

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF LOUISIANA
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
OFFICE OF CONSERVATION

GROUND WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION
18TH REGULAR MEETING
11:00 A.M.

LASALLE BUILDING - 1ST FLOOR
LABELLE ROOM
617 NORTH 3RD STREET
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70802

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

OFFICE OF CONSERVATION

STATE OF LOUISIANA

GROUND WATER RESOURCES
COMMISSION MEETING

Report of the Commission meeting held by the
Ground Water Resources Commission, on Wednesday,
October 6, 2010, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

IN ATTENDANCE

GROUND WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION:

LT. GOVERNOR SCOTT A. ANGELLE, Chairman
KYLE BALKUM, Department of Wildlife and
Fisheries

ZAHIR "BO" BOLOURCHI, Department of
Transportation and Development

GLENN T. CAMBRE, Department of Health and
Hospitals

1 (IN ATTENDANCE) (CONTINUED):

2 ELLIOT COLVIN, Farm Bureau Member

3 KELSEY SHORT, Department of Economic
4 Development

5 BRADLEY SPICER, Department of Agriculture
6 And Forestry

7 PAUL MILLER, Department of Environmental
8 Quality

9 CHARLES KILLEBREW, Governor's Office on
10 Coastal Activities

11 TED MCKINNEY, Sparta Ground Water Conservation
12 District Board of Commissioners

13 WILLIAM R. DOWNS, Expertise in Ground Water
14 Resource Management

15 PAUL D. FREY, Louisiana Landowners Association

16 MAYOR JOSEPH D. HOLLINGSWORTH, JR., City of
17 Ruston

18 PAUL "JACKIE" LOEWER, JR., Louisiana Rice
19 Producers Group

20 EUGENE H. OWEN, Capital Area Ground Water
21 Conservation District

22 JAMES H. WELSH, Commissioner of Conservation
23
24
25

1 (IN ATTENDANCE) (CONTINUED):

2 STAFF MEMBERS:

3 GARY SNELLGROVE, Ground Water Resources Division

4 JOHN ADAMS, Staff Attorney, Conservation

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 PUBLIC COMMENTS BY:

13 MS. TIFFANY CRAVENS, Department of

14 Environmental Quality

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: We will go ahead and
2 call the October 6th meeting of the Ground Water
3 Resources Commission to order and ask the staff to
4 call roll.

5 MR. ADAMS: My name is John Adams. I'm the
6 attorney for the environmental division of the office
7 of conservation. Please sound off as I call your
8 name.

9 Lieutenant Governor Scott Angelle?

10 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: Here.

11 MR. ADAMS: Kyle Balkum?

12 MR. BALKUM: Present.

13 MR. ADAMS: Bo Bolourchi?

14 MR. BOLOURCHI: Here.

15 MR. ADAMS: James Burland?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. ADAMS: Glenn Cambre?

18 MR. CAMBRE: Here.

19 MR. ADAMS: Elliot Colvin?

20 MR. COLVIN: Here.

21 MR. ADAMS: William Downs?

22 MR. DOWNS: Here.

23 MR. ADAMS: Paul Frey?

24 MR. FREY: Here.

25 MR. ADAMS: Mayor Dan Hollingsworth?

1 MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH: Here.

2 MR. ADAMS: James Johnston?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. ADAMS: Charles Killebrew?

5 MR. KILLEBREW: Here.

6 MR. ADAMS: Jackie Loewer?

7 MR. LOEWER: Here.

8 MR. ADAMS: Mickey Mays?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. ADAMS: Ted McKinney?

11 MR. MCKINNEY: Here.

12 MR. ADAMS: Paul Miller?

13 MR. MILLER: Here.

14 MR. ADAMS: Eugene Owen?

15 MR. OWEN: Here.

16 MR. ADAMS: Kelsey Short?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. ADAMS: Brad Spicer?

19 MR. SPICER: Here.

20 MR. ADAMS: Jim Welsh?

21 MR. WELSH: Here.

22 MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, we have 15 members
23 present. Ten are required for a quorum so we have a
24 quorum.

25 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: Item No. 2, Adoption of

1 the meeting summary, August 18, 2010. Mr. Adams?

2 MR. ADAMS: Yes, sir. Last week, staff
3 e-mailed to you a copy of the draft meeting summary
4 from the last meeting. I received no comments or
5 questions to change anything. If you don't have any
6 additional change requests, then the staff requests a
7 motion to adopt the meeting summary from the previous
8 meeting.

9 MR. SPICER: (Makes motion.)

10 MR. MILLER: Second.

11 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: Motion by Spicer,
12 seconded by Miller. Any questions? Any discussion?
13 Hearing none, the motion is adopted.

14 MR. ADAMS: Thank you.

15 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: Item 3, statewide water
16 management plan update, Mr. Snellgrove. Before you
17 do that, I want to welcome Mr. Ted McKinney.
18 Certainly, good to see you Ted. I appreciate your
19 service. As I recall, you have taken Mr. Gene
20 Coleman's place.

21 MR. MCKINNEY: Correct.

22 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: Certainly, Mr. Coleman
23 did an outstanding job representing the state on
24 water resource issues for a long, long time. You've
25 got some big shoes to fill, but I know you are up to

1 it. Welcome and we appreciate having you. Thank
2 you.

3 Mr. Snellgrove?

4 MR. SNELLGROVE: Lt. Governor, we also have
5 another new member, Mr. Charles Killebrew.

6 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: Yes. Mr. Killebrew,
7 good to see you. I shook hands with you earlier.
8 Welcome and thank you. I appreciate your past
9 contributions to the state and look forward to
10 working with you in these efforts. Thank you.

11 I'm not hearing you on the microphone. I
12 don't know if you're not live.

13 MR. SNELLGROVE: Can you hear me now?

14 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: Yes.

15 MR. SNELLGROVE: Starting off here on the
16 recap of the statewide water management plan. I
17 updated the timeline as I have been in the previous
18 meetings. One change to note, things are on
19 schedule. However, we had information from our
20 contractor that requires that they need a little more
21 time to put together the draft following the
22 aggressive month of September with workshops and
23 questionnaires and responses. So we are going to
24 focus now on months 9 and 10 or December and January
25 putting out the draft comprehensive report and going

1 through the four public meetings that we had
2 scheduled as a part of the scope of services.

3 This will not impact -- at this point in time,
4 we don't foresee that this will impact completion and
5 publication of the final report still on target for
6 February.

