

Missouri Clean Water Commission  
Department of Natural Resources  
Lewis and Clark State Office Building  
LaCharrette/Nightingale Conference Rooms  
1101 Riverside Drive  
Jefferson City, Missouri  
January 8, 2014

### **Strategic Plan**

**Issue:** The Commission expressed interest in reviewing their potential involvement beyond the more immediate matters brought by the Department. There are numerous opportunities for the Commission to expand their involvement in matters beyond those typical of recent meetings.

**Background:** In May, 2012 the Commission met to discuss their authorities and potential involvement on various matters under the laws providing the Commission's activities. These activities provide opportunities for active involvement shaping future discussions and action on clean water and water resource matters. Together with the following agenda item, this may provide the Commission the opportunity to identify areas of Commissioners' interest and form the basis for actions, including direction to the Department on these matters.

**Recommended Action:** Information only.

**Suggested Motion:** None.

**Attachments:**

- Summary of information from May, 2012 strategic planning session.



# CWC Strategic Planning Session

05-03-2012

## Claysville Store

### **I. Welcome & Introductions**

Vice Chair Parnell - Responsibilities of CWC to envision what our waters will be like 20 years from now and in the future; we want to talk about what that process looks like and how we might be able to get there.

### **II. Meeting Overview (Rick Todd)**

- Branson did two strategic planning processes – one that was a 20 year plan, then a 5 year strategic plan to get you moving
- Concept of investors – CWC invests their time and would like to see some benefit at the end of it

### **III. Statutory Authority of the CWC (Jenny Frazier)**

- Discussed the handouts
- Distributed the 2008 document “Understanding the Missouri Clean Water Commission”

### **IV. Department Water Planning Efforts (Ryan Mueller, Darrick Steen, John Madras, Kimberly Hoke, Andrea Balkenbush)**

- Discussion on OMW
- Perception if CW fee meetings are only in Jefferson City – need to reach general public and out-state areas
- We tend to be a siloed agency, department wide over 28 boards and commissions – so we need to message and communicate better to the citizenry.
- Need to consider going out to listen to public’s concerns and engage with them on agency-wide issue.
- We struggle to engage the average citizen; overall messaging on the big picture of what the department does
- Question from Todd Parnell – he listed 8 or 9 agency priorities – based on what we presented to them – why are they our operational priorities and what is our strategic approach to those?
  - Answer – some are required by law (affordability); federal policy (integrated planning); OMW – because we don’t have framework to have all of these discussions and how they interrelate; overall we need to integrate regulatory requirements from the federal level – CWC could help with small communities in general

## V. Strategic Planning

*Note: Where discussions were captured on flip charts, the text is in blue. Text not in blue was part of discussion or Rick's presentation.*

- Have to build relationships with the people we serve – other governments, EPA, public, stakeholders, staff, management
  - Have to manage relationships – if don't we can lose credibility
  - Share information, communicate, keep people informed
  - Don't let problems fester
  - Think of all of these things in terms of relationships
  - Citizens – marketing – where are they and what are they biting on
  - Fish where the fish are and with what they are biting on

### Break

- Important that we define our timeframe and define our goals and objectives
- Maybe we should set specific calendar targets to set our strategies every year – with planned time to meet, re-evaluate, and plan for the coming year.

### Questions with feedback

#### How do you describe yourself as an organization?

1. Governmental entity with responsibilities to preserve protect and enhance Missouri's natural, cultural and energy resources (Mission Statement)
2. Provide leadership to ensure clean and plentiful water is available
3. Serving citizens of Missouri
4. Allocating resources via financial assistance

Rick presented what he got from 2008 document – “Protecting and Preserving Water Quality for the State of Missouri” – then he brought out some objectives from that document:

1. Develop water quality standards and implementing programs and/or regulations to maintain those standards
2. Develop and implement programs and /or regulations to minimize pollution
3. Insure waste water facilities and waste management systems are operated correctly
4. Develop and implement a nonpoint source management plan

