



April 30, 2018

Citizens Environmental Quality Committee
Winona, Minnesota 55987

Dear Committee Members:

The next meeting of the Citizens Environmental Quality Committee meeting will be held on **Thursday, May 3rd, 2018 at 4:30 p.m. in the Misato Room of City Hall.**

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Review and approval of March 23 and April 5, 2018 meeting notes**
3. **Review of Planning Commission action regarding the CEQC (15 minutes)**
4. **Next Steps for Independent Commission Status (15 minutes)**
5. **Visit to Wastewater Treatment Plant (5 minutes)**
6. **Ongoing Initiatives Update (10 minutes)**
 - 6.1. **Partners in Energy**
 - 6.2. **GreenStep Cities**
 - 6.3. **Lake Winona Waterfowl Management Framework**
7. **Other Business (5 minutes)**
8. **Adjournment**

Sincerely,

John Howard

Natural Resources Sustainability Coordinator

CITIZENS ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING NOTES

DATE: Friday March 23rd, 2018

TIME: Scheduled for 1 pm

PRESENT: Fran Goodin, Bruno Borsari, Dan Hall, and Hans Madland

GUESTS: Two members of the public (Fran's family)

STAFF: Brent Bunke (Water Plant Superintendent), and John Howard (Natural Resources Sustainability Coordinator)

1. Johnson St. Water Plant Tour:

The sole focus of the meeting was a tour of the Johnson St. water plant. The tour began at 1 pm with introductions of CEQC attendees. The Water Department Superintendent, Brent, then started his PowerPoint presentation beginning with a history of the water department. The City's water department was created in 1882. Earlier iterations of the water plant had a stand pipe, which is a skinny water tower that looks like a smokestack, and then a more traditional looking water tower. The City began filtering water in 1969. The most recent technological change was switching from vertical filtering cylinders to horizontal ones in 2000.

The City's water wells are between 500 to 1,000 feet deep and draw water from the Mt. Simon aquifer. There are a total of 8 active water wells: three at the Johnson St. plant, three at the Westfield plant and two at the Wincrest water plant. Bruno enquired about the size of the aquifer, and neither John or Brent could provide an estimate. John replied that he believes some metro cities draw from the aquifer as well, and Brent pointed out that most metro cities draw their drinking water from surface water.

Brent also handed out a model of the hydrologic and groundwater system. There was a question regarding where water enters the aquifer. Brent and John indicated there is not one point, and were unsure where Winona's water has traveled from. Brent said that Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) looked at the age of the ground water in the last year, and dated the water as being in the ground for nearly 10,000 years.

One guest asked why water taste varies between different places in town. Brent indicated this was likely due to the pipes the water passes through, and potentially there could be different tastes between wells and treatment plant.

Brent explained that iron and manganese are removed from the City's water. Iron water from sand point wells causes an orangish discoloration on building and sidewalks, and may impact taste. Manganese is removed primarily for taste. The City does not soften water, although removing these two elements will change the grain count. Typically water will leave the plant at about 15 grains of hardness.

In addition to the three water plants, the city operates reservoirs. Booster stations are needed in some locations to increase the water pressure – one example is near the base of the Treetops subdivision.

The group then started the walking tour of the water plant. The first stop was at the fluoride station, which is automated. The MDH requires fluorination, although it is a small amount – no more than 2 parts per million. Typically the City water registers at 0.6-0.7 parts per million.

Next was the chlorine disinfection station. Chlorine has long been used as a water disinfectant and is much cheaper compared to other measures. Dan asked about alternate measures, as he knew this was of interest to other CEQC members not in attendance. The group discussed that UV light works as a disinfectant, and putting water in a clear bottle is a method used in less developed areas that takes advantage of the anti-microbial power of the UV rays in sunlight.

The group was able to see the well withdrawal area where ground water is pumped to the water plant from the wells. The water is put in a large underground reservoir before being treated. One of the guests from the public asked whether the City uses clean energy for the water plant, and if not, why not? Brent deferred to John, who replied that the City subscribes to a community solar garden, so we will get solar energy to power some of the water plant's operations.

