

**TRI-STATE WATER RESOURCE COALITION  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 2009 – 9:00 A.M.  
FIFTH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM – JOPLIN, CITY HALL**

**Welcome & Introduction:**

Bob Nichols called the meeting to order and welcomed those present for attending. He then asked those present to introduce themselves as follows:

Lynn Calton – City of Lamar, Missouri  
Bob Williams – Carthage Water & Electric, Carthage, Missouri  
Bob Nichols – Chairman, Tri-State Water Resource Coalition  
Morgan Pearman – Kansas Department of Agriculture’s Division of Water Resources (DWR)  
Roddy Rogers – City Utilities of Springfield, Springfield, Missouri  
Pete Rauch – City of Monett, Missouri  
Hal VanDaGriff – Verona, Missouri, representing Empire District Electric  
David Rauch – Springfield, Missouri, representing Senator Claire McCaskill  
Steve McIntosh – Joplin, Missouri, representing Congressman Roy Blunt  
Stacy Burks – Springfield, Missouri, representing Senator Christopher Bond  
Harold McCoy – Allgeier, Martin & Associates, Joplin, Missouri  
Greg Perkins – Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Springfield, Missouri  
Brian Fredrick - Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Springfield, Missouri  
Ryan Mueller – Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Jefferson City, Missouri  
Mike Wells - Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Jefferson City, Missouri  
Morgan Pearman – Kansas Division of Water Resources  
Matt Barnhart – Missouri American Water, Joplin, Missouri  
Dan Johnson, City of Joplin  
Lynn Onstot, City of Joplin  
Susan Champlin, City of Joplin

**Report of Membership Committee:**

Harold McCoy had no new activities to report at this time.

**Report of Technical Committee:**

**Recommendations concerning the Reservoir Site Screening Study:**

Pete Rauch distributed a status report on the activities of Freese and Nichols. He explained that the technical committee and several of the board members met in Monett two week ago to review and discuss the draft report from Freese and Nichols. He asked for final comments at that time and anticipated the final report being completed in three weeks. He stated that several individuals had comments regarding the report.

Roddy Rogers had some additional comments. He suggested starting at the beginning of the process instead of the end, and that the report should speak more to the challenges of building dams and reservoirs on existing streams.

Pete Rauch explained that Jan Tupper suggested looking closer at Site 11, the Shoal Creek site, as being able to send down the creek channel to Joplin where the treatment plant is already in place. Also, water could be sent into Kansas, which would reduce pipeline costs for those water coalition members to the west, such as Pittsburg. They would have to pipe to the Empire lake under their present plan and would need a treatment plant at one end of that pipeline. Site 11 would also reduce costs to Monett, Mt. Vernon, Aurora, and the surrounding towns. Construction of the west facility first would speed up service to our most critical areas.

Matt Barnhart wanted the water protected when it went down Shoal Creek. He liked the idea of saving money with regard to the cost of moving water.

Pete Rauch explained that Missouri has no way to restrict the use, even though the water was impounded. A land owner could pick that water up and use it for a reasonable use the way the law is currently written.

Mr. Nichols explained that David Hertzberg suggested an executive summary at the beginning of the report, and that there were some concerns about the feasibility of developing Site 8, with regard to recreational activity, as well as looking at Site 7. He discussed the additional exploration of Site 2A to serve the Lamar and Pittsburg area.

Mr. Nichols learned of a potential water district forming in the Baxter Springs area who believes they can obtain stimulus funding to build their project. He did not believe their design work is completed or that they have contracts executed with potential customers, so he did not think they would qualify for stimulus funding.

Ryan Mueller explained that the perception has been that any projects must be shovel-ready to qualify for stimulus funding. Mr. Nichols expressed concern that Oklahoma doesn't fit into this proposal and discussed meeting with their officials to put together a program to fit their needs. He did not believe anyone from Oklahoma has joined this coalition at this time.

Pete Rauch explained that Oklahoma's water concerns are not as critical as Missouri and Kansas as they have access to the water without a moratorium.

Mr. Mueller explained that the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) comments were largely technical in nature. He also recognized the concern about once water from Site 11 would be released back into Shoal Creek, or even from Site 8 or Site 7A, and the concern about someone else picking that water up before it meets its final destination.

Pete Rauch explained that Site 11 peaked his interest because of its proximity to Monett, with a possible water treatment facility located in the area of Monett to further distribute the water to other communities in that area. The easternmost edge of Site 11 would be located 15 miles from Monett. He mentioned constructing a distribution line from the Joplin area to Monett if Monett receives their water from the western side, but that this would be extremely costly.

Mr. Rogers suggested taking the whole region and dividing it by the participants involved, and comparison of the existing Stockton and Table Rock reservoirs to new reservoirs.

Pete Rauch also received comments from Bob Williams about Neosho being the central distribution point. Mr. Williams understood that the original plan was to run the distribution line all the way to Joplin, but instead of running it to Joplin and then pumping the water back, to place the treatment facility at Neosho.