**What have been the greatest accomplishments or successes of this organization?**

1. Implementation of the Parks & Soils Sales Tax and the repeated re-authorization of that tax
2. Improved water quality at Table Rock Lake and James River Basin
3. Improved relationship with regulated entities, collaborative processes, forums, better pro-actively seeking input and building relationships
4. Motivated General Assembly to fund program to address water quantity; We have raised awareness of water quantity issues significantly enough for the GA to allocate GR
5. Development of regional water supplies; investment in water supply development
6. Reduced the rate of soil erosion in the State of Missouri
7. Moved money and resources to help regionalize systems (\$3B); Local government assistance to help regionalize
8. Safe Drinking Water Program; chemical and bacteriological testing – it all ties together
9. Permitting Volume

**Other Notes from discussion:**

- It can take time to measure success sometimes more than 15 years especially with respect to water quality
- Stream teams and 319 watershed grants – getting local citizenry involved
- We have moved millions of dollars through to communities with modernized systems
- Funneled the money to where it would address the problems – put the framework in place to be able to do that

**What are our weaknesses?**

1. May not be great at letting stakeholders know they are doing good
2. Don't have a good way to communicate what WC does and the value
3. Married to process without looking at overarching goals
4. Outdated federal law; Antiquated regulatory structure with CWA being 40 years old – dealing with today's problems with yesterday's solution
5. Tend to be reactive
6. Perception that it takes too much time to get things done
7. Silos = not great cross-departmental teamwork
8. Don't maximize the use of the Commission; we need to bring things to them that make use of their time

**Other Notes from discussion:**

- Unrealistic public expectations
- Legal action taking so long

## Lunch

### Strategic Planning (cont'd)

- When relating to customers you have to understand where they are coming from
- Don't think 'this is what I want or this is how I would want to be served' because you have to serve THEM the way THEY want

### Questions with feedback

#### Who do you serve today?

1. Missouri citizenry now and in the future
2. Business owners
3. DNR Employees/Co-workers
4. Federal government
5. Elected officials – local, community, state level
6. Fish and wildlife; the environment
7. Agriculture
8. Tourism
9. Municipalities
10. CWC

There a lot of people with a stake in what we do

How would you prioritize these? What would be the top 2?

*Note: Each person in the room voted for their top two.*

1. 17 Votes - Missouri citizens now and in the future
2. 7 Votes - Elected officials
3. 5 Votes – Municipalities
4. 2 Votes – Business Owners
5. 2 Votes – Fish & Wildlife
6. 2 Votes – Agriculture
7. 1 Vote – CWC
8. 1 Vote – Federal Government

We need to build very strong relationships with those entities that are most important to us.

How will it be different in the future?

The list of who we serve will not change over the future, but the makeup of those groups will

- We have an organization in flux on the government side that changes constantly
- We need to develop a document that will survive through administrations

- Develop long-term plans and regularly review them and measure success – hold us accountable
- Discussion about whether there would ever be a consolidation of several commissions into one; some commissioners in favor, others are not.
- As an agency we could do a better job educating commissioners
- Do commissions understand their job descriptions?
- Elected officials are important of who we serve- all staff must be engaged in making them successful – we have to manage them and develop relationships – contribute to their success.
- Get plan together and determine the best way to align responsibility and organization and make adjustments as necessary

### **What do the people you serve most value about the organization?**

1. We add to citizens' quality of life by protecting resources
2. Technical expertise - answers
3. Financial assistance
4. Safe & secure
5. Problem solving – mediating and facilitating
6. Good customer service – the definition can vary but at its basic level, responsiveness to public, elected officials, constituent issues. Good customer service has to be a fundamental theme that we consider in everything we do – it has to be fundamental throughout the agency

#### **Other Notes from discussion:**

- With customer relations, perception is reality
- Some stakeholders may feel like they don't like the formal way they interact with the commission; some states have other models.
- In some cases, with one decision, some will see it as good customer service and some will see it as bad customer service
- We know that is a fact; we have to implement the regulations – we just have to acknowledge that and be honest and communicate the issue.
- It's the 'how'
- Our customers want predictability and responsiveness

