

# WSSC Ad-Hoc Committee on Large Diameter Water Mains

# Oct 23 Meeting Output

# **Approved Meeting Minutes**

The meeting began at approximately 8:50, with a quorum of Committee members.

The following individuals participated in the October 9<sup>th</sup> Committee meeting.

#### Ad-Hoc Committee

- All members of the Committee participated except:
  - Craig Shuman
  - o Denise Mitchell
  - Howard Stone
  - Vincent Berg

#### WSSC Staff

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

#### **Facilitators**

- Ellen Kagen, Indiggo Associates
- Seth Verry, Indiggo Associates

There were also several observers.

#### Statements of the Situation / Threshold Question Discussion

**Purpose of this Session:** This discussion in the morning of the meeting included a review of the revised Statements on the Situation and responses to the "threshold question": based on what you have learned up to this point, do you believe that additional risk reduction measures are necessary? This was put out as a **non-binding** question: just a point in time barometer reading of the Committee, based on what the Committee has come to understand in this process up to this point, recognizing that the Committee is still deeply engaged in the process, with several learning opportunities still yet to come. The Committee engaged in a general discussion on the topic and then went around the room and each member had the chance to provide a response with comments.

#### **Threshold Question**

• Point in time 10/23/13: Based on what you have learnt to this point: do you believe that additional risk reduction measures are necessary?

# **General Notes from the Discussion**



- 1. Many Committee members indicated it was premature to ask this question, believing they need more information before they will be able to make any final determination on this question
- Committee members were also troubled by the word "necessary," noting that it would have been easier for them to respond to the question if the word instead was something like "advisable" or "appropriate" - necessary implies that the status quo must change
- 3. Committee members shared their point-in-time views, almost all of which were qualified in some way
- 4. The sense of the room was 9 yes's, 6 no's, and one abstention
- 5. The facilitators intend to ask this question again later in the process, and expect that the outcome will be different

# Building and Land Rules and Regulations Discussion (Continued from Oct 9)

**Purpose and Approach to this Discussion:** The goal of this discussion was to work through the four prioritized solutions in the 'Building and Land Use Rules and Regulations' category, selected in the October 9 Committee meeting. The Committee engaged in a discussion meant to clarify / "flesh out" each of the ideas, and to consider the benefits and drawbacks of the ideas. The Committee worked through all four ideas and then took a non-binding vote on the options, with a discussion of impressions and next steps needed.

### Non-Binding "Vote" on the Four Options

	My #1 choice at this point in time	Should be cut from consideration
I No changes (maintain status quo)	4	7
II Optional Toolkit for builders to keep buildings safe in high risk areas	1	6
III Required Building Performance Standards in high risk areas	9	1
IV Setback for high risk areas	1	4

# **Next Steps from Discussion**

- 1. Prioritization Dave Burke presentation at first November Committee meeting
- 2. Visualization existing work group of Fern, Rose, Craig, Rupert, Gary
  Best practices new work group formed, including Laura, Diane, Virginia; this work on
  other communities will need to be focused on what they have done with respect to land
  use policy in response to PCCP; Indiggo to send its work on other communities to the
  whole committee
- 3. Report Writing new work group formed with Carol, Virginia, Laura to begin thinking through outline and approach

Meeting adjourned – 1.25pm