Mr. McCoy asked if a smaller (10 million gallons per day) reservoir can be constructed on Site 1, with the costs being reduced accordingly. He explained that a reservoir on Site 1 could serve Pittsburg, Lamar, and the rural water districts to the north much easier. He asked about reducing the costs to where they would be comparable to a pipeline. He wasn't sure if this alternative would be feasible.

Mr. Rogers asked about maintaining the coalition as its intended purpose to work together. Pete Rauch explained that the larger the coalition becomes, it will be more advantageous to everyone, no matter who gets the water first.

Mr. Nichols asked about identifying the entities that really want to pursue this, in that they need to know what that water is going to cost.

Pete Rauch explained that all the comments have been forwarded to John Rutledge with Freese and Nichols, with those comments being addressed in his final report. He has received invoices of \$192,000, with about \$8,000 remaining for the finalization of the report.

### **Future Activities:**

Pete Rauch asked about hiring someone to shepherd this thing, with hiring an actual staff person. He explained that the coalition has only asked for money when they needed money to pay for an assessment. He recommended annual membership dues to budget for expenditures. Collection of annual dues would give the coalition something solid to operate with.

Mr. McCoy explained that the coalition members have leaned on Mr. Nichols too much. He suggested contacting all the area entities to see who is agreeable to joining the coalition, with those entities who join making the determination as to who the coalition will be serving. He also suggested contacting and educating the rural water districts.

Mr. Barnhart agreed with Mr. McCoy that the coalition members lean on Mr. Nichols a lot, but that it is time to go forward and run the coalition like a business, and that it takes someone who can dedicate full time to it.

Pete Rauch asked the coalition members if they wish to revisit the fee structure on how the dues are collected if they decide to collect annual membership dues. He personally thought what the City of Monett is paying for the water coalition membership is very reasonable in comparison to other recurring fees they are currently paying. He thought the dues should be collected annually.

Mr. Barnhart asked about appointing a committee to discuss the membership dues. Mr. Nichols appointed Roddy Rogers, Harold McCoy, Matt Barnhart, and Hal VanDaGriff to discuss the collection of dues. He asked Mr. Rogers to chair the committee and asked this committee to report their recommendation at the May coalition meeting.

Pete Rauch asked about the hiring of a water attorney and understood that the decision was not to do anything at this time. He asked Mr. Nichols if the attorneys he interviewed were on a retainer basis, or if they were available on an as-needed basis. Mr. Nichols replied on an as-needed basis, based on an hourly charge.

Mr. Barnhart mentioned that Missouri American Water contracts with an attorney who will also assist the coalition. He also explained that Steve Murray is now a full-time governmental affairs person in Jefferson City, and he has delegated to assist the coalition in any way he can. Mr. Nichols asked about putting together an entity together on a tax-exempt basis.

**Discussion Items:**

**Request to Beaver Water District:**

Mr. Nichols plans to revisit with the Beaver Water District regarding their activities.

**Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment Concerning Grand Lake:**

Mr. Nichols explained that his meeting with the Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment was cancelled due to weather conditions, and that he has been unable to reschedule that meeting. He explained that Oklahoma's director of water planning will be present at the Second Annual Environmental Conference on March 27.

**Expand Tri-State boundaries to include Northwest Arkansas:**

Mr. Nichols had no new information to report from Northwest Arkansas at this time.

**Meeting with State elected officials:**

Mr. Nichols had no new information to report at this time.

**Meeting with County and City officials:**

Mr. Nichols explained that the coalition has been invited to make a presentation at a county officials' meeting, but that the meeting conflicts with this coalition's general membership meeting. He asked for a representative to attend that meeting instead of the coalition meeting. Mr. McCoy explained that he can attend the county meeting, and that the DNR director will be speaking at that meeting.

**Meeting with Chambers of Commerce:**

Mr. Nichols had no new information at this time.

**Forming Stakeholders groups:**

Mr. Nichols mentioned a conference on September 11, 2008, at which was a good deal of discussion about getting the public more involved. He mentioned that a future water committee is forming in Springfield.

### **Consider water conservation program:**

Mr. Nichols still feels that water conservation is the cheapest water we'll ever have, in what water we save. He distributed correspondence he received from Paul Kiesel of Niagara Conservation, who states that stimulus funding may be made available for conservation activities and incentives that water suppliers could offer to their customers.

Mike Wells explained that the DNR is currently discussing the handling of the stimulus funding, but that they basically know what their allocation for drinking water through the clean water revolving state fund will be \$38 million, with slightly over \$100 million for wastewater. The DNR has an intended use plan where communities have projects that are already shovel-ready and awaiting funding, with some projects being partially paid for by grants or loans.

Mr. Wells also mentioned some potential administrative set-aside funds that may fit into some of these initiatives. Mr. Nichols asked Mr. Wells to visit with his staff regarding funding for water conservation activities.

Mr. Wells discussed a section called Green Project Reserve, in which a certain amount of funding is set aside for "green" projects. He understood water conservation would be considered a "green" project. He thought any project should be ready to go.

Mr. Mueller mentioned some guidelines or practices that are pretty standard, but that a focus group with an efficiency or conservation charge is something that needs to be developed. He asked about marketing water conservation so that the public would embrace it a little better. He explained that the challenge is that some record flooding occurred during 2008, but that you never know when it's going to start getting dry again.