### **Do you have a clear mission? Why do you exist?**

Rick Todd displayed the following based on previous discussion:

- Ensure there is and will be plenty of clean water available

One of the hardest things to do is think about the future – what do you want to be, what do you want to do? Rick called this BHAG's - Big, Hairy, Audacious Goals

**What are Landmines (things that will cripple the organization and prevent it from fulfilling its mission?)**

1. Lack of adequate funding
2. Loss of credibility
3. More red tape with inflexible processes and procedures
4. Breakdown of communication; isolation
5. Significant decline in water quality
6. No flexibility on how to do things; assuming that the way it is done is how it always has to be done
7. Lack of focus
8. Negative economic impact on a segment of customers we serve, including communities

### **Break-Out Groups**

#### **Group #1**

**Aspirations – what should you preserve for 2020? What shouldn't change?**

- Maintain healthy and substantive collaboration and communication with our Tier 1 stakeholders
- Preserve a citizen-based commission
- Keep financial resource function
- Keep resource funding and authority to carry out our mission
- Maintain a viable soil and water conservation effort
- Maintain technically proficient and scientifically trained staff and decision making structure

**What should be reduced or eliminated over the next five to ten years?**

- Where possible, eliminate or remove antiquated and inefficient processes
- Reduce length of response time
- Eliminate/reduce arbitrary decisions and increase predictability
- Reduce overlap/organizational barriers to integrated services; Silo busting

**What should you do more of?**

- Maintain and improve water quality and quantity
- Increase community based watershed education and outreach → more educated and aware public
- Market our clean water efforts more effectively



- Increase exposure and empowerment of the commission
- Take a more proactive role as a commission
- More science, more technology, more data for better decisions
- Money – stable and sustainable
- Improve delivery of services – flexibility, innovation, technology

### Group 2 – Key Result Areas

- Streamline organization and procedures to enhance efficiency (department and commission)
- Establish sustainable funding
- Build public understanding of our mission (a water ethic) – and stress the importance of water quantity and quality in terms of an economic driver for the State of Missouri
- Better utilize resources to achieve progress toward strategic water quality goals

### Group 3 – Key Result Areas

- Establish and promote the value of clean water
- Maintain continuous improvement of water quality
- Improve monitoring system for water quality and quantity; establishing a baseline to know where we have been and where we are going
- Provide prompt responses to customers and establish mechanisms to receive their feedback
- Establish better partnerships with communities to implement efforts to improve water quality

### Summary of Break-Out Groups

- We need a “people goal” to make our people successful
- Degree to which we meet our goals will be largely determine by how satisfied our employees are – quality of staff, are they progressing on their careers, are we harnessing their passion and heart?
- Messaging and communication, marketing, branding – we have to be able to sell what we do, the value of what we do, we need to be able to communicate and market; how do we know where we are on customer service? Figure out a way to research it – send a survey.
  - If we had each of our customer service groups in today how would they rate our customer service?
  - How do we measure this? Results, surveys, etc. there are a variety of ways to measure – how many people come to us asking for help
- Stable and sustainable funding – once you build a strategy, build a financial plan to support that strategy.
- Better use resources – set standards, train and audit and take corrective action to that standard

- Establish value with what you do – what is the return on the investment (my note – define what they are investing)

### **Objectives – Quality Results**

1. All water bodies in the state have the right standard
2. X% of water bodies have improved enough to move off the impaired waters list
3. More informed or engaged citizenry – improved customer service

### **What happens next?**

1. Confirm your goals and objectives – two ways to do that – tell staff and ask them to bring back the goals and objectives for these areas and get involvement with lots of people in the organization; other ways – takes more time than you typically think – hard to predict to how long it will take to get a group going.
2. Get input – get more input than just staff – stakeholders, citizens, public input before you get too far down the road
3. Assign responsibilities for developing the strategies – who is the right person to develop the strategy and tactics
4. Agree on strategies
5. Get input
6. Develop strategic initiatives (tactics)
7. Get input
8. Realign resources and responsibilities – look at organization and responsibilities job duties, assignments should change
9. Annual updates
10. Scorecard
11. Make it a habit
12. A leader devoted to the successful implementation of the strategy and plan is key
13. Plan needs to be supported with people, money, time, systems and communication
14. Communicate to everyone in the organization
15. Hold monthly or quarterly strategy meetings
16. Take corrective action when needed

### **How do you know if everyone understands?**

- Inside organization – ask internal staff how the mission, vision and strategy impact their job?
- What do they need to do differently, what can they do to contribute to success?