7 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: I'd like for you to,
8 perhaps, visit with me next week. I want to visit
9 with the Attorney's General office. As you know,
10 when we put this statewide management plan together,
11 this schedule, House Concurrent Resolution No. 1 had
12 not been adopted by the legislature. And House
13 Concurrent Resolution No. 1 has since been adopted,
14 request a March 1, 2012, delivery date which would
15 add additional time to our work, not at all
16 suggesting that if we need more time that we ought to
17 take advantage of the time. But I want to make sure
18 that we're not doing anything that would conflict
19 with the issues of the legislature.

20 MR. SNELLGROVE: Will do. And here's a
21 breakdown percentage by task. The only one -- here
22 again, things are on schedule. The only thing of
23 note would be Task 1. Last time, I reported a
24 95 percent completion on review of past and current
25 data. At that time, when that was reported -- this

1 was back in August -- the assumption at that time was
2 that we would not be able to obtain current data from
3 2005 to present. We've been working diligently with
4 our contractor as well as with USGS, and we are now
5 able to get that information.

6 So Task 1 has been adjusted as new information
7 is coming in to fulfill that requirement under Task 1
8 as we are getting the data from USGS. Again, Task 9,
9 the finality of the report is still on schedule for
10 February 2011.

11 And this slide right here kind of recaps the
12 draft plan development as we took a turn in the
13 direction of providing the commission members and the
14 task force members and all interested parties an
15 additional opportunity to provide input and
16 involvement in the draft plan prior to it being
17 published for public hearings that are coming up in
18 now December and January.

19 During this process, there was a written
20 questionnaire that was submitted to all. In
21 response, we received 16 responses to the
22 questionnaire. We held two public meetings,
23 September 22nd and 29th in Alexandria. And our
24 meeting facilitator was -- services were provided by,
25 as I said, consultants, Dr. Christel Slaughter and

1 with the assistance of Dr. Williams. And at this
2 point in time, I'd like to go ahead and hand over
3 discussion to Dr. Christel Slaughter.

4 DR. SLAUGHTER: Thank you very much. Thank
5 you, Commissioners. Thank you, Lieutenant Governor
6 and Mr. Welsh.

7 We had very good response, in my opinion, from
8 you on the questionnaires. We were not sure how many
9 responses we would get. I think 16 is pretty good.
10 It was a combination of commissioners and task force
11 members. The progress report, which was prepared by
12 ecology and environment had been posted. A link was
13 posted. The questionnaire was designed around key
14 elements that would be provided potentially in the
15 final version of the statewide master plan, water
16 management plan.

17 The questionnaires were really very helpful to
18 get some insight into what some of the topics would
19 be and some of the more controversial topics and the
20 topics that would give us more discussion. And I
21 want to start by thanking the staff, particularly,
22 Gary Snellgrove, Tony Duplechin, and Charlotte
23 Hardison as well as all the guys who stepped in and
24 helped people get registered and helped with the
25 logistics and making everything run smoother, getting

1 the Power Points ready and, actually, helping us do a
2 good job to facilitate a meeting.

3 The meetings were set up more as workshops
4 than public meetings than a traditional public
5 meeting. We did not have people address the
6 commission and such. Comments were in a structured
7 sort of format so it worked out very well even with a
8 large crowd.

9 I think the first day we might have had 60
10 plus people. On the 29th, the second workshop was a
11 little bit smaller. But there was a lot of interest.
12 In some cases, a little bit of tension or emotion as
13 people spoke about issues that were important to
14 them, which you would expect, and I think wonderful
15 to have it in the central part of state. So we were
16 able to get good attendance from a wide variety of
17 people.

18 Some of the people who were in the audience
19 included members of the USGS staff, representatives
20 of the agricultural associations, people from the
21 Sparta area, couple of people from Arkansas, and a
22 number of people who either had personal or business
23 interests in this particular topic.

24 As you can see on the slide, what we have
25 prepared for today is really to give you some of the

1 highlights of the discussion and some of the areas
2 that received the most discussion. And at the end of
3 each of the sessions consultants from ecology and
4 environment were available to answer questions and
5 talk about timeline and the next steps. So I think
6 it went very, very well.

7 Here are the areas that received the most
8 discussion or interest. In water well registration,
9 legislation for denial of ground water use, a cryptic
10 comment had a lot of implications to it and there
11 were a number of comments about that, what should or
12 should not be done. I would make a note for
13 commissioners, that I was rather surprised at the
14 number of questions we had for Mr. Snellgrove, our
15 attorney, and some of the rest of the staff about
16 what is currently being done in the office of
17 conservation, in DOTD, in the whole area of ground
18 water for the state. So I think it's a signal that
19 some education needs to occur. And when we get the
20 new plan, a lot of education is going to need to
21 occur about what you-all actually adopt and bring
22 forward in recommendations.

23 Again, under water well registration, notify
24 local government prior to issuing response to new
25 well notifications. Some of these are

1 self-explanatory. Require drillers to provide prior
2 notification, right now this is handled within DNR
3 and they wanted more public attention to that.

4 Some of the ones that came in on the
5 questionnaires under this item, verification of well
6 use, provide user friendly nontechnical form
7 completion guidance, and establish one stop shop for
8 all applicable local, state, and federal regulations.

9 Under the next slide, on evaluation, under
10 this topic there were comments about utilizing
11 academic federal agency resources for larger scale
12 ground water and aquifer modeling. Especially, in
13 the first session, quite a bit of time was spent
14 talking about modeling, the cost of modeling. This
15 is expensive for a state to do for a very large
16 aquifer, but there was a lot of interest in pursuing
17 that and getting very good data over a period of time
18 so you could continue to make data based and
19 scientific based decisions.

20 Second item, increase water metering, water
21 level measurements, agency inspections, and reporting
22 and database entry. Again, this would have a fiscal
23 note associated with it. And, earlier, when I had
24 spoken with you-all, as commissioners, some of you
25 had said that more resources would be needed to do a

1 better job in the future and I think some of these
2 comments reenforced that.

3 Increase emphasis on sustainability of aquifer
4 recharge areas. Again, the models will be very
5 helpful in that area and USGS was helpful in those
6 discussions talking about what they could do and what
7 was required, additional resources.

8 Provide single number for water well
9 identification was pretty straightforward. Implement
10 collection of data to support aquifer modeling and
11 increasing use of existing USGS ground water well
12 monitoring database were also noted in the
13 questionnaire but did not bring much discussion.

