| 1 | STATE OF LOUISIANA |
|----|----------------------------------|
| | |
| 2 | DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES |
| 3 | OFFICE OF CONSERVATION |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION |
| 8 | 12TH REGULAR MEETING |
| 9 | WEDNESDAY, JULY 25TH, 2018 |
| 10 | BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA |
| 11 | COMMENCING AT 11:00 A.M. |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | LASALLE BUILDING - FIRST FLOOR |
| 15 | LABELLE ROOM |
| 16 | 617 NORTH THIRD STREET |
| 17 | BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70802 |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | REPORTED BY: |
| 24 | BRITTANY E. VIDRINE, CCR, RPR |
| 25 | BATON ROUGE COURT REPORTERS, LLC |
| | |
| | l l |

| 1 | COMMISSION MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: |
|----|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | KYLE F. BALKUM |
| 4 | LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES |
| 5 | HONORABLE GLENN BRASSEAUX |
| 6 | MAYOR OF CARENCRO, LOUISIANA MUNICIPAL |
| 7 | ASSOCIATION |
| 8 | DAVID D. CULPEPPER |
| 9 | GEOSCIENTISTS WITH EXPERTISE IN GROUNDWATER |
| 10 | RESOURCE MANAGEMENT |
| 11 | MARK S. DAVIS |
| 12 | TULANE INSTITUTE OF WATER RESOURCES POLICY AND |
| 13 | LAW |
| 14 | ANTHONY J. DUPLECHIN, JR. |
| 15 | CAPITAL AREA GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT |
| 16 | JOHAN FORSMAN |
| 17 | LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HOSPITALS - |
| 18 | OFFICE OF PUBLIC HEALTH |
| 19 | WARREN L. FOUNDS |
| 20 | SABINE RIVER AUTHORITY |
| 21 | BRANDON FREY |
| 22 | EXECUTIVE SECRETARY LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE |
| 23 | COMMISSION |
| 24 | PAUL D. FREY |
| 25 | LOUISIANA LANDOWNERS ASSOCIATION |
| | |

| 1 | COMMISSION MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE (CONTINUED) |
|----|---|
| 3 | KAREN GAUTREAUX |
| 4 | RESTORE COASTAL LOUISIANA |
| 5 | LINDSEY K. GOUEDY |
| 6 | SPARTA GROUNDWATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT |
| 7 | TYLER P. GRAY |
| 8 | LOUISIANA MID-CONTINENT OIL AND GAS ASSOCIATION |
| 9 | THOMAS HARRIS |
| 10 | LOUISIANA OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR |
| 11 | RICHARD P. IEYOUB, SR. |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER OF CONSERVATION |
| 13 | CHRISTOPHER P. KNOTTS, P.E., FASCE |
| 14 | LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND |
| 15 | DEVELOPMENT |
| 16 | SHERRI MCCONNELL |
| 17 | LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT |
| 18 | DAVID B. RABALAIS |
| 19 | PORTS ASSOCIATION OF LOUISIANA |
| 20 | BRADLEY E. SPICER |
| 21 | AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY |
| 22 | JOHN P. STOSHAK |
| 23 | RESIDENTIAL CONSUMERS |
| 24 | ELLIOTT B. VEGA |
| 25 | DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY |
| | |

| 1 | I N D E X |
|----|---|
| 2 | PAGE |
| 3 | 1. Call to Order4 |
| 4 | 2. Roll Call4 |
| 5 | 3. Welcome of New Members7 |
| 6 | 4. Adoption of Previous Meeting Summary8 |
| 7 | 5. "Water - What We Pay For"15 |
| 8 | Rusty Reeves, Deputy Director, Louisiana |
| 9 | Rural Water Association |
| 10 | 6. Update on Coastal Lowlands Aquifer System43 |
| 11 | Project |
| 12 | Linzy Foster, Hydrologist, U.S. Geological |
| 13 | Survey |
| 14 | 7. Introduction to Strategic Planning Partnership - |
| 15 | Capital Area Ground Water Conservation |
| 16 | Commission and the Water Institute of the |
| 17 | Gulf69 |
| 18 | Alyssa Dausman, Ph.D., Vice-President for |
| 19 | Science, Water Institute of the Gulf |
| 20 | 8. Public Comments (none) |
| 21 | 9. Adjourn89 |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | |

| 1 | CALL TO ORDER |
|----|-----------------------------|
| 2 | |
| 3 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Balkum? |
| 4 | MR. BALKUM: Here. |
| 5 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Bishop? |
| 6 | MR. BISHOP: (No response.) |
| 7 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Bopp? |
| 8 | MR. BOPP: (No response.) |
| 9 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Brasseaux? |
| 10 | MR. BRASSEAUX: Here. |
| 11 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Chabert? |
| 12 | MR. CHABERT: (No response.) |
| 13 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Cormier? |
| 14 | MR. CORMIER: (No response.) |
| 15 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Culpepper? |
| 16 | MR. CULPEPPER: Here. |
| 17 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Davis? |
| 18 | MR. DAVIS: Here. |
| 19 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Duplechin? |
| 20 | MR. DUPLECHIN: Here. |
| 21 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Forsman? |
| 22 | MR. FORSMAN: Here. |
| 23 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Founds? |
| 24 | MR. FOUNDS: Here. |
| 25 | MR. REONAS: Brandon Frey? |
| | |
| | |

| 1 | |
|----|----------------------------------|
| 1 | MR. FREY: Here. |
| 2 | MR. REONAS: Paul Frey? |
| 3 | MR. FREY: Here. |
| 4 | MR. REONAS: Ms. Gautreaux? |
| 5 | MS. GAUTREAUX: Here. |
| 6 | MR. REONAS: Ms. Gouedy? |
| 7 | MS. GOUEDY: Here. |
| 8 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Gray? |
| 9 | MR. GRAY: Here. |
| 10 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Harper? |
| 11 | MR. HARPER: (No response.) |
| 12 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Harris? |
| 13 | MR. HARRIS: Here. |
| 14 | MR. REONAS: Commissioner Ieyoub? |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER IEYOUB: Here. |
| 16 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Knotts? |
| 17 | MR. KNOTTS: Here. |
| 18 | MR. REONAS: Ms. McConnell? |
| 19 | MS. McCONNELL: Here. |
| 20 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Rabalais? |
| 21 | MR. RABALAIS: Here. |
| 22 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Spicer? |
| 23 | MR. SPICER: Here. |
| 24 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Stoshak? |
| 25 | MR. STOSHAK: Here. |
| | |
| | |

| 1 | MR. REONAS: Sutcliffe? |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. SUTCLIFFE: (No response.) |
| 3 | MR. REONAS: Mr. Vega? |
| 4 | MR. VEGA: Here. |
| 5 | MR. REONAS: Ms. Zaunbrecher? |
| 6 | MS. ZAUNBRECHER: (No response.) |
| 7 | MR. REONAS: So we do a have a |
| 8 | quorum. We're good to proceed. |
| 9 | MR. HARRIS: Thank you. |
| 10 | Our first order of business, I'd |
| 11 | like to welcome we have two new |
| 12 | members. First, is Brandon Frey, |
| 13 | Executive Secretary of the Public Service |
| 14 | Commission, and he is replacing Eve |
| 15 | Gonzalez. Mr. Frey, would you like to |
| 16 | just say a couple of words and introduce |
| 17 | yourself? |
| 18 | MR. FREY: I've been with the |
| 19 | commission, let's see, almost 20 years |
| 20 | now. I've worked on a lot of cases. |
| 21 | Unfortunately, Secretary Gonzalez |
| 22 | retired, but I'm happy to take her place. |
| 23 | MR. HARRIS: Thank you very much. |
| 24 | Second, we have J.P. Stoshak |
| 25 | representing residential consumers. He's |
| | |

| 1 | an appointment of Representative Bishop. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Would you like to introduce yourself? |
| 3 | MR. STOSHAK: Good morning. My name |
| 4 | is J.P. Stoshak and I'm from Milton, |
| 5 | Louisiana, Lafayette Parish. And I've |
| 6 | been asked to served by Representative |
| 7 | Stuart Bishop, and I must say, I'm ready |
| 8 | and willing and honored to serve. |
| 9 | MR. HARRIS: Thank you. Welcome to |
| 10 | the new members. Look forward to working |
| 11 | with you. |
| 12 | Everyone has received a copy of the |
| 13 | minutes, the summary from the December |
| 14 | 2017 meeting. Do I have a motion to |
| 15 | approve those? |
| 16 | MR. RABALAIS: I move. |
| 17 | MR. HARRIS: Mr. Rabalais moves. Do |
| 18 | I have a second? |
| 19 | MR. FOUNDS: Second. |
| 20 | MR. HARRIS: Thank you, |
| 21 | Commissioner. |
| 22 | All in favor, say "aye." |
| 23 | ("Aye" in unison.) |
| 24 | MR. HARRIS: All opposed? |
| 25 | (No response.) |
| | |