Plans fail because they are not implemented, aren't supported by key stakeholders and lack of focus on big rocks

Write it all out, put it in a format, and ask staff to take key result areas

#### Next Steps for DNR/CWC/WPP

- First commissioners need to talk about what they want
- We can compile this discussion and send it to CWC
- We haven't gotten to what can be changed in terms of what CWC does
- Staff should define – with clarity – goals, objectives, strategies, tactics; CWC has to make sure that those are the key result areas they want to see.



# Clean Water Commission

## Strategic Planning Meeting

### 05/03/2012

### *Department Water Planning Efforts*

---

#### **Statewide Water Resources Monitoring**

Missouri benefits from abundant water resources such as large rivers, streams, lakes and high-quality aquifers. However, the quantity of water may not always be adequate to meet demand during times of drought or when conflict arises between competing water uses. During 2006, nearly every county in the state was impacted in some way by drought; a condition that raised awareness of the potential vulnerability to future water supply shortages and the need for long-term water resource assessment and planning.

The Department has completed over 40 studies to evaluate the long-term adequacy of drinking water supply reservoirs and groundwater availability throughout the state. In addition, the department has enhanced water monitoring capabilities by operating 164 groundwater observation wells and funding 43 stream gages statewide. Many of the wells and gages that have been recently added help to better understand the effects of drought and intensified water use. Real-time water resources information can be found by visiting <http://dnr.mo.gov/env/wrc/index.html>.

#### **Regional Water Supply Planning**

##### **Regional Water Supply Transmission Pipeline – Northwest Missouri**

Since 2005 communities in northwest Missouri have focused on options to ensure that the 12-county region has adequate water to meet current needs and facilitate future growth. After surveying area water concerns, a locally-lead partnership endorsed a regional water transmission strategy. The Great Northwest Wholesale Water Commission (Commission) includes representation from each of the local water systems and communities that obligate themselves financially to be part of the regional water delivery system. The Department provides financial support and technical expertise to assist with planning of the system. Currently, the Department and Commission have initiated a study to evaluate engineering costs and project feasibility for staged construction of the water transmission pipeline.

##### **Water Demand Forecasting – Southwest Missouri**

The Department in partnership with the United States Army Corps of Engineers – Little Rock District is developing a water demand forecast that will address both the short-term and long-term municipal, agricultural, and industrial water supply needs of a high-growth, 16-county region in southwest Missouri. Water demand projections will be developed from present time to the year 2060. This study

will build upon and complement ongoing efforts of the Tri State Water Resources Coalition, a regional planning organization that has been seeking to identify a long-term, regional water supply strategy. The study will be completed during the summer of 2012.

### **Locust Creek Watershed – North Central Missouri**

The Department of Natural Resources has supported the need for increased water supplies in North Central Missouri for several decades. Additionally, the Locust Creek watershed has need of restoration and contains one of the State's outstanding examples of natural wet prairie wetlands at Pershing State Park. The Department in partnership with the United States Army Corps of Engineers – Kansas City District has initiated a study to help protect valuable park features, improve the stream and evaluate actions to mitigate the effects of altered hydrology in the watershed. This study will also inform planning efforts for a proposed 2,200 acre drinking water supply reservoir in East Locust creek.

### **Our Missouri Waters**

Our Missouri Waters is an initiative aimed at transitioning management of our water resources to an integrated watershed-based approach that will increase local participation in watershed planning and decision-making activities in an effort to better target our limited resources. We hope to increase collaboration with public and private partners, allowing enhanced leveraging of resources to implement key priorities.

A two year pilot was created to demonstrate and evaluate principles of watershed level approaches and activities. Through the pilot, our aim is to establish the building blocks for state wide implementation of a watershed management approach. The pilot, in Big River, Spring River and Lower Grand River watersheds will provide a variety of education and outreach activities designed to: 1) build local leadership and technical capacity, 2) showcase watershed characteristics, 3) increase stakeholder response and awareness, and 4) increase local commitment to fulfilling goals.

### **Upcoming Regulations**

The Water Quality Standards regulation (10CSR20-7.031) provides the foundation for all water pollution control efforts. Standards include water classification, uses, general and specific criteria, and other expectations for all state waters, including groundwater. The standards are required to be updated at least every three years by federal law. Current regulation changes in development include additional stream classification, nutrient standards, tiered aquatic life standards, use attainability analysis protocol, specific criteria changes, effluent regulations and pretreatment. Future rulemakings may include changes to rules related to subdivisions, storm water and operator certification.

### **Small Systems**

Many small wastewater treatment systems experience significant challenges to providing adequate treatment. This is due in part to the high degree of treatment required to protect aquatic life and other beneficial uses of waters receiving the discharges from the systems. It is also due in part to nature of

small systems, which may not have experienced and certified operators, the capabilities to modify their operations to address specific needs, or the financial capacity to upgrade their treatment plant. New requirements, such as new ammonia limitations, are difficult for small systems to meet. The department uses several techniques in working with small systems to help them achieve compliance in reasonable time frames. We are in the process of developing processes and policies which we can use to assist small systems in meeting their regulatory obligations.

### **Affordability/Integrated Planning for Communities**

The Missouri Clean Water Law (Section 644.145 RSMo.) requires the department to consider affordability when issuing any permit to a publically owned treatment work or taking an enforcement action on such a system. This requirement in the law may be amended to include storm water or other aspects in the current session of the General Assembly, and the department will establish the procedure in rule at some point. We are developing an affordability process and procedure to document affordability findings when drafting permits and enforcement documents.

Missouri communities face many challenges in meeting their environmental responsibilities. These include longstanding needs to maintain and replace aging infrastructure, as well as current needs to upgrade treatment to meet new requirements. Community leaders struggle to comply and usually have budgetary situations that limit their capabilities. Some communities have multiple responsibilities that may include wastewater, drinking water, solid waste management and other areas. The department strives to work with communities to identify the most important environmental needs based on risk to human health and the environment, and establish reasonable expectations for compliance with new or on-going requirements. Schedules of compliance address community capacity to address environmental needs, and these can be implemented through permits or compliance actions. The department establishes long term relationships and understandings with communities to make environmental progress that account for environmental needs and the communities' abilities to respond.

### **Program Funding and Clean Water Fees**

Clean Water Fees are established in state statute at 644.052 and 644.053, RSMo. The fees in effect today were established in 2000 and have not increased since that time. House Bill HB89 (2011) reinstated the fees structure established in 2000 until September 1, 2013. HB89 also contains a requirement for the department to conduct a review of the current fee structure and produce a report with recommendations for a fee structure to the General Assembly by December 31, 2012. That requirement can be found at 644.054.4, RSMo.

The department has been holding regular Clean Water Fee stakeholder since late 2011. During these meetings, we have presented information on Clean Water activities, funding sources, expenditures, requirements and challenges. Stakeholder meetings are now transitioning to a discussion of the future of the Clean Water program in Missouri. We are considering stakeholder input on activities and services they would like to see in the future and will use that to develop some potential fee structures.

Information on Clean Water Fee Stakeholder meetings, documents that are distributed at the meetings and other background material can be found on the department's Clean Water Fees web page at <http://www.dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/cw-fees.htm>.

## **Messaging**

All citizens of the state of Missouri benefit from the clean water activities and services the department provides. Whether the benefit or interest includes clean water for drinking, economic vitality, agricultural usage, fishing, recreation or natural and or wildlife habitat, the services the department provides and the statutes we are entrusted to uphold are vital to the over 6 million Missouri citizens.