14 Also, in terms of evaluation, exploring
15 methods to estimate ground water use, increase ground
16 water quality testing, use independent labs for water
17 testing and publish data. The evaluation of aquifer
18 sustainability over a longer period of time, that was
19 really included in earlier ones. And define aquifer
20 sustainability and sustainable yield criteria and
21 establish resources to manage the same. Again, those
22 are all very similar.

23 There were a lot of comments about education.
24 A number of people from a variety of areas of the
25 state believe that this is essential for success in

1 water management of all kinds, both ground and
2 surface water. Developing water conservation and
3 recycling curriculum, that would go into the
4 department of education and into the school systems.
5 Implement a sustainable yield based conservation
6 education for stakeholders. That was stakeholders of
7 all kinds, agricultural, industry, and consumer,
8 local governments as well.

9 Coordinate with and promote local efforts,
10 apparently, there are some areas in the state that
11 had done a number of things and we would learn from
12 them in terms of best practices or learning from what
13 they had discovered.

14 Implement established effective/efficient
15 methods to reach the public, encourage public water
16 suppliers, both private and municipal to educate
17 customers. Expand efforts with LSU AgCenter, LDAF,
18 and others. Those were the items under education
19 that were most prominent in the discussion.

20 Again, there were other ones having to do with
21 notifying state agencies of water management
22 priorities and finding alternatives to public water
23 supply lawn and gardening watering, cisterns, etc.
24 Educating water users of rules and regulations, there
25 was a feeling that is not done as effectively as we

1 could. Provide more frequent stakeholder outreach
2 events, disseminate water conservation success
3 stories, provide semi-annual newsletter and utilize
4 drillers to distribute educational materials to well
5 owners.

6 In terms of emergencies, this was an
7 interesting topic. And, actually, some of the
8 discussion focused on things that had happened in
9 other parts of the state, particularly, Shreveport,
10 how that was handled, how that might be handled
11 differently in the future.

12 Current emergency regulations are adequate,
13 that was one of the questionnaire items that was sent
14 in and a number of people felt that emergency
15 regulations were adequate. Others felt we needed
16 improved state and local agency emergency response
17 coordination and involvement. And there were
18 actually some comments about having state officials
19 on site or the people who were sent by the state to
20 have the power to make decisions or find out who to
21 call very quickly.

22 Establish a priority ranking and allowable
23 usage system during emergencies and then the other
24 two items was suggestions to create a parish water
25 water management board. That drew quite a lot of

1 discussion, including from the Lieutenant Governor,
2 and a lot of talk was how to combat the difference in
3 the authority level in the commission and what would
4 be expected in parish. And I think the conclusion or
5 consensus was this was not an attempt to take
6 authority away from the statewide commission. It was
7 simply to involve parish and local officials so that
8 in emergencies they would be able to help.

9 Establish agency representative standing
10 committee to recommend water quality/quantity
11 emergency actions. Again, that's very similar to the
12 one above.

13 Under enforcement, there were four prominent
14 items. Mandate surface water use, cooperative
15 endeavor agreements, these would take a variety of
16 forms. They are used in some other states and
17 there's a precedent there. Assess violators with
18 civil penalties to fund water projects. Interesting
19 concerns about having violations and funding water
20 projects and the pros and cons of that. So I think
21 that needs to be explored a bit further. Fully fund
22 state programs and, again, the comments that current
23 regulations for enforcement are adequate.

24 Other items under enforcement were to empower
25 parish staff and sheriff's office to issue and

1 enforce citations, have water well inspections, some
2 of which is done by DOTD be done by DNR employees.
3 Integrate ground water resource quality and quantity
4 management within one agency. That is related to the
5 bullet above that and assure water well registration
6 and notification compliance.

7 The last few slides, one that was very
8 interesting had to do with incentives and you can see
9 there were a number of interesting items that came up
10 here. Have a trust fund for surface and ground water
11 use fees to subsidize surface water use. And the
12 idea of trust fund, the idea of actually putting
13 money into a fund that could be utilized for various
14 projects that you thought were important based on,
15 for example, scientific modeling or data you would
16 get later on was seen as particularly important.

17 Cost share funding to assist in developing
18 surface and waste water reuse alternatives, cost
19 sharing, again, to help offset some of the expenses
20 that a local government or industrial user might
21 have. Credit system for alternative users and that
22 could be anything from tax credit to a variety of
23 other incentives that could be put in place.

24 Again, provide incentives/tax reductions to
25 encourage surface water alternatives. Incentives to

1 retain forests and agriculture to benefit watersheds.
2 This was discussed, particularly, as being important
3 in certain areas of the state. Some folks from
4 central Louisiana said -- and I think Mr. Frey helped
5 with that -- that we don't realize how dependent we
6 are on those in our current system. And then provide
7 positive publicity to water users choosing surface
8 water alternatives. So a lot of consensus there
9 about opportunity for incentives.

10 Ground Water consumption fees were mentioned
11 in the questionnaire. Amend E&P no waste on site
12 storage requirements to provide greater opportunity
13 to recycle and streamlining and systemize state,
14 local, and federal government regulatory authority
15 was also seen as an opportunity to provide additional
16 incentives.

17 Under collaboration, focus collaboration on
18 incentives and education, including other states and
19 local agencies in aquifer evaluation and establishing
20 regional bodies, which was discussed more heavily in
21 the workshop that we had on the 22nd. Those all were
22 important areas of discussion on collaboration.

23 Others that came up on the questionnaire or
24 received less discussion were to expand ground water
25 commission to include federal agencies and others not

1 currently represented. Actually, federal agencies we
2 learned are prohibited from serving, but we could
3 certainly have them in attendance at your meetings or
4 available as advisors and to continue to look to make
5 sure that your commission is composed of important
6 stakeholder groups as seen as an opportunity for
7 improvement in the future. Encourage water district
8 and USACE involvement, seek and retain competent and
9 productive staff. That one drew some interesting
10 comments on the 29th about how competent and
11 productive our current staff was and the need to seek
12 replacements as they retire and retention efforts
13 there.

14 Report consistent information and data to all,
15 increase task force membership and role in water
16 policy and management decisions. The concept of
17 maybe dealing with quorum issues in legislation in
18 the next session or the one after that came up
19 because of the task force difficulties because they
20 are so large of getting a forum.

21 Utilizing institutional knowledge and
22 research, hold more frequent and localized meetings
23 for local government participation and seek
24 legislation to provide for effective state and local
25 collaboration for research, funding, planning,

1 oversight, resources, etc., were seen as
2 opportunities moving forward.

