

# Nokomis Area Groundwater & Surface Water Evaluation

## Leadership Team Meeting Notes

**May 01, 2018**

**Location:** [Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board Headquarters](#), River Conference Room, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, 2117 West River Road

**Attendees:** Katrina Kessler (Minneapolis), Michael Schroeder (MPRB), Deb Pilger (MPRB), James Wisker (MCWD), Tiffany Schaufler (MCWD), Dan Lais (DNR), Harland Hiemstra (DNR), Lisa Fay (DNR), John Evans (Hennepin County), Rosemary Lavin (Hennepin County)

### Meeting Notes

#### Introductions

#### Project Organization

*Project name, problem statement/definition*

The team agreed that the project is an evaluation and that the name should be specific that the evaluation is about groundwater and surface water, not all water such as potable water which is not an issue. The project will be referred to as: Nokomis Area Groundwater & Surface Water Evaluation.

No change to problem statement.

*Structure: partner agencies, teams, responsibilities*

Discussed project structure and approach, draft project organization and charter documents. Project Partner agencies include City of Minneapolis, MCWD, MPRB, DNR, and Hennepin County. John Evans and Rosemary Lavin are the Leadership Team contacts for Hennepin County, Karen Galles is the alternate. Karen Galles is also the Technical Team contact for the County. Technical Team contacts for the City of Minneapolis, MPRB, and MCWD were clarified: City – Paul Hudalla; MPRB – Rachael Crabb; MCWD – Tiffany Schaufler, with consultant Wenck Engineer. The team decided an informal approach to the agency partnership is best at this time. The City of Minneapolis, MPRB and MCWD have an MOU in place.

For the Project Organization document, some responsibilities were added for the Leadership Team: Define work, focus the work of the Technical Team; compile list of questions/"issues" for push-out communication and update as needed.

*Process: meeting frequency, location, facilitation, note taking; decision making; information sharing within teams and externally; joint document production and review; use of PM*

Discussed the process for moving the project forward. The team agreed the process is working naturally and decided an informal approach is best at this time.

Meeting frequency will vary depending on the team and the work in progress. A set meeting schedule will ensure people have time set aside on their calendars, meetings will be cancelled if not needed. Meeting locations may vary but MPRB typically has rooms and parking available, and its headquarters are somewhat central compared to other partners.

For now, email is working as a means to exchange documents and other information. SharePoint would be a good option for sharing documents in the future. Lisa will look into arrangements for a project SharePoint site for all partners to access. The City of Minneapolis project webpage continues to be an effective way to share information externally. The webpage also provides an email address for citizens to send questions to; most of the questions are being handled by City of Minneapolis staff. The group agreed a “living” Q&A document would have value in sharing information and responding to repeat questions. The communication plan will address sharing information with external parties. A regular progress report may be useful in keeping internal and external parties informed.

The group agreed that joint documents will be prepared with partner agency input/review.

The group agreed it will be important for continuity to have the PM at interagency team meetings. Lisa will arrange and attend interagency project meetings, develop meeting agendas, facilitate regular check-ins, circulate information as needed, and track progress.

See Project Organization and Project Charter, updated based on discussion at meeting.

## **Invitations to Other Agencies**

### *Letters to City of Richfield, MAC, others*

The team will review the draft invitation letter prepared for the City of Richfield. The team is considering if the invitation will be made and if so, if it would come from all entities or just one, such as DNR.

MAC has been responsive to information requests, and has indicated it is available and will provide additional information as needed.

Mn/DOT has been responsive to information requests and has indicated it will continue to provide information as needed.

Continue to invite USGS to technical team meetings. We are on the right track to understanding the issues and USGS expertise could provide useful input.

## **Communication Plan**

### *Purpose and content*

Harland Hiemstra, DNR information officer, described elements of a DNR communication plan and how those elements might apply to the Nokomis Area Groundwater & Surface Water Evaluation. Primary goals with the plan are to ensure consistency in our messaging and be proactive in our communications. Need process for handling information requests and for “pushing” information out. The City of Minneapolis is exploring educational items that could be posted on the webpage to help inform the public and increase understanding of the complex issues. There is a need to address misunderstanding and misinformation. Team agreed it is important to have a plan in place soon.

### *Agency coordination*

Discussed coordination among agency communication staff. Agencies will send staff names to Lisa/Harland so Harland can work with them in development of the plan.

### *Public outreach and engagement*

Discussed at a high level: the goal to be proactive, continued use of City of Minneapolis webpage, project email address for inquiries, FAQ/Q&A documents, messaging and information sharing via GovDelivery, public meetings

## **Updates (City, MCWD, MPRB, DNR)**

### *Feedback at recent public meetings*

[Time did not allow for discussion of this topic at this meeting.]

### *Weir operation*

[Time did not allow for discussion of this topic at this meeting.]

### *Proposed wells (notes reflect Dan Lais follow up to clarify location of monitoring wells)*

DNR Hydrogeologist staff completed a review of groundwater level monitoring information near Lake Nokomis and presented information to the Lake Nokomis technical team on March 30. DNR staff are recommending two additional intermediate depth monitoring wells located next to (nested with) existing shallow water table wells to help understand the flow dynamics and vertical groundwater gradients near Lake Nokomis. DNR also thinks these sites may be feasible for two additional wells in the underlying bedrock (this needs further evaluation and confirmation). These bedrock wells would be added to DNR's long-term groundwater monitoring network and could be installed using existing DNR clean water funding. A primary goal of the network is to better understand water level trends and support water supply planning. These two additional bedrock wells would help fill in a gap in our network. In addition there are cost efficiencies achieved by installing wells in the same locations.

DNR has a drill rig that can install wells up to 100 feet so could install intermediate depth aquifer wells. Would need assistance to fund the materials.

Access agreements needed prior to well installation. Can take time. City of Minneapolis and MPRB can facilitate. Most of the areas being considered for wells are under their authority.

Hennepin County can provide funding for at least two of the shallower wells. Would like to contract installation of the shallower aquifer wells themselves, instead of contracting for material costs with the DNR. Question of who would own and monitor? Coordination is needed between Hennepin County and DNR staff on well details. DNR staff (Scott Pearson and Nick Evans) have been identified to connect directly with John Evans in this regard.

Following the last technical team meeting, DNR and City of Minneapolis technical staff have been coordinating on information obtainable through city manholes and their use as "quasi-piezometers." An update on this progress is needed for the Leadership Team.

## Next Steps

- Interagency communication team coordination
  - Partner agencies will send communication staff contacts to Harland/Lisa
- Evaluate data needs
  - City of Richfield well pump logs
  - Document rationale for four new wells, identify proposed locations
  - Access agreements for placement of wells
- Hennepin County and DNR coordination regarding additional wells
- Update leadership team on manhole groundwater information progress
- Unified response to citizen letter – MCWD is drafting for team input
- Develop Q&A document – MCWD volunteered to draft for team input

## Next Meeting

- Next leadership team meeting proposed to be around June 1