WSSC Ad-Hoc Committee on Large-Diameter Water Mains

Aug 27th 2013 Committee Meeting

Meeting Minutes - Approved

The meeting opened at approximately 8:30 am.

Meeting Participants

The following individuals participated in the August 27th committee meeting.

Ad-Hoc Committee

1. All members of the committee participated except:
   a) Denise Mitchell
   b) Johnnie Hemphill
   c) Howard Stone
   d) Pamela Sams
   e) Rose Krasnow
   f) Rupert McCave
   g) Vincent Berg

WSSC Staff

1. Jerry Johnson, WSSC GM & CEO (Convener of the Ad-Hoc Committee)
2. Mark Coughlin, WSSC Project Manager assigned to the Committee

Facilitators

1. Ellen Kagen, Indiggo Associates
2. Seth Verry, Indiggo Associates

There were also several observers.

Open Items

The committee spent most of the morning moving through a large number of open items, including: review and approval of the revised mission and charter; review and approval of the revised meeting mechanics; update and discussion of the work of the vision work group; discussion and decisions regarding public information sharing (content and design of the committee's public Web page); review and approval of the minutes from previous committee meetings; updates on the ongoing work of the problem and visualization work groups.

Mission, Charter, and Meeting Mechanics

The facilitators reviewed the process agreement for input and informed the committee that no comments had been received on the Mission / Charter and Meeting Mechanics, which had been revised based on the August 2nd committee meeting.

Outcome of discussion
1. The revised Mission and Charter were accepted with no discussion.
2. The revised Meeting Mechanics were accepted with no discussion.

Vision of Success

Laura Swisher and Adrian Gardner provided an update on the vision work group's activities since the August 2nd committee meeting. The work group had reviewed the comments from the August 2nd meeting but concluded that none of them warranted changes to the draft vision of success. The committee then engaged in discussion regarding the content and format of the vision.

Outcome of the Discussion
   Committee members agreed that a vision of success should be written as a forward-looking statement of the future they would like to create that would compliment the retrospective narrative
   • Carol Rubin will join the vision team

Next Steps on the Vision of Success
   • Adrian, Laura, and Carol will create a forward-looking vision statement

Public Information Sharing

The committee engaged in a discussion of what information should be made available for the general public to access via the Web site page for the committee on the WSSC Web site. Mark Coughlin provided an update on changes already being made to the design and content of the committee Web page that aligns with the Committee name and charter. A proposal for what information should be included on the site was also submitted before the meeting by Diane Jones, and endorsed by Erv Beckert, which was shared as pre-reading with the committee members. The discussion ensued in the context of the update from Mark and proposal from Diane – ultimately, the committee went line by line through the components of Diane's proposal to determine what should and should not be included on the Web page.

Outcomes of Discussion: Items to be Included on Committee Web page

1. Roster – no objections
2. Charter (versions 3) – no objections
3. WSSC resolution - no objections
4. Schedule of meetings – no objections
5. Meeting agendas – no objections
6. Meeting minutes – no objections
7. Background documents and presentation documents authored by WSSC – no objections
8. Links to additional information and key resources – no objections
9. Correspondence relevant to the formation of the group – no objections to:
   a) Relevant correspondence from April 23 2012 forward
   b) Committee members can nominate any correspondence prior to that date; the committee will need the chance to review it before posting (forward request to facilitators two weeks before next meeting)
10. Schedule of work groups including purpose and membership (but not notes of workgroup meetings) – no objections

Additional Outcomes of Discussion

1. Meeting materials (worksheets, detailed outputs, etc.) not to be included on Website
   a) Vote was taken on Not Including them: 9 in favor, 4 opposed
2. Virginia to serve as advisor to WSSC ad-hoc committee website design to assure clarity, ease of access and user-friendly (not content)

Next Steps on Public Information Sharing

1. Assure that all members of the committee have seen documents before they go up on the website (Note from facilitators: Absent members will adhere to meeting mechanics and take responsibility to follow up with facilitators to assure they have seen documents presented in their absence.)
2. Virginia to serve as advisor to WSSC ad-hoc committee website design (not content)
3. WSSC to make changes to Web site in accordance with outcomes of this discussion
4. Committee members to nominate any correspondence from before April 23, 2012 they would like to see included on the Web site.

Meeting Minutes

The committee reviewed and discussed the meeting minutes from the June 14 and August 2 meetings. There was not a quorum at the start of the meeting so the committee put the review of the meeting minutes until later in the morning, when a quorum was present. As the minutes had not been circulated in advance of the meeting, committee members were given several minutes to review the minutes before discussing any needed changes and moving to approve them.

Review and Approval of June 14 Minutes

Requested Changes
1. Add who was present to the June 14 minutes
2. Add that it was a full day meeting (give timing)
3. General in the future: highlight requests for follow up that was voted on or required for follow up
4. Some committee members would prefer not to include the closing comments – seems very subjective, and it raises more questions than it answers – After a brief discussion, the committee requested that the closing comments remain only in the output document.

Outcome of Discussion
• All voted in favor of the minutes with the requested changes

Review and Approval of August 2 Minutes

Requested Changes
1. Add notes about timing of the meeting (as with the June 14 meeting)
2. Eliminate title about 100% responsibility
3. Remove all six update notes from the minutes – minutes should only reflect what occurred at the meeting, not providing any further updates
4. Pertaining to "from this process looking backward" – Replace "Vision Statement" with "Vision of Success"
5. Shaun: name is misspelled on the August 2 – correct

Outcome of Discussion
• All voted in favor of the minutes with the requested changes

Next Step on Minutes
• Facilitators to make changes per committee's requests and post minutes to Web site

Defining the Problem: What We Know

Committee members requested time to discuss "what we know" about the problem that was not built into the planned agenda. Diane Jones initiated this discussion by sharing some of her initial thoughts regarding "what we know" about the problem. A broader discussion ensued, that focused on the scope of the problem, WSSC's current program, the key break impacts to address, and how WSSC's remediation efforts are prioritized. In each part of the discussion, Gary Gumm played a role in fielding questions or clarifying points made by committee members, as well as reacting to some of the potential ideas and solutions introduced.

Developing Solutions to the Problem

The purpose of this session was to review and build upon the set of potential solutions that have been identified thus far in the process (the purpose was not yet to evaluate ideas). Committee members requested that Gary Gumm comment on whether any of the catalogued ideas would not be possible. Committee members also asked questions of Gary regarding the feasibility of some of the ideas, and about what WSSC currently does in relation to some of the ideas. Following this Q&A and discussion with Gary, committee members wrote down any additional ideas they had in four categories of potential solutions.

Agreements Reached on Developing Solutions
1. Solutions Workgroup created to support facilitators in determining how the committee will continue to generate and evaluate potential solutions
   a. Potential roles: synthesizing ideas, determining what technical information will be needed
   b. Work group composition: Marlene, Shaun, John

Next Steps on Developing Solutions
2. Facilitators to schedule meeting of Solutions Workgroup to clarify role and begin supporting the solutions development work stream

Developing an Assessment Framework

The purpose of this session was to surface the key interests at stake that ought to form the basis for the criteria the committee can use in this process to assess the strength of potential solutions. Committee members paired up and listened to one another talk about their key concerns and interests with respect to failing water mains, and then each reported out on the key items they heard expressed by their partner.

Next Steps on Developing an Assessment Framework
1. Facilitators to take outputs from discussion and draft assessment tool
2. Draft tool will then be circulated for review and comment by committee members
3. Facilitators will then consolidate feedback and draft a second version

Closing Comments

We closed the meeting with an around-the-room sharing of committee members' reflections on this third meeting of the committee.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:30.