was reviewed and divided into categories such as residential use, commercial use, industrial use, and agricultural use. Half of the use is residential use. There are 18 industries responsible for using 85% of the industrial water (3.1 billion gallons per year). We are currently working with MnTAP to do a one day assessments and outreach efforts to industries in the GWMA on conservation opportunities.

In summary, there are significant residential water conservation opportunities. Industrial water conservation has strong incentive opportunities. Tools exist to help communities meet water conservation goals. More tools are being created to help.

Committee feedback and discussion included:

- Referring to the study, it is important to evaluate the lifeline rates, but it is up to the decision makers to determine what works best for them. Tiers don't reduce water consumption. One size does not fit all. For utility, they need to balance between what to use and the money needed to operate. Shifted to a fixed fee due to the variable rate of consumption year over year. Good information, but a lot of variability.
- Historically, 7,500 gallons used as a benchmark, more recently it is trending downward. So rates could be skewed.
- Hugo has adopted development ordinances and wonder if these could be reflected in the conservation toolbox for growing communities.
- Reference to the ground water and surface water histograms – Have the size of the systems been evaluated or age of the systems? Yes. The most expensive system is East Bethel with the next four being Hamburg, Cologne, Greenfield, and New Germany. These are established, growing communities. The number of rate payers is driving the rates. The least expensive system is White Bear Lake. The system has been around for a number of years and is not growing much anymore. Data is available for every community.
- We discussed having two water meters in the homes at a recent City Council meeting. Do you have any experience or information on cities that use a second meter for irrigation? Staff stated

that there are 37 municipal utilities that offer one or more rate structures for irrigation. Some residential, some commercial. Homes with separate irrigation should reflect a lower water use for irrigation when two meters are in place. In your research, do you find cities that use dual metering? Staff stated that there are some such as Excelsior, Lino Lakes, Minnetonka, Plymouth, and White Bear Township as an example.

- Separate meters are available for irrigation. Water is not charged differently. Those who utilize dual metering for irrigation, are given a credit on their bill because the water does not go in to the sanitary sewer system.
- The conservation toolbox is working; however, presents challenges for those that lose summer revenue.
- If the conservation pricing isn't working right now, how do you change it to work? Staff stated for a third of the communities, the amount of water used monthly is in the lowest tier which could be the incorrect tier. Most should be in the second tier. Some communities are too small to be placed in the correct tier. We might want to look at California this year for ideas as there are significant changes in rates and water use.
- Could you remind me of the state rules for tiered rate structures, how prescriptive are they? Staff stated there is a statute for water conservation rate structures. Verbiage was updated that changed the requirement to water conservation measures, which could include a water conservation rate structure, it requires demand reduction measure and must have a conservation rate, but does not state what it is. There are many variables.
- How to enact a change from summer to winter peaking factor and how to reduce that. The DNR has a surcharge on usage for appropriations. It has been in place for 5 to 6 years. Hope to reduce summer peaking through this surcharge.

WATER RESOURCES POLICY PLAN UPDATE, Judy Sventek, MCES

"The Council staff will provide an update on the formal public review for the Water Resources Policy Plan and share the up-to-date policy and strategy changes related to water supply so that members understand how regional stakeholders comments are shaping the Master Water Supply Plan"

Staff presented an update on the Water Resource Policy Plan and how it relates to the Master Water Supply Plan.

There were three main phases to the plan process which included information gathering, the formal review process, and final adoption. As part of the process for the WRPP input was gathered in 2013-2014 from partners including working with Watershed Management Organizations, MAWSAC, and Metro Cities on draft policies and strategies. Informal meetings were held in October where input was received from partners with over 95 people attending. The plan was refined prior to releasing the draft plan for formal public comment. The plan was adopted in January for the formal public review process. Two meetings were held to clarify questions related to the plan in February during the public comment period to assist those were planning to submit comment letters. The public hearing was held on March 10 with one presenter from Metro Cities. The record closed March 27. The draft response to comments and major changes proposed for the WRPP was presented to the Environment Committee April 14. The final plan and comments is scheduled for presentation to the Environment Committee May 12 for approval after which will be sent full Council for approval. Final plan adopted is anticipated on May 24.