3 Under monitoring, requiring water metering,
4 water level measurements, agency inspections,
5 reporting and database entry. We received a lot of
6 discussion, again, the pros and cons of that versus
7 self-reporting or auditing and the need for resources
8 in order to do that effectively was part of this
9 discussion.

10 Increasing surface water quantity measurement
11 came up in a number of different ways and require
12 water well use reporting, the pros and cons of the
13 way DNR is currently doing that came up as well.
14 Some of the ones that were mentioned in the
15 questionnaire that didn't receive a lot of
16 discussion, specifically, were large scale continuous
17 aquifer monitoring network, privatize water quality
18 and quantity monitoring, water well sampling and
19 testing by certified labs, you saw those come up a
20 moment ago in different ways.

21 Provide funding to local and regional
22 organizations, pool state, local, and federal
23 resources, maintain monitoring at state and local
24 levels, assess current monitoring activity and reduce
25 duplicity, improve external sonris well data search

1 capabilities, improve external sonris water use and
2 production search capabilities, and improve Louisiana
3 water use report data reliability.

4 Under auditing, again, related to what you
5 just heard about monitoring and inspections, greater
6 accountability for self-reporting requirements. I
7 think that the staff in the office of conservation
8 felt that what they were asking for in applications
9 and their ability to review, their ability to use the
10 matrix to do an evaluation on the front end, had a
11 lot more gravity to it than I think some of the
12 people in the workshop maybe realized. So the
13 concern was could somebody come in and slip through
14 that process and there would be nothing on the back
15 end in terms of auditing. So you saw that come up in
16 several different ways on different slides, certainly
17 came up here.

18 Other items that received less discussion was
19 periodic inspections of parish water quality offices
20 by other state offices, interesting comments.
21 Automated electronic reporting, assessing staffing
22 needs for adequate auditing, and performing
23 independent evaluation of water resources agency
24 practices and data quality.

25 And, finally, the ambiguous "other" category

1 where people would put things that they are not sure
2 of where they go. Reservoir development, that was an
3 interesting discussion in the second workshop with
4 the conclusion that we may not need that right now in
5 the state but could look forward in planning a time
6 when that may be more important.

7 Shift non-potable users (agriculture,
8 industry, etc.) toward surface water resources,
9 develop the plan on sound scientific objectives. And
10 then some other ones, develop surface water
11 resources, require field identification tags on water
12 wells, ensure surface/ground water resources
13 connection and recognition in state law, and maintain
14 diligence on addressing critical area and area of
15 ground water concern issues.

16 So those were, basically, the areas that we
17 brought up. There were other areas that were
18 emphasized in the group discussion as we went through
19 it. A number of commissioners were able to attend
20 one of the sessions. A couple of overachievers came
21 to both and that was very much appreciated. And it
22 was very beneficial to have you there, even those of
23 you who were really there mainly to listen. I think
24 it made interested and concerned citizens and agency
25 personnel realize how important this is to you.

1 I'd be happy to answer any questions,
2 Lieutenant Governor or Commissioners, if there are
3 some.

4 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: A couple of things, but
5 thank you very much for a very robust report. I
6 would say that it would be my opinion that these two
7 meetings or these two periods of time were probably
8 the most robust discussions ever held in the state on
9 giving folks representing a variety of stakeholders
10 an opportunity to comment on what they think ought to
11 be in the ground water management program. So I want
12 to commend the staff. I want to commend you for
13 providing leadership and making that happen and
14 getting that kind of input. We, obviously, don't all
15 agree at the beginning of a plan to sit down with
16 people who have good ideas, which may be different
17 from our own individual ideas, and take those good
18 ideas and make them great. I would just like to
19 remind the commission members what we are trying to
20 do here is an effort to establish a management regime
21 at least on one thing and one thing only, that is a
22 sustainable water resource program, make sure that we
23 protect the water resource asset of the state, doing
24 it in a transparent way. So all of these
25 recommendations, all of those ideas and suggestions,

1 in my mind, all lead to a more sustainable policy.

2 At the end of the day, we are charged with the
3 responsibility of filtering out those things of which
4 we believe have a chance to become law. We have a
5 responsibility to filter those things out which may
6 be left for another day because not all good ideas
7 are worth implementing because they have certain
8 consequences. So what I'm assuming, Dr. Slaughter,
9 what we will begin to do now is work on these
10 suggestions and the suggestions that our professional
11 consultant has put together for us and we will help
12 to push through those things of which we can agree
13 on. And I don't necessarily think any of us have
14 veto power over what goes in the plan, and I'm
15 hopeful that we can find a way where we will be able
16 to reach some agreement.

17 For instance, I will tell you very clearly
18 that I am not in favor of taxing water. I will do
19 everything I can as chairman of this commission to
20 advocate with my colleagues that that not be a
21 recommendation of this commission. And at the end of
22 the day, I may not prevail. And so I think we are
23 going to have figure out how it is that we're going
24 to do it and would take this information and,
25 hopefully, go through a process of coming up with a

1 draft and then 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, and then get to those
2 things that we can agree on.

3 So having said that, thank you very much and
4 if any other commission members have a desire to
5 speak or be recognized, please let me know on this
6 issue.

7 MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH: One question I might ask
8 is under reservoir development, was that an
9 assumption that we had plenty of surface water
10 available or was that -- what was that based on?
11 Because there are some areas, particularly, north
12 Louisiana where we don't have any alternative except
13 that.

14 MR. SNELLGROVE: Well, I can add that the
15 comment that I recall during the workshop,
16 particularly, the second workshop was that there are
17 reservoirs already in existence. And before getting
18 too far into looking at developing new ones, the
19 comment was suggested that, perhaps, we should look
20 at utilizing ones we already have in place in the
21 state.

22 MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH: Okay.

23 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: One of the things I
24 think was somewhat difficult, Mayor Hollingsworth, is
25 members had an opportunity to kind of describe what

1 it is they thought about certain elements of the
2 ground water management plan, some members were more
3 descriptive in what it is that they wanted and others
4 were not as descriptive. But, nonetheless, I think
5 the staff had a duty and obligation to kind of grab
6 that information.