| 1 | MR. HARRIS: Hearing none, the |
|----|---|
| 2 | motion carries. |
| 3 | We do have one item that I'd like to |
| 4 | add to the agenda, and that would require |
| 5 | a motion by the Board to or Senator |
| 6 | Long is here. He would like to give us |
| 7 | an update of legislation from the past |
| 8 | senator. |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER IEYOUB: (Makes |
| 10 | movement.) |
| 11 | MR. HARRIS: Commissioner moves. |
| 12 | MR. SPICER: Second. |
| 13 | MR. HARRIS: Mr. Spicer seconds. |
| 14 | All in favor? |
| 15 | ("Aye" in unison.) |
| 16 | MR. HARRIS: All opposed? |
| 17 | (No response.) |
| 18 | MR. HARRIS: Motion carries. Thank |
| 19 | you, Senator. |
| 20 | SENATOR LONG: Thank you. Thank |
| 21 | you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 22 | Members, I'll be brief, but I I |
| 23 | know that we all have been consumed with |
| 24 | the work of government. I told someone |
| 25 | recently that in my 11 years as the state |
| | |

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

senator and my years as the president pro tempore of the Senate, I've never been challenged like we were to bring a consensus as to how we move forward. I wanted to take about four minutes of your time and tell you that legislatively speaking, for the first time in many years we have stability. You see that played out in the bond market, the ratings for the sale of Louisiana have moved up, which allows us to borrow money at a much more competitive rate, which means we move projects. And as results of that, we're beginning to see great interest on the part of business. I just left Mark Cooper's office who is the chief of staff for the governor. I have an 11:45 meeting with the governor to discuss some of these issues.

But I wanted to tell you, and Paul
Frey reminded me, that about five years
ago I was the guest speaker at the
Louisiana Landowners Association, and I
made this statement: "One day we will
talk about water as we talk about oil and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

gas." That day is here. And we're going to take a very progressive position as a state Senator in my last year and a half to begin to put into play how we might use this valuable resource.

Many of you know, of course, that I represent the Sabine River Authority Toledo Bend. A staggering statistic of those 187,000 acres that comprise Toledo Bend. Here's what we know: 95 to 97 percent of that water that enters Toledo Bend eventually enters the Diversion Canals or the Gulf of Mexico. We have a resource that we can market. We need to do it environmentally. We need to do it progressively, but we need to look at how we can market this particular commodity. Now, there may be other opportunities beyond Toledo Bend. But I can tell you this, when I was chairman of natural resources, I literally had people from Austin, Texas and other places in Texas meet with me to discuss how Louisiana can partner with them. Now, quickly, a side note, the State of Texas, their laws are

2.0

so convoluted, it's extremely difficult for Texas to move water within the State of Texas. Very complicated. But that is how their laws are set up.

I have a meeting on August the 9th in Many, Louisiana. I will create within the Sabine River Authority a study commission as to how we can move forward. But I will also offer a resolution next year asking you to be a participant in that. And as we establish that, I would ask Mr. Chairman that we have at least one member of your committee to serve on that.

Louisiana is rich in many resources. I think the one that goes most undernoted is water. And we need to be progressive as I suggested to you. So legislatively, I want you to know that because we have fixed the budget, and I think that is a correct assumption, there is a seven-year clause that provides permanent funding that one-half cent penny that was almost a half is locked in for seven years.

In meeting with Mark Cooper 20

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

minutes ago, I was amazed at the number of businesses and industries that are beginning to contact Louisiana because now they see permanency and they see some things that are very important to them.

When you look at the growth of the south, we follow only Kentucky as you measure growth economically and business-wise. Good things are happening in Louisiana. I think a big part of that is going to be how we move forward with this precious commodity that we all take for granted quite candidly. But it is a product. It is a marketable resource that we have, and I want you to know that as a state Senator it's very important to me that we share with where we're going. You have two excellent chairmen in Representative Bishop and Senator Chabert, who I work very closely with. But I think the thing I wanted to share with you is, first of all, thank you for being patient with the legislative Sometimes it doesn't work the way we want it to work. But I can tell

2.0

you, we're there now. Good things are ahead for us, and I just wanted to thank each of you, and particularly these commission members who serve. Extremely important. I always look forward to my Tulane update, great information, and, of course, everything you send out, I read and -- because it's important to me.

But, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for allowing me to take just a moment to give this brief report.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Senator Long. I appreciate you coming here today.

On a belated note, I'd like to give everyone an update on the work of the work group for the sale of surface water. We have met twice since the work group was formed last December -- by this commission last December. We have another meeting, we're trying to schedule that some time in the month of August. I do anticipate that I will be setting up a draft of our report to the commission some time between now and our next --

1 next meeting which will probably be late 2 November, early December. I look forward 3 to getting that out to all of you. We made quite a bit of process 4 looking at a lot of the issues with 5 technical, legal and procedural and look 6 7 forward to getting that report out. 8 Matt, we do have -- the next item is 9 a presentation by Rusty Reeves. 10 MR. REONAS: Yep. MR. HARRIS: Mr. Reeves is the 11 12 Deputy Director of Louisiana Rural Water 13 Association. 14 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman, 15 Commissioners, thank y'all for this 16 opportunity. 17 I'm Rusty Reeves, Louisiana Rural Water Deputy Director and Training 18 19 Coordinator. I work for Mr. Pat Credeur. 2.0 My presentation today is going to be 21 brief. And it is in regards to water and 22 what we pay for, and I'm talking mainly 23 consumer water, water to homes and at the 24 businesses. Senator Long is going to be 25 a tough act to follow, because he's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

talked about how precious this commodity is. And we're going to find out today -- or we already know that a lot of it is given away at a discounted rate to our consumers because it's thought to be a cheap commodity, and it's not.

Looking at these first two pictures here, that's some water buffaloes in some little communities that experience water issues, either boil advisories or no water to drink. And the National Guard furnished these buffaloes. And if you'll look here on the one to the right it says, "Free clean drinking water. Bring your own container." "Bring your own container." What is a container? What is a container? We think of a gallon jug, we think a five-gallon bucket, but a water system has many containers. have tanks. They have piping throughout the community. That's all a storage container for that water system. We have neglected to maintain some of them containers, and it's caused us issues.

When we look at water systems,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

they're not all created equal. We have multiple forms of water systems. Some of them are municipalities. Some of them are private, not profit. It's a local co-op of residents that got together and formed the water system. Some of them is private for profit. Some of them are an association, that's a private, nonprofit situation. Some are a public water supply appointed by a local police jury. And then there's private water districts across the state. So one set of regulations don't apply to everybody. One water system may have water rates of 12-dollar minimum and two dollars a thousand, and the water system 20 miles down the road they get 25-dollar minimum and six dollars a thousand depending on what kind of treatment they have and what's involved there.

A few years ago the legislative auditor put out a report in regards to the water system, the rates, and one of the things it addressed is the management for the system, having the proper

2.0

management in there and possible training for some of these decision-makers.

A lot of people are of the consensus that, you know, water is cheap, it's readily available, you know, Sabine River Authority -- or the -- the Toledo Bend is full of water, but none of it's consumable unless you process it. And the treatment process costs money.

The other thing that's disturbing is in the 2017 American Civil Engineer's Report, our water infrastructure ranked a D in the needs of upgrades and repairs. When we look at these kind of reports, I -- actually our highway infrastructure ranked higher than our drinking water supplies.

USDA and the EPA have come up with a training course in regards to effective utility management, and some of the things that through this management training for decision-makers that they had us address is the product -- the quality of the water. That's what most people complain about or are dissatisfied

2.0

with is what the water looks like, the smell of it. Getting the proper quality of the product is very essential to be able to sell the product for a fair arrangement.

Customers satisfaction, we all know that they want the water as cheap as they can get it. Sometimes that may be a feasible option if you have a millage tax to support it or you have other means of supporting it. Your infrastructure stability, what is the condition of your infrastructure? How well are we going to maintain it? What's our plans for the future to improve it or upgrade it?

Community sustainability and economic development. Without good water and without good sewer systems, it's hard for the area to grow economically because that's services that has to be utilized in every business or every industry that comes into this state.

Stakeholder Understanding and Support, I don't think our consumers, our customers of our water systems understand

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

what truly is involved in getting the drinking water from the well or from the lake to their house and it be in compliance with DHH and EPA regulations. How do you educate your stakeholders, your community people? That's one of the things we discussed in that training.