Staff shared a map layout out the metro area reflecting where comments were received. Staff stated 21 letters (166 comments) were submitted from 5 Counties, 4 Watersheds (three sent a joint letter), 14 Individual Cities (two sent a joint letter) and Metro Cities. In the previous Water Resource Policy Plan update in 2008, 46 comment letters were received.

Cities were generally concerned with water supply language and roles and responsibilities. Counties generally were concerned with the description of roles and responsibilities for many areas, appearance of Council wanting to become regulators.

Ten common themes resulted in feedback. Most comments were in the water supply, wastewater, and roles and responsibilities theme areas.

- 27 general comments ranging from support for integrated approach, reaffirming need for technical and financial assistance, to clarifying the impact on local comp plans.
- 4 comments on regional growth policy – Inver Grove Heights and Oak Grove had questions about the forecasts for them in thrive and sewerer forecasts, others on how WRPP was tied to Thrive.
- 15 on reuse – need for more in this area, direction, tools to use, guidance, assistance in removing barriers to reuse and encouraging us to lead by example.
- 20 comments on roles – about clarifying roles, reducing overlap with other agencies, not proposing to do more than already required to do under statute, assure them that we do not want to become regulators.
- 15 specific comments – suggesting verbiage or clarification changes on titles of tables and charts.
- 10 comments on surface water – confused over role in monitoring, confused about the local water plan requirements, wanted something on agriculture to be specific strategy in watershed approach.
- 4 on sub-service sewage treatment systems (SSTS) and community systems – why we want to know about this, what is our role? Are we trying to regulate this or take over county, city and township responsibilities in this area.
- 26 on wastewater – need more flexibility for inflow and infiltration, want us to look at SAC policy again, how regulatory impacts from Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDLS) will impact our wastewater treatment plant permits.
- 8 directly on sustainability – need better definition, have we thought about how decentralized wastewater treatment plants and growth impact aquifer drawdown, impact sustainability, how will sustainability apply to them.
- 38 comments on water supply – many around implied focus on surface water and not all options as solution, one size does not fit all, need for technical assistance and funding solutions, confusion over all role and others, are we trying to regulate this area.

Summary of common areas of agreement:

- Integrated approach
- Need for technical and financial assistance
- Need for further collaboration on the issues
- Stormwater and wastewater reuse concepts
- Need for looking into wastewater reclamation facilities to serve in the future
- Investment strategy on maximizing regional investments

Key areas of change:

Policy on Sustainable Water Supplies –

Original language:

- *The Council shall support and plan for the sustainable use of water sources that focuses on the implications of increasing groundwater use including impacts to surface waters, wetlands, and ecological areas while ensuring that supplies of potable water are sufficient for the region's current population and projected growth.*

Revised language:

- While recognizing local control and responsibility for owning, operating, and maintaining water supply systems, the Council will work with our partners to develop plans that meet regional needs for a reliable water supply that protects public health, critical habitat and water resources over the long-term.

Water Supply Resiliency Strategy –

Original language:

- *Promote water supply resiliency by identifying and pursuing options to increase surface water use, when economically feasible.*

Proposed language:

- Support community efforts to improve water supply resiliency by cooperatively identifying economically and technically feasible water supply alternatives.

Roles and Responsibilities in Water Supply –

Original language:

- *Collaborate with agency partners in developing and implementing Groundwater Management Areas, wellhead protection plans, review of water appropriation permits, and aquifer recharge projects.*

Proposed language:

- As required by Minnesota Statutes, continue to review and comment on local water supply plans.
- As requested by the DNR, continue to review and comment on Groundwater Management Areas and water appropriation permits.
- As required by Minnesota Statutes, continue to review and comment on wellhead protection and county groundwater plans.

Committee feedback and discussion included:

- Dakota County submitted a significant number of comments on the Water Resource Policy Plan. I just wanted to thank you for coming out and talking with us one on one and really getting rid of those comments and addressing those for us. Nice job in making sure our voices were heard.

MASTER WATER SUPPLY PLAN UPDATE – Lanya Ross, MCES

“The Council staff would like to receive MAWSAC member’s feedback on the April 2015 draft, ensuring that members are satisfied with how input on key issues is incorporated into the Master Water Supply Plan. The Council staff would like MAWSAC support to the release of the plan for public comment from all interested regional stakeholders.”

- a. How the Master Plan addresses key issues heard so far
- b. Group discussion
- c. Next steps

Staff provided an update on the status of the plan. Input so far has been received from public meetings, this Committee, the Community Technical Work Group as well as MCES staff.

Substantial revisions were made throughout the document, and changes generally fell into several common themes or categories.

The common themes and some examples of verbiage changes include, but are not limited to:

Vision for Regional Water Suppliers –

Original language

Sustainable water supply management will maximize the region’s use of the most economical sources, within sustainable limits. There are six main approaches that can be managed within sustainable limits.

Proposed new language

Sustainable water supply management will maximize the region’s use of existing water supply infrastructure investments – usually groundwater - within sustainable limits. Where demand exceeds the sustainable limits of existing sources, water conservation and other sources are available to support demand.

Emphasis on Conservation –

Original language

Some strategies, like water conservation, have short-term benefits that buy time to consider long-term issues. Other strategies, like expanding surface water infrastructure, pay off over a longer time frame.

Proposed new language

Strategies like water conservation can begin immediately and may eliminate the need for or buy time to consider additional options. Other strategies, like expanding surface water infrastructure, take longer to implement but can alleviate pressure on groundwater systems in areas with irreducible demand for potable water.

Emphasis on Cooperation –

Original language

Not enough emphasis – see proposed addition to Chapter 7 below.

Proposed new language

Currently, over 100 independent water supply systems operate throughout the region, and regional sustainability hinges on collaboration among these many systems. There is no simple solution, no one answer. Rather, the future of water management will involve many partnerships and tweaks and enhancements to a highly complex set of systems. The approaches will be varied, they will be creative, and they will require nimble thinking.

Clarify Roles and Responsibilities –

Original language

Not enough emphasis – see proposed addition to Chapter 5 below.

Proposed new language

The regulatory complexity of water management in Minnesota has been identified as challenging for decades. Public water suppliers and communities have identified several challenges, including: Supplying, treating and distributing water to consumers in compliance with Safe Drinking Water Act standards, water appropriation permits and well code.

Implementation and Tracking Progress –

Original language

‘Consistency with the Master Water Supply Plan’ section briefly describes how the plan guides local water supply planning.

Proposed new language

‘How the Master Plan Guides Local Water Supply Planning’ section provides more detail about the review process and local water supply plan considerations, including:

- Extended water demand projections
- Potential water supply issues
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Water conservation
- Proposed approaches to meet extended water demand projections

Reliability, Security, and Cost Effectiveness –

Original language

- Table 1 did not identify funding challenges as a management consideration for all sources.
- Table 1 identified drought as a management consideration.

Proposed new language

- Table 1 now identifies funding challenges as a management consideration for all sources.
- Table 1 now identifies drought and related risk of water shortages.

Uncertainty and Variability –

Original language

Not enough emphasis – see proposed addition to Chapter 5 below.

Proposed new language

New section added: ‘Key Factors Contributing to Uncertainty’. There are different types of uncertainties related to the issues discussed in this chapter. For instance, a distinction can be made between monitoring uncertainty and uncertainty regarding future conditions. Also, science has its limitations when dealing with complex societal problems where there are many system uncertainties, and where facts and values are intertwined. And insights may change over time as new information becomes available.

Water Quality –

Original language

Table 1 identified vulnerability to contamination as a management consideration.

Proposed new language

Table 1 now identifies vulnerability to contamination and related monitoring and treatment requirements as a management consideration.

These and other changes have been discussed with the Community Technical Work Group, whose members agree that the current draft is ready to be reviewed by a broader group of stakeholders in a public review process. The next steps are to get MAWSAC endorsement to release the draft for public review and request approval for a public hearing date from the Environment Committee and the Council. Public review period and hearing will be determined at the Environment Committee meeting on June 23 with approval through full Council on June 24. Public hearing is proposed for August 11. Public input will be accepted through August 25 with revised draft and request for final adoption in September.

Committee feedback and discussion included:

- Identification of Community Technical Work Group members include:
 - Michael Thompson, Maplewood
 - Steve Lillehaug, Brooklyn Center
 - Bob Cockriel, Bloomington
 - Dale Folen, Minneapolis
 - Jim Graupmann, St. Paul
 - Brian Olson, Edina
 - Bert Tracy, Golden Valley
 - Steve Albrecht, Burnsville
 - Russ Matthys, Eagan
 - Mark Maloney, Shoreview
 - Jennifer Levitt, Cottage Grove
 - Klay Eckles, Woodbury
- Does this do a better job of clarifying the vision? For water supply changes, I see it responding more toward conservation, which is fine. I'm cautious going too far to go one way or the other, but acknowledge.
- You don't want to lose the fact that surface water is an option and it may not be the best option. It is important to address sustainable limits. A limit that is out there, but no one is able to define it. What is the limit that is sustainable for the region? It is a challenge and will probably be met with comments when you go out for public comment.
- Suburban communities are able to postpone capital investment. There is a different need for building out infrastructure versus repairing.
- The original language "like expanding surface water infrastructure, pay off over a longer time frame" is very clear. The proposed language is less clear. Is surface water supposed to be considered for certain areas? In some areas where demand and use cannot be decreased, other strategies will take longer to implement. There may be some areas where the community or sub region is exceeding the sustainable limits of the aquifer they are using. They could look to surface water, but may not have any. May have to consider other alternatives. Recommendation made to word smith to two simple sentences.
- We have a copy of the draft water supply planning template. If there is consistency with the plan that hasn't been adopted, but a draft template that is based on being consistent with the

plan, can you explain how the two work together? Developing the template, the DNR has worked closely with the Metropolitan Council. The template may not be finalized until fall 2015. We want to be sure the template is circulated to all communities as quickly as possible without jumping ahead. The template existed before water supply planning commenced. Chapter 1 page 5 lays this out. The Master Water Supply Plan provides more information to consider when filling out the template.

- With the template, are comments being received from the Department of Health and the Pollution Control Agency at the same time? It is one template and meets the requirements for the DNR local water supply plan, the water supply plan portion of the local comprehensive plan as well as the requirements for the contingency planning required by the Department of Health. It is an efficient way to meet all the needs of the agencies. It is being reviewed by the Department of Health, Pollution Control Agency, MN Rural Water Association, as well as Metro Cities.
- An inquiry was made asking if this Committee would have an opportunity to review the document after public comments are addressed between August 25 and the September adoption. Staff stated there would be before the public comment period is complete, the Committee will be kept informed on feedback that is received.
- Are we ready to move forward?
 - Chair Rummel stated she received feedback from MAWSAC Committee members Lisa Volbrecht (Sherburne County) and Randy Ellingboe (Department of Health), who have reviewed the document and both felt the draft is at a point to go public.
 - Barry Stock (City of Savage) – I think the document has had a tremendous amount of input. I want to thank the staff and commend the staff, everyone that has been involved, for being open and very receptive to the comments. You can see quite a few changes in the document from when it was originally presented. When it was originally presented, I think it instilled a lot of fear in folks, and I think the language has been changed to reduce that dramatically. I like the clarification of roles that has been added because I also think in the beginning, many folks thought this was something the Met Council was just all of a sudden doing because they had nothing else better to do, but we all know pretty clearly now that much of this is mandated by the state legislature so I think that relieves a lot of concerns. I'm pleased with it. I like it. I think it's time to get out there and get more comments and get it done.
 - Chuck Haas (City of Hugo) – First, I'd like to thank Lanya when I was on my snow birding here this winter. She reached out and I appreciate getting that opportunity to comment even though I wasn't able to make this meeting. Secondly, I want to echo what Barry said. It's clear, especially from Lanya here today, her energetic ownership to the process to create a good workable plan and I like to see that. I trust that it's a good workable in process and I would agree that it's time to move it along.
 - Sandy Rummel (Metropolitan Council District 11, MAWSAC Chair) – I would like to echo the comments that have been made. I've been watching this very closely and listening and going places and I think some of the anxiety that surfaced really years ago has been dampened down and I think the clarification is what we want and is real good clarification; who does what and why we do it. I go to a number of meetings and there seems to be a myth out there we don't talk to each other. The cooperation, particularly with the DNR and other agencies on this. This isn't just something that is coming down the pipe all by itself. The addition of the Technical Advisory Committee has been a real asset. It's coming together pretty well. I appreciate the work you have done and the team has done and all the agencies that have participated and those of you who have read these documents and gone through them and found the things that are vague. It's really been helpful.

- Steve Schneider (St. Paul Regional Water Services) – I agree. I think they are ready to go.
- Anyone object to us moving forward? No objections from those present.
- Will the blank template in Appendix 1 be utilized in the plan again? Staff stated the Community Water Supply Profiles template will be customized for each city, county, watershed as well as sub regional level. Bookmarks will be included to make it more searchable. It will be part of the public review process.
- The communities will receive one package of systems plans. Communities will be able to link to the Master Water Supply Plan and will be included in the local planning handbook.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – Ali Elhassan, MCES

Legacy Funding Bill

The **House passed its Legacy funding finance bill** – *HF303* – last Thursday; the bill includes appropriations from the Outdoor Heritage, Clean Water, Parks and Trails, and Arts and Cultural Heritage funds.

Appropriations from the Clean Water Fund in the bill include \$975,000 in both FY2016 and FY2017 for the Council’s water supply planning projects work, and \$250,000 each year for a water demand reduction pilot program. The Clean Water Fund section of the House bill also changes the Council and the University of Minnesota from voting members of the Clean Water Council to non-voting members.

The council appropriation in the **Senate Legacy Funding bill**, which was released on May 4, 2015, differs from the house bill – \$750,000 was added in both FY2016 and FY2017 for grants or loans for local inflow and infiltration reduction programs addressing high-priority areas in the metropolitan area. The Clean Water Fund section of the Senate bill **does not** change the Council and the University of Minnesota membership in the Clean Water Council.

- Next step for this bill is heading to the Senate floor which has not been scheduled as of the time of this meeting.

House’s Omnibus Environment Bill – HF846

The **house’s omnibus bill** includes the provisions of *HF1835* that make changes to the Metropolitan Area Water Supply Advisory Committee (MAWSAC) by adding two members and creating in statute a separate technical committee to advise a policy advisory committee, and striking the requirement that local government water supply plans be consistent with the Master Water Supply Plan. The policy advisory committee would report to the legislature by February 15, 2017, and at least every 5 years thereafter. The bill appropriates \$100,000 in FY2016 and FY2017 to the Council for providing administrative and technical support to the technical and policy committees.

No companion bill is included in the **senate omnibus environmental bill**

- Next step for this bill is environmental conference committee which has not been scheduled at this time of this meeting.

Committee feedback and discussion included:

- Who are the members being added? Staff stated two members are being added from the St. Paul Utility Board as well as from Minneapolis. In addition, Hennepin and Ramsey Counties should be represented.
- Was it an agency sponsored bill? Is the bill similar to what is being done now? We are in consultation with Metro Cities and others in the analysis of the bill. MAWSAC membership is adding two members. The same service, roles, and guidance of MAWSAC members will remain intact with the addition of new members. The Technical Advisory Group is part of statute. Metropolitan Council started the Advisory Group prior to the start of the legislative

session. We are hoping to continue this group as they have started developing the knowledge and have a good look to the technical information we are using. We are hoping this same group could continue in the future.

- Patti Nauman, Metro Cities, Executive Director provided context about the policy advisory committee inquiry. The original bill is being carried by Representative Runbeck in the House and Senator Roger Chamberlain in the Senate had sought to remove the Metropolitan Council out of the water supply planning role. There has been a great deal of work done and have worked with the authors. The establishment of a Technical Advisory Committee in statute is calling it a Policy Advisory Committee is meant to distinguish the two. It is about providing clarity.
- My understanding is with the reformation of the legislative water commission created another policy board and the intent is to have MAWSAC report to that commission.
- This bill has bipartisan support in the House, not in the Senate yet, but will be in a conference committee shortly. The Republications and Democrats both want to see the legislative water commission have more of a say and role in some of these issues. There is another bill in the House omnibus state government finance bill that abolishes the legislative water commission.

GM REPORT

MCES General Manager, Leisa Thompson expressed gratitude for the efforts of staff in the Master Water Supply Plan process. I am proud of the efforts of everyone.

Regional water supply planning objectives document presented to those present. It is a one sheet piece of paper that shows what we do. Hopefully it is a useful communication tool for staff as well as others.

Announcement: Leisa thanked Glen Gerads for being part of an interview panel for the Environmental Quality Assurance position vacated by Keith Buttleman's retirement. He is currently in Italy on a great kick off to his retirement. I would like to introduce Sam Paske who has assumed Keith's role and has been coming up to speed. He previously worked for CH2MHill and embodies the interest in collaboration and co-creating things and is a great addition to our staff.

ADJOURNMENT

Business completed, the meeting adjourned at 11:58 a.m.

Susan Taylor
Recording Secretary