7 For instance, if there's someone here -- and
8 you don't have to identify yourself today -- but if
9 you were the member of the staff that wrote in your
10 comments something about reservoir development, it
11 would probably be a good idea for you to visit with
12 the staff and let the staff know at a later date what
13 exactly you meant by that. And, quite frankly, if
14 there's anything -- that might not be a bad idea for
15 us to provide this and I think we have a copy of it
16 here -- for any of you who are authors of these
17 comments, if you believe that your comments were not
18 accurately interpreted by the staff and that needs to
19 put a little bit more meat on the bone, it would be a
20 good idea for you to do that within the next couple
21 of weeks. I think, quite frankly, there are a lot of
22 things like that that the staff had to struggle with
23 because it was more of a subjective type
24 questionnaire. Thank you very much.

25 Any other questions?

1 MR. SPICER: Yes. I'd like to make a comment.
2 I think we need to look at the reservoir issue very
3 closely. I think it's a critical part of the surface
4 water management and there's a lot of issues there
5 to be addressed. I don't mind visiting with you and
6 I think we probably have some experts or other state
7 and federal agencies that would be glad to share some
8 information regarding reservoirs and the development
9 part of the surface management plan. So I'd sure
10 like to not just let that sit there and for you not
11 to do anything with it because I think there's a lot
12 of work to be done.

13 DR. SLAUGHTER: Lieutenant Governor, I would
14 also suggest, Mr. Snellgrove and his staff have
15 scanned in all of the questionnaire responses. These
16 are very cryptic, sort of a sound bite to get them on
17 the slide. And I think that if you're interested in
18 seeing the differences of people's opinions, you may
19 want to actually go back to the original
20 questionnaires. I would echo what the Lieutenant
21 Governor said, that I think if you are more
22 interested in an area and a reasonable explanation
23 for why you feel strongly about something, you
24 definitely need to communicate it. Writing is not
25 the best form of communication. And I think

1 everybody was very careful in the workshop not to
2 dominate. I commend the commissioners for that. But
3 if you can get the staff off on the side, you can
4 chew them up. So I think it's very important that
5 you are well understood because you each have such
6 interest and expertise in these matters.

7 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: Right. Just, again, to
8 follow up on what our goal is here, which is to give
9 to the people of this state and to our stakeholders
10 and the legislature recommendations on what we
11 believe a sustainable ground water management program
12 looks like, what are the component parts, what are
13 the obstacles, what are the hurdles, what are the
14 objectives. And some of them may be able to be
15 accomplished very easily like investing in an
16 awareness program. Some of them may go as far to the
17 extreme as recommending withdrawal reductions. And
18 so if we just think of the fact that this is probably
19 going to be the first comprehensive. I know there's
20 some component parts out there. It's not going to be
21 a perfect document. It's going to be a great
22 document and a good starting point.

23 But I would envision much like I've been
24 involved in coastal resources management, that this
25 is going to be Water Management 1.0 and then we will

1 begin to see Water Management 2.0 and 3.0 as we
2 evolve into time and get more information.

3 So, again, I'm looking forward to visiting
4 with you about some of the issues and as members of
5 the commission engaging on what they think ought to
6 be in the plan and we ought to be working with our
7 consultant on that.

8 MR. MCKINNEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a
9 question. Who can explain -- since I'm new on the
10 block here -- who can explain how and who will get
11 this into a hard copy document?

12 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: I think what will
13 happen is we will have a draft document that will be
14 put together by our consultant that is engaged for
15 this particular purpose. That draft document will
16 contemplate some of the things that were on here that
17 there seemed to be much agreement about. And then,
18 perhaps, there will be things that -- for those
19 things that are highly controversial or there was not
20 much agreement about, we will have an opportunity to
21 debate them all but kind of go through that process.
22 I'm not yet sure exactly how we go about doing it
23 with the commission, but we need to do it in a
24 transparent way, vis a vis, a public meeting. So
25 I'll be trying to struggle with that over the next

1 month and try to set it up. But I think we have
2 ample time, and I do believe it's important for us to
3 have those debates.

4 MR. MCKINNEY: Okay.

5 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chairman, one concern I have is
6 that because a suggestion has been made and nobody
7 challenged it at the workshop, it comes across as a
8 consensus suggestion. I don't think that's
9 necessarily true. It seemed to me that the workshop
10 was a forum for, at least, hearing those suggestions,
11 but I certainly hope there's ample -- there's many
12 suggestions up there that I for one do not agree
13 with.

14 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: That's a good point. I
15 think it's important that, again, while we have those
16 things in which we may all agree upon, that nothing
17 gets into the report until we have an idea to invoke
18 all of them. What the staff and our folks may
19 believe is a noncontroversial issue, one of us may
20 believe is controversial. So how we go about
21 identifying those is certainly one thing we need to
22 work on. But I will tell you at the end of day that
23 we need to put eyes on everything. This ought not be
24 Congress where we try to vote on something that we
25 haven't read. Now we're getting into some of the

1 hard work that we get paid so well for. So I
2 appreciate your contributions.

3 I need to step out for another meeting real
4 quick. I'm going to ask that Vice Chairman Spicer
5 take over on Item 4. Is that correct,
6 Mr. Snellgrove?

7 MR. SNELLGROVE: On the agenda, Item 4.

8 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: You still have a quorum
9 without me, right?

10 MR. SNELLGROVE: Yes.

11 MR. SPICER: Are you ready to take up Item 4?

12 MR. SNELLGROVE: Yes, sir. I'll continue.

13 So at this point in time we will go through
14 what we typically report as program updates to the
15 various items that are depicted here. Evolution of
16 the water well driller program that we picked up and
17 made effective March 1st of this year. And we will
18 give you an update on the LRA funding update, office
19 of community development now for water well damage
20 activity from Katrina and Rita that we are pursuing
21 funding. I'll get into that as well. I'll give you
22 an update on the water supply for frac water in
23 Haynesville area. We will go through our statewide
24 water well notification audit and enforcement
25 activities and a little bit on public outreach and

1 education.

2 So as far as the water well driller program,
3 the latest bit of information at the last commission
4 meeting I reported that we would publish draft change
5 to Title 56, which is for the water well driller
6 water well construction licensing procedures that we
7 took over or that we're managing now, say, since
8 March 1st. We did propose regulations be sent out to
9 interested parties. This information here is a
10 compilation of those proposed items. It was put in
11 the state register as well as distributed via e-mail
12 to all interested parties. And we're seeking
13 comments on these items. And once we get that
14 information, then we will adjust accordingly based on
15 the comments we receive and go through a more formal
16 rule making process where we will publish a notice of
17 intent.