The tour continued outdoors to the reservoir, where there were questions about site security and terrorism prevention. Hans asked what would happen if a flood got over the levy? Brent hoped such an incident never occurs. Brent stated that the fence around the plant is the standard security measure used by water plants.

The group went back inside and looked at the pumps that draw water from the reservoir into the treatment area. Typically one to two of these pumps operate at a given time.

Next the tour proceeded to the basement of the main building. This is the intake area to the filters on the floor above. A CEQC member asked if untreated water is ever used in an emergency. Brent replied that this is only a last resort, and to his knowledge, the City has not done this. Doing so would require a clean out of the pipes. On the way back to the main floor, another member asked about the pipe labeled sludge, which is where the buildup from the filter backwash is pumped – essentially it is the material removed from the water by filtration.

Brent explained that the large tanks on the main level are for filtration. The water enters at the top of the tank, and percolates through filter media, either starting with “green sand” or anthracite coal. As the water moves through the filter, the media gets larger and the water gets more pure. After filtration, the water is ready for chlorination and fluorination. Brent demonstrated the water purity levels at different levels of the filter tank based on the level of filtration.

The group proceeded to the education area where Brent showed an example of the typical household connection to the water main. The property owner is responsible from the connection point off the water main through to the house. Often a “goose neck” pipe, which is curved, connects to the water main, and has an emergency shut off that reaches to the ground level. Brent advised keeping the shutoff available, as it may be needed in an emergency. The “goose neck” piece of the pipe historically was made of lead, as it was a malleable metal.

Brent gave a demonstration about a flushing toilet, as a poor flushing toilet is the cause of 90% of all high water bills. John added that these high bills can be in the hundreds of dollars. A guest asked about how to test for a leak, specifically a hissing sound. Brent was familiar with this type of issue, and said the hissing is likely a poor gasket seal. To test for leakage, he suggested adding a dye packet to the toilet reservoir and seeing if it seeps into the bowl. A number of attendees took a free dye packet.

Following some miscellaneous questions, the tour concluded at approximately 2:45 pm.

CITIZENS ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

DATE: Thursday April 5, 2018

TIME: Scheduled for 4:30 pm at the City Hall Misato Room

PRESENT: Chris Meyer, Bruno Borsari, Dan Hall, Hans Madland and Lynette Power.

GUESTS:

STAFF: Natural Resources Sustainability Coordinator John Howard

1. Called to order: 4:37 pm
2. Approval of March 1st minutes: Motion by Chris, Bruno seconded. All in favor.
3. Water plant tour:

Dan was impressed by knowledge of the superintendent and cleanliness of the plant. Bruno echoed that tour was informative. Dan said host was congenial.

Hans was concerned by security, and ease at which a malfeasant could do harm. Dan said security was pretty standard for a water plant, and John affirmed. Bruno talked about how water supply is always a vulnerability, and cited the cryptosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee. Lynette asked if CEQC was familiar with Fountain City contaminated water supply? No one in attendance was familiar. Hans believes precautionary principle should apply, and it is worth taking substantial caution to protect our water supply.

Dan described that he asked about chlorine and fluoride, and chlorine is used for cost considerations as it is the cheapest highly effective option. Lynette expressed that if values are aligned to using alternatives, funding would be found, as there is public concern about using these two chemicals. Dan noted that bottled water actually is less regulated than tap water.

Hans voiced interest in visiting the City's waste water treatment plant (WWTP), as the water plant tour was very worthwhile. John will look into times to visit the WWTP, and suggested waiting until warmer weather as much of a tour would be outdoors. Dan said he was an intern at the WWTP, and that the processes occurring at the WWTP will be more complicated than at the water plant.

4. Discussion of Goals:

Bruno stated his desire for the CEQC to be more robust in their measurement of goals. Bruno's specific suggestions:

- In goal #1: Documenting City's Environmental Actions and Progress, we should make sure the report is made available to the public, and ideally hold a presentation or other outreach so the public is aware of it.
- In goal #6: Active Transport, we are vague as what "success" is.