The next one is Water Resource Adequacy, and that's where y'all come into play. You know, 40 years ago we went up to it and drilled a well and we had water and we went to pumping. A lot of these wells that were drilled 40 years ago are not even metered. They're starting to meter more and more of them. But a lot of these systems when they get an issue, we get a phone call that says, "Hey, my well can't keep up. I've got a well problem." A lot of times we get there and find out that it's not a well problem, it's a leak problem, but because they're not monitoring that source, they have no way of telling that I produced 50,000-gallons more today than I did yesterday and last week. We talk about

2.0

metering the sources and helping them get meters in place. But a meter is just like a gas gauge on a car, if you don't look at it and pay attention to it, it does you no good. So the other thing is getting them to monitor it and record the data on a regular basis.

Operational Optimization and Energy Efficiency, that's another thing that we look at quite often is trying to have a water system be sustainable in lower rates by lowering the electrical consumption, the chemical treatment, and part of that goes in curtailing the water wells of the system.

Operational resiliency. Do you have the capacity to make it through the bad times, when things is tough, disasters and stuff like that there, what is your contingency plans? And one of the things that we struggle with across the state is employee leadership and development. We have certified operators, but we notice more and more that there's more and more systems having a difficult time hiring

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

someone that's certified and qualified to run the water system, and we're especially seeing this in our little, small water systems that's, you know, two, three, four hundred customers. They just don't have the economy of scale to pay someone an adequate salary to take care of their water system.

And then the last one is Financial Viability. Most water systems operate strictly off of the water revenues that come in. Some of them happen to have a little tax base. Some of them may rob the sewer fund to pay for the water. But a lot of our little, small nonprofits in our water districts, operate strictly off of what the consumer pays and the higher qualified people who run it, they keep it in compliance and they maintain updates and stuff. We're starting to see water rates across the state of 25-dollar minimums, two, three, four, six dollars a thousand thereafter. That put average bills at 50 and 60 dollars a month. sounds like a lot for drinking water.

But I laid a cell phone on that desk over there a while ago when I walked up here that probably cost \$100 a month. If my water system blinks under LDH regulations, I got to issue a boil advisory. That cell phone can drop me talking to President Trump if I was that lucky to get him on the line, and nobody is going to tell me the phone failed.

When we look at the overall scheme, you've got your system, the organization system, the makeup, what type of system it is. How many customers? What form of government manages that system? The age of the infrastructure. Then we look at the management, you know, again, we get to what type of government is there. We look at the debt service. Is it -- in-house employees maintain it, or do we have it contracted out to other operations?

Our funding sources for water systems is either going to be loans or grants or every once in a while you get an industry coming in there and they'll

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

come in there and say, "Well, we're going to drill you a new water well, build you a tank if you will sell us water." There's a few systems across the state that have been very blessed with that opportunity. It's allowed them to take on customers and serve a higher capacity water for these customers but maintain a reduced rate for their customers as well. Some support it by taxes, and then others support it by other forms of income, whether it be grant dollars from the state or contributions from local agencies. And then our biggest operational cost is the operations. know, what does it cost? You know, the water demand, how much water do we really need for that system? And I'm talking about the water we really need. I'm not talking about the 32 percent that we're letting run down the -- run on the ground out there through leaks and stuff. I'm talking about what we need to furnish the everyday demands for that system, the households, the businesses. Their water

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

source and their quality. You know, what kind of treatment has to come into play to make the water applicable and compliant with state and federal regulations. And then, again, we get into that personnel and labor cost. And a lot of times when we're working on a water system and we're looking at trying to cut cost, folks, it's like in any business, there's very few things you can cut and usually it comes down to labor. And a lot of times when you cut your labor, you cut your knowledge, because somebody else will come in and do it for cheaper but he don't have the 15 years experience.

Matt asked me to speak a little bit about the infrastructure -- the Rural Water Infrastructure Committee. It was formed by the governor just a few months ago. It's tasked at looking at water systems across the state and determining some of the needs of the water systems. It consists of representatives from the governor staff. Water system regulatory

2.0

agencies, funding agencies, technical assistant providers and other governmental associations. We meet periodically, but then also we actually have a, what they call, an initial response team that goes out and meets with water systems that's on the distressed list of systems to try to find out what the plan of action is.

And one of the primary functions of this committee is not so much to go hammer on the water system but to bring everybody to the table and let's work together to get these projects going to get the upgrades in place that needs to be, to pool the funding assets together.

And we had a meeting Monday, and one of the things they told us at the meeting through our -- through the committee being formed, the funding agencies are actually looking at their practices, how they went about approving projects for funding and stuff like that there.

Through some of this committee work, we've discovered that there's some

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

funds -- forms of funding out there that the money goes to the system as a grant and the system is not required to put no resources aside to maintain or update the other parts of the system, and they're just continually operating off of one grant after the other. In the meantime, they got a water rate of 11- or 12-dollar a month minimum and two dollars a thousand and their neighbor just borrowed two million dollars and they have a water rate of a 25 minimum at five dollars a thousand, but they're upgrading their system. This other system is getting straight grant money and they're not putting no monies aside to try to maintain their improvements and keep up with it.

So the other agencies are currently reviewing their funding policies and basically telling some of these water systems, "We're going to get the money, but you've got to provide us that you're going to maintain your system with a sustainable rate and maintain the

2.0

upgrades that we're putting in place."

And as we come to the last slide, this is one of my grandchildren at a camping trip, a three year old. And our consumers are as innocent as this three year old. She went to the neighboring camp spot, started out washing her hands and eventually she was drinking water from that tap. Our consumers in the households trust us to have that water to that quality that they can drink it and it sustain them and it be healthy for them to drink.

We have a big challenge at hand.

There is some places that -- our little rural water systems, our municipalities need some help. This presentation to the committee today was just to kind of update of the rural water systems in the state and the status that they're in.

There's a report out that we got a few years ago that shows a lot of north

Louisiana has a severe water loss issue.

That's the systems we can get to participate in the survey that we've

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

done. And a lot of times, the information that we was given, I could look at it and say, "Really, do you think I need to believe this?" And we've been submitted some information that showed they sold as much water as they produced. And we all know we can't do that. We all know we lose some somewhere.

Any questions or comments?

MR. BRASSEAUX: I've been working with the RWA for probably going on 16 years, and, to be honest, the smaller systems, I don't know how they do it or how they could exist without Louisiana Rural Water. Our community is just under -- we're about 9,500 people, and so we -- our counsel understands that when that auditor says you need to raise your rates, they don't hesitate. But some of these smaller municipalities and rural systems, for some reason, they don't want to -- they don't want to bite the bullet and do what they have to do. Louisiana Rural Water, you know, they provide so much technical assistance to

1 water systems throughout this state that 2 if you have a problem, all you do is pick 3 up the phone and within a matter of minutes you're going to have somebody on 4 5 the phone or actually at your water plant giving you advice. 6 7 So I could go on forever, but I just 8 wanted to commend them for what they're doing that -- for the people that aren't 9 10 familiar with the Louisiana Rural Water, they really need to, you know, do some 11 12 research and, you know, get up to snuff 13 on that, so thank you. 14 MR. REEVES: Thank you, 15 Mr. Brasseaux. 16 MR. FREY: Mr. Reeves? 17 MR. REEVES: Yes, sir. 18 MR. FREY: One concern I've had, I 19 guess, over the years, we had a workshop 20 several years back for this Commission, 21 and I remember Mr. Credeur mentioning the 22 leakage problem. And I can understand 23 the lack of metering and how you address 24 that, but are we making any progress with 25 the leakage from these rural water

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

systems? I know it's in the millions of gallons daily, as I remember a number, or --

MR. REEVES: Yes, sir. And we're making progress because some of these systems are putting in meters at their -once they realize that the meter is utilized as a tool, some of them are starting to install them on their systems. Some of them are actually putting them in distribution legs for different areas so they can monitor different areas of the system. We still have a significant number of the systems that have not put meters on at the sources. And I was part of the design committee when we just reworked the design regulations, and Johan [Forsman] was in the meetings with us there, and that was one of the -- moving forward, one of the requirements that all of the sources would be metered. It may not be metered every well, but there would be a meter going into that plant to determine how much water was being produced from

1 that well or that supply of water. 2 of it may come to where it's regulated 3 that everybody put a meter on that supply. And a lot of them tell you first 4 5 thing, "Well, it's going to run the cost up." The other thing some of them are 6 7 scared of, "Well, if I got a meter there, 8 somebody can come in there and tell me 9 you're going to pay a penny a thousand 10 gallon feet because now we can monitor 11 the source." And, you know, you can 12 monitor with our meters even, because we 13 can put a flow meter on there and tell 14 them what a well produces, and if we know 15 it runs six hours a day on average, we 16 can get a pretty close estimation. 17 MR. CREDEUR: I'm going to jump in 18 here --19 MR. REEVES: Yes, sir. 20 MR. CREDEUR: -- Rusty. Paul, to 21 answer your question, as far as the leak 22 problems are -- and I'm Pat Credeur, 23 Director of the Louisiana Rural Water 24 Association. The problem continues. 25 constantly do water leaks across the

state. We turn in the information. It's up to that community to fix their own water leaks, and a lot of them do. But the ones that have really large problems, they have to go out for grants and try to repair this. The national average for water loss is somewhere around 15 percent. Just a few years ago when we conducted a survey ourself, I think, Louisiana is somewhere in the 25 to 30 -- 32 percent range.