18 As far as the database goes, we did complete
19 merging the DOTD database with the historical
20 database that we have here at DNR. That information
21 is now currently available and has been now since the
22 last commission meeting that was in August to the
23 public as well as for our own internal use for our
24 evaluation purposes and registering water wells. Of
25 course any time you merge data, you're going to have

1 issues to clean up and we're actively pursuing
2 cleaning up the data to make it more -- to put it
3 more in a consistent format that we can more easily
4 search and use the data.

5 For instance, there are some instances where
6 there's inconsistencies in the way that -- and this
7 may not be exactly accurate, but it's a hypothetical
8 for you to understand what we're dealing with --
9 there may have been some inconsistencies in the way a
10 date was reported in a particular field. So we're
11 going through and our IT staff are writing programs
12 or doing some things that will help to debug, if you
13 will, those types of situations to get it consistent
14 so that we will have better access and usability
15 throughout the system. The latest information on our
16 efforts with the office of community development to
17 go out and repair or plug and abandon the 120 wells
18 or so that have been identified as moderate risk or,
19 say, high risk due to the damage caused by storm
20 surges and the events of Katrina and Rita, we should
21 be getting either today or before the end of the week
22 before Friday an application that was put together
23 through a consultant that works with the office of
24 community development and the application will
25 require the Secretary's approval of DNR. Once that

1 occurs, then it will go back to OCD for their review
2 and approval. And once they approve, they will issue
3 a notice to proceed. So we're getting very close to
4 concluding that process to secure the funding and to
5 begin the project.

6 We've been reporting this information for the
7 Haynesville shale frac water for probably a year now.
8 This is a continuation of that process. And just to
9 give you a short recap, effective October 1st of 2009
10 we implemented -- the office of conservation, that
11 is, implemented an expansion of the work history
12 reporting that occurs for permits that have been
13 issued that include hydraulic fracturing processes.
14 Operators are now required or have been since
15 October 1 have been required to provide water use
16 information in their reporting back to the agency.
17 And what we do with that information is capture it
18 into our database and periodically update statistics.
19 So this slide here represents the break down on the
20 information that we received from October 1st, 2009,
21 to September 30th of 2010. And as you can see, we're
22 still above on frac supplied surface water. We're
23 still above 75 percent or at 75 percent, above
24 70 percent, of water being used for fracking purposes
25 coming from the surface.

1 And, of course, the graph is pretty
2 self-explanatory, but we haven't seen any real
3 substantive change to the data that's been reported
4 from the onset of the project to the current in that
5 we are still well into the 70s on reporting frac well
6 supply coming from surface water.

7 At this point, we will briefly discuss the
8 water well notification audit and enforcement
9 activity, where we are. We set in motion effective
10 almost now two years back a systematic or procedural
11 way to go about it, touching every parish in the
12 state through an audit process to compare those wells
13 that have been known to have been registered and
14 drilled versus those that were required to be
15 submitted to our agency under the department of
16 natural resources for prior notification for our
17 evaluation. We've gone through -- this slide I'm
18 going to show you, we've visited Carizzo-Wilcox
19 parishes, Chicot, and SPARTA. We've gone throughout
20 southeast Louisiana. We've gone through the
21 Mississippi River Alluvial and now we're into the
22 general category of "other." We're now currently
23 auditing and near completion of September. This is a
24 breakdown of the enforcement actions taken as a
25 result of the audit. And you can see here that we're

1 now rounding third and heading home. There's been
2 over 2600 enforcement actions since we began the
3 audit process.

4 To give you a breakdown on where we are with
5 the latest public outreach and education in
6 consideration of the fact that, of course, the two
7 workshops that we just went through in the entire
8 month of September was a very large scale public
9 education and outreach effort. I'm going to bring
10 you up to date with where we are and what we reported
11 in August with some of the latest for this fiscal
12 year on our efforts.

13 We're in the process of developing a
14 curriculum guide that our objective is to get out to
15 state superintendents statewide before the end of the
16 year, hopefully, so that all of this would be in
17 preparation and in response to, I'd say, the ground
18 water awareness week that comes up in the springtime.
19 But our objective here is to get a curriculum guide
20 out there and available for use here by the end of
21 the calendar year.

22 We've been very active on pursuing public
23 education or conservation tips or guidance through
24 the monthly billing for both public and private water
25 supply, public water supply providers. Obviously,

1 particularly, those that are withdrawing ground water
2 and using that as part of their public supply. We've
3 been working with our public relation folks to put
4 something together and to get that out to reach out
5 to all the public water suppliers. I kind of see
6 this as more of a survey as it is a
7 please-go-out-and-do-this effort because I think a
8 lot of them are already doing it. We've already
9 gotten some positive feedback from some of the more
10 major users whereby they have already incorporated a
11 conservation tips element to the billing cycle. But
12 needless to say, there may be some that aren't and
13 maybe some of the smaller scale operators could
14 assist us with that effort.

15 And, thirdly, we met with -- following the
16 last commission meeting that we held in August, we
17 met with the LSU AgCenter and the NRCS staff to
18 further firm up our relationship with those entities
19 and to partner with them on their public ed and
20 outreach when it come to ground water conservation or
21 water conversation efforts. We shared some ideas.
22 Our objective now is to partner predominantly with
23 the AgCenter as they have already in place a nice
24 distribution statewide and already very well rolling
25 on their efforts with this.

1 Our first objective is to provide to them a
2 fact sheet, a one-page handout type of deal that they
3 can provide to the folks who are in the audience or
4 participating in their public outreach efforts. And
5 then we will build off of that and, perhaps, get to
6 something more sophisticated like a Power Point
7 presentation. And, certainly, we do intend to have a
8 presence at some of their events where they are in
9 areas where ground water is more of a concern where
10 there are known issues that need to be addressed. We
11 want to have a presence with LSU AgCenter with a more
12 robust outreach effort through their deal.

13 And, finally, we had also opened up an
14 opportunity through local colleges here in Baton
15 Rouge to create a public service announcement. Last
16 time I announced that would take some effort to find
17 and to have the ability to get the production
18 equipment to do this. It's not a cheap thing to do
19 to pursue if you're going to do it on your own. So
20 the objective here is to see if we could partner with
21 LSU or Southern, and we have gotten some feedback, I
22 believe, from LSU. But we've also received some
23 information, I believe, here in our own building.
24 The department of revenue has some production
25 equipment. And we are working with our public

1 relation folks. They have been working on putting
2 together -- I think there's some type of agreement
3 that may need to be between the two agencies that
4 would allow us to utilize that equipment and to put
5 together a public service announcement that could
6 then go out to the media and distribute.