Mr. Nichols explained that conservation efforts not only save water, but also save people money. He stated that it reduces revenues for the utility companies, but Mr. Barnhart stated that it saves the utility companies money for having to provide additional capacity.

Mr. Mueller explained that the DNR's state water plan is for 25 percent of future water needs to be met through conservation practices. Mr. Nichols discussed plumbing fixtures that conserve water.

Mr. McCoy stated that the Joplin Area Chamber of Commerce has agreed to host representatives from this coalition, but that a meeting date and time will need to be scheduled. Mr. Nichols explained that Rob O'Brian registered for the annual environmental conference on March 27.

### **Report of the Treasurer:**

Matt Barnhart explained that the current balance is \$76,002.64. He made two payments, one to the Monett Chamber of Commerce for a meeting room, and a second payment for a storage facility for the paperwork the coalition is generating.

Mr. Nichols explained that Pete Rauch will be signing a letter to forward to the Senate Appropriations Committee on behalf of the Tri-State Water Resource Coalition explaining how helpful the DNR has been to the coalition.

### **Public Relations Activities:**

Lynn Onstot had no new activities to report at this time, but that she will have some new activities to report in the future.

Mr. Mueller appreciated the opportunity to continue to work with this coalition and other regional water organizations, and he feels that the Freese and Nichols draft report was of very high quality. He stated that the DNR is very pleased to partner with this coalition. He discussed the current pressures to make budget cuts, with the difficulty of weighing a lot of issues against each other, and looking at the available revenues to make allocations. The DNR is hopeful that they can continue to help fund or be partners with studies like this.

Mr. Mueller is looking forward to working and listening to the other state reports on water planning at the conference on March 27. He explained that the water issue is very important, and he is looking forward to listening to colleagues at the conference as well.

Mr. Mueller explained that one idea for a potential speaker at an upcoming meeting may be Ms. Liz Grove, who works with the Clarence Cannon Wholesale Water Commission. She recently spoke to a similar organization who is trying to form a water commission or water district in northwest Missouri. That group is looking at the Missouri River as a water source and having a regional series of transmission lines being built throughout northwest Missouri.

Mr. Nichols then asked Stacy Burks if she had any comments from Senator Bond's office, and she had no new activities to report at this time. Mr. Nichols also asked Greg Perkins for comments, but he also had no comments or activities to report at this time.

Mr. Nichols asked Morgan Pearman from the Kansas Division of Water Resources (DWR) to report on their activities. Mr. Pearman explained that the KGS will soon provide the Division of Water Resources with a draft of the water quality report, and overall conclusion suggests that changes have occurred in water quality. The USGS Water Quality Report may be published by the end of April. The USGS has also requested that the DWR chief engineer provide an update during the annual meeting to provide some direction as to how the DWR will handle the moratorium area.

Mr. Pearman explained that the public wholesale water district held a meeting on March 10, 2009. The meeting was to visit with rural water districts and city representatives about becoming a part of Spring 19, and signing contracts for supply. This meeting was to determine if all area suppliers have been contacted regarding the district and to ensure that all suppliers needing water are considered. The meeting was well attended, with water suppliers seeking input relating to costs, contract language, and questions relating to treatment of multiple sources. Spring 19 believes that anyone who doesn't get on board at this time will need water in the next six or seven years.

Mr. Pearman did not see any significant changes in their water quality samples during testing that was conducted in Cherokee and Crawford Counties during the second week of March. He explained that most of the downward trends occurred in the southern portion of the county, but that all measurements taken in Crawford County indicated that the trends were upward.

## **Second Annual Environmental Conference, March 27, 2009:**

Mr. Nichols explained that the second annual environmental conference has been scheduled for March 27, 2009, at the La Quinta Inn in Joplin. The conference begins at 8:30 a.m. with representatives attending from the four-state area. He has registration forms available, along with copies of the program.

### **Old Business:**

Mr. Nichols asked for any additional business to come before the coalition. Mr. VanDaGriff asked about approval of the minutes which were distributed at the beginning of this meeting.

### **Approval of Minutes:**

Mr. Nichols asked for comments regarding the minutes from the general membership meeting of January 21, 2009.

**Harold McCoy moved, seconded by Bob Williams, that the minutes of the general membership meeting of January 21, 2009 be approved as written. The motion passed, with all voting "aye".**

### **New Business:**

Mr. McCoy mentioned a water treatment conference to be held on Thursday, March 19, in Lamar. For those who might want to attend, the conference is free. Engineers can receive continuing education hours for licensing in water treatment or wastewater. The conference runs from 8:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Mr. McCoy visited with the Stockton office of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. They reported that the turbine has thrown a blade and will be out of service for at least two years and possibly up to five years. They also stated that no one is removing water for drinking supplies from the Truman reservoir. They are looking at releasing water to serve the Truman reservoir, and how much water they can release to serve Truman.

### **Adjourn:**

There being no further business to come before the Tri-State Water Resource Coalition, Mr. Nichols thanked those present for attending and adjourned the meeting.

---

Daniel Johnson for  
David Hertzberg, Secretary