

Triangle Water Supply Partnership

MEETING SUMMARY

June 7th, 2019

North Cary Water Reclamation Facility
1900 Old Reedy Creek Road – Cary

Action Items

- Technical Committee will meet to discuss source water protection.
- Sarah Braman to send out poll regarding logo selection.
- Sarah Braman to work with Syd Miller and TJCOG to finalize map showing sources, partners and general water flow in the region.
- Partners to submit any additional feedback to Sarah Braman via email on the website (text, context, layout), and one-pager, and respond to the logo poll.
- Durham/Administrative Agent to send poll and information regarding Administrative Committee conference calls.

Welcome and Opening Comments

The partners reviewed the requirements for a quorum (simple majority, or 7 of 13 members) and a super majority (3/4, or 10 of 13 members). Adoption or modification of the budget, including cost allocation, and acceptance of new members are actions that require a super majority.

Approval of the April 5, 2019 Meeting Summary

Motion to approve by Jeff Adkins, second by Ruth Rouse, unanimous approval.

Adoption of the FY20-24 Five-Year Project and Funding Plan

The partners reviewed the FY20-24 Five-Year Project and Funding Plan and FY20 budget (attached), which had been updated since the April meeting to include costs through May 30. Motion to approve by Whit Wheeler, second by Jeff Adkins, unanimous approval with a super majority of Representatives present. Invoices for FY20 dues may be sent by Durham in July, or by the Administrative Agent in the coming months.

CommunityViz Growth Model

John Hodges-Copple presented an overview of the CommunityViz (CV) tool used for transportation planning including a handout (attached). Transportation planners have to (by federal law) select one evidence-based forecast of future growth to analyze transportation conditions and air quality impacts, pick one scenario that is most likely, defend it, and use it for planning. Main points are, a) make sure nothing unreasonable is done (e.g., development in Jordan lake) and b) be able to look back at what was done. Model includes all of Wake, Durham and Orange Counties; other counties' areas partially included but data can be supplied for remaining areas to use the tool. Two main uses are: 1) analyze land use scenarios and 2) allocate growth into areas. Right now looks out to 2045 for transportation planning. Has capacity for growth of different types – then allocates based on assumptions and capacity.

- a. OWASA used the CV analysis for its water demand projections and added in a Monte Carlo simulation (5000 scenarios) for water supply planning – applied highest uncertainty to non-residential development (+/- 50%). OWASA also applied uncertainty to residential development, unit water demands, conservation, precipitation and temperature.
- b. Every parcel is defined as one of 40 place types that it will become which forces users to have a common terminology of place types, but each jurisdiction can use different density or floor area ratio (FAR) for a type. (E.g., lookup tables are specific to jurisdiction, but each can only have one value for each place type). See handout for details.
- d. Two inputs that are most often corrected in QC checks are 1) what a parcel will become and 2) the parcel's current development status.
- e. For allocating – held focus groups with developers to help develop ranking for suitability factors (e.g., rapid transit, sewer available, etc.) - suitability is the “squishiest” variable. Also have to tell the tool total population to allocate. SFR, MFR, then jobs: industry, service high demand, service low demand, office retail. Third party control totals are used at the county level for jobs and population, because they tend to be accepted by the participants and have “standing” for other uses. They are allocated to be consistent with county control levels because of things like school systems which have to remain in county.

f. Questions:

What is regularity of updating? – Transportation does updates every 4 years – this month will launch a look at version 3. Updated to version 2 four years ago. Working with the guy whose company owns the software – good resource. Probably not expanding boundary this time but when 2020 census hits will probably expand urban area (e.g. Johnston County). Tweak it in between 4year updates. (Syd) For this update what is the process and timeline – how do jurisdictions work into it? (John) Primary inputs are type of place each parcel will become and current dev status. Alternatives for 2050 plan will be out in spring 2021 (transportation planner schedule). Getting what is in development pipeline (“committed”) is one of the biggest challenges. (Syd) Durham is updating comprehensive plan, water supply, and transportation – so schedule is consistent. Handout included resources for contact - Matt Day is not on list of resources but is in the middle level between John and Ben Bearden.

Syd asked OWASA and Cary if they felt the place types were adequate. OWASA – relied on local govts. For non res, prefer to go simpler and play with uncertainty rather than get more detailed. (Ruth) What-if based on sewer sheds and corridors - use CV for what-ifs of development. (Sarah) Place types were less consequential than the lookup tables with density. Only time Cary used place types was institutional. What would be interesting would be if the granularity in meter data showing user type was more reliable so that it could be correlated to place types. Relied on planning dept for density QC. (Jeff) In last few years, working with CV model, conversations that happened since then have helped understand working with the model as compared to working with results. (John) Transportation planners place types are designed to differentiate trip frequency and destinations.

(Jeff) One input that was a struggle was the county-level population estimates from the state – what are they developed for? (John) Didn't want to have to try to resolve differences and they are recognized resource, so just used them. Other regions like Minneapolis have a demographer on staff. In the Triangle they do sensitivity rather than try to come up with different “better” estimates. (Syd) DWR uses the state pop estimates when looking at JL allocation and compares to the applications.

(John) Matt Noonkester with CityExplained is the CV guru and there is a meeting (location TBD) at 9 am Friday Jun 28. Folks that come to that are MPOs – land use planners but any are welcome. Transportation planners are working on 2021 update and meet every 2 weeks.

(Sarah) What are milestones between now and then? (John) Communities doing planning along the way so they end up working with them to being in the best data. Don't want to start too early but don't want to change too late in the process, so it is a balance. Try to identify "the person" for each community by fall. (Syd) Everyone is working on their own water supply planning and the regional plan will be compilation so don't need to try to coordinate with CV schedule– each community will use or not use CV for water supply which is ok.

Regional Interconnections Map Review

Sydney Miller presented a first cut at updating the interconnections map. The idea behind the map is to show the relationships between the different systems and their sources of water and how that water can move between systems and from source to system. It's not intended to show every interconnection, number of interconnections, or where interconnections are. TJCOG developed the map. Sarah is going to work with Jen, with Syd's input, to continue working on the map.

Communication

Sarah Braman has received feedback on the website and one-pager and several more detail comments were offered during the discussion. Howard requested some kind of asterisk or coding for level 1 or level 2 allocations on page one. Also Raleigh is going to give up allocation so it will be removed; their Council has approved a letter being sent to DWR. There were several details discussed and Sarah will update the one-pager and the website.

Sarah Braman presented several logos – she will create a poll and send it out for member voting. (Vicki) once the new logo is approved Durham make a budget request for some printed items.

Administrative Items

Source Water Protection Rules update - Technical Committee met May 3 and focused on selection of proposals. Did not talk about source water protection much – learned more about American Water Infrastructure Act which requires risk assessment be done by March 2020; this drives the timeline more than state requirement for water supply protection plan. Technical committee will return to this topic next time they meet.

Formation of TWP Administrative Committee –Don Greeley asked about formation of an Administrative Committee; Durham staff have essentially been serving in this capacity by having weekly conference calls (about 30 minutes, and in slower times they tend to be cancelled) with Fountainworks to plan for meetings and follow-up on action items. Consider having Chair and Vice Chair – are others interested? Group consensus was to set up a call-in number and send out details so that anyone can participate, in addition to Chair and Vice Chair. In the past Fountainworks has provided agenda for call with bullet points of items to follow up on from last meeting and to prepare for the next week. Goal is to keep partnership on task. Has been 9 am on Fridays, but will do doodle poll after Administrative Agent is selected.

Jordan Lake Round 4 contracts - Jeff Adkins reported that DWR said they were waiting until they got all comments on drafts, and then were going to try to address the comments as consistently as they can across all the contracts before sending out final contracts. Primary contact is Kim Nimmer but DEQ attorneys are working on it. It will be FY20 before they are finalized. Allocation holders will get 2 invoices – one that should have been sent spring 2019, and the FY20 invoice.