7 So we've got some positive developments on all
8 of those forefronts and look forward to getting those
9 implemented here soon. And at this time, that
10 concludes what I've had here prepared to discuss.

11 MR. SPICER: Thank you, Gary. Anyone have any
12 questions for Gary on his update?

13 MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH: I do. I have some
14 experience in radio and television production. I
15 would think it would be a lot cheaper for you to
16 outsource that from a lot of production facilities
17 that are available for rent and that sort of thing.
18 I couldn't imagine investing money in production
19 facilities when there are plenty of them available.
20 All you've got to do is rent them and take care of
21 them.

22 MR. SNELLGROVE: Yes, sir. I appreciate that.
23 Well, I think what we have right now is a fish on the
24 hook that really won't cost us anything. The
25 department of revenue, I believe, has the equipment.

1 Patrick Courreges didn't inform me that there would
2 be any cost associated with it. So I think we've
3 probably got, at least, that part of it maybe secured
4 or close to being secured.

5 MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH: Could I add another
6 question or pose an idea, at least? And I'm sure
7 it's not a new idea. But on the matter of reservoirs
8 of rural water systems, that is, I think there were
9 some regulations passed down from events about water
10 systems, really looking into tying in to help one
11 another, were they not? I understand that. But,
12 anyway, I was thinking in the instance of reservoirs,
13 Lake D'Arbonne, the lake that we're looking at as an
14 alternative or source of freshwater for Ruston and
15 the other two parishes, there are five months of the
16 year that probably Lake D'Arbonne can supply all the
17 water we need for many parishes because millions and
18 millions of gallons go over the spillway every day.
19 And I was wondering if anybody had thought about
20 using that on the shared basis to take the rural
21 water systems off the SPARTA aquifer or any other
22 aquifer for that matter during those high yield
23 months on the lakes that are available or reservoirs
24 to treat the water to have that as an option or
25 requirement, that they use that water during those

1 high volume months and it would be available to take
2 an enormous load off some of our aquifers.

3 MR. SPICER: Thank you, Mr. Hollingsworth.
4 Any other comments?

5 MR. WELSH: Mr. Snellgrove, can you tell me if
6 you're experiencing any complaints or phone calls
7 about the water use in the Chicot -- I mean, the
8 Carizzo-Wilcox aquifer now that such a high percent
9 of the fracking is done with surface water? Or are
10 we getting those calls like we used to do two years
11 ago?

12 MR. SNELLGROVE: No, sir. We are not getting
13 the volume of calls that we used to. It has quieted
14 down some. What we have found is a lot of -- well,
15 what we are now getting when we do get inquiries
16 about this area, what we found is a lot of it has to
17 do with truck driving and not so much the ground
18 water, but activities associated with moving water
19 around on the roads and what have you. At least,
20 that's been my experience. And for those
21 circumstances where we have received a complaint, we
22 certainly go through the evaluation process and
23 investigate. And we have found that if there is a
24 nearby oil and gas operator, they go above and beyond
25 what we ask to communicate with and to meet with the

1 person that has lodged the complaint. And,
2 typically, what we found is they work it out. The
3 problem gets resolved.

4 MR. WELSH: Good. Thank you. I've just got
5 -- I guess this is kind of an announcement. Next
6 week, I have been asked to go and be on a panel at
7 the Marcellus Shale Summit at Penn State University.
8 I and Professor Gary Hanson, who you all know, and
9 Mike Mathis, who is a Chesapeake Energy water
10 manager, are going to appear on a panel at Penn State
11 to discuss the issue of how the regulatory companies
12 were using a very low yield ground water aquifer to
13 try to get enough water to frac with. It was
14 discovered early on that that aquifer was not
15 suitable, so we early on came up with our solution,
16 which was, basically, to ask companies to move in the
17 utilization of surface water for the fracking. So
18 the slide that Gary Snellgrove showed a while ago 75,
19 78 percent of that water is now surface water.
20 That's a success story. So we want to tell this good
21 news story to another part of the country that's
22 debating their development of the shale similar to
23 our Haynesville, how the regulators, the public, and,
24 actually, the regulatory industry have all got on the
25 same page and are making this work. So we think

1 that's a good news story and that's what we're going
2 to do. That's next week. Thank you.

3 MR. SPICER: Any comments?

4 MR. SHORT: Two quick questions. On that
5 75 percent water usage, is that primarily the Red
6 River and can you give a breakdown of where that is
7 coming from?

8 MR. WELSH: Well, it's a total of water use
9 for fracking and for drilling. The water comes
10 primarily from the Red River and Toledo Bend. Those
11 are the two major surface water sources that we've
12 estimated that there's about 300 billion gallons of
13 excess water available from those two surface water
14 supplies. That's enough to frac 88,000 wells a year.
15 And the total demand for the Haynesville shale will
16 take about 10,000 wells over 20 years. So I'd say we
17 have a lot of surface water.

18 MR. SHORT: Why does St. Tammany have so many
19 enforcements that stuck out on the list of parishes?

20 MR. SNELLGROVE: Yes. There's a lot of --
21 they are heavily dependent upon the aquifer for their
22 drinking water supplies. So predominantly what that
23 represents are a lot of private public supply water
24 well owners like subdivisions. And during that time
25 period, which is part of our evaluation, which is

1 from our audit, say, from 2001, 2003 to present
2 because Katrina and Rita and you had a lot of
3 migration towards those parishes and you had an
4 expansion of population and development and with that
5 comes water well development, etc. So that's what
6 we predominantly are seeing. It's not so much
7 agricultural. It's pretty much the public supply.

8 MR. LOEWER: Can you define what action means?

9 MR. SNELLGROVE: Actions are either compliance
10 orders or notice of violations and they both have
11 different --

12 MR. LOEWER: They would range from, what, 20
13 -- what, I mean, is extreme --

14 MR. SNELLGROVE: Well, a compliance order is
15 one of which we implement whenever there's been a
16 violation in the audit process from 2003 to present.
17 A notice of violation is because of the way it is has
18 to do with statutory law. We issue -- we don't feel
19 like the commissioner -- it is our legal status
20 opinion that the commissioner doesn't have the
21 authority to issue anything greater than a notice of
22 violation, so it has to do with degrees of severity,
23 if you will, and what the statutory language says he
24 can do and can't do because there was a change
25 between 2001 and 2003 with authority, as I appreciate

1 it. So when the act was created in 2008, that gave
2 the authority of our agency to enforce the
3 regulations. It didn't go back and tap back into the
4 time period between 2001 and 2003. It's somewhat
5 confusing. I know. I understand. But that's the
6 reason why there's a difference between the type of
7 actions. So that's why I choose to call them
8 enforcement actions, separate them out.