We can drive down any road -- any country road through any community and you're going to see water flowing in the ditches on a dry, dry day. A lot of the problems that we're told is that a lot of these utilities don't have enough staff to help them locate these leaks, which is why we come in there. We go in, we locate it, we give them the problems, we give them the pictures, we give them the address of where the problem is, and it's up to them to fix it. And, of course, we do that with sewer as well and we test the meters, we do rate studies. So we do

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the whole nine yards.

And the bottom line about all this, thank God for grants from state and USDA and EPA. We can do this at no charge to the communities. So the problem is still there. We can go into an area, and we can locate them, they'll fix them, but then because of the old pipes infrastructure, you're going to have breaks, which is why the governor put this committee together. And the ten worst systems in the state right now is Enterprise Water, Town of Tullos, Village of Clarence, Village of Powhatan, Hammock Water in Rapides Parish, Rogers Community in LaSalle, Town of Melville in St. Landry Parish, Town of Baldwin and Ozone Pines. Those are the top ten. Are those the only ones in the state, no. But those are the critical ones that this committee is working with to try to get them back into the 21st Century.

So we're here to help out. Anywhere in your communities if you hear of something, pick up the phone and call us

1 and we'll send staff out there. 2 Rusty, I'm sorry to take over. 3 MR. REEVES: That's okay. Did that 4 answer your question, Mr. Frey? 5 MR. FREY: Yeah, that helps. glad to see that we're making some 6 7 progress in some areas. You know, 8 Senator Long mentioned the fact that 9 we've been blessed with an abundance of 10 water and I think maybe the attitude probably statewide is one of the reasons 11 12 why we're losing a little bit of water. 13 Well, a little bit of water, you know, 14 sometime in the future is going to be a 15 very valued commodity. So just I wanted 16 to make sure we're working on that. MR. REEVES: Well, and to add to 17 18 that there, we're talking about the 19 funding committees and some of them 2.0 reviewing their policies and stuff. USDA 21 and SRF and Clean Water which is DEO 22 monies, they require a system to put in 23 meters to get funding. Some of the other 24 funding sources didn't require meters and 25 they're looking at that process there to

2.0

require meters as well as part of the requirement to get the funding so that we can start getting a handle on some of this here.

Yes, sir?

MR. DAVIS: Rusty, I'm Mark Davis from Tulane Water Institute and various other places.

First of all, thanks for that presentation. It's dealing with work our guys have been doing for a long time.

But I think it's important for the committee to know this is not just a rural problem. I live in the city and, quite frankly, if we get the 25 percent loss -- it's New Orleans -- it would be a great day.

MR. REEVES: Yes, sir.

MR. DAVIS: So the overall issue of how we manage water and how we pay for the things that need to be paid for and how we provide the professional services is going to be a critical one. And I think the first step for market value is to put an actual value, not a price, but

a value on it. Price can come, you know, one day. But right now we are -- you know, we're treating it as though it's free or that someone else will pay for it.

The work you-guys are doing to encourage metering, I think maybe the single most important piece is that it was up against, you know, economic and cultural barriers but you cannot manage what you're doing -- you're not measuring.

MR. REEVES: That's correct.

MR. DAVIS: And we have to increasingly realize that that is the world we're going to.

And I also want to commend you because I think frequently the objection to things like, you know, metering and even, you know, regulating is strongest in rural communities, because it's not what they're from. But they will be the principal victims as the water becomes more of a commodity. We're already seeing that in neighboring states. And

1 for those of you that don't know, in 2 Mississippi and Tennessee are litigating 3 over the Sparta Aquifer in the US Supreme Court right now, because in Tennessee 4 urban wells are draining Mississippi 5 rural wells. 6 7 We're seeing similar things 8 happening between New Mexico and Texas. 9 And these are the not anomalies. This is 10 the future we should be preparing for. 11 And so -- and also I'd like to -- if 12 I can figure out how to get on the 13 contact list for the new committee -- the 14 infrastructure committee, I'd love to do 15 that. I think I could learn a lot from 16 it. 17 MR. REEVES: Okay. Ms. Leslie Durham is the chairman of it. 18 19 MR. DAVIS: We can figure a way. 2.0 MR. REEVES: Yes. I can get that 21 information to Matt. 22 MR. DAVIS: Thanks. 23 MR. REONAS: I've got it. 24 MR. REEVES: Okay. I'll get that 25 and make sure Matt has it.

1 MR. DAVIS: Appreciate it. 2 MR. HARRIS: Mr. Gray? 3 MR. GRAY: I have a question. It's a little obscure, but it's -- so I 4 5 understand if you're not prepared to answer it. Is the Town of St. Joseph a 6 7 member of the Rural Water Association? 8 MR. REEVES: Yes, sir. MR. GRAY: I mean, I just want to 9 10 report that the past couple of years, 11 we've dealt with some legislative issues 12 that Representative Marcus Hunter has 13 introduced to make significant changes to 14 the way that water is regulated. 15 part of that has to do with a town that's 16 in his district of St. Joseph that had 17 some problems, I believe, related to 18 You know, I just wanted to make water. 19 sure to bring that to the attention of 20 the commission that basically you've got 21 a representative within the legislature 22 that's trying to make significant changes 23 to the policy with one community, right, 24 and, you know, I just didn't know if 25 you-guys had ever dealt with that town or

2.0

if you had any thoughts or comments on how to manage or even help that isolated community rather than making significant changes to the overall water policy.

MR. REEVES: Patrick?

MR. CREDEUR: I'll answer that.

Yes, Marcus Hunter and I became very good friends. He comes up with a lot of these water bills that were going to more or less help out his district and St.

Joe, but overall statewide it was going to actually hurt all of the water systems.

We listen to what the Department of Health tells us. And the Department of Health tells us there's really not a lead problem in the State of Louisiana. Yes, you're going to find some communities that have lead problems, but they're being taken care of individually throughout the state.

Marcus wanted statewide bills that were going to hit every water community, every water system and raise the rates from \$30 a month to \$100 a month because

2.0

of new treatment processes, and the small communities cannot afford that. We were never totally against what Mr. Hunter was proposing. But I have a thousand utility members that are members of our association, and the reason I bumped heads with him is because our members did not want this to happen. Even in the zoned districts, they did not want this to happen.

Some of the things that he proposed were good for water systems, yes, it was. But as an overall package to all the utilities including mine in Carencro,
North Lafayette Water, it was going to be a problem and the water rates were going to -- going to climb tremendously.

Eventually, one of these days, we're going to pay \$100 a month, \$150 a month water bill. It's coming, and it won't be long. So it has nothing to do with Hunter or just that one district. We were opposed to it because of what our membership was telling us to say, wanted us to do. And it wasn't a fix-all for

2.0

the home state.

MR. GRAY: What I explained in the same -- just to share what our conversations were, as an industry representative we try to maintain that definition between the community water system and the public water. And so that was really where we tried getting the (inaudible), because I agree with you, we don't have a lead problem. And so to have that over extended authority, we were a little concerned with that. So I'm glad to hear that you-all have been working on that. Thank you.

MR. CREDEUR: After about 12 amendments, 12 or 13 amendments, the health department and we as well, we didn't oppose it. He got one amendment in there to do one school in one parish for the next year to test for lead. So that's 12 schools for the whole year, and we'll see what comes about that.

MR. GRAY: Well, I would be interested in anything that does come from that, so hopefully I'll just get on

| 1 | that list or whatever I need to do. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Thank you for your work. |
| 3 | MR. CREDEUR: Yes, sir. Thank you. |
| 4 | MR. HARRIS: Do we have any other |
| 5 | questions? Mr. Reeves, thank you |
| 6 | MR. REEVES: Thank y'all. |
| 7 | MR. HARRIS: not only for being |
| 8 | here today, but also for what you do with |
| 9 | the Rural Water Association. Along with |
| 10 | air, both are just highly |
| 11 | underappreciated. Most of us don't even |
| 12 | think about it unless we don't |
| 13 | wouldn't have it for some reason. |
| 14 | MR. REEVES: Yes, sir. And if we |
| 15 | can help any of y'all with any situation |
| 16 | in your community or your district don't |
| 17 | hesitate to call us. Thank you. |
| 18 | MR. HARRIS: Thank you again. |
| 19 | Our next agenda item we're going to |
| 20 | have an update on the coastal lowlands |
| 21 | aquifer system project by Linzy Foster. |
| 22 | She's a hydrologist with the US |
| 23 | Geological Service. Welcome and thank |
| 24 | you. |
| 25 | MS. FOSTER: Good morning. I'm |
| | |

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

happy to be here to talk to you-guys about the update on the coastal lowlands aguifer system project. This is a five-year study that we're in the second year of. This is a congressionally mandated project to look at the regional aguifer system of the coastal lowlands. We developed a numerical model to understand groundwater flow. So we're not focused on water quality or contaminant transport, but really just water budgets, understanding how the regional groundwater flow and the system to answer -- basically to answer questions. MR. REONAS: Just for Commission members, we do have a copy of this presentation in your packets if y'all haven't found it yet. Hopefully everybody has. MS. FOSTER: So I'm a co-project employee along with Brian Clark. actually in Austin, Texas. Brian Clark is some other colleagues in the room are lower Mississippi Gulf Water Science

2.0

Center, so this is a project combined with two water science centers to look at understanding the system.

So as I mentioned, this is a USGS
Regional Groundwater Availability
Project, so I've got a -- just a map here
showing some of the other ongoing
projects that have been completed and are
in progress by the US Geological Survey.

The main goal of these regional groundwater availability projects are to really understand groundwater flow in these regional systems and document both anthropogenic effects on the water level storage and stream flow, but also explore climate variability impacts and predictions that we try to make, and also to evaluate the adequacy of our data network. So that tends to -- when we talk about data, we tend to talk about monitoring wells and water level data.

So a little bit on the coastal lowlands in general for those who aren't familiar with the principal aquifer, it is a 140,000 square miles, it covers five

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

states, so it goes from the Texas/Mexico boarder all the way to the Florida panhandle. So this includes for our -for Louisiana, the Southern Hills Regional Aquifer System, the equivalents of Chicot, Evangeline, Jasper aquifers. It is nationally fourth in groundwater for public supply and fifth as -- fifth in groundwater for private domestic supply. It includes the Houston area, which one major concern in the Houston area is land surface subsidence, which is also a concern in Louisiana as well. that's actually something that we're focusing on the study in simulating subsidence. Other cities, Baton Rouge, New Orleans, Mobile.

So a little bit of what we're really primarily focusing on with this study, we obviously can't answer every potential problem or issue in this large regional study, so we've really chosen to focus on subsidence as like our one unique thing that we can look into. So we're going to be simulating land surface subsidence and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

that's not from subsidence from natural, like, tectonic processes or losses of sedimentation, but it's from actual dewatering or depressurization or water pumping of the aquifer.

So another thing that's unique to this project that hasn't been done before with these large regional models is we're going to be applying something called uncertainty analysis. There are different forms of uncertainty analysis. We're going to being applying a couple of different kinds. There's what's called linear and nonlinear. So the real advantage with application uncertainty analysis is for anyone who's familiar with models, they are known to be nonunique. So there's a lot of uncertainty in the properties that go into the -- to the models, the data as well, and that uncertainty propagates through to the predictions that we try to make with the model, whether those be water levels, water budgets, draw downs or subsidence rates.

So in an application uncertainty analysis, we really move from moving from a traditional -- making one estimate of what water levels could be in one particular area to considering things in terms of normal distributions or ranges of what plausible values could be for that prediction.

A further advantage to application of uncertainty analysis is that we can actually quantify the worth of improving data sets. So what does that mean?

Well, that means if we were -potentially were to have new wells that we put in where we were gathering new water level data information or perhaps a new gauge was put on a stream or river to collect discharge data, we can actually quantify and assess what the value added of that data is to the model and the prediction that we're trying to make.

So in the USGS we use some Python scripting tools to do this. Most notably, we use a package called pyEMU, which has been developed by the USGS to

2.0

quantify uncertainty.

So a little bit on just the system geometry. This is a historical perspective. Most people are probably familiar with the old RASA models that were developed in the '80s and '90s for the coastal lowlands, also the uplands in Mississippi embayment regional aquifer system and what is now actually being continued to work on as well which is the Mississippi alluvial plain project.

The system was conceptualized for the RASA model into what were termed permeable zones, and these were basically lumped based on having similar hydraulic properties. So we had permeable zone A down to the Vicksburg, Jackson confining unit. So there were seven layers in original coastal lowlands system conceptualization. And just to show you here it overlies — the coastal lowlands here overlies the Mississippi embayment. And the Mississippi alluvial plain is kind of this thin layer on top of the embayment which actually abuts to the

2.0

coastal lowlands.

In our current approach we have really gone back to the drawing board to no longer use this conceptualization of permeable zones, but actually to go build the hydrogeologic framework based upon the aquifer units that we -- are known to exist now based on newer data. So those, in particular, are the Chicot, the Evangeline, and the Burkeville confining unit, the Jasper aquifer, and then the last unit, which is probably the least used is the Catahoula.

So we've done extensive work so far in compiling data for these different hydrogeologic picks, making determinations of these aquifer units across the study area. And that data release is going to be published this fiscal year, so in the next couple of months it should be readily available.

So one advantage of this data set for local and regional stakeholders, like this commission and like users in the State of Louisiana, is that there will be

2.0

a new data set of these determinations of these aquifer units for the state. So this will be independent of what's developed as part of the model. And once the model gets published, we may have updates to this that will be published as well.

It looks like my -- I had some videos in here and they're not working right now. So my apologies. A little bit more on the data compilation. You can see that for the State of Louisiana, we used a little network of about 1,400 wells with about 17,000 picks, and I think we had about eight different data sources for this data to make these determinations for these units across the study area.

So, obviously, we know the geology is really complex. Coming from Texas, which is where I'm from and I work, we tend to have a more simplistic understanding of the Chicot, Evangeline and the Jasper. Coming into Louisiana, we have these 100-foot spans and the

2.0

geology is much more complex. So this has been quite a huge undertaking to make these correlations in a regional sense. And I just showed an old strat map here from the -- actually this is from John Lovelace report from the mid-nineties just to show some correlations of these different units. And as we see in just a preliminary cross section here, we've been able to extend these across the State of Louisiana and regionally for the model. So that data will release again by September 30th.

So I wanted to talk a little bit about our approach with this project and why it is different and what's traditionally done. So in a traditional model development we would come up with some kind of conceptual model, we would compile or maybe collect data, and then we would go through this exercise of calibration or what I like to call history matching, which is really just using data that's available to kind of massage the model to produce output

2.0

that's realistic to the real word.

Then we may go to some stakeholder meetings, like this meeting here, and talk about, Hey, we've made this model. We think it's going to be really useful. Hopefully you-guys will use it. And maybe from that meeting, we might come up with some forecast that we're interested in making like, what are water level declines going to look like in baton Rouge in the year 2075. So we've come up with some scenarios, developed models based on our calibrated models, run those scenaries to answer some questions, and then we would produce a report.

The indifference in this approach is we have been trying to involve stakeholders earlier in the process to come up with areas of potential concern, what are issues that are known in the study area to help us identify what these quantities and interests are early in the process so that we can make sure when we develop the model those are in line with the questions that we're trying to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

answer. So it's been a much more iterative process.

This is really based on a publication that came out recently on a new approach for groundwater modeling, which is called forecast first modeling. So you can't really see very well on the slides here, but I've included just a snippet from this publication, and it just basically says, by focusing the forecast on the predictions, a more robust analysis of the appropriate level of complexity can be undertaken. complexity is driven not only by the ability to reproduce the past or data, but also simultaneously by the need to provide robust estimates of forecast for prediction uncertainty.