Western Intake Partners Update

Sydney Miller reported that Pittsboro has already signed the agreement; Durham City Council approved it on Monday; OWASA coming up next Thursday; Chatham County considering it towards end of month. Once Durham has all signature pages it will go through Durham contract process and should be executed by end of month. Need to meet and decide what projects to undertake first, write RFQ and get moving.

Jordan Lake One Water

Jen Schmitz/TJCOG reported that stakeholder meetings are every quarter. Advisory committee is meeting regularly – work plan almost finalized and next full stakeholder meeting is June 26 in Mebane (about 50 people rsvp'd so far). Elected officials meeting tentatively with Secretary Regan, maybe June 24. Met with Rich Gannon (NPS group) with DEQ to review coordination with next round of Jordan Lake rules. UNRBA has also talked about this.

RFP Discussion - The Partners excused the consultants from the room to discuss private agenda items including the RFP.

Partner Updates and Problem Solving

i. OWASA –PFAST (Collaboratory) monitoring network results show high levels of PFAS in Cane Creek Reservoir. OWASA knew we had higher levels and have been sampling quarterly at our intake and in our finished drinking water. Investigators did let OWASA know about a week before they arrived to pull sample so they coordinated their quarterly samples with the Collaboratory's sample. OWASA's results are similar to the Collaboratory results. OWASA has been asking Collaboratory to also collect finished water samples with the raw water at cost to the utility, but the Collaboratory has not wanted to do finished water because they say there is no removal in the drinking water process. A reporter called and asked OWASA if the Collaboratory results were for raw or finished water. Lab staff have concerns about sampling protocols. (Syd) in a meeting with Collaboratory reps last fall, utilities were assured they could get to talk to them before any info went out; clearly that has not happened. (Ruth) Collaboratory sent results as a graph; had to ask multiple times to get raw data. (Jeff) were results consistent? Ruth said yes. (Jamie) During hurricane test a few months ago Rebecca Sadowsky was asked about non-targeted testing but said it is targeted, which is different than heard in beginning. Testing for 50 PF chemicals – more than Cary can do in lab. (Syd) is it more than EPA has approved methods? (Ruth) Lab staff are talking w/each other about this. (Jamie) Apparently Collaboratory is letting people know as they see flags and not waiting until have all data. They had a session for all pretreatment people a few weeks ago – word got out about 2 utilities; having a 2nd meeting. (Vicki) Durham has been contacted and did own sampling. (Whit) Raleigh has been contacted and they do quarterly sampling. (Syd) Results are available through the Triangle Area Water Supply Monitoring

Project website. (Ruth) Samples by Collaboratory not taken at intake, but at plant. (Jamie) When Duke discovered compounds in Cary water, DEQ tested Jordan Lake and Falls Lake and reports are on website.

ii. Simon – planning larger interconnection with Durham.

iii. Howard – asked about status of old 86 connection with Hillsborough? (OWASA) Simon will get back with Howard.

Attendance:

Marty Stone – Town of Apex
Matt Echols – Town of Apex
Jeff Adkins – Town of Cary
Sarah Braman -Town of Cary
Jamie Revels – Town of Cary
JD Arnold – Town of Cary
Brandon Blakely – Chatham County
Don Greeley – City of Durham
Vicki Westbrook – City of Durham
Sydney Miller – City of Durham
Aaron Levitt- Town of Holly Springs
Josh Baird – Town of Morrisville
Howard Fleming Jr. – Orange County
Ruth Rouse – OWASA
Simon Lobdell - OWASA
Elizabeth Goodson – Town of Pittsboro
Whit Wheeler - City of Raleigh
Warren Miller – Fountainworks
Leila Goodwin – Fountainworks
Jen Schmitz – Triangle J Council of Governments
John Hodges-Copple - Triangle J Council of Governments
Adam Sharpe – HDR
Kevin Irby – CDM Smith