9 MR. LOEWER: For our use, since they go from
10 minor to very severe, they could also be broken down
11 between the paperwork involved, it could be an
12 infraction or anything in the amount of paperwork
13 that needed to be done with the well or could it be
14 with the well itself, which would be more of a
15 concern.

16 MR. SNELLGROVE: Yes, sir. This audit process
17 that I'm reporting in these meetings is not inclusive
18 of all actions that our agency has taken. This is by
19 far the most and in the process a systematic approach
20 that we go through. Very frankly, the reason we
21 implemented this one is because we're mandated to do
22 so. But, more importantly, in my opinion, it is
23 almost -- it's an outreach. We are notifying the
24 public of situations that they have not complied and
25 we are giving them the opportunity to resolve that

1 situation in an amicable way, in my opinion. We're
2 not assessing civil penalties at this time whenever
3 we go through this process. So I think it serves two
4 purposes and both purposes are very important. So to
5 answer your question to the other side, yes, the act
6 that was passed that gave you the ability to enforce
7 our rules and regulations came with a matrix and with
8 that matrix is written into an actual act and
9 statutory law now. If you do this, there's a range
10 that we can assess a civil penalty.

11 Now, there's also some language in the act
12 that says this is what the commissioner may -- it
13 doesn't say he shall. So it's at the discretion of
14 the agency to decide what is the best way to go about
15 resolving situations that come up. We had a
16 situation where we felt like the assessment of a
17 civil penalty was greatly warranted, whereby, a water
18 well driller that wasn't licensed drilled a water
19 well pretty much knowingly and willingly. So we had
20 gotten this through a complaint. We pursued it and,
21 lo and behold, it became factual. So in this
22 situation, we felt it was more than warranted than to
23 assess a civil penalty with a compliance order. So
24 that gives you one example of more the extreme, but
25 there's all kinds of things as you noted in between

1 that we take case by case. We follow the statutory
2 requirements. We try to hold to that. But if we can
3 get the job done without assessing a civil penalty,
4 that is the route that we would prefer to take.

5 MR. SPICER: Any other questions? Thank you,
6 Gary. The next item, the next meeting is scheduled
7 for Wednesday, December 1st, 11:00 o'clock. We
8 haven't decided where it's going to be, Gary?

9 MR. SNELLGROVE: No, sir. We will have to get
10 back with the Lieutenant Governor and discuss that.
11 But on the agenda we do have a section for public
12 comment.

13 MR. SPICER: Yes, sir. That is coming up
14 next. We will take public comments. Does anyone
15 want to speak? Anyone? I don't see anyone so with
16 no objections, we will adjourn.

17 MS. CRAVENS: I want to speak.

18 MR. SPICER: Please come forward and introduce
19 yourself.

20 MS. CRAVENS: My name is Tiffani Cravens. I'm
21 with the department of environmental quality in the
22 aquifer evaluation and protection section, which is
23 upgrading the water quality assessment division. And
24 I work with two programs that I think may be of
25 interest to the commission, so I just want to tell

1 you about them now.

2 One of the programs that I work with is the
3 the source water assessment program. And it's not a
4 sampling program but a public education community
5 involvement outreach type of program and it's
6 designed to teach people where their drinking water
7 comes from, how to protect it, and why they should
8 protect it. We work one parish at a time. We
9 currently work in Iberia Parish and around Concordia
10 Parish. Basically, it is a public education
11 campaign. I know education is important to the
12 commission for source water purposes.

13 And the other program that I work with -- I
14 had these two maps that I'm going to put on this
15 table real quick. You have to look at them as you
16 leave. But it's the aquifer sampling and assessment
17 program. It is a statewide ambient ground water
18 sampling program. We sample on a three-year
19 rotational basis on an aquifer wide basis. We have,
20 approximately, 200 wells that we sample every three
21 years. And, like I said, on an aquifer wide basis,
22 we have data going all the way back to the early
23 '90s. This data is on the Internet. It's for public
24 viewing. It's available. I know that several areas
25 of the questionnaire was mentioned about the sampling

1 program or aquifer data and so we do have that
2 available. We sample for a variety of parameters,
3 volatile compounds, pesticides, PCBs, involatiles,
4 water quality nutrients, and all this is available
5 and we are continuing our program. It's not on as
6 large a scale as is necessary to include in a ground
7 water plan because it's only 200 wells and we've
8 sampled about one well for over 400-square miles is
9 our goal. We would love to triple that, quadruple
10 that amount, but with funding right now that is the
11 amount of wells that we sample. And if you have any
12 questions on that, we would be glad to do a full
13 presentation at any time on either or both of the
14 programs.

15 MR. SPICER: Any questions?

16 MS. CRAVENS: These are all our wells on these
17 maps.

18 MR. SPICER: I don't have a question, but I
19 have a comment. Are you familiar with the ground
20 water testing that the department of ag and forestry
21 conducts dealing with pesticides?

22 MS. CRAVENS: They do and are targeting areas,
23 I think, where the pesticides are used. And, yes, I
24 am familiar with that. And we do -- I don't know
25 that we overlap, necessarily. There are probably

1 some areas that we do, but since we sample statewide,
2 not just on targeted areas, and we sample all types
3 of wells. We sample ground water, but we do include
4 some pesticide data also.

5 MR. SPICER: Thank you. Any comments or
6 questions of the speaker? Thank you.

7 Any other comments from the public? If not,
8 then I move that we adjourn. Any objections?

9 MR. WELSH: No objection.

10 (MEETING ADJOURNED AT 12:11 P.M.)

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, DEANA C. DAUTEL, Registered Professional Reporter, and Certified Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the above-named witness, after having been first duly sworn by me to testify to the truth, did testify as hereinabove set forth;

That the testimony was reported by me in shorthand and transcribed under my personal direction and supervision, and is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability and understanding;

That I am not of counsel, not related to counsel or the parties hereto, and not in any way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Baton Rouge, Louisiana, this 1st day of November, 2010.

DEANA C. DAUTEL
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTER
CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER