

NC Source Water Collaborative  
August 31, 2012 Meeting Summary

**Summary**

The purpose of the August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2012 meeting of the NC Source Water Collaborative (SW Collaborative) was to complete the prioritization process of the list of initiatives, select a couple for immediate action and to create teams for each action initiative. The prioritized list of initiatives was accepted with some modification. Two initiatives were selected: developing an education package and creating an awards program. The teams for each of these initiatives have been loosely formed. The group agreed that more work would need to be done to move the teams forward before the next SW Collaborative meeting in November. The group brainstormed ideas regarding the education package initiative. These ideas are summarized below. Finally, it was agreed that our regular SW Collaborative meeting would be 3 hours instead of 2 because of the amount of work needed to be accomplished during each meeting.

**Welcome and Introductions**

Introductions were made. Meeting notes from the May meeting were approved. Purpose of the meeting was presented.

New items discussed included the new SW Collaborative website and a request for participants to assist in promoting the site by creating links on their websites. Also, Jay gave a quick status report on the collaborative and noted that in only 3 meetings we had accomplished a good amount, including creation of a Mission, Vision, Operating Structure, and Statement of Commitment.

The following people attended the meeting:

Amy Axon, DWR	Erica Anderson, Land of Sky COG
Patrick Beggs, NCSU – Cooperative Extension	Ed Buchan, City of Raleigh
Melinda Chapman, USGS	Nancy Daly, Ecosystem Enhancement Program
Bill Eaker, Land of Sky COG	Julie Elmore, USDA – NRCS
Jay Frick, DWR	Nancy Guthrie, CWMTF
Tom Hill, DACS – DSWC	Gale Johnson, DWR
Jeff Marcus, WRC	Beth McGee, CWMTF
Christy Perrin, NCSU – Cooperative Extension	Richard Rogers, CWMTF
Mike Schlegel, TJ COG	Rick Seekins, Kerr Tar COG
Keith Starner, NC RWA	Cy Stober, Piedmont Triad Regional Council
Dale Threatt-Taylor, DACS – DSWC	Johnny Wear, Western Piedmont COG
A driene Weaver, DWQ	Linnette Weaver, DWR

**Clean Water Management Trust Fund Planning Grants**

Nancy Guthrie of the Clean Water Management Trust Fund provided an overview of the new planning initiative that they have developed and will be rolling out very soon. In 2011, the General Assembly expanded CWMTF's purposes in protecting, preserving and conserving all surface water sources. In response to these recent statutory changes, the CWMTF Board of Trustees allocated up to \$175,000 to consider awarding grants for surface drinking water protection and restoration planning and may award up to \$35,000 for each plan (enough for 5 potential grants). The goals of these plans are to:

1. Support the long-term protection and restoration of the quality and quantity of the state's existing surface drinking water sources through comprehensive watershed planning and identification of on-the-ground projects,
2. Support and accelerate local and regional actions to protect and restore existing surface water sources now, rather than waiting until urgent action is needed, and
3. Foster and support much needed inter-jurisdictional coordination in the protection and restoration of existing surface drinking water sources.

The request for proposals will be posted on September 10<sup>th</sup> and the due date for the applications is December 14<sup>th</sup>. The RFP is going to be posted on their website at [www.cwmtf.net](http://www.cwmtf.net)

The following summarizes the question and answer session that followed Nancy's announcement:

Q. Will any priority be given to specific watersheds?

A. *No priority to one watershed classification or another. However, if they get more applications for projects than they can fund, priority will be given to projects that have demonstrated greater threats to the watershed and its water quality.*

Q. What is the timeline of the projects?

A. *They foresee that the overall project may run for 1 to 2 years.*

Q. Will Letters of Commitment be required?

A. *Yes, they would like to see letters from members on the stakeholder group.*

Q. Is Match required?

A. *Matching resources are encouraged, but no specific number on the match amount had been set.*

Q. Will any priority be given based on geographical location?

A. *No. They would like to get applications from all over the state. Although they are aware of the fact that there are not many surface water sources being used by public water supply systems in the coastal areas.*

Q. What if applicant is working outside of their jurisdictional boundary due to the location of the source, is that acceptable?

A. *It is if someone from that jurisdictional area is on the stakeholder group and sends a letter of commitment.*

Q. Who is eligible as an applicant?

A. *Conservation Non-profits, local units of government, and state agencies. CWMTF is really encouraging groups that do regional and collaborative projects like the COGs.*

## Completion of Initiative Prioritization and Selection

The purpose of this topic of discussion was to present the voting results from the group on prioritizing the list of initiatives, come to consensus on the list, and select at least 2 initiatives for the SW Collaborative to begin working on.

An explanation was given on steps taken after the May meeting in order to prepare the list of initiatives for further prioritization. Results from the email voting process were shared and are shown below:

<b>Initials of Person</b>	<b># of Votes</b>	<b>Initiative Description (Initiative #)</b>	<b>Volunteers</b>
RS, AW, BM, KS, TG, HD, CP, AA, JF, PB	10	Develop a source water protection education package that can be personalized/customized at a local level. (4)	Lisa Corbitt, Christy Perrin, Holly Denham, Dale Threatt-Taylor, Cy Stober, Beth McGee, Evan Kane, Patrick Beggs
AK, SB, TG, HD, BE, JM, AA, JF, GJ	9	Cooperate with the NC American Planning Association to target and educate local planners and promote source water protection through land-use management. (5, 6 & 20)	Phil Trew, Jeff Marcus, Cy Stober
AK, PT, TH, BM, SB, TG, HD, CP	8	Identify and/or develop source water protection cost benefit analysis tools. (24)	Tom Hill, Beth McGee, Amy Keyworth, Julie Elmore
KS, PT, RS, TH, BE, JF, GJ	7	Participate in, support, and/or initiate local source water protection plans. (22)	Rick Seekins, Cy Stober, Keith Starner
JV, ND, AW, TH, BM, BE	6	Collect information on projects that received priority funding points from existing source water protection partners (i.e. CCAP, EQIP, CWMTF, and CWSRF). Show the outcomes of these projects. (15)	Rick Seekins, Julie Ventaloro, Adriene Weaver, Tom Hill, Beth McGee, Ed Buchan, Julie Elmore
JV, KS, JM, PB	4	Identify and publicize "shining stars" in source water protection. Use these positive outcomes as examples of success and publicize/promote them as templates to similar demographic groups. (27 & 28)	Dale Threatt-Taylor, Julie Elmore
RS, AW, CP	3	Disseminate unified messages from the SW Collaborative that demonstrate broad support for SWP and that spark education and action. (1)	Rick Seekins, Adriene Weaver, Cy Stober, Evan Kane
ND, JM	2	Align the SW Collaborative's efforts with existing successful programs and approaches (the storm water education outreach program, for example). (21)	Holly Denham, Julie Elmore
AK, ND	2	Identify and connect with existing landscape-based conservation programs. (19)	Jeff Marcus, Amy Keyworth, Julie Elmore
AA	1	Determine the information needs of public utility managers with respect to source water protection (outreach materials for customers, for example) and respond to those needs. (12 & 14)	Ed Buchan
JV	1	Increase awareness of the location of drinking water sources through use of signs. (13)	Phil Trew
SB	1	Include source water protection information in Consumer Confidence Reports that are sent out annually by public water systems. (18)	
PT	1	Improve data collection regarding the quantity and quality of groundwater supplies. (16)	Melinda Chapman, Julie Elmore

GJ	1	Identify data related to ground water protection and make it available. (17)	
		<b>Explore/develop an awards program as an incentive (25) *</b>	Lisa Corbitt, Julie Ventaloro, Phil Trew, Christy Perrin

We then discussed the potential for some of the initiatives to be combined due their similarities. The below table was provided to discuss this recommendation:

Initials of Person	# of Votes	Initiative Description (Initiative #)	Volunteers
RS, AW, BM, KS, TG, HD, CP, AA, JF, PB	10	Develop a source water protection education package that can be personalized/customized at a local level. (4)	Lisa Corbitt, Christy Perrin, Holly Denham, Dale Threatt-Taylor, Cy Stober, Beth McGee, Evan Kane, Patrick Beggs
RS, AW, CP	3	Disseminate unified messages from the SW Collaborative that demonstrate broad support for SWP and that spark education and action. (1)	Rick Seekins, Adriene Weaver, Cy Stober, Evan Kane
AA	1	Determine the information needs of public utility managers with respect to source water protection (outreach materials for customers, for example) and respond to those needs. (12 & 14)	Ed Buchan
JV	1	Increase awareness of the location of drinking water sources through use of signs. (13)	Phil Trew
AK, SB, TG, HD, BE, JM, AA, JF, GJ	9	Cooperate with the NC American Planning Association to target and educate local planners and promote source water protection through land-use management. (5, 6 & 20)	Phil Trew, Jeff Marcus, Cy Stober
AK, PT, TH, BM, SB, TG, HD, CP	8	Identify and/or develop source water protection cost benefit analysis tools. (24)	Tom Hill, Beth McGee, Amy Keyworth, Julie Elmore
KS, PT, RS, TH, BE, JF, GJ	7	Participate in, support, and/or initiate local source water protection plans. (22)	Rick Seekins, Cy Stober, Keith Starnier
JV, ND, AW, TH, BM, BE	6	Collect information on projects that received priority funding points from existing source water protection partners (i.e. CCAP, EQIP, CWMTF, and CWSRF). Show the outcomes of these projects. (15)	Rick Seekins, Julie Ventaloro, Adriene Weaver, Tom Hill, Beth McGee, Ed Buchan, Julie Elmore
JV, KS, JM, PB	4	Identify and publicize "shining stars" in source water protection. Use these positive outcomes as examples of success and publicize/promote them as templates to similar demographic groups. (27 & 28)	Dale Threatt-Taylor, Julie Elmore
ND, JM	2	Align the SW Collaborative's efforts with existing successful programs and approaches (the storm water education outreach program, for example). (21)	Holly Denham, Julie Elmore
AK, ND	2	Identify and connect with existing landscape-based conservation programs. (19)	Jeff Marcus, Amy Keyworth, Julie Elmore
SB	1	Include source water protection information in Consumer Confidence Reports that are sent out annually by public water systems. (18)	
PT	1	Improve data collection regarding the quantity and quality of groundwater supplies. (16)	Melinda Chapman, Julie Elmore
GJ	1	Identify data related to ground water protection and make it available. (17)	

	<p><b>Explore/develop an awards program as an incentive (25) *</b></p>	<p>Lisa Corbitt, Julie Ventaloro, Phil Trew, Christy Perrin</p>
<p>Note: The initiatives highlighted with this color have an educational theme and could possibly be combined.</p>		

As can be seen in the above table, the area of recommended consolidation was centered on the idea of adding several other “education” themed initiatives to the first one, which is to develop an education package tailored to the local level. The group was asked if they agreed with this idea. Also the group was asked if they had any concerns, questions or suggestions for improvement of any of the initiatives. A healthy discussion ensued. The following contains many of the comments, questions and responses posed during this discussion:

*Can you add in the consumer confidence report one into the education theme?*

*Can we have a generic standard main message; the main body of work is a good jumping off point. We need consistency and then we can customize for audiences.*

*Land use planning, specifically – will have to be more focused and targeted and not so much general info.*

*Not only cooperative with APA, but also with Urban Land Institute (ULI), there are some strong chapters, includes public and private partnerships.*

*This ‘one’ educational tool could be a very big project – maybe one team with subgroups.*

*Maybe do two focuses for technical and professional staff and then non-technical such as elected officials. All will need some general introductory information.*

*County Commissioner’s association and League of Municipalities could be good to contact for language and outreach.*

*No point doing the APA work separately, yet it is not one and the same with outreach and education.*

*Other groups can take the base information and help tailor it for their people/audiences.*

*Maybe purposefully put APA outreach after general education.*

*Would be helpful if whatever we come up with has some specific language to help launch idea of Source Water Protection.*

*Educational package should be one of our priorities.*

*Focusing on this establishes some education curriculum but also begins to develop a way for feedback and input.*

*Q. Identifying awards program versus identifying shining stars – what is the difference? Are they related or is shining stars part of education.*

*R. Could be both, all. They may differ. But not necessarily, shining starts may help us identify an award format.*

*Should also be looking out of state for stars – who is doing best, what can be replicated, what are the hurdles.*

*Can also help us identify options for people.*

*Good to identify effective local programs – success. Laud the local.*

*Teams will help these ideas evolve and develop.*

*Looking at cost benefit analysis tools could be good for the education and outreach initiative.*

*The tools could be the outreach, the education.*

*Economics valuation is difficult and time consuming and specific.*

*Raleigh has been working to develop an economic tool, somewhat based on nutrients, working with conservation trust of NC.*

*We have bmp cost benefit analysis as part of Jordan lake rules.*

*Bmp – migration transfer times*

*WECO (Watershed Education for Communities and Officials) has a short 4 pager on the questions to ask, for Transylvania County.*

*Transportation grants ask for much different economic information, not what I had expected or have seen in other questionnaires.*

*Good to identify what can be answered – help decision understand what questions can be asked and answered.*

*Portland group called earth economics – working to put a value on green infrastructure – most communities do not put a number on that. San Francisco and Portland do a good job on that. Mecklenburg County does a good job for that. Raleigh is thinking about doing something along these lines.*

*NC Division of Forest Resources is looking at forested watersheds (High Rock Lake) and their impact on treatment costs of drinking water. Trying to see if there a good relationship with water quality and treatment costs? Should be done a year from now. They are working on a 12 digit HUC scale to look at change in land cover, i.e. forest vs. cropland vs. pavement, etc.*

*Upper Neuse Clean Water Initiative – TLC was working with them and maybe the Environmental Finance Center – to help municipalities determine costs and prices. Need to find this from EFC.*

*Q. Have we had some discussion about helping the SW Collaborative action teams find some funds to work on these projects? It would help members to be able to work on these.*

*R. DWR doesn't have that type of funding. Maybe we can all look at grants to go after for this.*

*Some ideas to move forward - can we show some success that will allow us to show off and find some money from private sector.*

*I think SWC has the ability and potential to do things that none of us individually can do on our own. We have so much expertise, both in technical and collaboration. I want to see this grow and develop.*

*One idea – COGs could agree to work together and look into applying for 205j money, all being put into one big pot?*

*What about education being a large group that then breaks out into smaller groups as needed?*

*I think we are leaving something out – existing incentives to do source water protection may be lacking, they could be strengthened. I don't know what kind of points you get for having a source water protection plan - my guess is not many or we'd all have these plans.*

*What are the existing incentives for having plans? Talk to agencies to see if we can increase incentives, such as number of points you get on a grant application. The competition for grant funding is increasing.*

*Some groups have added points to their application if you have a source water protection plan.*

*Also should talk to NC rural center.*

*It is often about cost – what will it cost us to do any of this, what is the benefit to my local government to having a plan?*

*The points need to be significant.*

*Have a conversation with infrastructure grant program managers if they will do this.*

*Source Water Protection Program has done this with some agencies. Jay suggests taking this on internally. Bill Eaker said he'd help him.*

*Who funds projects that could be useful for water supply? Identify them and that helps us move forward on this.*

*Use the power of the SW Collaborative, the muscle of the name to move this forward once agencies and specifics have been identified.*

## **Conclusion**

The group agreed that the education package initiative was very broad and that the other education-themed initiatives should be rolled into it. The education package would need general source water protection information along with specific information that would target unique organizations or groups of stakeholders.

We also came to agreement that the first two initiatives that the SW Collaborative would work on are:

1. Develop a source water protection education package that can be personalized/customized at a local level (also for a specific group)
2. Explore/develop an awards program as an incentive.

## Form Teams for the Two Initiatives

The original plan was to split into teams based on the initiatives we had selected. However we were lacking time and people, therefore we opted to stay together as a group and continue brainstorming ideas for the Education Package initiative. The following ideas and comments were made by the group and provide a good starting point for the team:

*For any education effort, first thing we will need to do is identify and understand target audience – before you can craft something to meet their needs.*

*Education process may change based on the size of supplier.*

*NC Rural Water Association goes out to schools – grade k-8 – and use surface water model and ground water model to discuss source water protection. K-8 good age to hit with this*

*Attend festivals. The audience is school age kids.*

*Another audience is water systems.*

*Identify audiences and then sharpen focus on message – what specifically are we trying to get across – it is a broad topic.*

*For watershed restoration work, we have 2 questions that need to be addressed: why should you care and how can we fix this problem. The same two questions apply for all audiences. Also need different visuals that also meet these two questions.*

*Need outreach material for surface and groundwater sources.*

*Need materials for different audiences, school age and water managers.*

*Good to remind people of all the different sources of water.*

*Need an inventory of who has a protection plan and why they chose to do that. Yes.*

*Who are the local entities that you worked with to do these plans?*

*Rural Water - We have some funding for potentially having an individual to help communities to develop surface water protection plans.*

*Who else has done this, both nationally and SE regionally. – could help with shining stars idea. Can use this information for when people ask what they should do – we can give these as examples.*

*We are still looking at broad ideas of audiences. Need to look at: local officials, elected and otherwise, local decision makers, all elected officials and all the managers.*

*Can we list out all the potential target audiences – could help us determine what they need to know.*

*School age kids*

*Elected officials*

*Government managers*

*Water managers / systems – different sizes*



*End user / customer  
Business and industry consumers  
Economic development people*

*Are there any establish users we can go to, such as civic groups – as an audience or an avenue.*

*Rotary – Kiwanis  
Boy scouts*

*“Why”- in the triad we have more water supply and waste water supply than we need. We need to reach out to civic groups to help get in with government managers.*

*What is the science?*

*The concept takes in a lot of different groups – not sure it has been done before. Some people worry about their aquifer, others their streams, etc, but this is all of the above.*

*Ground water and surface water is far more interrelated than some people realize.*

At the end of the discussion the group was asked to let us know what team (if any) they wanted to work on. Based on a raise of hands by the meeting participants and from the Volunteers list compiled during and since the last meeting, the following people are interested in participating on the Education Package Team:

Adriene Weaver	Lisa Corbitt
Beth McGee	Christy Perrin
Mike Schlegel	Holly Denham
Rick Seekins	Evan Kane
Tom Hill	Patrick Beggs
Cy Stober	Phil Trew
Amy Axon	Jay Frick

For the Awards Program, the list is:

Nancy Daly	Phil Trew
Christy Perrin	Lisa Corbett
Julie Ventaloro	Amy Axon
Jay Frick	

We were unable to get an action plan developed for each team due to lack of time. Therefore, we agreed that further organization of the teams would need to happen outside of a regularly scheduled SW Collaborative meeting, which will be in November. Rick Seekins volunteered to help organize the first meeting for the Education Package initiative.

### **Adjournment**

In closing, we discussed whether or not the regular SW Collaborative Meetings needed to be spread apart more to allow the teams more time to work. We felt that it was too early to make that decision and for now, the SW Collaborative will continue to meet on a quarterly basis. Also, due to the amount of work we try to accomplish in each meeting, it was agreed that the SW Collaborative Meetings would be 3 hours long, instead of 2 hours. The meeting dates and lengths can be revisited in the future if this becomes an issue.