So the real difference here is that, again, we come up with the questions that we're trying to answer early in the modeling process so that we can apply uncertainly analysis and see quantitatively how new data sets improve our ability to answer those questions.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So the approach that we're taking with the model is we've coined this term the 85 percent model, not to mean that we're leaving out 15 percent of the most important part of the model, but we're leaving out 15 percent of the part of modeling that really is not informing the prediction or the forecast that we're trying to make. So the way that we have approached this is we're using existing models, which on the next slide I'll show our existing models that we have. We're pulling together historical data, of course, water levels, base flows, also water yeast estimates. And then we're defining our quantities of interest. So right now, we just have water levels, subsidence, draw downs. And then building forecast models. So this is where we currently are with this process as we're trying to fine tune the forecast models that we're developing. We apply uncertainty quantification. Again, there's a couple of different forms of this. Right now we're just doing a

2.0

simplistic linear based approach. And then we added new data sets to repeat and compare. So the real advantage this gives us is in this concept that most people are familiar with of diminish in returns is that we add the amount of complexity needed to answer the questions that we want to answer with the model without going past where we're really not being productive with development of the model, but we're kind of just wasting our time and effort.

So one further advantage of the application of uncertainty analysis is we can look at individual predictions that we want to make and we can look at how the data has actually reduced the uncertainty of those predictions. So potentially some water level prediction we want to make in a well in Baton Rouge we can look at how they calibration data has reduced the prior uncertainty of that prediction and provided a new understanding of can the model really make this prediction well, is the model

2.0

reliable for use in this way.

So our current model is a one kilometer scale. It is in line with what's being produced nationally. And there's going to be a national water model developed, so this is consistent with the national water model. And it's current just one layer, but we're going to be splitting it into those aquifer equivalents, so a minimum of five layers to represent those different units.

Previous modeling efforts, there are several. So not only do we have the RASA models that were developed, but we also have GAM models which are the groundwater availability models that were developed in the State of Texas. We have more local scale models such as for the Baton Rouge, the Chuck Hayward model, other USGS models, a hydrogeologic model for northwest Florida. So we're trying to, instead of, you know, starting from ground zero, really utilize these models as a jumping off point for what we already know about conceptualization and

2.0

flow in the system.

The Texas groundwater availability models are the most thorough modeling data set that we have. These are one mile by one mile grids. I'm not sure how familiar the Commission is with these models, but they were developed from -- they simulate predevelopment of water use all the way up to either 2000-2012. The layers are already consistent with the Chicot, Evangeline, Jasper units, and they represent a variety of different boundary conditions. So they're pretty thorough in regards to simulation of groundwater flow and water budgets.

In Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida we have -- we don't really have any models that cover these entire areas outside of the original RASA model, so this is one area that we're working on. It's filling in these data gaps where we don't have models already developed for these areas. We're really having to utilize best available data in that sense.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

So this is a MODFLOW 6 model that we're using. MODFLOW 6 for those -hopefully everyone here is familiar with MODFLOW which is USGS standard for groundwater flow simulation. There's a new version that's just come out and it's really been rewritten from the ground up to better kind of handle development of local models within regional models. that's a further advantage of this model for stakeholders in Louisiana is that you'll be able to take this model when it's finished and embed smaller local scale models such as in Baton Rouge more seamlessly into the regional model and you'll already have an understanding of your major components of the water budget, groundwater flow directions from that regional model. So we're hoping that not only does this tool provide a good understanding regionally of water flow, but that it's useful as a tool for local and subregional stakeholder as well.

So the current model is for

2.0

predevelopments. We're starting in 1900 and we're going up to 2015. We've done some simple parameterization so far with just parameter set raised 60 kilometers to start to look at potential variability. And we're using some sophisticated software, pyEMU, that I mentioned before, but also PEST + +, which is being used to calibrate the model.

Currently we just have water levels as kind of our data that we're using to constrain the model. We have not implemented subsidence data yet, but that is one thing that we're looking to do in the next couple of months is to begin to look at how a model is doing at estimating subsidence.

So just a little bit more about forecast or prediction uncertainty. One really important thing that tends to fall out from this is that we can learn that some forecasts are more informed by our data than others. So what I've shown here is just a graph of some water level

2.0

predictions that we're making at different locations in the model. And what this graph is showing is that some of those predictions — this is on the Y axis here — is your percent uncertainty reduction. Some predictions have a large reduction of an uncertainty when we apply the data. And so what that tells us is that this location in general for this particular model and the data we have that the data has well informed that prediction that we're trying to make.

Other predictions such as this one next to it have just like a 25 percent reduction. So this is saying basically that the data wasn't as well informed in making that prediction.

You can further kind of take this analysis and now looking at a specific prediction of the water level we're trying to make, you can determine, well, what were the parameters that were most important in forming that prediction.

So this uncertainty analysis is really powerful, it provides us with a

much stronger understanding of how a model is doing, the questions that we're trying to answer and what those potential causable ranges could be, but also it drives additional questions like, where is the model doing poorly? What kind of data can we gather to improve our understanding of a model in that area?

And I apologize that my video -- my movie is not playing here, but another data set that we have independently been working on to put into the model is the WEL package. So this is all the groundwater withdrawals. So for the State of Louisiana colleagues here in the room actually have been working on putting together a data set for the water use component. I think it went by category, you know, municipal first, industrial, irrigation.

We've -- we're pretty close to having kind of our final product and the next step is going to be assessing our data gaps that we have in this data set, which we have noted so far are in our

2.0

irrigation estimates.

We're also using as far as the Grand groundwater well locations data that's readily available from the DNR website from the viewer. And we're also combining these with model -- available model estimates as well.

So for Texas we have models that cover the entire time period, but, again, outside of that, we're really having to make some estimates to fill in data gaps in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida.

So we're going to have this data set available for -- in publication next year probably within the first or second quarter of next year.

As I mentioned, we're going to be focusing on land surface subsidence. And our really unique question that we're trying to answer outside of just groundwater availability. So I've included here a new viewer that actually the Texas Water Science Center has produced looking at land surface

2.0

subsidence, in the Houston area. We're are going to be utilizing this data and other data on subsidence in Baton Rouge, for instance, that's available in the National Water Information System. We're also working to compile additional subsidence data sets, such as remote sense InSAR data. I just wanted to let you-guys know about this in case you haven't looked at it. It's a really useful tool to look at spatially and temporally how subsidence has changed and how water levels have changed in the Houston area.

As a further step in our modeling with the new MODFLOW 6 there was not a current package to simulate subsidence processes, so as part of this product we're also developing a new subsidence package or subsidence process for the model. And that should be coming out as well on next FY.

So really where we currently are is we have a working model, we're implementing our new framework right now.

2.0

We're coming up with those quantities of interest I've mentioned, you know, where we're going out to stakeholders and saying, what are the real concerns in your area. If you had questions you wanted to answer in this model, what would those be. We're compiling information on our understanding of the system from all of the available literature, from available models, and then we're kind of working on our next round of uncertainty analysis.

One component that hasn't been added yet is surface water routing. So the Surface Water Network isn't implemented in the model yet, so that, we're going to be working on in the next coming months as well. And then adding in the additional subsidence process once it gets published.

So timeline, again, it's a five-year project. We're wrapping up at the end of 2021. Not only are we developing a model and applying uncertainty analysis and calibrating the model, but we're also

1 going to be just looking from a regional 2 perspective about what is the story of 3 groundwater availability, groundwater sustainability moving forward with 4 5 potential anthropogenic changes and pragmatic changes into the future. And 6 7 that will be published in a professional 8 paper in the last year. 9 So I've got a snapshot of our web 10 page. You can go here for more 11 information on our approach. People that 12 are involved: My contact information. 13 And, again, I really -- just wanting to 14 get the word out more on this project, 15 wanting to get feedback, wanting to hear 16 from interested stakeholders on how they 17 can see potential uses of this, if they have additional data that they can 18 19 provide, what their concerns are. For 2.0 that, I think that's all I have. MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Ms. Foster. 21 22 Do we have any questions? 23 Thank you very much. We look 24 forward to you -- I'm sorry. 25 MR. CULPEPPER: Hi, Dave Culpepper.

And I'm also a treasurer of New Orleans
Geological Society and been actively
involved in the -- working on subsidence
drivers in South Louisiana for the last
few years.

Are you going to have an open comment period for your report and your data, like a round two for questions and comments?

MS. FOSTER: Well, in the publication process, we probably submit the report to interested stakeholders to get their feedback, and then we tend to have these stakeholder engagement meetings a couple of times a year. So we've got a mailing list that you can stay tuned. We'll be having, you know, ongoing presentations to get feedback. So as far as printing the report online to get feedback, that won't be happening until publication. But we will be providing, you know, early kind of draft copies to interested stakeholders.

MR. CULPEPPER: I'll just say, I'd be happy to try to work with that around

1 on the professional geoscience community 2 in Louisiana, some other people. 3 MS. FOSTER: Yeah, that would be 4 great. 5 MR. BALKUM: Linzy, great presentation. I appreciate that. 6 7 Kyle Balkum with the Department of 8 Wildlife and Fisheries. I had a question 9 about surface water routing. What do you 10 hope to find out from that. 11 MS. FOSTER: So we're not going to 12 be focused on like flood inundation, 13 those types of processes, but really we're going to be looking at estimating 14 15 base flow from groundwater into the 16 surface water. So we're going to be 17 doing at best monthly stress periods within the model, probably many of the 18 19 years of the study period will be annual 20 stress periods, really trying to get at 21 what's the base flow component into the 22 stream. 23 MR. BALKUM: Okay. Thank you. 24 MS. FOSTER: All right. Thank you. 25 MR. HARRIS: Thank you very much.

1 Look forward to your final report. 2 Our next presentation will be from 3 Dr. Alyssa Dausman. Am I --DR. DAUSMAN: Yes, Dausman. Yes. 4 5 MR. HARRIS: Welcome and thank you. DR. DAUSMAN: Thank you. Thanks for 6 7 having me. So this project hasn't officially 8 9 even started. It's been approved. 10 it's very new. So I was just going to 11 give you a quick overview of the 12 production of the strategic plan and 13 partnership that The Water Institute of 14 the Gulf has undertaken with the Capital 15 Area Groundwater Conservation Commission. 16 So just to give you a little bit of 17 background, because some people are familiar with the Water Institute as far 18 19 as some of their surface water work 2.0 that's been done with the master planning 21 effort and the Coastal Protection 22 Restoration Authority. But I just want 23 to give a little bit of background about 24 who the Water Institute is other than the 25 building down the street that you see

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

when you come across the bridge.

Post Hurricane Katrina there were a series of meetings that happened between the Governor's office. At the time Mary Landrieu and some others were saying, you know, we need to start up a Deltares type institute that can help us solve some of our water problems. And they -- Deltares is a research institute in the Netherlands that's been going on and, as you know, they dealt with lots of problems in the Netherlands, everything from subsidence to surface water problems to groundwater problems. And so Louisiana leaders were looking for a new approach. They took a number of trips and they found a need to set up an institute similar to that model.

And so the Water Institute was founded in 2011, and we're a nonprofit, independent research and technical services for -- and really our goal is to think about resilient coast, sustainable water recourses. And the work of that institute is to help livable communities,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

you know, really thrive in coastal systems, right. And so Louisiana being a coastal state, having a lot of those issues, as part of being stood up in the State of Louisiana, you know one of the things that were thought is the Governor's office and other decision-makers were trying to make decisions. They wanted an unbiased research perspective. And so even though we are a nonprofit, we are not advocacy. And so that's really important for me to point out. We don't advocate for or against anything other than sound science that supports resource managers and decision-making. And so -- and that's an important point to point out because as we develop -- start to develop a relationship with the Capital Area Groundwater Conservation Commission, I think that was an important distinction as we talked about embarking upon this work together. And so the Water Institute of the

Gulf was founded. That's a picture of our building. I'm sure you've seen it.

It's not far away. You're welcome to come visit. Maybe when the construction is over across the street, it will be a little better. It's been very loud as of late.

And so the approach of the Institute is an integrated approach. We do modeling and monitoring, physical systems and sediment system processes. We have a human dimensions group, which is important to point out. So we have -- we have people. We have anthropologists on staff and social geographers, and so that they're really thinking about how water resources decisions affect people and vice versa, and that is taken into account in the decision-making or the research process when you're providing science to support decision-makers.

We have Coastal Ecology Group and we also do some policy research. We do not do -- we do not write policy and we don't advocate for policy. That's also really

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

important, right. We just do research related to policies and what those might have resulted in. But it's really -- we take an approach that it's up to decision-makers to make decisions. It's not up to us to make decisions. We just provide sound science and information to make those decisions.

And so when having these discussions and talking to the Capital Area Groundwater Conservation Commission -- so my background -- so I'm the Vice-President for Science at the Institute, and I have been there since October of last year. And my technical background, actually, is in groundwater. So saltwater intrusion modeling is my background, that's my -- my Ph.D. research was done in South Florida. worked with Linzy [Foster] for many, many years down there, and now she's in Texas and I'm up here. And so as -- but I was raised in Mississippi. I went to school in Louisiana. And so I have a real passion for groundwater and water

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

resource issues. And after taking this job, I thought -- I started to look around and say, "Are there ways" -- "are there things that we as the Institute can do to help move some of these issues along, "right? So there's clearly been some issues, otherwise, people wouldn't be having this conversation for 40 years about what -- is our groundwater resource sustainable in this community? What do we need to be doing about it? And so we started having some conversations with the Commission, with the chairman of the Commission, and talking about are there ways that we could help. And so with that, through the conversations, we started talking about how we can work with the Commission to support a strategic longterm planning process.

And so the overall objectives in that long-term planning process is to work with the Commission and stakeholders to identify and evaluate, like, reasonable realistic longterm alternatives to meet longterm water

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

resource needs. And I don't have a definition for "longterm," right. That's going to actually be decided with the Commission. Does longterm mean 10 years, 20 years or 50 years? I think that's yet to be said, right?

Taking a look at the state of the science, and it's interesting that Linzy talked before me talks a lot about the modeling. There's been a lot of modeling, a lot of investments that the USGS has made overall, salt intrusion modeling and at the same time are there things that are missing, are there other things that need to be looked at. And then also, you know, how do the natural resource economics tie into that. does the human dimension component tie into longterm water resource, and the environment and sustainability of the aguifer. And then really looking to identify management alternatives that are economically feasible and acceptable to development a longterm plan.

And so, okay, so it's a plan. Is it

planning to plan? I mean, I think people talk about planning a lot. I was doing a lot of reading, you know, over the last six months related to some of the problems, and there's a lot of discussions about planning. And so what has happened or why hasn't the planning really moved forward? And I don't -- it's not that there aren't amazing scientists in the State of Louisiana that haven't done amazing work, but a lot of times it's getting people to come together to decide how they want to move forward.

And so with that, I have some background in what we call structured decision analysis, which really tells us let's take a step back and work together to frame what the actual problem is. And to some people you would say, "Well, it's easy, the problem is," and I would say to you that, if I asked every person here on this commission what the problem is related to water -- or related to groundwater, I might get 10 to 20

different answers. I might get
everything from, it's the environment or
it's industry or it's saltwater intrusion
or it's this or it's -- I mean, people
all have a lot of different opinions on
what an actual problem is. And so to be
able to move forward with a longterm
strategic plan, you actually have to be
on the same page at the very, very
beginning.

And so the Proact framework which goes to problem framing, objectives, then alternatives and consequences and tradeoffs and then decide to take action, it seems like it's actually a long -- it could be a relatively long process. I mean, this process could take up to 30 years or longer. I'm not going to pretend like it's that easy, because, for example, you know, the Commission, the Capital Area Groundwater Conservation Commission has 17 members, right. And so -- and it recently added one, right. So that's a lot of people to figure out, like, how do we move forward on the same

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

page. So identifying the problem and actually detailing out what your longterm objectives are, are very important into framing a strategic plan. Any and so that's where I would call the human dimension component of this comes in, and thinking about it in that way. Because a lot of times in science -- and I've been in science a long time, and I did modeling for a long time. I haven't modeled very much in the last seven or eight years, and part of it was because I realized that I was producing a lot of models but nobody was using them to make decisions, and that's very frustrating as a scientist. And a lot of times -- I see a couple of people smiling because they've probably seen that before. Like we run off and we do all our science; we think it's really cool, and then we throw it over the fence and we ask somebody to catch it and maybe they'll use it to make a decision, and that's not a great way to operate, right.

And so a lot of times as a scientist

we move stright into alternatives because we assume as scientists that we know the alternatives that all of you should be using to make your decisions or the Capital Area Groundwater. And, oftentimes, we're not even looking at the right alternatives, because we didn't have a conversation with them at the beginning about what their problems or actual objectives are, and then you craft that as part of the process in moving forward. And so that's the idea behind taking a step back.

And so currently -- and I'm not going to pretend that -- this PrOACT framework for structured decisions is not new. I mean, people have been using this for 20 or 30 years, but it's not always applied. You really have to have the right facilitators and experts. When I say "experts," I mean people who are really good at taking people, moving them together and framing a problem and objectives.

And so it's not easy, right. It's

not easy to get a bunch of people in a room and be like, "We're going to sit in here and we're going to talk until we can actually come to consensus on what the problem is." That's not easy, and a lot of people don't want to do it and don't like to take the time to do it. And so -- but the Capital Area groundwater Conservation Commission has decided now is the time to take that on.

And so currently, phase one has been approved for funding. And, like I said, we haven't officially started because we're actually still working on moving the funding through. It was just approved in June. And so we're going to start with these facilitative workshops. And looking at a scientific review in the state of science, because as you do these workshops and frame the problem and objectives and especially as you think about the alternatives, the scientific review in the state of science becomes very important. Because I actually think there's been a tremendous amount of work

2.0

in the state of science related to groundwater. You can read a lot of reports. But has it been well connected or are there additional things they need to do to tie it to natural resource economy and population growth over time, you know, because I'm sure no one here thinks that the Baton Rouge area is going to stay static over time. It's probably going to grow, so water resource needs are going to grow. All of those things happen. And so that's how we're going to tackle that at the beginning.

And so I just wanted to provide an introduction and then open it up to any questions that I may or may not be able to answer until we actually move forward.

COMMISSIONER IEYOUB: Dr. Dausman, I want to commend you on your report, and I will tell you that I'm very encouraged and, in fact, relieved that someone is going to begin to work on the plan to achieve longterm sustainability of the aquifer. That's what needs to be done, and I'm glad that we're on the road to

2.0

try to do that.

You mentioned that you'll be mostly working with the Capitol Area Groundwater Conversation Commission, but I want you to know that you can depend on the Office of Conservation to help you in any way that we possibly can, because actually statutorily we have a main responsibility of ensuring the sustainability of the aquifer. So that's our responsibility, and we certainly want to work with the Capitol Area Groundwater Conversation Commission and you on this particular plan, if we may.

And also in your report you mentioned something about working with -that you will seek out, quote, technical stakeholders, end quote. I hope that you will define that broadly and allow local governmental officials and members of the public to be involved in the planning process, because I think that you have a lot of individuals that are interested in this particular subject. And in order to generate public interest and helping

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

forming these plans, I think it would be good to include as many people as we can, you know, in various areas. So please let us know -- and the Office of Conservation -- if we can be of assistance. We definitely want to be involved, because I think it's called for.

DR. DAUSMAN: Thank you. And we definitely will. I've had a few conversations with a couple of folks of what does that mean. And, you know, if you've seen the more detailed scope of work in the phased approach, we're both -- and with our objectives, we're both talking about the structured decision analysis and the state of the science. And so I know that we'll be also incorporating technical stakeholders and experts as part of looking at the state of the science, and that is broadly interpreted. So, for example, thinking about the natural resource, economics is a part of that, right. It's not only just looking at, is there enough water in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the ground and -- and also thinking about, are there other areas of the country that have tackled these problems. So Tampa Bay Water had some -- 30 years ago were pretty much in a point where they're like we have to start thinking about things differently, and since 1998 through very structured facilitated consensus, lots of stakeholder engagement from 1998 up to now they've reduced their groundwater withdrawals by 50 percent. And part of that is because they worked for a lot of other solutions to find other sources of water really being creative, pulling everyone together but that didn't happen overnight. It took them -- you know, a bunch of local governments coming together standing up and, you know, overall the process was between 20 and 30 years for them to get there. And so it takes -- it takes a long time. And -- but it doesn't mean that it's not possible. And so that's part of it. Like, it's possible to be done if people work together to get

| 1 | there. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. HARRIS: Thank you. |
| 3 | DR. DAUSMAN: Thank you. |
| 4 | MR. DUPLECHIN: Alyssa, Tony |
| 5 | Duplechin. I'm the Director of Capital |
| 6 | Area Groundwater. |
| 7 | Commissioner Ieyoub, does that |
| 8 | assistance include financial assistance |
| 9 | that you're offering? |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER IEYOUB: I wish we had |
| 11 | the financial assistance, but, if |
| 12 | possible, it would. |
| 13 | MR. DUPLECHIN: Okay. |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER IEYOUB: I'll ask the |
| 15 | legislature to give me the finances to |
| 16 | try to help them. |
| 17 | MR. DUPLECHIN: Thank you. |
| 18 | DR. DAUSMAN: Thank you. |
| 19 | MR. DUPLECHIN: One of the things |
| 20 | we're looking to do when we approach the |
| 21 | Water Institute was to bring in a well |
| 22 | respected body in doing this work. There |
| 23 | are a lot of people who question what the |
| 24 | Capital Area Groundwater Conservation |
| 25 | District has done over the last 40 years. |
| | |

1 It's always, "Why are you doing another 2 study? Why are you doing another study"? 3 And I have one little thing I'd like to say, and I know it's not politically 4 correct, but I bet Custer wishes he would 5 have done two or three more studies 6 7 before he went down that hill. We need 8 to make sure what we're doing is right, and we feel it will be going this path. 9 10 There are a lot of people who look at us 11 and think they're experts. Well, they 12 are experts, they're just not experts in 13 hydrology and management of groundwater 14 resources. So we're really looking 15 forward to getting started with this 16 project. Thank you. 17 DR. DAUSMAN: Thank you. 18 MS. GOUEDY: Dr. Dausman, Lindsey 19 Gouedy with the Sparta Groundwater 20 Commission. Good to see you. 21 It's good to see you. DR. DAUSMAN: MS. GOUEDY: I'm excited to hear 22 23 about what the Capital Area Commission is 24 working towards. Over the last year the 25 Sparta Commission and the Capital had a

2.0

lot of mirroring conversations, so to speak. The Sparta Commission has recently begun similar conversations, and I would like to visit with you, in particular, further about the scope of this work. I've visited with your colleague, Ryan Clark, on this same topic a couple of weeks ago.

I would be interested, and I think it would be interesting especially since our two commissions work so closely together, if there were some ways to link two potential plans covering large regions of the state. And Commissioner Ieyoub, since we're discussing money, if you want to throw the Sparta in the mix of that, we would be eternally grateful.

But in all seriousness, the Sparta Commission is looking towards this area, we're gathering support within our 16 parishes. With our one thick project right now on the edge in Union Parish and Lincoln Parish, even that entity is involved in discussions about creating a regional plan. So I would love to

| 1 | discuss that with you further. |
|----|--|
| 2 | DR. DAUSMAN: Thank you. We'll set |
| 3 | up a time. That will be great. And I |
| 4 | think it's definitely possible. I think |
| 5 | you've seen the scope, and if not, I'm |
| 6 | sure |
| 7 | MS. GOUEDY: We've got it. |
| 8 | DR. DAUSMAN: You've all got it? |
| 9 | MS. GOUEDY: Yeah. |
| 10 | MR. HARRIS: Any other questions for |
| 11 | Dr. Dausman? |
| 12 | (No response.) |
| 13 | DR. DAUSMAN: Thank you very much |
| 14 | for having me. |
| 15 | MR. HARRIS: Thanks for coming. We |
| 16 | appreciate it. We appreciate your input. |
| 17 | Do any of the commission members |
| 18 | have any questions, comments? Members of |
| 19 | the public, any comments? |
| 20 | (No response.) |
| 21 | MR. HARRIS: Well, I guess this |
| 22 | would be a good time to entertain a |
| 23 | motion to adjourn. |
| 24 | MR. SPICER: (Makes motion.) |
| 25 | MR. HARRIS: Motion by Mr. Spicer. |
| | |

```
MS. GAUTREAUX: (Makes motion.)
 1
 2
                     MR. HARRIS: And second by
 3
               Ms. Gautreaux.
 4
                    All in favor?
 5
                    ("Aye" in unison.)
                     MR. HARRIS: All opposed?
 6
 7
                    (No response.)
 8
                     MR. HARRIS: Motion carries.
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 I, BRITTANY E. VIDRINE, Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Louisiana, 3 Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify the foregoing 89 pages. 4 I further certify that said testimony was reported by me in the Stenotype reporting method, 5 was prepared and transcribed by me or under my direction and supervision, and is a true and 6 correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding. 7 I further certify that the transcript has been prepared in compliance with transcript format quidelines required by statute or by rules of the 8 board and that I have been informed about the 9 complete arrangement, financial or otherwise, with the person or entity making arrangements for 10 deposition services. I further certify that I have acted in 11 compliance with the prohibition on contractual relationships, as defined by Louisiana Code of 12 Civil Procedure Article 1434, and in rules and advisory opinions of the board. 13 I further certify that I am not an attorney or counsel for any of the parties, that I am 14 neither related to nor employed by any attorney or counsel connected with this action, and that I have 15 no financial interest in the outcome of this matter. 16 This certificate is valid only for this transcript accompanied by my original signature and 17 original raised seal on this page. Baton Rouge, Louisiana, this 28th day of 18 August, 2018. 19 20 21 BRITTANY E. VIDRINE, CCR, RPR CCR NO. 2014025, RPR NO. 963689 22 23 24 25