Dan believes the discussion today should not be about rehashing goals, but to make sure they are clear and an accurate reflection of the goals the CEQC discussed. John noted that in order to make the Planning Commission submission deadline, the goals as included in the CEQC agenda packet were already sent out to the Commission. John can report any changes made today at the Planning Commission meeting, but they will not be shown in the text that the Commission sees.

Hans made the point that even if we are not formally a part of the Commission following the separation, it would still be wise for the CEQC to stay abreast of Commission projects, and to network with other commissions at the City.

Hans felt the changes to the air quality goal were significant and somewhat concerning. The goal was changed from doing monitoring to just looking into and planning how monitoring would be done. Hans stated that technology exists that can do monitoring, and guidance on how to do monitoring is easily accessible. Dan believes the CEQC still needs more specifics before we can say the City will do monitoring. John added that he talked with the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) last fall about borrowing monitoring equipment, and it is maybe possible, but not typical. The MPCA would like to see a Council request before getting highly involved. Hans said many citizens are concerned about air quality, and Bruno added that poor air quality is a legitimate health concern. Hans pointed out that the timeline was already out of date with March 2018 being listed as the deadline for the goal.

Chris stated that the CEQC should still focus on other goals and concerns since they are important too. She gave the example that water quality is a major concern to her.

Hans discussed that he sees the CEQC acting as an advocate for residents, and should not shy away from proposing an action or goal because another group/commission may not see it as a priority, or even be opposed to it.

Dan reiterated that the goals are not a justification for seeking independence from the Planning Commission.

Motion made by Dan, and seconded by Lynette to make the first change suggested by Bruno regarding more public engagement on the environmental report, and to add a year to the air monitoring deadline as noted by Hans. Other goals were to stay as written. All voted in favor.

Quorum was lost after the vote, so meeting was adjourned at 5:31 pm. Topics 5-8 tabled.

CITIZENS ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE

AGENDA ITEM: 3. Review of Planning Commission action regarding the CEQC

PREPARED BY: John Howard

DATE: May 3, 2018

At the Planning Commission meeting on April 9th, the Commission heard from staff John Howard and CEQC chairman Dan Hall about revisions to the CEQC's goals. The Commission was not asked to make any formal motion or decision, although they did have a few questions. The most pointed was about why the CEQC would look into alternative water filtration methods and fluoridation, which they believed were established and effective technologies and mandated by the state. John replied that fluoride is required by the state, but that a CEQC member was concerned about it.

At the Planning Commission meeting on April 23rd, John presented a resolution and draft ordinance text to the Commission. Commissioners had questions about the name, composition, and structure of the proposed new environmental commission. The resolution to support the CEQC becoming an independent commission was called to a vote, and passed 3-2.

Minutes from the Planning Commission are being prepared and will be available at the meeting for CEQC member to read.

Attachments:

- Cover sheet sent to the Planning Commission for April 23 meeting
- Resolution approved by the Planning Commission
- Draft ordinance text

PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA ITEM: 3. CEQC Standalone Advisory Commission Request

PREPARED BY: John Howard

DATE: April 23, 2018

Included are two documents that support the CEQC's goal of becoming an advisory commission to the City Council. It is important to note that this change in status would not curtail or limit the ability of the CEQC to continue to act as an advisor to planning topics. As is the case currently, the Planning Commission would be able to request that the CEQC research or advise on a topic.

1. The CEQC requests that the Planning Commission consider and vote on the attached resolution that supports the CEQC becoming an advisory commission to the City Council. This resolution would be taken to a future City Council meeting to show that the Planning Commission approves of the CEQC's change in status.
2. At the Feb. 12th Planning Commission meeting, the Commission requested to see draft ordinance language for moving the CEQC to a standalone commission. The attached has been adapted from language on other commissions currently outlined in chapter 22 of City Code.

Attachments

1. Resolution
2. Draft Ordinance

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the City of Winona Citizens Environmental Quality Committee (CEQC) serves as an advisory committee to the City's Planning Commission with a focus on achieving the goals and objectives of Chapter 7 of the City's Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the CEQC wishes to address a variety of environmental concerns, including on topics outside the purview of the Planning Commission, and therefore seeks to become an advisory commission independent from the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, many Minnesota communities have successfully created and sustained commissions that focus on the environment; and

WHEREAS, an environmental quality commission could and would coordinate with other city commissions and departments, and therefore would continue to fulfill their current function as an advisory resource for the Planning Commission.

NOW THEREFORE LET IT BE RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of the City of Winona, Minnesota that the Planning Commission supports the CEQC's objective of becoming an independent advisory Commission.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2018.

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND
THE CODE OF THE CITY OF
WINONA, MINNESOTA
1979

The City of Winona does ordain:

Section 1. That Section 22.14 (a)(1) of Chapter 22 of the City Code of Winona, Minnesota, 1979, which chapter is entitled “City Administration”, be amended as follows:

22.14 DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.

(a) Creation and Functions. A department of community development is hereby established. The functions of the department of community development shall include the following:

(1) Provides staff work for Boards or Commissions established by the City Council including but not limited to the following: Port Authority of Winona, Planning Commission, Board of Adjustment, Architectural Review Board, Board of Gas Examiners, Building and Fire Code Board of Appeals, ~~Citizens Environmental Quality [Committee] Commission~~, Heritage Preservation Commission. Staff work shall include, but shall not be limited to, preparing detailed staff analysis on development issues, provide research on matters relating to development, prepare appropriate documents and correspondence, prepare meeting agendas and official minutes, and other documents related to development activities.

Section 2. That Chapter 22 of said Code, which chapter is entitled “City Administration”, be amended by adding thereto the following section:

22.33 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMISSION.

(a) Established. There is hereby established within and for the City an Environmental Quality Commission, which shall be an advisory commission and which shall have the duties and responsibilities hereinafter provided.

(b) Purpose. The purpose of the commission is to advise city staff, the Planning Commission and the City Council on matters concerning environmental quality and natural resources in order for the City to achieve its energy and environmental goals and implement the energy and environmental programs and policies of the City.

(c) Composition.

(1) The commission shall consist of nine members to be appointed by the Mayor, subject to confirmation by the City Council. A quorum of the commission shall be five members.

(2) The first commission shall consist of three members appointed for a term of three years, three members for a term of two years and three members for a term of one year. Thereafter, members shall be appointed for terms of three years, or may be appointed to complete the unfinished term of a member no longer on the commission. The members of the commission shall serve without compensation and may be removed from office for cause by the Mayor.

(3) Any member who misses 40% of the duly called meetings within twelve consecutive months or misses three consecutive duly called meetings within twelve consecutive months shall be automatically removed from the commission.

(d) Duties and Responsibilities. In fulfillment of its purpose, the commission's advisory duties and responsibilities shall be to:

(1) Adopt bylaws and rules for the conduct of the commission including, but not limited to, selecting a chairperson and vice chairperson from its membership on an annual basis, fix the date, time and place for regular monthly meetings, and establish rules for the conduct of business at the meetings. The City Manager shall designate a city staff person to serve as the secretary of the commission. The secretary shall keep an accurate record of the proceedings of the commission.

(2) Enlist the cooperation of agencies, organizations and individuals in the community in an active effort to better the natural environment.

(3) Advise city staff, the Planning Commission and the City Council and other commissions or committees of the city on environmental topics and issues.

(4) Act in an advisory capacity with respect to developing the environmental and energy goals for the City.

(5) Promote public awareness and concern for environmental quality and conservation of natural resources.

(6) The City Council may assign other duties and responsibilities to the commission.

Section 3. That this ordinance shall take effect upon its publication.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2018.

Mayor

Attested By:

City Clerk

April Planning Commission Notes:

4/9/18 Meeting: CEQC Goals discussion:

Natural Resources Sustainability Coordinator John Howard provided an overview of the changes to the goals of the Citizens Environmental Quality Committee that was working to address concerns raised previously by the Planning Commission. Mr. Howard also introduced Dan Hall, chairman of the CEQC who was available for questions.

Chairman Hahn inquired about Goal #1's timeline for a report during the year. Mr. Howard noted that it would likely be end of August but no specific date was determined.

Chairman Hahn asked about Goal #3's driver to investigate water treatment alternatives. Mr. Howard noted it was a focus of one of the members of the CEQC. Mr. Hall noted that the CEQC was impressed by the current facility but the committee was willing to follow up on the concern expressed by one member.

Commissioner Buelow asked about the fluoride and chlorine concerns expressed in Goal #3. Mr. Howard noted that the chlorine could be examined but fluoride is mandated by the state.

Commissioner Shortridge asked about Goal #4 and whether noise was part of the mandate. Mr. Hall responded that it currently was not a part of the goal of the committee.

Mr. Howard noted that a formal request for recommendation of commission status would come to the Planning Commission later along with an ordinance to establish the CEQC as an independent commission. Commissioner Shortridge asked when that would happen. Mr. Howard said he was confident it could come forward at the next meeting.

Commissioner Paddock noted that the terms used in the document are very specific to the field and not a particularly approachable document for a layman. Mr. Hall mentioned that this was an internal working document.

4/23/18 Meeting: CEQC Standalone Advisory Commission Request
CEQC Standalone Advisory Commission Request

John Howard, Natural Resources Sustainability Coordinator for the City of Winona, brought forward new business of a resolution of support for the Planning Commission to consider. The resolution would indicate the Planning Commission's review and approval of the CEQC becoming a standalone advisory commission. Mr. Howard also included draft text of new City Code that could establish the environmental commission. Mr. Howard noted that the word "Commission" in the strikethrough edit of 22.14(a)(1) of the draft code text was erroneously included in the strikethrough, and that "Committee"

should not have brackets around it. The strikethrough should read "~~Citizens Environmental Quality Committee~~". Following this introduction, Mr. Howard asked for questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Porter asked why the Citizens Environmental Quality Committee chose to come forward for status as a standalone advisory commission with the current members and goals rather than choosing to disband the CEQC and start with a new, re-structured organization. Mr. Howard responded that the current proposal came forward based on the active involvement of the current committee members and that there was interest in continuing the work currently ongoing. Commissioner Porter noted that there has not been a substantive body of work thus far in the committee's existence. Commissioner Paddock expressed hope that the current members of the proposed commission would be able to change that and provide more substantive work in the future. Commissioner Shortridge added that the goals of the proposed commission would still be within their current scope of work. General discussion of the existing committee's past work and reports ensued.

Commissioner Shortridge suggested to Mr. Howard and the proposed commission that they pick some goals with action items sooner rather than later, especially work with the park and recreation department. Some examples may be snow removal or mowing. General discussion about the goals presented at the April 9, 2018 meeting ensued with an emphasis on picking action steps to show progress.

Commissioner Paddock expressed his faith in the current committee's membership to achieve their goals and his belief that they can accomplish their goals and action items.

Acting Chairman Buelow asked where the movement to become a standalone advisory commission came from and the future makeup of the body. Mr. Espinosa responded that the purview of the committee had begun to stretch beyond land use. Mr. Howard noted that there are currently six members of the committee and that would be expanded to nine members should the proposed commission be approved by City Council. Mr. Espinosa noted that the proposed commission's relationship to the Planning Commission would still be similar to its existing advisory role.

Commissioner Boettcher noted that the proposed advisory commission would be able to bring things in from the background and forward to the Planning Commission.

No further discussion being made, the Planning Commission voted three to two in favor of the resolution with Mr. Howard's amended strikethrough recommending approval of the CEQC as a standalone advisory commission; Commissioners Boettcher and Porter dissented.