1	STATE OF LOUISIANA
2	DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
3	OFFICE OF CONSERVATION
4	
5	
6	GROUND WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION
7	17TH REGULAR MEETING
8	WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 18, 2010
9	11:00 A.M.
10	STATE CAPITOL
11	900 NORTH THIRD STREET
12	HOUSE COMMITTEE ROOM 5
13	BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70802
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

·	
1	OFFICE OF CONSERVATION
2	STATE OF LOUISIANA
3	
4	
5	GROUND WATER RESOURCES
6	COMMISSION MEETING
7	
8	
9	Report of the Commission meeting held by
10	the Ground Water Resources Commission, on Wednesday,
11	August 18, 2010, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
12	
13	
14	IN ATTENDANCE
15	* * * *
16	GROUND WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION:
17	REPRESENTING THE OFFICE OF CONSERVATION:
18	LT. GOVERNOR SCOTT A. ANGELLE, Chairman
19	KYLE BALKUM, Department of Wildlife and
20	Fisheries
21	ZAHIR "BO" BOLOURCHI, Department of Transportation and Development
22	JAMES S. BURLAND, Louisiana Chemical Association
23	GLENN T. CAMBRE, Department of Health and Hospitals
24	
25	THOMAS "GENE" COLEMAN, Sparta Ground Water Conservation District

1	(IN ATTENDANCE) (CONTINUED):
2	WILLIAM R. DOWNS, Expertise in Ground Water
3	Resource Management
4	PAUL D. FREY, Louisiana Landowners Association
5	MAYOR JOSEPH D. "DAN" HOLLINGSWORTH, JR., City of Ruston
6	JAMES "JIMMY" JOHNSTON, Ph.D., Louisiana Wildlife Federation
7	
8	PAUL "JACKIE" LOEWER, JR., Louisiana Rice Producers Group
9	ROBERT "MICKEY" MAYS, Police Jury Association of Louisiana
10	
11	EUGENE H. OWEN, Capital Area Ground Water Conservation District
12	JAMES H. WELSH, Commissioner of Conservation
13	GARY SNELLGROVE, Ground Water Resources Division
L 4	JOHN ADAMS, Staff Attorney, Conservation
15	
16	PUBLIC COMMENTS BY:
17	MR. BUCK VANDERSTEEN, Louisiana Forestry Association
18	
19	MS. LINDSAY GOUEDY, Sparta Ground Water Commission
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	GROUND WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION
2	16TH REGULAR MEETING
3	WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 18, 2010
4	
5	* * * *
6	
7	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
8	Okay. We will go ahead and call the
9	meeting to order, and I welcome everyone to the
10	State Capitol, and I appreciate you all being here
11	for the 17th Regular Ground Water Resources
12	Commission meeting, and would ask the staff to call
13	the role.
14	MR. ADAMS:
15	I'm John Adams, Attorney for the
16	Environmental Division of the Office of
17	Conservation. As I call your name, please sound
18	off. Lt. Governor Scott Angelle?
19	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
20	Here.
21	MR. ADAMS:
22	Kyle Balkum?
23	MR. BALKUM:
24	Present.
25	MR. ADAMS:

1		Bo Bolourchi?
2	MR.	BOLOURCHI:
3		Here.
4	MR.	ADAMS:
5		James Burland?
6	MR.	BURLAND:
7		Here.
8	MR.	ADAMS:
9		Glenn Cambre?
10	MR.	CAMBRE:
11		Present.
12	MR.	ADAMS:
13		Gene Coleman?
14	MR.	COLEMAN:
15		Here.
16	MR.	ADAMS:
17		Elliot Colvin?
18	(NO RESPO	ONSE)
19	MR.	ADAMS:
20		William Downs?
21	MR.	DOWNS:
22		Here.
23	MR.	ADAMS:
24		Paul Frey?
25	MR.	FREY:

1	
1	Here.
2	MR. ADAMS:
3	Garret Graves?
4	(NO RESPONSE)
5	MR. ADAMS:
6	Mayor Dan Hollingsworth?
7	MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH:
8	Here.
9	MR. ADAMS:
10	James "Jimmy" Johnston?
11	MR. JOHNSTON:
12	Here.
13	MR. ADAMS:
14	Jackie Loewer?
15	MR. LOEWER:
16	Here.
17	MR. ADAMS:
18	Mickey Mays?
19	MR. MAYS:
20	Here.
21	MR. ADAMS:
22	Paul Miller?
23	(NO RESPONSE)
24	MR. ADAMS:
25	Eugene Owen?

1	MR. OWEN:
2	Present.
3	MR. ADAMS:
4	Kelsey Short?
5	(NO RESPONSE)
6	MR. ADAMS:
7	Brad Spicer?
8	(NO RESPONSE)
9	MR. ADAMS:
10	And Commissioner James Welsh?
11	COMMISSIONER WELSH:
12	Here.
13	MR. ADAMS:
14	Mr. Chairman, ten members are
15	required for a forum. We have more than ten
16	members; so we have a forum.
17	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
18	Thank you very much. We'll go to
19	Item Number 2, Adoption of the Meeting Summary by
20	Mr. Adams.
21	MR. ADAMS:
22	Yes, sir. As many of you received
23	as all of you received about a week and a half ago,
24	we forwarded the meeting summary from the previous
25	meeting to everyone. In response to comments from

1 you, we made one minor typographical correction; in 2. that, on Page 2, Mr. Glenn Cambre's name was 3 misspelled. We corrected that. That's the only 4 change that we made. Staff requests at this time a 5 motion to adopt the Meeting Summary. 6 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 7 We did Okay. Is that -- excuse me. 8 not have a quorum at that last meeting; so that's 9 why you're calling it a Meeting Summary as opposed 10 to adoption of minutes? 11 MR. ADAMS: 12 No, sir. We did have a quorum. We're calling it meeting summary just because it's 13 14 not quite as detailed. It doesn't have -- it's not 15 as lengthy as a set of minutes would be. 16 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 17 Okay. Is that a change? 18 MR. ADAMS: 19 No. 20 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 2.1 Is that what we had started to do? 2.2 MR. ADAMS: 23 All of our meetings we've compiled 24 meeting summaries for; so there's no change. 25 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

1 All right. I entertain a motion. 2 Motion by Mr. Cambre. 3 MR. BURLAND: 4 Second. 5 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 6 A second by Mr. Burland to approve 7 the Meeting Summary as presented by Mr. Adams. 8 objection? Any discussion? Hearing none, that 9 motion is adopted. Thank you, Mr. Adams. 10 I would like to recognize two members 11 of the legislature that have joined us today, 12 Representative Jim Morris and Representative Richard 13 Burford, two members of the Natural Resources 14 Committee who have done an extraordinary job over 15 the last several years helping us with natural 16 resource issues. 17 Thank you for being with us today. 18 know it took quite a sacrifice to be here from North Louisiana and to go through the weather to get here, 19 20 but, again, thank you. 21 Both of you have -- we haven't always 22 agreed on issues, and you were wrong when you 23 disagreed with me, but having said that, having said 24 that, I do appreciate the commitment that you have 25 made to the Natural Resources -- do you want me to

```
1
     give you the opportunity to speak, sir?
2.
                REPRESENTATIVE MORRIS:
3
                     I don't think you do.
 4
                LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
5
                     You know I was joking, right?
                                                     Mr.
6
     Burford, would you like the opportunity?
7
                REPRESENTATIVE BURFORD:
8
                     No, thank you.
9
                LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
10
                     Thank you, sir. I appreciate it.
11
            In addition to that, Commissioner Welsh has
     Okay.
12
     made a request to introduce students who are working
13
     with him at the Office of Conservation.
14
                COMMISSIONER WELSH:
15
                     Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We do have
16
     three students here that the Office of Conservation
17
     has employed. They're top students from the Baton
18
     Rouge Community College here in Baton Rouge.
19
                     We have them employed temporarily as
20
     student worker interns, and they're working with
21
     Mr. Snellgrove in the Environmental Division in some
2.2
     ground water matters.
23
                     I'd like to introduce Harold Abarca -
24
     if you could stand up, Harold - Kaylee Hebert, and
25
     Naomi Mustafa; so let's welcome them to the meeting.
```

(APPLAUSE)

2.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Thank y'all very much. Thank you,
Commissioner Welsh. Okay. Item Number 3 will be a
Statewide Water Management Plan Update. Mr. Gary
Snellgrove?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Thank you, Chair. Okay. On presentation, do we have -- can we correct the video, please? Thank you. Okay. At this point in the meeting, we'll just give you an update on the current status of the Statewide Ground Water Management Plan.

We're now in the point where we're the contractor is putting together the information.
As you can see on the time line here, we're in
months three through seven time period. We're
moving rapidly, approaching the month eight where
there will be a draft plan that will be put out for
public comment.

This gives you a breakdown of where each task that - on the scope and services for the contract, where we are with each task. We met with Ecology and Environmental on July the 22nd, and they provided this update to us.

1 So Task 1, which is a historic data 2 review which is subbed out to LGS, is near complete. 3 We're waiting on the final report. That will be 4 issued to Eco and - Ecology and Environment for them 5 to then proceed with other steps along the way. 6 The Water Use Statistics Task, too, 7 is about 65 percent complete, and that task focuses 8 on populating or getting data for ground water and 9 water statistics from the time period of 2005 to 10 present. 11 Moving through Task 3 is Water Well 12 Registration --13 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 14 A little bit closer. 15 MR. SNELLGROVE: 16 Water Well Registration and 17 Notification review. The staff at Ecology and 18 Environment met with staff of DNR, and they continue 19 to do so to get an understanding of what we do and 20 how we do it and how we implement and enforce the 21 regulations. 22 Task 4 and 5, of course, are 23 dependent upon previous tasks getting complete so 24 that they can ultimately make the recommendations 25 and provide cost benefit and prioritization elements

1 of the scope of services. 2. Meanwhile, you know, they're still 3 making ground on other tasks like Tasks 6 and 7, 4 funding opportunities, making that opportunity to, 5 you know, find resources that once recommendations 6 are made that, you know, we can try to have some 7 ways to fund those opportunities. 8 And, lastly, the Best Management 9 Practices and Cost Analysis, they're proceeding with 10 research on that topic - those topics and putting 11 together some information there. 12 We're on task as scheduled with the 13 scope of services to go to the public hearings with 14 a draft report by November - through November and 15 December, and, of course, once we get comments from 16 them and use those comments and make a final draft, 17 we're still on schedule for February 2011. 18 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 19 Mr. Snellgrove, is that -- if we can 20 go back to the task that we specifically identified

MR. SNELLGROVE:

21

2.2

23

24

25

here.

RFP --

Correct. That is correct.

Those are the tasks that were part of the

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

1 Part of the contract, correct? 2. MR. SNELLGROVE: 3 Yes. 4 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 5 And part of what was approved by the 6 Ground Water Commission as the task that we wanted 7 to go ahead and be a part of, the component parts of 8 this Ground Water Management Plan, correct? 9 MR. SNELLGROVE: 10 That is correct. 11 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 12 All right. Thank you. 13 Mr. Hollingsworth. 14 MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH: 15 Mr. Snellgrove, I was just wanting to 16 check. Do you anticipate you'll get the well 17 registration done by the time you get the complete 18 draft, or is that -- how is that moving along? 19 notice it's only 40 percent. Is that good, bad, or 20 where is that? 21 MR. SNELLGROVE: 2.2 No, sir. Well, considering that we 23 met on July 22nd, and so it's been some time since 24 then. I'm sure that they moved -- part of what 25 they -- when they met with us at that time was to

2.

meet with the staff; so I would say that that particular item is probably much more further along.

But, yes, I do - I do fully believe that they will -- in our meeting, I think that they will complete their analysis of what we do in Conservation with well registration - water well notification in our procedures and evaluations. Thank you.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Mr. Snellgrove, I would like to suggest as we continue to move towards the February 2011 report, as we are, by borrowing a sport's analogy, moving down the field and would be crossing perhaps mid field and looking to get into the red zone, I think it makes sense for the Commission members here to receive a monthly report on — an update where we are on performance on the various tasks, in as much as the Commission now is meeting on a quarterly basis, and that itself has been challenging, at least this last couple — this last quarter. I would — I think it would be a good idea to have as many of the stakeholders understand where we are and have a report issued. I think it's appropriate to do it on a monthly basis.

And it doesn't have to be limited to

2.

2.2

just the Ground Water Commission members. I'm sure we have a stakeholder group that is particularly following this, and I think it would just be a good idea, because we probably will hear some comments on what we might want to do a little differently to speed things up or make it better, and we ought to try to do that.

MR. SNELLGROVE:

I thank you for that comment. It's noted, and we'll do so. Chair, at this time, Chris --

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. Thank you very much. Any questions for Mr. Snellgrove, Members of the Commission? Okay. Having said that, we would ask Miss - Dr. Christel Slaughter of SSA Consultants to brief us on her work with regards to interviewing members and stakeholders. Welcome, Dr. Slaughter. Thank you for being here.

DR. SLAUGHTER:

Thank you very much, Lt. Governor, and thank you, Commissioners, for having me back.

The Lt. Governor talked about the red zone. I was engaged in the game plan formation; so very early on our firm was asked to come in and solicit input from

2.

you in terms of what you saw as major issues that you wanted the plan to address and what involvement you wanted to have.

I did come to your April meeting and brief you. After that point in time, we were able to get a few more Commissioners interviewed and get some additional input which was very, very helpful. And so some of this will be slightly redundant to those of you who were here at the April meeting, but the handout that you have will be the slides that you see up on the screen.

So we were engaged, as I said, to interview primarily Commissioners, but there were some other relevant stakeholders that did come forward during the process, a tremendous number of documents and prior analysis that our staff was able to review. And, again, our objective was to determine the scope and the breadth of the plan and the level of involvement that you desired.

And you will see in a moment as we go through this that that varied from one Commissioner to another, and, actually, what you wanted out of the plan varied to a certain extent.

In talking about the role and structure of the Commission which certainly is part

of this as you will tour planning, most of you stated that you were very pleased with the direction that the Ground Water Resources Commission has been going in. You felt very involved and informed. You liked the fact that you had detailed agendas. You thought that there was robust discussion and the meeting was a very open environment for people to bring forward issues, and the staff was providing timely and solid information, especially as you requested certain things from them.

In terms of some specific observations that came out in talking about the Commission itself, some people mentioned that it's a rather large Commission, that you thought 19 people was fairly large. That had not been a problem to date, but in the future as you - once you have your plan as you begin to move forward, there might be some look at that.

Several of you mentioned that you were pleased with the Lt. Governor's openness and attitude, whether you approach him between meetings or during meetings, that he's very open to your thoughts and comments and a good listener.

Many of you have been involved with water issues for over a decade, whether you are a

state civil servant who has dedicated your life to this or whether you are representing an entity in the private sector. There's a tremendous amount of knowledge that rests within the Commissioners themselves and the people that you represent in some cases. That needs to be tapped into as part of this process.

Some people did mention that they
felt that the Commission did not have the budget or
authority that it needed, that it needed to figure
out how it linked back with the Conservation
Department in getting recommendations back to DNR,
but your hope was that through the master plan
process that some of this would be developed and
brought forward; and so you look for that as part of
this process.

Generally, generally, Commissioners like the meetings rotated around the state to get more public participation, and there was broad agreement that there's good representation of interested parties on the Commission. No true oversights there.

There was interest and some concern over the Advisory Task Force and its relationship to the Commission, but please remember when we started

2.

doing these interviews, we had not yet reengaged the Advisory Task Force; so I think those comments came fairly early on and I think people are hopeful now that that's been dealt with effectively.

There was some concern expressed that there was a number of parties that needed to be involved in the planning process, and there was some hope that there would be ways to get broad involvement in the steps in the process. I think Mr. Snellgrove is going to follow my remarks with some efforts to do that that would help allay some of those concerns.

More than one of you said that you did not want to be simply handed a draft plan in a public meeting and asked for feedback. Early involvement of Commissioners is critical to success, and I think you'll see in a moment that there are some plans for that.

In terms of general feedback, surface water issues are uppermost in the minds of many of you, worrying from both successful and progressive states as well as states who have had difficult water wars. It's going to be very important to success. There are other people who have gone through this before us, and we need to learn from

them.

2.

Many favor a phased-in approach with incentives for compliance and ease for usage so that we would not have any sort of knee-jerk reaction once the plan is completed and adopted by this Commission.

There is not complete consensus on how fast states should move forward and how urgent this problem is. Some Commissioners believe that there's tremendous urgency. Others say we're in a dire situation in some areas of the state but not in all areas, and some of you say a phased-in approach and a calculated approach is what's needed, that things are not on fire, and we need to take this slow and do it the right way. So I think that that's something as you get through, you know, the steps in this plan that your plan consultants will need to get consensus on in terms of how you go about implementing the plan itself.

Many of you believe that public education efforts are going to be critical for sustained success in conservation issues and that this is something that needs to go on around the state, but particularly in some regions of the state in order to be effective, both in the short term and

in the long term.

2.

There's some indication that additional staff or resources for inspection, testing, and monitoring may be needed in the future in these tough budget times for the state. This is an area for concern, but, again, I think - I caution you, having seen this with other agencies in similar situations, if you begin to have expectations that staff will increase their role or do more with regard to ground water, we need to make sure that those expectations are matched by resources; and so this is something that will need to be dedicated as well going forward.

As the role of the Commission in the state versus local jurisdiction in areas surrounding the Sparta Aquifer and in the Ruston area giving the state and Ground Water Resources Commission state-wide authority is somewhat controversial.

That's just a fact of life. However, more than one Commissioner stressed the importance of Louisiana retaining statewide authority to regulate tax and post fees on ground and surface water wherever regulation is necessary to preserve and insure the sustainability of this resource - or of these resources. And I think that, again, learning from

other states and positive impacts and challenges that they have had as they approach these similar issues will be very helpful.

Because the Commission is part time, you all are not dedicated to this a hundred percent of your time and most of you sort of have day jobs, you wanted planned elements and recommendations to be black and white, if you will, not to be vague, so that you're able to follow it and understand it and track it and make sure that your role as Commissioners are effective in terms of implementing whatever the plan results are going to be.

And I realize that that's a difficult task and probably somewhat unrealistic in pure terms, but, again, the more we can give you through this planning process that gives you an understanding of role and elements in your relationship to what needs to be happening I think will be helpful.

Several of you mentioned that you must find ways to track progress over the next few years and, if this is successful, will look back in ten years and be very proud of what you've accomplished in this very important moment in Louisiana's history.

Commissioners are committed to the concept that - of the statewide plan, but there are different expectations about content and process.

As I mentioned, some of you wanted very specific and descriptive. Some would like to see regional plans included. I think that may actually be somewhat out of scope, but I think the intention is to have a statewide plan that would lead to regional expectations going forward.

Some want a broad frame work for the state that provides a blueprint for the future, and some of you are really looking for something very detailed. And I have to tell you, when I hear those kinds of differences in interviewing people, I pass them on to Mr. Snellgrove and the consultants who follow me because that is something that we need to get you all on the same page about so that we make sure we meet your expectations going forward.

It was very important to many of you that a number of different groups and individuals are included in developing the master plan in order for it to truly be adopted by all the entities that need to comply and collaborate going forward.

The groups that were specifically mentioned were environmental groups and NGOs, the

1 Sabine River Authority, Capitol Area Ground Water 2. Conservation, industrial users, agricultural 3 representatives, USDA and NRCS, USGS and the 4 Department of the Interior, the Police Jury 5 Association, the Louisiana Municipal Association, 6 the League of Women Voters, and the Arkansas Sparta 7 Group, to name but a few. There were several 8 others, but these received multiple comments from 9 many of you, and some of you felt very strongly 10 about some of the people on the list and need to 11 include them early. 12 So, with that, Lt. Governor and 13 Mr. Snellgrove, I'll be happy to answer any questions or clarify any of those points. 14 15 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 16 Thank you very much, Dr. Slaughter. 17 Do the Commission members have any questions? Any 18 comments? Do you want to light the board? Yes, 19 Mr. Coleman. 20 MR. COLEMAN: 21 I was wondering why the Sparta Group 22 was not included in that listing, in - the Louisiana 23 Sparta when you included the Arkansas Sparta as one 24 Sparta.

DR. SLAUGHTER:

Thank you for that question. Our assumption was that many of the regional entities were absolutely involved in the process; so we were looking for people that may not be expected to be involved. Certainly that would absolutely be, but thank you for that clarifying point.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. A couple of comments I have. There's no other questions from members, at least on the board here, but a couple of things. I would just want to drive a couple of issues. The page is not numbered, but on general feedback, more than one Commissioner stated that he did not want to simply be handed a draft plan and asked for feedback at that point; early involvement is critical to success. I thank you for bringing that.

I certainly thought we would get that comment, and that's absolutely what we want to avoid. We do not want to have a plan that is submitted for final blessing, only to have folks who need to provide the blessing not involved in the process. I'm hopeful that as a result of this suggestion we have a opportunity that we're going to provide Commission members to be more engaged in that; so I know we'll hear from you on that. Again,

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I appreciate the Commissioners being very honest about that.

On another comment on general feedback, there is not complete consensus on how fast the state should move. Some Commissioners believe that the situation is urgent, while others believe that a calculated, phased-in approach would be more prudent.

Again, I would say that science ought to dictate those kinds of things. The only way we can use science is we've got to have data. to have as much data as we possibly can in useable formats, and I'm going to continue to drive and ask the Commissioners and the Department and the State to invest where it's appropriate to get as much data. Much like, obviously, a board of directors that needs to make decisions on expanding their business or inventory or whatever it may be, each one of us needs that data. And one size likely does not fit all. You know, what may be a problem in one area of the state may not be a problem in another area of the state, and we need to be -- that data needs to be broken down in a lowest common denominator so that we can use it and have science rather than emotion or politics dictate what we may

2.

be doing with a natural resource.

DR. SLAUGHTER:

And, Lt. Governor, if I might just make one comment about that. I think what you said is exactly right, and there are some areas of the state who are in crisis and believe they're in crisis and want some — want this Commission to get involved and take action immediately.

Yet there are other areas of the state represented by Commissioners who are not necessarily in crisis today but see crisis coming.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Sure.

DR. SLAUGHTER:

And they want a plan that's going to help them get ahead of the train, so to speak. And you're right; the data should definitely drive that. And I think if we take it out of subjectiveness, one commissioner versus another or one area of the state versus another into the plan, then I think the Commission would feel comfortable approving that and knowing that some of these issues will be taken care of in a timely way.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Right. And, again, I would say that,

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you know, the State only became very serious about this issue perhaps over the last decade, perhaps maybe even a shorter period of time; so we do have some catching up to do. Our data system collection, what we collect, how we collect it, what we do with it, is going to continue to go through a grinding process. But to the staff, I would tell you there is no substitute for having good decisions coming out of this group than having the best data in a useable format; so I thank you for your help on that. And I don't see any other questions for Dr. Slaughter on this issue; so thank you for being here. DR. SLAUGHTER: Thank you very much. LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

You're welcome. Okay. Do you want to go ahead and take Item 3B, Mr. Snellgrove?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Yes, sir. One point of comment for the folks. If anyone wants to make a comment on the public comment period of the agenda, you will need to fill out and please pass up one of these blue cards.

Moving on to follow up to

Dr. Slaughter's presentation on the - on her efforts

of liaising through the plan and to focus on the

issue that had been brought up about involvement,

this slide right here presents to the Commission

that you will be provided the opportunity and part

of - to be part of a workshop that we will schedule

in September.

We plan to schedule this workshop in the Alexandria area. We're currently looking at a venue to hold it, and we've got several dates that we've got in the latter part of the month to make this workshop come together.

And what we're going to do is put out a questionnaire that will give you the opportunity to provide comment and input prior to the draft plan being finalized for what we call a hearing process; so that's forthcoming. And as soon as we get more direct - get more confirmed information about the date and the place and the time, we will send it out as quickly as we can to all members to participate in the workshop, and we'll provide the - we'll work with Eco and the contractor that's developing the state plan to come up with the questionnaire and certainly with the input of appropriate staff.

2.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. Mr. Snellgrove, just for a moment, I want to have a conversation with the Commissioners. This workshop is a direct result of the comments that Dr. Slaughter received, that Commission members wanted to be involved and, again, did not want to have a document handed off at the eleventh hour.

So the best way I know is to build a camp fire, invite everybody to gather around and to come forward and provide the suggestions that you think ought to go into a Comprehensive Ground Water Management Plan.

I would tell you that we need to have as many of those workshops as you feel necessary to avoid — when we do get to the eleventh hour that we have avoided a situation of folks being able to say I didn't get a chance to participate. So I'm prepared to ask the staff and the consultants to do whatever we have to do to host as many meetings as necessary so that when we go to the legislature with a plan that we don't have a situation — we may not all agree with the plan. There may be some aspects of it that not all of us are in favor of. I understand how the process works and you do too, but

2.

2.2

we certainly want to make sure that we've provided as many opportunities for Commission members as we can.

So, again, I would ask Commission members, do you have any other suggestions on how you might want to participate in this process, what tools we might be able to use to allow you to participate in the process, recognizing that all of you serve in a voluntary capacity? And now would be a good time to share that with us and - so we can get that information. Mr. Owen?

MR. OWEN:

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that one area that we should consider in this workshop is the availability of enabling legislation to authorize and to take certain remedial steps. We are going to end up eventually with the science, if you will, to tell us where a problem area is - may materialize either now or in the future. But we often find ourselves when those problems materialize without the proper enabling legislation to do anything about the problem. And it seems to me that there are a number of profitable areas that we could spend in looking at the necessary future legislation to enable us to control or make best uses of our

2.

natural resources, whether they be surface water or ground water.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. So what I'm hearing from you is that the venue in Alexandria is appropriate but what you are looking for is to particularly add made a subject matter during those discussions which would include legislative challenges.

MR. OWEN:

Correct.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

And I certainly don't disagree with that, but what I would suggest is that may be putting for a moment - and I certainly will defer to your judgment, that may be putting the cart before the horse, in as much as I think what we need to do is perhaps drive towards what is the appropriate ground water management plan and then perhaps determine what legislative shortcomings we have to implement that plan and then to begin making a list of recommendations. Because, quite frankly, that's part of Representative Fannin's resolution, is for us to provide a list of recommendations to the legislature to better do that.

But, again, you know, how you might

2.

suggest we do that in September, I'm very open to accommodating that request and would look forward to working with you on what might we add to that.

Mr. Johnston?

MR. JOHNSTON:

I have a question. As we put this plan together, how much involvement, Gary, has the task force had, if any? And, also, I noticed the groups that she mentioned, many of us represent those groups here. And so my question is: How much involvement have these groups and the Task Force had in the development of the plan? And, secondly, this workshop in September, are they going to be involved in this?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Well, certainly the focus is goes to be on any and all who want to participate. It would be an open, public forum. It will be similar to what we did in - last year about that same time, and I think in October we held a Ground Water Aquifers of Louisiana workshop, and it was a public meeting, but there was no -- there was no decisions to be made; in other words, it wasn't - it wasn't that type of meeting. It was more of a educational ground water one-on-one.

So I think in this regard -- in following that same concept, I think that's the way we're going to do it. So we'll send out notice to all in the e-mail distribution list that we have, the date, place, and time, and all are welcome to provide comment through the questionnaire process that we'll have out there. And, of course, there will be specific questions, but there will also be general comments that could be provided in that process.

And the Task Force is as involved as they want to be. We bring this up -- we keep them abreast at the meetings that we hold quarterly with that group. They are certainly part of the e-mail distribution list too. So I meant to say that they are definitely engaged.

MR. JOHNSTON:

Well, I just wanted to make sure, because Angelle talked about the science driving this process can be critical, especially in something like this, that's it's more important to get involved, you know, as opposed to, you know, with a phone call and we discussed it, answered a bunch of questions by phone, but, you know, a written questionnaire is a whole lot better to

```
1
     document what people say.
2.
                MR. SNELLGROVE:
3
                     We agree.
4
                LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
5
                     I'm sorry. Mr. Burland. I'll come
6
     back to you, Mr. --
7
                MR. BURLAND:
8
                     Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also
9
     agree, Mr. Chairman, that this is a great idea to
10
     solicit Commission member input early on, but let's
11
     not forget that, you know, there's the public and
12
     there's also water users out there and these other
13
     entities that want to probably testify or submit
     some kind of technical data.
14
15
                     I think this really looks to me like
16
     it would be more in terms of a technical conference
17
     more than anything else and a series of them which I
18
     agree to, but I think we need to think in terms of
19
     not so much slowing it down but let's think about
20
     adding a little structure to this. In other words,
21
     let's identify some phases in order that we can
2.2
     proceed and not just throw all over the map; for
23
     instance, you know, bringing up legislative
     recommendations prior to determining some other
24
25
     ideas in this - in these different areas.
```

So my thought would be to give people two or three weeks notice with an agenda, with a series of topics that we can bring in, because I know that water users that I know and represent are going to want to come in and talk about what they can and can't do and what's good, not good.

You've got to give these people time, two or three weeks to prepare. You just can't throw out a meeting notice a week ahead of time and say come in September and give us your thoughts. So my thought would be to kind of back it up, prepare and get your agenda out with topics that will be discussed at that particular meeting so that we, in turn, can generate the kind of testimony that we need to get full participation from everyone. That would just be my thought.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

That's a great comment. What I would hope we would do during this time or perhaps again by e-mail right after this is for the Commission members to put the meat on the bone that they want at this workshop. You know, certainly, I think it's a great suggestion to have industry folks, users. You know, particularly what we have here is a group of folks who represent those users.

If we want to -- you know, I'm hoping that you all are in touch with the various groups that you represent and you come forward with that information. If you want to subcontract that out to a variety of other folks, I'm fine with what. You know, we can play any way you want in the sand box.

But, you know, you all have been chosen by the various groups and appointed by the Governor to do that, and so if you have a particular issue or item as we try to build this structure. Because this is the first time we'll have this kind of meeting in the state, again, I'm looking for suggestions. I'd ask that the staff, again, e-mail you out tomorrow with those suggestions and the staff kind of grind through those suggestions and come to some consensus so that we can have a meeting, number one, that meets your expectations - we certainly want to meet your expectations - and, secondly, obviously, you know, does the good work that we need for the State; so I think it's a great suggestion.

And what we can't have is -- you know, we are going to have opportunities for a variety of folks to comment on. If you're suggesting that this not be an opportunity for the

2.

Commission to bring forth their ideas but more as just, you know, a couple of days of receiving testimony from folks, I would say we ought to invite that in a written format. We ought to send notice out to every stakeholder that we can identify saying that we are interested in receiving your written comments on what a useable comprehensive ground water plan ought to look like. We ought to take the responsibility of going through it, reading it, researching it, and then taking that and then visiting in this comprehensive way in Alexandria.

And so backing it up, perhaps, might work. Maybe October instead of September might work to give folks an opportunity - stakeholders to put in their written comments.

MR. BURLAND:

Yeah. I wasn't necessarily requesting that you back it up, but at least phase it in certain -- if we're going to do several meetings to at least focus in on certain topics at certain meetings so that by the end of the Fall we would certainly be where we need to be rather than in Alexandria, you know, hitting 20 different topics and not really finishing --

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

1 Correct. 2. MR. BURLAND: 3 -- the testimony on each one. That's 4 just my thought. 5 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 6 Good point. Mr. Loewer? 7 MR. LOEWER: 8 Yes, sir. I think my question probably was answered, but I'm trying to look what 9 10 our responsibility is with a workshop like this, and 11 is it only going to be that we're receiving 12 information to collect later and make decisions 13 later, or are we going to be expected to come up with certain kinds of plan suggestion? And maybe 14 15 part of that education will be a look at maybe some 16 other plans already developed with other states. 17 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 18 Sure. Sure. 19 MR. LOEWER: 20 What's something like this look like? 21 When we're done, what's it going to look like, I 2.2 mean, not all specific, but how can it be unique to 23 Louisiana. And not just receiving -- of course, I 24 think if you get 25 different people, and this is 25 what we believe, we're going to be there all day and

all we're going to do is receive information, which is fine. Is it a two-day meeting, a one-day meeting?

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

You might want to bring your sleeping bag for this one. But I think, again, we're getting to the point where a lot of the -- you know, again, I use a lot of sports analogies. The stadium is built. The tickets are sold. The field is ready. Now we're getting on the playing field and doing the work that we - you know, we asked or - we asked or somebody asked us to do as members of the Ground Water Commission.

So I suspect that we will have multiple meetings. I suspect they will be long; they will be grinding; they will be getting into the weeds on what are the appropriate component parts of a ground water management plan. But that's our job and that's our task. So, Mr. Mays?

MR. MAYS:

I'd just like to say that I look forward to that meeting, and I don't know that we can say that two meetings or three meetings or what will do it. Maybe after the first one, we can make a decision. But I would like to limit it as much as

1 possible to this Commission so that we can get our 2. ideas together, and that's what all of us have said, 3 that we wanted to be part of drafting this plan, and 4 perhaps later on an additional public comment could 5 be part of it. 6 The only question I have is who will 7 be the moderator? 8 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 9 Well, it sounds like you've got 10 yourself a job. 11 MR. MAYS: 12 No, no. I was not volunteering. 13 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 14 That's what I heard. But, anyway, 15 I'm not so sure of the structure. We've got some 16 work to do, and I assure you that I will be meeting 17 with the Commissioner and his staff to try to, you 18 know, layout this next serious phase of what we've 19 got. Great question. Don't have the answer today. 20 Mr. Balkum? 21 MR. BALKUM: 2.2 Gary, Mr. Chairman, I think we've all 23 had an opportunity to talk to Dr. Slaughter and tell 24 her what we believe should be in the plan. I think

what would benefit me the most is that when we come

2.

together for this workshop if we have a preliminary draft, some documentation to review so that we see what the plan looks like. I understand it's a draft, it's preliminary, and that may help lead our discussions and help guide us in where we're going.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. Very good. Again, perhaps some strawman, very light, just to kind of get folks engaged in where we're going and use that as a quide. Mr. Coleman?

MR. COLEMAN:

Yes. One of the things that was mentioned and a thought come to my mind is that some people's terms will be expiring in September, and we certainly need to make note of the fact that the new people that are going to be coming on board need to be - participate and invited to these seminars, you know, whether it's before or after the 14th or whatever that cut-off date is.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. Good point. Term limits, hum?

Okay. Having said that, I do want the record to reflect that Paul Miller representing DEQ is now here. And while I'm sure there are various folks in the audience that I should call out individually, I

2.

do want to especially recognize Pat Credeur with the Louisiana Ground Rural Water Association and thank you for your cooperation and help as we try to bring about the management regime that we need in the State.

And also I want to thank the Attorney General's Office for their help in today's meeting and in some of the issues that we've had over the last several months.

Mr. Snellgrove, do you have anything else on that item?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

No. I've taken notes down. Very good input. And we will put together an agenda for all to review and work towards the workshop questionnaire and get it out.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. Very good. Thank you very much. Item Number 4 is a briefing of the Attorney General's Surface Water Use Opinions. You should have in your package, and the staff can confirm by nodding of the head that the members do have copies of these opinions. You should have in your package and you do have in your package four opinions - sorry, five opinions: Opinion Number 08-0176, dated

March 17th, 2010; Opinion 09-0028, dated March 19th, 2010; Opinion Number 09-0066, dated March 19th, 2010; Opinion Number 09-0291, dated April 27th, 2010; and Opinion Number 09-0148, dated April 5th, 2010.

I want to particularly spend a little bit of time giving you what is a non-attorney's view of these opinions and kind of let you know where I think we are going to be called on to weigh in on some issues.

These opinions have — are the expressed opinions of the State's chief legal adviser of the Attorney General. I understand that these opinions have gone through a variety of checks and balances and a review process. Before — these opinions, like any opinions, before they are actually issued go through a process of staff members reviewing research and then a public release.

Whether one agrees or does not agree with an opinion is of little consequence to me today, and I will suggest it's of little consequence to you today. They are the opinions of the Attorney General. I personally don't have the luxury of disagreeing from a public policy standpoint with the

2.

Attorney General as far as how we operate the Office.

And, so, what these opinions do is basically say that the running waters of the State of Louisiana are, in fact, owned by the people of Louisiana, and things that are owned by the people of Louisiana, according to the Attorney General, are not subject to be given away by the State, that anyone who is interested in the things that belong to the State of Louisiana must adequately and properly compensate the State for that resource.

And there are a lot of things on point in these particular opinions that deal with some of the issues that we have been struggling with with regards to production of hydrocarbons in the State.

I simply bring these to you to let you know that it may be the first time that we have these - we have an opinion of this and certainly the first time we have so many opinions that were issued in such a rapid-fire approach. And it may signify either the need for additional legislation for folks who want to clarify this; it may signify the need for addition management, depending on how they end up being interpreted.

And the fundamental thing I want you to take away from these opinion is that, again, the Attorney General has opined that the running waters of the State of Louisiana belong to the people of Louisiana and, therefore, the State is entitled to a fair market value compensation for those resources. They must be acquired through a written contract, and that written contract must be approved by the Attorney General and the Department of Natural Resources. And, again, we will talk about Act 955 shortly, which is one of the consequences of those various opinions.

Certainly many of you have seen these opinions and have your own opinions about them, and I wanted to go ahead and make sure that you had copies if you didn't and see if we — this would be a good time if anybody wanted to weigh in and provide any comments on those opinions.

Have any of you seen these opinions?

Yes? Anybody have any comments? Okay. Very well.

Again, they're for your reference.

And let me go ahead and move on to, then, Item Number 5, which is a brief summary of Act 955 which was House Bill Number 1486. The author of that bill was Representative Jim Morris who, again,

is here with us, and Representative Burford was a coauthor of this particular bill.

And what I want folks to understand is that we did not codify -- again, keep in mind the Attorney General's opinion is that it is an opinion of what he believes when he looks at a variety of legislation, the constitutional issues. It's an expression of his opinion.

There is no specific, specific, law in Louisiana that says you must — if you're interested in surface waters of the State you must issue a written agreement and you must acquire for fair market value. There is no specific law that says that, because if there was a specific law, perhaps there wouldn't be the need for an opinion. But they are a variety of laws, some of which conflict with others. And after reviewing all of those, again, he opined to that situation.

So House Bill Number 1486 is not an attempt to codify the opinion, to make it the law, but to only give to those folks — or to the folks who are interested in complying with that opinion, if they believe it is the right opinion, they can go through a process and acquire the rights to the running surface waters of the State of Louisiana

2.

through a process that is spelled out in here.

This is what we would call in the Capitol a Permissive Bill. It provides permission in a process, but it does not require anybody to do it.

Now, again, everybody who fails to avail themselves to this process does so at the risk of disagreeing with the opinion of the Attorney General. Okay? But this bill is a simple tool in the toolbox that allows companies, allows individuals to read those opinions and say, okay, I agree with those opinions, my business plan says that I need to go ahead and acquire water rights and, as so, one would then turn to the provisions of Act Number 955 to see what the process is, how one goes about getting it, what form is put on, what are the rates, and what are the kind of things that decision makers need to keep in mind as they're going through with it.

Again, I would tell you that we have - as a result of this bill, there is a requirement for the State Mineral Board to adopt a form, a Surface Water Cooperative Endeavor Agreement which has, again, been in the process of making since the time that this bill was signed into law,

and as a result of that, we're going to hear shortly from someone with the State Mineral Board, Mr. Rick Heck, to give you an update on that provision, again, which is, if we start at the beginning, we start with opinions from the Attorney General which then cascaded into legislation being drafted to allow folks to come in compliance with that, and then the process from there is further broken down which requires a cooperative endeavor agreement to be drafted and approved, and Mr. Heck will certainly tell you a little bit about that.

The other bill that I just wanted to bring to your attention is Act Number 994 by Representative Fannin which also had several coauthors, and what that particular bill does -- let me back up.

The Attorney General's opinions specifically also — the Attorney General's opinions specifically recognizes the rights of riparian owners. So a riparian owner, according to these opinions, has the right to withdraw surface water and use it for his riparian lands. Okay? But according to the Attorney General's opinion, they're silent on whether or not he can use it for non-riparian lands. Okay?

1 There is some -- if you read all four 2 of them, there is some language that attempts to 3 address that. However, what Act Number 994 does by 4 Representative Fannin, it says that when you are -5 when a riparian owner has the right to certain 6 waters and those waters are used in either 7 agricultural or aquacultural pursuits, then the 8 riparian owner has the right to use it on 9 non-riparian lands only for those purposes. 10 So what we've done with this 11 particular legislation is created a - tried to 12 legislate and create an exemption for agriculture 13 and aquiculture to work around the Attorney 14 General's opinions. 15 Again, I'm not at all expressing 16 whether or not that's good or bad public policy. 17 I'm just simply bringing you up to date. I'm not 18 offering my opinion on any of this. I'm just 19 bringing you up to date on what happened during the 20 legislative session. 21 Okay. Any questions from the members 22 on these two legislative acts? Mr. Burland? 23 MR. BURLAND: 24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've tried 25 to review these opinions here as I sit. It's the

first time I've seen them, and I apologize for not having reviewed them any sooner. But I have some questions, and maybe we can take some direction from staff, but a couple of questions I have about the interaction of the Attorney General opinions and the acts that have been passed.

Is it a fair statement to say that with respect to running waters that any user other than the riparian owner would have to enter into a cooperative agreement for the use of that water, and, if so, does that include public entities? Does that include cities, parishes, industrial users?

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Well, let me say that, again, those are all appropriate questions, and I don't think we have the Attorney General's Office here. It's my opinion that there is — and I will, again, as a non-attorney express my opinion. There is a provision of law that does not require public water suppliers to enter into those kind of agreements. But I would — those questions are best asked to the Attorney General's Office and I — you know, because I don't want to get into a staff debate on what's permissible and not permissible because only the Attorney General is in my mind qualified to render

1 that opinion. 2. MR. BURLAND: 3 Could we invite them to appear at a 4 future meeting to discuss this? 5 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 6 Yes, we certainly can. I would 7 suggest that if you have those questions and you 8 want to submit them to me, again, I could submit it 9 to them so that we don't have to wait for a future 10 meeting to get those questions answered. Mr. Mays? 11 MR. MAYS: 12 Being neither a legislator or an 13 attorney, I have a question, and I don't know where 14 to direct it to. But we have been for years working 15 on an alternative water source, which is Lake 16 D'Arbonne in Lincoln Parish in Ruston operating 17 under the statute that made Lake D'Arbonne where 18 only Union Parish and Lincoln Parish had the water 19 rights. 20 Would it be appropriate to get an 21 Attorney General's opinion on that as it relates to 2.2 either - any of these acts or the opinions that he's 23 already rendered on some of these surface waters? 24 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 25 It would be very appropriate, because

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 opinion, obviously, is written in kind of a generic sense to the question that was - I'm sorry, a specific answer to a specific question asked by the author of the question. Okay?

So if you have a set of circumstances; whereas, a variety of legislation has been passed providing certain authority to a board or a commission or parishes dealing with water rights issues, then I would suggest that a question be formatted and articulated to the Attorney General to ask what are the specific rights with regards to that water body and who has the rights under current legislation to be able to manage that, because not -- again, not every -- you know, there are a variety -- I'm thinking there are perhaps over 25 different lake commissions or recreation districts or water commissions. They have a variety of authorities, some which may conflict with these opinions because these opinions perhaps did not address that specific lake's authority - lake commission authority or water authority. By your body language, I don't think I answered you question.

MR. MAYS:

No. You did. It just generated

2.

2.2

about 75 other questions. But I guess another question I would ask, these opinions all had to do with running water. Has he had any opinions or do we have any that have to do with ground water or actually who owns ground water?

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

These opinions do not address that. It's certainly my opinion based on what I have been briefed on over the years is that, again, ground water is the rule of capture and anyone who can - you know, owns the right to a property to - you know, physical lands to drill a well and is not one that is of such a magnitude that would require a permit from the Commissioner in a area of ground water concern has the right to drill that well without compensation to the State and without compensation to his neighbors. That is clearly the way I understand the law to be and clearly the way we are operating in the State with regard to ground water, rule of capture.

 $\label{eq:Let_me} \mbox{Let me -- I'm just going on the board} \\ \mbox{here. Mr. Loewer?}$

MR. LOEWER:

Yes, sir. I think you're correct in your definition. As you brought up these surface

2.

2.2

water issues to a ground water board, it's moving in the direction we've talked to in the past, that we look at everything, and I would suggest that in our last discussion on the workshop that we may incorporate some of this in this management plan - I mean in our discussion of management plans and possibly have some legal advise there on what we can do and what we can't do based on some of these opinions.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Good point.

MR. LOEWER:

In deciding this, and not just a letter from them saying this is the way it is; so we can throw that in the mix also to determine what we can do.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Right. And the reason I bring these opinions to you, and it's a great observation, that this is a Ground Water Resource Commission and why we're spending some time on surface water opinions, because House Concurrent Resolution Number 1 by Representative Fannin which calls for the Ground Water Commission to bring about a Ground Water Management Plan to the legislature calls for the

2.

Ground Water Commission to look at surface water features as a potential solution for our ground water issues.

In addition to that, the RFP that we put out that we contracted, and we showed the various tasks earlier, also require the contractors to take a look at what surface water features are out there that can help be the link to ground water shortage solutions.

So, again, I think we are moving clearly into a opportunity for us to provide the leadership, to be the epicenter of water resource management, regardless if it's ground water or surface water, not withstanding the fact that we will set up statutorily only for ground water but by HCR 1 by the legislature has at least sent a signal to us that they want us to look at surface water.

Does this evolve into a revision of this Commission to be the Water Resources Commission in years to come? Who knows. But the legislature is calling for us to look at all of those things, and it's a good idea for us to be able to address those in our various workshops. Mayor Hollingsworth?

MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH:

Mr. Chairman, I clarify the issue relative to Lake D'Arbonne that Mr. Mays alluded to a moment ago. I think the way that came down, that was not an act of the Lake Commission, but that was in the enabling legislation that designated the City of Ruston and the Town of Farmerville as having first dibs on the water in that lake; so that has pretty strong backing, I think. So we would need it tasked in that direction.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

And that would help -- I'm sorry.

Not to interrupt you, but if we wanted to get belts and suspenders on that I would help - to help draft the appropriate question, because often what happens in Attorney General's opinions is you get a great answer but you failed to ask the right question; and so I would be willing to -- if you wanted to set up a call over the next week or so so we could perhaps articulate that very specific question to get you the answer that you're looking for. Whether it's the answer you want or not remains to be seen, and that's why we need the opinion, but, you know, I find that asking a specific question obviously is very, very important. Mr. Burland?

MR. BURLAND:

2.

Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to try to refocus my question because I would like to get a DNR staff response to, I guess, the question that I'm going to ask, and that is; given all that's before us and what's transpired with the opinions in the legislation, are there any affirmative acts that a permittee or water - a ground water permittee from DNR or one that's registered, is there any affirmative action that that must be taken now that - in order for them to continue what they're doing? Does this prohibit anything that they're doing at this point? I just need a general statement as to what current water users - ground water users have to do in consequence to these --

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

I would answer that. None of the legislation addresses ground water issues. This is strictly surface water — the opinions are based on surface water. The opinions all ask questions about surface water. None of the legislation that was adopted sets up a difficult management regime for ground water of the ones we're referencing here. There may be others that I'm not, you know, particularly aware of today.

1	But what was happening for ground
2	water permittees prior to these opinions is
3	unchanged after these opinions. This is strictly
4	surface water use only. Okay?
5	MR. BURLAND:
6	Yes. Thank you.
7	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
8	Mr. Frey?
9	MR. FREY:
10	I'd like to second what Mr. Loewer
11	suggested. I made a note that I think we need to
12	have Ms. Allgood and Mr. Seidemann from the AG's
13	Office at a workshop so we can get into these
14	opinions. And a point of clarification,
15	Mr. Chairman, on Act 955.
16	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
17	955?
18	MR. FREY:
19	Right.
20	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
21	Yes, sir.
22	MR. FREY:
23	Am I interpreting that
24	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
25	What page and what part are you on?

,	
1	MR. FREY:
2	The last page.
3	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
4	Page
5	MR. FREY:
6	The back page.
7	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
8	Page 6?
9	MR. FREY:
10	Page 6 of 6.
11	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
12	Um-hum.
13	MR. FREY:
14	If I interpret
15	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
16	I'm sorry. What line?
17	MR. FREY:
18	What line? Line 14 through 17.
19	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
20	Yes, sir.
21	MR. FREY:
22	I interpret that to mean that the
23	provisions of this Act will be null and void after
24	December 31st, 2012; so that's a sunset date for
25	that act?

2.

2.2

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

That's correct. That's a sunset date for that, that's correct. It is hopeful — the reason that that particular sentence is in there, it is — it is the legislature's hope that the work of this Commission in the development of a comprehensive water resources management plan will be adopted and this short-term piecemeal solution will be only that, serving in the interim to provide some process for the stakeholders. Mr. Coleman?

MR. COLEMAN:

I think you partly answered my question already, is, I was wondering if it wouldn't be good to encourage that these questions regarding water be directed through yourself or the Commission so that we get as full and complete an answer as possible. I think that does happen sometimes; you ask a question but then when you get the answer it really doesn't solve the issue that you have.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Right.

MR. COLEMAN:

And so it might be that if we people were to choose to do that, it might help to
do it, I think. The other thing that I wanted to

mention was as I was sitting here looking, maybe out of content, but if we could get this kind of information about what's going to be presented at these meetings, where we can look it over a week beforehand so that you could make notes on what questions you want to ask because you get a general gist of what's fixing to happen so that we can do a little studying before we come here and be prepared to participate in a better way.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Sure. A point well made. Obviously, the staff is going as quickly as they can to get it in advance. What I'm hearing is that that's not meeting the expectations; so I would request that we find a way to get all of the information that is presented at these meetings to the Commission members perhaps seven days prior.

And I realize that much of that is often as you are waiting for clearance from me to approve documents; so that is not to reflect poorly on the staff as much as it is on the leadership which falls on my shoulders. So a point well made, and we'll redouble our efforts to get you that information —

MR. COLEMAN:

1 When possible. 2. LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 3 Sure. No. It's a good point. I 4 mean, obviously if we want folks to serve in a 5 voluntarily capacity and use their intellect to come 6 and help make good decisions, you need good, timely 7 information. I don't take it personally. 8 appreciate that. 9 Okay. I would like to then go -- are 10 there any other questions? Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. 11 The next item -- I would like to go a little bit out 12 of order to accommodate the schedule of Mr. Patrick 13 Forbes. We are going to go to Item 8B, and I'm 14 going to ask Mr. Forbes, who is with the Louisiana 15 Recovery Authority, to address the issue of 16 Katrina/Rita damage water well issues that we have 17 had for now some time. 18 Mr. Forbes, welcome to the 19 Commission. Thank you for being here. 20 MR. FORBES: 21 Thank you, Lt. Governor and 2.2 Commissioners. Thank you for having me here to talk 23 about the funding source. Just a little bit of 24 background. Right after Katrina and Rita, one of

the things that the Department of Natural Resources

recognized as a potential issue was busted water wells at private properties that would potentially not be eligible for FEMA repair and consequently need some funding source.

They worked with EPA to get some funding to do the study. The study revealed that there were 174 high and moderate risk open well heads, if you will, that we all felt potentially endangered aquifers and the resources of the State.

Consequently, the Louisiana Recovery Authority allocated \$360,000 to go do repairs to as many of these wells as we can. This is through a program called the Local Government Infrastructure Program. It is a program that's designed to address unmet needs from other programs. We have lots of infrastructure problems in Katrina/Rita disaster recovery, but not every need is met, and this is one that showed up as being urgent.

The process for this funding is we entertain a pre-application which we have received, we've approved that. The purposes of pre-application is to establish the eligibility of the project for the program. By all accounts, by our review of that pre-application, it is, in fact, an eligible expense.

The next thing is that an application is developed. I want to let you know that the disaster recovery unit pays the consultants who are developing these pre-applications and applications. There's very specialized knowledge required in spending CDBG funds. We don't expect every single applicant to develop that knowledge just for this one little piece of work that we need to do; so we provide that.

The role of the Department of Natural Resources is to go out and get the contractor to actually do the work. So consequently -- sorry. Pre-application complete, approved. Application currently under development. There's a deadline of October 31st. I've spoken with the consultants working on this. They don't see that as an issue for completion. Shouldn't have any problem meeting that deadline.

Once that application is approved, you essentially go hire contractors who go to the work of plugging and abandoning the identified damaged wells.

The \$360,000 in looking at the report that was funded and in talking with DNR personnel may not be enough to do all the wells. I'm certain

1 that the approach will be to address the most urgent 2. ones first and move down the line. At this point, 3 that's all the funding that's available for the 4 effort right now. 5 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 6 Thank you, Mr. Forbes. How many 7 high-priority wells do we have on that list? 8 MR. FORBES: 9 Twenty. 10 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 11 Twenty. And we had some medium 12 priorities? 13 MR. FORBES: 14 154 moderate according to the report. 15 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 16 Okay. And I know that we have been 17 working with you and your organization to get to 18 this point. I want to specifically acknowledge the 19 efforts of Mr. Robert Benoit with the Department of 20 Natural Resources who has followed this like a 21 bulldog to make certain that we would not get left 2.2 out. We view this as very important. 23 I do appreciate the fact that you 24 obviously have been drinking from a fire house, to 25 borrow a cliche, with all of the issues you have

1 had, but I certainly would say this: If it were not 2. for Mr. Benoit, I'm not so sure that this one 3 wouldn't have been part of the unfunded stack, and I 4 say that with all respect to the process. 5 Having said that, we are excited 6 about the fact that you are here and we look forward 7 to moving this. We believe it is appropriate use of 8 those funds as we try to mitigate those issues from 9 Katrina and Rita. So thank you very much. 10 Any other questions from the 11 Commission for Mr. Forbes? Thank y'all very much. 12 Thank you, Mr. Forbes. I appreciate you being here. 13 MR. FORBES: 14 Thanks very much. 15 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 16 Thank you. Okay. We're going go to 17 Item Number 6, which is a update from Mr. Rick Heck 18 on the Surface Water Cooperative Endeavor Agreement 19 that, again, is a result and a consequence of Act 20 Number 955. Mr. Heck? 21 MR. HECK: 2.2 Lt. Governor, Commission members, 23 ladies and gentlemen, my name is Rick Heck. I am 24 the Petroleum Lands Director for the Office of 25 Mineral Resources which is the staff of the

2.

2.2

Louisiana Mineral and Energy Board which had the task of approving the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement.

Act 955 was a result of a focal incident; and that is, the discovery in the Haynesville Shale of massive amounts of gas, the production of which requires a process called a fracing process which uses an unprecedented amount, enormous amounts of water, millions of gallons, and that water could not be supplied totally by underground aquifers; so the use of surface running water became a big issue.

With the need, there was a potential for chaos and conflicts over the uncontrolled water use of surface running water with riparian land owners, with the water systems with industry.

So Act 955 was passed to provide Louisiana's first running surface water management tool to provide orderly safe access to this valuable resource.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Mr. Heck, excuse me. I just want to make sure that while I certainly do appreciate the fact that you have mentioned the fracing process to produce Haynesville Shale gas requires unprecedented

use of enormous amounts of water, two things I would say to that is that the - what is happening in the Haynesville Shale I would just say for the record is creating an economic driver for the State, and I know that your comment was not intended to be the contrary of that; and that is, improving - with some challenges improving the quality of our fiscal situation in the State.

The second thing is, it is not only the legislation that was drafted and the opinions that were issued, not only - did not only effect the use of surface water for natural gas exploration, but, rather, it is for anyone who wants to use running water - running waters of the State that are - that fall into the legislation that are non-riparian owners, correct?

MR. HECK:

Correct.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Right. So if you are in the timber business or you're in the industrial manufacturing business or you're in any type of business where you're a non-riparian owner, you would be subject to what we're talking about here.

MR. HECK:

That's correct. And later on in the - I do mention those kinds of issues.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

And timber might be agriculture. I saw Mr. Burland jump up.

MR. HECK:

And I also want to mention again that because we deal with the oil and gas industry, when I say we, I'm talking about our office, the Mineral Resources in the Mineral and Energy Board, we certainly don't want to downplay the effect or the results of the Haynesville Shale and the economic benefits to the State and to the people of the State. The issue was that the process by which this gas was recovered required such a great amount of water that it became a focal issue as to the rights of the various people who had the need for the water; so 955 was passed to help and begin the process of — an orderly process of safe access.

And it was a result, again, as we mentioned earlier of certain Attorney General's opinions, one of which said that under the Louisiana law persons with the possible exception of riparian land owners are not authorized to remove state-owned surface water without obtaining the prior written

2.

approval of the State and without paying fair value.

In subsequent Attorney General's opinions, it stated that the waters are owned by the State in its capacity as a public person that holds it in trust for the people of the State.

Further Attorney General opinion says that the waters are a thing of value that belongs to the people of the State of Louisiana and that the waters must be purchased pursuant to the laws governing the sale of State property if it is to be used for anything other than a public purpose.

When I mention that, it refers to Constitution Article VII, Section 14 which prohibits the donation of State property, and a public purpose cooperative endeavor agreement is the one exception to the Constitution to that donation.

Further, the Attorney General said that in the sale of surface water it must be in writing in the form of a contract or a cooperative endeavor agreement, the cooperative endeavor agreement being the exception to Article VIII, Section 14 of the Constitution. It must be approved by the Secretary of Natural Resources and the Attorney General and it must be for fair value.

The legislation was again enacted to

provide clear and specific statutory authority meeting applicable constitutional mandates to provide for the sale of the running waters for commercial purposes.

Again, I mentioned two constitution articles here that do have an effect on this, and that is Article VII, Section 14 which is — says that, "Except as otherwise provided by this constitution," which is the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement, "the property or things of value of the State or any political subdivision shall not be donated to or for any person, association or corporation, public or private.

Article IX, Section 1 which deals, of course, with natural resources, it says, "The natural resources of the State, including air and water, shall be protected, conserved, and replenished insofar as possible and consistent with the health, safety, and welfare of the people."

So Act 955 had to complied with both of these - if you want to call them restrictions, and it was done so that a cooperative endeavor agreement or a contract could be used to - use of surface running water without violating the terms of that.

2.

2.2

Now, who is included in the new law? In other words, which parties are governed by, if you will? It is commercial users who are not riparian owners who seek to withdraw water from the running surface waters of the State. And a riparian owner is defined as one whose land touches the source of the surface water.

So Act 955 particularly does not affect the riparian owner and his rights which are in the Civil Code.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Let me just again make the point that Act 955 does not require any commercial user to follow this process; so, again, a commercial — the Attorney General has issued an opinion. This law does not codify that opinion. It simply makes a permissive process available for those folks who wish to avail themselves to it.

So normally laws require people to do things. This law only sets up a process for those folks who wish to do those things of which we have to follow so that we can have transparency.

MR. HECK:

The user groups or the groups that are specifically exempted from this statute are the

2.

riparian owners, public and private water systems and agriculture users; so those are not governed by this.

Both potential and the real effects on the sustainability of the water body must also be considered on navigation and on the environment and ecology balanced against social and economic benefits of the contract for withdrawal. So all of these factors must be considered in the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement and with the uses of water that is going to be obtained under the contract.

Also, it must be considered whether the proposed use is consistent with Louisiana's comprehensive master plan for a sustainable coast.

There is a priority of use of running surface water. The first priority is human consumption via a public water system or a private water system that provides domestic potable water service. The second is agricultural uses that provide sustenance to animals or irrigation to plants. And the third is the commercial or industrial activity. These are the -- when I say priorities, these are the priorities that the Secretary of DNR must consider when a proposed Cooperative Endeavor Agreement is applied for.

2.2

Also, impacts, that must be considered, and there are several of those. One is the stream or water flow energy, sediment land and distribution, navigation, aquatic life, and other vegetation or wildlife. All of these are scientific, if you will, elements that must be consider and weighed against the amount of usage under any particular cooperative endeavor agreement.

The Secretary is required to make sure that each withdrawal agreement provides for the Secretary's authority to protect the resource and to maintain sustainability and environmental and ecological balance. The action that may be taken by the Secretary under any cooperative endeavor agreement and entered into must allow for the suspension or termination of the withdrawal water and other necessary actions. Again, the balancing act that has to be considered. And the authority has to be with the Secretary to be able to accomplish that.

Upon the signing of Act 955 into law, the Chairman of the Ground Water Commission and Lt. Governor, Scott Angelle, established a task force to draft a cooperative endeavor agreement, to draft an application for the cooperative endeavor agreement,

2.

to contact existing commissions and water districts to gather information on their processes, and to gather federal, other state and local government requirements for implementation.

And pursuant to that, the Chairman distributed draft applications which the Task Force came up with, and I was a member of that Task Force, draft applications and the agreement forms to various stakeholders for comments on July 15th of 2010.

Those comments were received from the stakeholders, not all of them at that time, and were considered by the Task Force and were appropriately incorporated into the draft agreement. It says before you today for consideration and approval.

This was a presentation from the Mineral and Energy Board for their approval. And I might say that the form itself of the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement was presented to the Mineral and Energy Board last week at their meeting on Wednesday, and the Board did approve that form.

Now, before I go any further, I'd like to mention that that form is not an absolute in-stone form. It is going to be a living agreement. It is form, if you will, 1.0 simply

2.

2.2

because, again, at the time it was confected we did not have all of the comments from the various stakeholders that were presented with the document for review.

Likewise, we -- and the reason for getting it out, I guess, as quickly, it may seem like it was too quick, but the process had to be accomplished because when the Act was signed into law, a provision of Act 955 states that if there is another agency that has the authority to sell water, and there are a few, that whatever agreements they enter into to use that - withdraw and use surface running water must comply with the form that is approved by the Mineral and Energy Board.

So if we had waited until we had all of the items in and all of the comments from the stakeholders, that form may not be out there yet. And, yet, there are water authorities such as the Red River Commission and the Sabine River Authority that are — and the Sabine River Authority is a different animal. I'll use the Red River Commission, for example. They have the authority to sell running water. They have applications, and they actually have signed agreements that were signed before this Act was passed into law. But

after the Act was passed into law, which was
July the 2nd of 2010, under this Act, whatever
agreements that they entered into must have passed
muster with the form that was approved by the
Mineral Board.

So the idea was to get a form out there that as best we could met the requirements of Act 955 so that the number of applications and water use that were already in the pipeline, if you will, could as closely as possible meet the requirement of Act 955.

And, again, we are considering now comments that are coming in from other stakeholders. They have been considered. We will have further meetings, if you will, to tweak the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement to make it more in response to the stakeholders' comments. And, with that, I would be glad to answer any questions from the Commission.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. Before I go to questions, again, I want to thank you and the State Mineral Board and would just make a comment to Representative Morris and Representative Burford that your hard work did obviously, you know, prove that the State was capable of moving in a really

1 accelerated fashion. 2. It's my understanding that there were 3 perhaps over 50 different requests that various 4 water districts had in advance of this legislation 5 being passed and as this form was being developed; 6 so, again, I think you did the right thing to move 7 in an accelerated fashion. You cannot let 8 perfection be the enemy of good, and certainly you are correct that like the other forms that we have 9 in government, we can have 2.0 and 3.0. There's no 10 11 limit on the number of times that we can continue to 12 receive stakeholder input and improve that process. 13 So a job well done. Mayor Hollingsworth? 14 MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH: 15 Yes, sir. Mr. Heck, I wanted to ask 16 you about the term "public purpose." Does this 17 Act -- was it a public purpose before this Act was 18 passed or did this Act make it a public purpose and 19 set up the process, or was it a public purpose? 20 MR. HECK: 21 Are you talking about the water use 2.2 or the form itself? 23 MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH: 24 Water use, right.

MR. HECK:

Okay. A public purpose under the Constitution and the need for a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement — I don't know if you have a form in front of you, but the form is available on our website. But if you'll look at the form, there are two amendeds of a applicant, if you will, paying the State. One is paying a certain amount of money per gallon — per thousand gallons. Another form of payment, if you will, is to show a public purpose to show that an economic benefit is being derived in the form of taxes — local taxes, jobs, those kinds of things.

That is the kind of public purpose that is contemplated in the Constitution as being an exception to the donation; in other words, if you show that public purpose — and, again, it's not defined in the Constitution, but if you show that the agreement is producing an effect, an economic effect or whatever, that is in the public purpose, and that means beneficial to the parties, the members, the citizens of the State of Louisiana, it will be an exception to the prohibition against donation of State properties.

So the idea in the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement was to provide two methods, and

2.

an applicant can do either one. It can use the public purpose or it can pay the State a given amount of money per thousand gallons or whatever, and it still has to be fair market value. It still has to be - measure those economic benefits against the environmental and ecological impacts.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Let me give you another example that you may be a little bit more familiar with. When the State decided to give \$65 million to the chicken process and manufacturer in Farmerville, I believe, the fact that the State of Louisiana would be given cash to a private corporation in and of itself would be a prohibited donation of the State's resources.

To perfect that situation and to make sure it is not a donation, a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement was entered into by the State of Louisiana, and Party A -- I'm not sure what the correct name of Party A is, and Party A has an enforceable - has a duty and obligation to provide certain types of jobs, "X" amount of payroll over a period of time of which there are clawback provisions in the event that those objectives are not met.

So I'm not sure -- there's nothing in

2.

the agreement - in the legislation that says oil and gas development is a public purpose. Public purpose is defined at what time - or what is it, in fact, the State is getting for the use of their resource in this instance.

So if the State is getting a return that is at least equal or greater to that of which they are providing in terms of dollar values, than it is considered a public purpose.

MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH:

I just know it's a problem when we try to do anything at the City; so. . .

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Right. And you are entitled to avail yourselves to that same cooperative endeavor agreement in local government as well.

You obviously have the same constitutional prohibition against donations of your assets, your money, your things, your labor; however, if you can provide a public purpose that passes muster, than they can be used.

Again, the value from which the State is getting or the municipality or parish has to be equal or greater than that of which they are given.

Mr. Owen?

2.

MR. OWEN:

I was curious, Mr. Chairman, to know since Mr. Heck has been absolutely silent on how you determine fair value. Does the State consider all waters to be created equal regardless of where you may withdraw the water, and, if so, why?

MR. HECK:

Well, as a matter of fact, that question came up to the Task Force when the Agreement was being put together, and the task that was given to us was to find out what - who had been doing this prior? And the Sabine Water Authority is one agency that has been selling water, if you will, for a very long period of time, and to find out how they valued the water.

Now, if you say it's - their value may be different there than it is any other place, you may be correct, and that may be something that in the future for this particular agreement or type of agreement we may take into consideration in the iteration of 1.1. But for right now we don't have the luxury of having all of the assessments of value of water; so we use the best assessment we can get, which, again, are those entities that have been selling water, if you will, for a period of time and

2.

what they use as a basis for their valuation. And we set that value until further study is done and we may be able to make a more-informed -- and there is a provision in the agreement, by the way, that gives an escalating clause of the value based upon usual economic terms on a yearly basis.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

And, again, let me just jump in here because that's a great question, one that we struggled with. Unlike real estate where, you know, perhaps you can have fair market value determined by a variety of appraisers looking at a situation where you have a willing buyer and a willing seller and can develop a variety of methodologies to come to a conclusion on what water may be worth, we all know that property at a interstate exit is going to be worth more than one that may be a mile away from a interstate exit. We know that water in a area where there is a acute shortage is going to have more of a monetary value than where we have a excess supply.

We struggle with this issue and basically in an attempt -- again, the Attorney General's opinion said that the State must receive fair market value. The Attorney General's opinions didn't define fair market value. Fair market value

1 is, again, generally - not using Black's Law 2. Dictionary here, but that which of what a reasonably 3 motivated buyer would pay to a reasonably motivated 4 seller. 5 There is not a history of documents 6 that we can use to govern this. The only real issue 7 we have is that of the Sabine River Authority, which 8 we think represents, again, the totality of what we 9 have for purchases of surface water, and we will use 10 that and we will defend that as the best research we 11 have until otherwise additional research is 12 available for us to use. Mr. Owen? 13 MR. OWEN: 14 That's it. 15 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 16 Okay. I'm sorry. I thought you came 17 up again. I'm sorry. Thank you. Okay. Any other 18 questions for Mr. Heck? Okay. Very good. Thank 19 you, Mr. Heck. 20 Okay. Item Number 8 -- I'm sorry. 21 Item Number 7, United States Department of the 2.2 Interior Cooperative Watershed Management Program. 23 Mr. John Adams? 24 MR. ADAMS: 25 Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. As you are

aware, the DNR recently received a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Ken Salazar, to the Governor of Louisiana, Bobby Jindal, discussing the cooperative watershed management program. Most of you received a copy of this letter and we forwarded it on to all of you, and in response to that, we received numerous questions.

As a result, I contacted John Tubbs, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water and Science with the Department of the Interior. He's the gentleman that's been put in charge of this particular program, and Mr. Tuggs explained to me that although the - this particular program became law in 2009, it has not received an appropriation yet, and, therefore, has not been funded. As such, the program is still in the information-gathering stage; that is, he's still in the process of establishing a list of contacts with each state to determine the State's desire and necessity to participate in this program.

Governor Jindal has appointed a contact from Louisiana. The contact is Chris Piehler, the Water Quality Assessment Division Administrator with the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality. I spoke with Mr. Piehler,

2.

2.2

and he has received the questionnaire from the Secretary of the Interior's Office, and he has completed and returned that questionnaire, in which he did state that Louisiana has a very high need and does desire to participate in the program.

The only other interesting thing that came out of the conversation with Mr. Tubbs is that, although the law contemplates working with small local watershed groups, Mr. Tubbs has informed me that for logistical purposes that the program may not end up being implemented in that way. The watershed groups are more likely than not going to be done on a statewide basis.

And Chris - Mr. Piehler and I have maintained communication and will continue to monitor the development of the program, and should it be funded or should some other development take place, I will make sure and forward that information to you. Basically, that's everything.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Mr. Loewer?

MR. LOEWER:

Yes, sir. I would question why would DEQ be involved and not the Office of Conservation?

MR. ADAMS:

```
1
                     That's a question you'll have to
2.
     ask --
3
                MR. LOEWER:
4
                     What's the rationale for that? I
5
     just wanted to --
6
                MR. ADAMS:
7
                     That's a question you'll have to ask
8
     the Governor's Office. I'm not sure, other than the
9
     Water Quality Assessment Division seemed to be a --
10
                LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
11
                     Let me try to answer that question so
12
     that Mr. Adams doesn't rapidly put himself in
13
     jeopardy with the Governor's Office.
14
                MR. ADAMS:
15
                     Thank you, sir.
16
                LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
17
                     You needed a lifeline very badly
18
     right there. The Federal Government requests that
19
     there be a point of contact on this, and it is
20
     appropriate for DEQ to be their point of contact,
21
     but, certainly, State Government will reach back
22
     into the organizations, whether it be DOTD, DNR and
23
     certainly DEQ, to provide a coordinated cooperation
24
     with the Federal Government on this. Thank you.
25
                     Okay. We will now go to Item Number
```

8A and hear a report from Mr. Gary Snellgrove on - an update on where we are on the entire Ground Water Resources Program.

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Okay. Thank you, Chair. Just to start off, first of all, this is where we're going to run through here, but basically I'm going to start off first with bringing you up to speed as to where we are with the evolution of the Water Well Driller Program. That was merged with DNR back - effective March 1st of this year of 2010. Since that time, we've had two major milestones that we - that we want to announce at this point. One is our efforts to put out by September 20th, 2010 in the State Register as an appropriate announcement revisions to Title 56 that governors or regulates water well drillers licensing and also water well construction. It's going to be an open process.

We're going to put this together for soliciting comment, very similar to what we're doing with this workshop and the plan, and, incidentally, putting this out at this time is timely; in that, our contractor for the State Water Well Management Plan will have the opportunity to review the same information and provide their input on that revision

also.

2.

Again, we will notify all and provide a link to those draft proposed regulations as they will be put out, and we look forward to your comments.

Secondly, we -- part of the drive or motivation to bring the two agencies' programs under one umbrella was to provide for greater efficiences in State Government, and, certainly, one of the major aspects of that is to have one way to manage the data of which we get massive amount of data from the water well drillers as they drill the wells and provide notification, and also under the existing DNR statutes that provide for water well owners to provide prior notification to our agency for certain types of wells to be evaluated prior to their installation.

I'm very pleased at this point in time, as I have been announcing it in several meetings past that we would get to this point in time where we have merged the databases, and we're at that point in time now.

And so we brought in some technical staff from the Information Technology Group under DNR that will provide to you, you know, a live

2.

demonstration of what we can do and what you can do with the information that's out there now and made available.

MR. AHMED:

Good afternoon, Lt. Governor and Commissioners, Representatives, thank you for the opportunity. As you can tell by my name and also accent, I'm a cajun. No. I have actually gone and did a speech in Washington, D.C. one time and there were a lot of people there, and the only way — by the way, I just mentioned very quickly that I'm a cajun and just continued my speech, and nobody said anything except one guy who said, "No, you're not. I'm from Lafayette."

Basically what we have been able to do is to -- we had a lot of technical difficulties to move the information from the Department of Transportation to DNR, and one of the biggest challenges was the technology. The technology that had been used at DOTD and DNR was completely different, but we were able to overcome it. We are there, and I think when you look at it, you will be pleased at what we have been able to achieve. It's a little bit more than what DOT has been offering to the general public.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Only a couple of things I will just tell you. I don't want to bore you. I think you want to see the demo. It's much better than just me The two things is very important for you to understand. The data that we were able to pull from the Department of Transportation. Department of Transportation system was very forgiving; they would accept anything. And that has created a lot of challenge for us because our system is a little bit tight. You know, everything has to be - constraint has to be there. So we have a lot of challenges to make sure the data is consistent. From there forward, we will make sure everything is more consistent and that will give you a better report or that will give the general public a better report.

We will also be able to continue providing the information to the various agencies just like DOTD has done in the past and perhaps provide them in a manner that they are expecting a lot more quicker direct -- DNR usually give a direct access; so if an agency is capable, we can give them a direct access and they will get the data a much better way than they have gotten in the past.

And, thirdly, what I would like to

2.

tell you is that we respect everybody's privacy; so, therefore, we are not going to display the information which we should not display. Obviously, there are a lot of information that is available with us and with people's inquires. When they ask for more information, we will be able to really accommodate them, just like we do in the SONRIS system for Oil and Gas Industry; we react to people very, very quickly. As soon as they come and ask us what they want, we are able to really react very quickly, and we will continue to react in the downloaded system as well.

So having all said that, what we are going to see today very quickly is to how you are able to access from DOTD and the comparable information that you will see from DNR website, and at the same time, Dustin will be able to show you some of the improvements we were able to make and more improvement about to come.

After the demo, we will address the Commission to really give us a go ahead. At that time, we will basically have everything available — things are available now, but we will then request DOTD to start displaying the information for public and DNR. Thank you. Dustin?

2.

MR. EWING:

Good afternoon everyone. My name is Dustin Ewing. I'm with the Office of Conservation for DNR. I primarily work with the water well registration and drillers licensing programs. As you see here, I'm going to give you a brief overview of what was previously offered with the DOTD public databases and what is now being with the DNR databases.

As you can see here up on the screen, this is DOTD's register water well database. And basically there is three different ways you can search the water well information, but, unfortunately, we are tied to choosing a parish. You download your parish, you're kind of stuck, but that's semi appropriate. Three different ways are you can search by section, township, and range. Select buyers. If you know the well owner, you can also search within a certain mile radius.

For example, if you just pick a particular section, township or range, you could search for it, and it provides you all the useful information we have in the database on that particular well, including, latitude, longitude, the driller's name, who owns the well, all the

1 information about that well. 2. You could also search for, let's say, 3 my last name. You could search all the wells that 4 have the name Ewing tied to it. In this case, 5 there's only three water wells that's owned by a 6 Ewing in Acadia Parish. You could also search by 7 latitude and longitude. So if you want to do a 8 quarter-mile search --9 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 10 I'm assuming you can't make this any 11 bigger. 12 MR. EWING: 13 No, sir. I've tried. 14 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 15 For the Commission members that are 16 looking to the left and right, you may want to look 17 behind you. 18 MR. EWING: 19 You can search by a particular lat 20 and long. It gives you all the wells within a 21 quarter-mile radius if that's the particular 2.2 distance you want to search. Of that particular lat 23 and long, it gives you all the same useful 24 information on a preview display. 25 This is a great website. It offers

1 plenty of good information, but we decided to take 2. it an extra step further. We wanted to kind of 3 expand on it and give you more options for being 4 able to search the water well information. 5 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 6 Okay. So, so far what you've shown 7 us, should we be impressed? 8 MR. EWING: 9 No, sir. This is what the DOTD was previously offering --10 11 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 12 I just want to make sure that what 13 I'm seeing when I get there I'm impressed by it. 14 MR. EWING: 15 It's all pretty basic. It's all easy 16 to understand, easy to use it. It's all user 17 friendly. 18 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 19 All right. You're getting to the 20 Cadillac? 21 MR. EWING: 2.2 This is giving the DNR's version of 23 the Cadillac now. Our website is -- you can click 24 on SONRIS. Click on SONRIS Lite. Scroll down to 25 the bottom. You have four ways you can search for

1 water wells. Basically, it's all the same functions 2. that were previously displayed. You can search by 3 section, township, and range. You can pick your 4 parish. 5 Basically, it provides all of the 6 same useful information that was carried over from 7 the DOTD's website. You can do the same searches. 8 You can search by well owners; you can search by 9 latitude and longitude. Or if you don't know who 10 the owner of the well is, this is an extra feature 11 you can include. You don't know who the well owner 12 is, don't really know where it's located but you 13 happen to know the well number, you can type that in 14 and search for the well number. 15 It's all the same useful information. 16 DOT --17 MR. AHMED: 18 Hold one second. Amedical said this 19 AHMED is talking and DNR, you can actually search 20 independently from anything; so this is one 21 improvement there. Do you want to show the other? 22 MR. EWING: 23 Sure. You can search by owner --24 MR. AHMED: 25 No, no, no.

1 MR. EWING: 2. We also offer what we call a query 3 page. If you scroll down underneath Conservation to 4 Ground Water Information, you can search water well registration information. In this particular page, 5 6 you can query for every water well in Louisiana or 7 you can query for any particular water well in any 8 particular Parish. 9 Say if you want to look, for example, for water wells in Caddo Parish that are, say, 10 11 irrigation wells or let's just try registered supply 12 wells, we can do that, and it will give every water 13 well in Caddo Parish that is a registered supply 14 well. This is very useful information for some 15 people who are trying to do large studies to see 16 where the well is located and what kind of 17 information the wells contain. 18 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 19 And here to before that information 20 was not available? 21 MR. EWING: 2.2 No, sir. 23 MR. AHMED: 2.4 No, sir. 25 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

1	So to get the value of what we're
2	talking about, what was before - what was available
3	before was a parish search?
4	MR. EWING:
5	Correct.
6	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
7	Not by type?
8	MR. EWING:
9	Not by type. You could input it into
10	Excel and filter it but
11	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
12	Okay.
13	MR. EWING:
14	this way it offers all the
15	information up front.
16	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
17	So you just have more options to mine
18	the data?
19	MR. EWING:
20	Correct.
21	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
22	All right.
23	MR. EWING:
24	Like I said, all of these fields are
25	searchable. You can search for wells for a

2.

2.2

particular water well size. You can search for particular well types. You can even search by owners, and you can also search by aquifer types. You can also do the same thing with water well drillers.

DOTD did offer a list of all of the water well drillers in Louisiana.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

reflection of DOTD. What this is more, is that, the computer system that the Department of Natural Resources had acquired over the years and its leadership has done a great job made it very suitable to have — to pull up water well — to pull water wells into that. Okay. So I don't want this to be a reflexion of somebody at DNR is better than somebody at DOTD because that is absolutely not the case. It's just a matter of being able to take advantage of a system, streamline government, and have one system as opposed to two.

MR. EWING:

Correct. DOTD also offered what was called a GIS water well search feature, and you could search pretty much the entire Louisiana looking for particular water wells. So if you

wanted to look in Pointe Coupee Parish for water wells, the downfall with this particular system is you had to literally know where the water well was and know the area and go on and search to where you thought the water well was located. Then you could use any of these little search tools at the top and select the water well and get the information that was attached to it. We offered the same thing through our public GIS system underneath the interactive maps.

I'll highlight some of the features that DOTD previously didn't offer but now we are. For starters, if you were confused about the geology or you wanted to know the geology for a particular location, you click on the Geology tab and it would populate the different geology regions here in Louisiana.

If you were particularly interested in one, you click on the Identify button and select where you think that geology is. You could do the same thing for aquifers. If you were also interested in, say, the areas of ground water concern, we also have that available to the public, as well as about 12 different imagery and different kinds of maps.

1	
1	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
2	Can you click on the areas of ground
3	water concern and show the wells in that area?
4	MR. EWING:
5	Sure. You can click this little box
6	feature over here; so you can select one area and
7	zoom into it in a lot of different parishes, and you
8	can populate water wells.
9	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
10	So that box indicates what?
11	MR. EWING:
12	That box is the area of ground water
13	concern within that particular area.
14	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
15	That box is an area of ground water
16	concern?
17	MR. EWING:
18	Correct.
19	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
20	And can you give me more information
21	about what's going on in those little squares?
22	MR. EWING:
23	Sure. If you highlight Water Wells,
24	and we can actually tabulate - provided the well
25	numbers as you can see, take this box once you
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

1 highlight the water registration field, you can 2. select on individual boxes or any number of them 3 that you like, and it provides all the information 4 for that particular water well. 5 It tells you its description, water 6 well casing, who owns it, so on and so forth. 7 MR. JOHNSTON: 8 It summarizes all the wells in a box. 9 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 10 Okay. Without trying to make this --11 I get a little concerned when I - when we continue 12 to talk about -- and I know you're trying to do a 13 before and after, but I don't want this to be a DNR 14 gets the gold star award and the DOTD gets a silver 15 star award. So, having said that, can you tell me 16 what the value of all of this is? I'm sure there 17 is, and I ask that question because I want it to be 18 publicly stated. Is this good for research? 19 MR. EWING: 20 Absolutely. All of this is available 21 to the public. 2.2 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 23 I understand who it's available 24 to, but can you tell me what specifically - what can 25 happen - not who, but what kind of research and

```
1
     discussion and analogies can begin to happen in
     Louisiana because of this improvement?
2.
3
                MR. JONES:
4
                     You can identify all public supply
5
     wells within that area.
6
                LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
7
                     Could we do that before?
8
                MR. EWING:
9
                     No, sir.
10
                LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
11
                     Could we identify public supply wells
12
     before? It's just a yes or no question. Could we
13
     identify public wells before this?
14
                MR. JONES:
15
                          That was not available on these
                     No.
16
     maps, no.
17
                LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
18
                     Okay. Well, DOTD is telling me yes;
19
     so let's throw that one out as a maybe.
20
                MR. JONES:
21
                     Well, then again --
2.2
                LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
23
                     I'm looking for -- you came up here
24
     and you did a very good job of selling us that we've
25
     got a super-duper situation, and I appreciate that,
```

2.

and I think you do, but I need somebody to articulate to the Commission on how this super-duper stuff is going to better allow us to split the atom bomb, by analogy. We're not splitting the atom bomb, please.

MR. SNELLGROVE:

No. This tool now is going to enable both the public, all users, as well as our staff to speed up the process of how we use the data. We use this data internally hourly. We evaluate water well locations.

Now we can -- we've got a system in place that we can populate quicker and that we can retrieve information quicker. It's about time management, and that's the advantage of this, both to us and to the public, to the users.

We're already getting positive feedback from the users on the outside. Consultants use this information daily, as we do. They go through and do environmental area reviews. Any information that they're able to get to today with fewer clicks of the bottom and that display that information and the ease of getting to it is where the advantages are.

Now, where we are right now is, is,

1 just basically putting out the same information that 2. DOTD offered, and Mr. Rizwan explained, you know, 3 pretty well why, because we have legal issues to 4 deal with with what we can and can't display over 5 the internet. So to stay within that legal 6 boundary, we are offering the exact same 7 information. It's not that we're providing more; 8 we're giving you a quicker way to access it. 9 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 10 Okay. 11 MR. SNELLGROVE: 12 Okay? 13 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 14 So, simply put, are -- what I was 15 looking for is, perhaps, will this allow us to do a 16 better job? I mean, and not us, but the entire 17 state to do a better job of managing the ground 18 water resources of the State? 19 MR. SNELLGROVE: 20 In my opinion, yes, sir, because it's 21 going to give us a tool that is going to be more 22 efficient and more effective in being able to get 23 information in a more timely manner and allowing for 24 us as the Commissioner and staff that's in charge 25 with implementing and enforcing and database

2.

2.2

population, all these things that we have to do on a day-to-day basis, it's going to make our jobs easier and allow us to do more.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. Let's just try what if and bring it down to a situation. If for whatever reason we were in, say, Northwest Louisiana where there's a lot of oil and gas activities and somebody were to go out to a particular site with a GPS and determine that there was a water well here at this particular site, would a user in the comfort of their home be able to go on to this system and determine if that particular water well was, in fact, registered with the State of Louisiana?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Yes.

MR. EWING:

Yes. That's one of the features we offer here. I didn't get a chance to explain.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. You realize that, you know, time is precious, and while I appreciate, you know, you doing a good job of kind of leading us up to it, I'm particularly interested in the ribeye on this deal and not the salad.

1	MR. EWING:
2	Fair enough.
3	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
4	Okay?
5	MR. EWING:
6	Okay.
7	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
8	So can we get to
9	MR. EWING:
10	We'll get right to it.
11	LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
12	Y'all did a really great job of
13	setting this up, and I'm on the edge of my seat
14	waiting to see the Super Bowl and I'm at a JV game.
15	MR. EWING:
16	Well, one of the most important
17	questions I get asked on a day to day basis is, some
18	people give me a particular lot/long and want to
19	know what the wells are or where it's located and
20	its neighboring wells around it. So, for instance,
21	you want to somebody gives me a particular
22	lat/long, they can go to their house and they can
23	plug it in themselves on our web page and see if the
24	water well is registered.
25	There it is in the blue dot right

1 So let's try to clean this up a little bit there. 2 so you can see it, draw a box around it, and it will 3 provide you with the information of all these wells. 4 So, in this particular instance, this 5 well belongs to Clyde Kimball. You can tell if his 6 water well is registered --7 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 8 You realize that that is the husband 9 of the Chief Justice of the Louisiana Supreme Court; 10 so be careful how you tread right now, a former 11 State Representative and a former member of the 12 State Mineral Board; so just be cautious. 13 MR. EWING: But this is how Mr. Kimball could see 14 15 if his water well was registered if he knew the 16 lat/long of this particular well. 17 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 18 And hurry up and say that it was 19 registered. 20 MR. EWING: 21 It was registered. Other features 22 are we can turn on our quad maps and we can find a 23 quadrangle, section, township and range. You can 24 zoom in, and you can see where it's located on the

map next to other landmarks.

If you wanted to do -- for instance, if you wanted to do a buffer search and you wanted to see how many water wells were within a quarter of a mile of the water well registered, you come here and search for water wells within, let's say, a half a mile, and it will provide every water well within a half a mile of his particular original well.

It provides all the information on those wells. If you want, you can turn on the names of those wells and you can have something to research by. If you perhaps wanted to see some satellite imagery of those particular wells, you can turn that on, zoom in, and see where that is in relation to other objects.

We even have a feature that you can turn on that will provide you the local roads and the primary roads. Zoom out a little bit so that's more clear. So that's just some of the features we offer for our online GIS database.

If there's any questions on how to use any of these tools, there's a little box at the top you can click on, and you can come across any of these features and click on them. It will give you a step-by-step direction on how to use it.

I feel this is very beneficial for us

1 because it provides everyone in the public the same 2. search opportunities we have as far as water wells. 3 If there's any questions, they are more than welcome 4 to use them. 5 MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH: 6 Do you have pumpage on these wells, 7 how they're used or anything so you can ascertain 8 what the draw is out of the aquifer that they're in? 9 MR. SNELLGROVE: 10 Wells, whenever they are drilled, 11 their drillers provide information as to the depth 12 and they do provide --MR. EWING: 13 14 They provide construction 15 requirements, how the well is constructed, the size 16 casing. We don't have pumping results attached to 17 this data just yet. 18 MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH: 19 Yeah, but you could get pretty close, 20 couldn't you? 21 MR. SNELLGROVE: 2.2 Yes, sir. And we understand, you 23 know, by case and size and limitations of the actual well construction itself on what the capabilities of 24 25 a well is and understand the aquifer carries risk.

2.

We can make good assessments as to what could be withdrawn from the well.

MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH:

Is there data that you keep that you're not able to make public but you keep it for overall use as far as strategic planning is concerned for water resources that you wouldn't make public but somebody needs to know what's going on?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Well, all the information that's in the public - in DNR, in our building is public, but as we had discussed earlier, there may be some issues with addresses and things of that nature that - due to Homeland Security and -- you know, after 911 things changed, and I believe that's what Mr. Rizwan was explaining, that our attorneys, both at DOTD and at DNR, went through a very detailed process to determine what could be legally, you know, put out on the internet and what could not.

We certainly -- as we get -- as we move forward and we get comments and provide more and more information out there, understand that in that process we're going to have to engage our legal staff and make sure that we stay within what we can and can't do as far as putting it out on the

internet.

2.

Usually what we do as a matter of public service is, certainly anybody who wants that type of information, we encourage them to come to the office and complete it or they can request it and we can provide it to them, but it will be a paper trail, a paper copy.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Mr. Coleman?

MR. COLEMAN:

Yes. One of the questions that I have, we got a recent report on a well being drilled. It's number 07-0146, and it's in Bienville Parish, the city of Arcadia, with a 10-inch casing and about 864,000-gallon capacity per day, and I notice that's a town of a little over 3,000, and the normal per person use is about 100-gallons per day, and that would appear to solve the needs of about 8,000 people, and they already have several other wells in place.

And our question was, is, this is put up as the public -- what is it; the public use wells? Can that water be used - sold to industry or used for other purposes, or what's -- what is the restrictions on that kind of a thing?

2.

2.2

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Mr. Snellgrove?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Yes. I'm familiar with the well that you're referring to. It is a -- it was notified that -- notification came to us for public supply use. That's the way it was identified as.

We ran it through our evaluation process, and based on the volume and — that they proposed to use the well for and the number of days that they proposed to use the well for, we didn't see that there was any adverse impact that was going to be — to our water wells or to the aquifer and the sustainability of the aquifer in that area.

The answer to your question is one more of, right, that's the City of Arcadia, to determine, you know, whether or not they're going to provide it to a population increase that may have occurred or if they were — if they intend to use it for other purposes that would be beneficial to the public.

I have to assume that they have a game plan with the well because they're not going to drill that size of a well without — with that type of investment without having some use for it.

1 Perhaps some of their other wells are experiencing 2. some problems and they need another well in reserve. 3 I would say this: From a standpoint 4 of what I appreciate the law to be on that situation 5 when it comes to what is the public supply and what 6 is not, I believe the law provides for public supply 7 wells to be a majority use for public supply 8 purposes as its defined in the acts - in the legislative acts and also in the regs. 9 10 So my information or the information 11 that we were provided doesn't indicate that it would 12 be - that it would not follow that requirement for 13 public supply use. 14 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 15 Okay. Do you want to continue on 16 with the presentation or -- I'm sorry to step up to 17 take a call. Does that pretty much finish with the 18 database? 19 MR. AHMED: 20 No, sir. We seek the permission of 21 the Commission to start using the system and --2.2 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 23 Okay. I'm not sure the Commission 24 actually has the jurisdiction over that matter. I 25 think that is actually -- you can take a look at

statutes, but I think that's the responsibility of the Commissioner as opposed to the Commission; so just get -- you know, get attorneys to check that out. But clearly the Commission does not have the authority to decide that issue. I appreciate you bringing it to the Commission, but the Commissioner is responsible for the day-to-day activities there, and get with him. If I'm wrong, then please come back to us.

I am particularly interested in hearing what members of the public and consultants have to say within the next, say, 60 to 90 days on this issue. So perhaps posting some opportunity for folks to comment the good, the bad, and the ugly about this particular version would be interesting, and I think the Commission would particularly be interested in those comments. Thank y'all very much.

MR. EWING:

Thank you.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

I appreciate it. Okay. Item -we've already taken care of 8B. We'll go to 8C.
And after 8C, I'm going to have to step out and ask
the Commissioner to be in the Chair.

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Okay. Well, then, on your PowerPoint presentation handouts that -- we're on Page 19. And recapping as we have been now for several meetings, you all are now familiar with the process on the work history reporting for oil and gas industry on frac water supply use.

As you know, we are tracking that information, and as part of our function here, it's to - you know, it's to provide you that information and provide - keep providing you updates on those statistics. So if we go to -- all right.

Okay. Right here is the latest statistics that we have on Haynesville Shale gas development and water use, and the statistics as we reported in the past, it shows you the breakdown of the percentage of surface water that's used for frac water supply versus the amount of water that's used from the ground water - from ground water resources.

And the important part here to understand is, is that, we've been tracking this now since 2009 back in - I believe it was October, and now we're here almost a full year, approaching a full year.

Of course, this date is set. It goes

to the end of July. But as of July 14, we have 423 frac jobs that have reported information to Item C to where we have, you know, developed the data from, and out of that total was 793 total work permits at that point in time that were issued.

This is tracking along due to - as expected due to the delays that are there in the oil and gas industry requirements to report the information. There's always going to be some delay there, obviously.

But the second point I want to make, is that, because of this, what we're seeing is the surface water frac supply number is basically staying the same as what we found when we did our first presentation here, with about half of the amount of reporting wells reporting. It's running between - you know, between 79 and 77, you know, give or take percentages here and there. So what that means to me is - from an objective standpoint is that we're gaining more reliability on the data that's being reported.

Obviously, when you initiate something, you're going to have some issues to deal with in the way people are reporting the information or not reporting it, et cetera. So we've come --

we've gotten through that, luckily, because we have a small set of operators that we deal with in the whole realm of things; so we were able to get more one-on-one with each and get them to report the information that we need in the manner that we need to see it and provide it.

So these statistics here reflect that we're running at that consistently, and now we do believe that we have some good reliable information at this time. And moving on to --

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Before you get there, do you have a breakdown by Parish?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

We do. It's in the Commissioner's report, July of 2010.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. Do you have -- just a couple of questions. Do you have a particular parish or region of the state that is tracking far different from this? Do you have a particular parish whose numbers are -- obviously, this is a total of the entire state, the 423 reporting wells which comes from various parishes. Do you have one parish or one aquifer that you have concern about?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Well, I can report this, of course, the Wilcox is always the focus as far as aquifers, and, hence, the reason why we're tracking is to keep an eye - a watchful eye on that.

I have not -- I personally -- and I don't have the information in front of me. I mean, I have it here, but it's buried in 123 pages and it'll take me a little bit of time to get to it, but it is available. You have a disc. Each of you has been provided a disc that's got that breakdown in detail, and you'll see if you look, we did add an extra chart. We put a horizontal border graph in there that shows a breakdown of - by aquifer for this data set, the aquifers that water is being drawn from, and the Sparta aquifer. The reason why we did that is because the Sparta aguifer did show up on a few frac jobs, and - but what we wanted to show is the relative - from a relative sense how much or how little Sparta water is being used in comparison to all of the other aquifers.

So I invite you to look at that information that's on this Commissioner's report, and we also have this report available on our internet; so you can review it by just clicking on

the link on the ground water page and go to that section on Haynesville Shale.

We added a new appendix in this report that we didn't have last year, obviously, and, so - and it's got all of the breakdown there, by parish, by aquifer, ponds, pits, surface water. It's pretty self explanatory.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. So just to restate my question. Is there a particular area of the state or a particular aquifer -- well, let me say area. I shouldn't say a -- a particular area of the state where you are seeing the use of ground water in fracing operations that does not reflect closely to this pie chart?

Asked another way, do we have areas of the State that are disproportionately using ground water instead of surface water for fracing wells?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Oh, well, absolutely, but I think you need to look at -- you need to understand the aquifer of interest. Perhaps, you know, the Red River is being tapped. In the parishes -- for instance, Red River Parish, it will show up in that

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

parish as being a large source for fracing purposes there.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

And you're okay with that because that particular aquifer does not have a high value for human consumption, correct?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

That's correct.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

All right. So let me restate my question again. Do you have -- do you have any areas of the State where you are very concerned about the use of ground water for fracing of wells in an aquifer that has a high value?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

We're keeping a watchful eye on the statistics as they come in. Yes, we do. I mean, we realize that DeSoto Parish is an area where there's high reliance upon the Wilcox Aquifer for domestic and public supply purposes.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. Can you -- I hate to keep you from moving on to your report, but I'm particularly interested in knowing that information, and while I hear you're telling me you've got a 129 report, I

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

see you've got a couple of staff members that probably could find that while we're waiting.

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Mr. Jones, do you have anything to add on that?

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. Before Mr. Jones -- do you have a copy of a report that shows a graph or a chart for another parish by parish.

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Well, we've got -- we've got all of the -- you're looking just for percentage of ground water use by parish?

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

I'm looking for this report - this diagram of what we have seen in the past where we have broken that down by parish. Okay? So as we try -- this is -- this is -- this is a tremendous success for what we have been able to do to get nearly 80 percent of the water that's used in the State of Louisiana for frac ground - natural gas wells to come from surface water. I don't want to delay a victory yet, but I'm very impressed. Okay? But I'm trying to find out if we have -- while we're doing okay, do we have a particular region that

1 needs a little bit more attention? 2. MR. SNELLGROVE: 3 Okay. I'm not finding it in this 4 information that I have on the desktop right now, 5 but we can certainly provide that information --6 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 7 Okay. 8 MR. SNELLGROVE: 9 -- as we are tracking it. We keep it 10 updated, and this same set of data here, as you 11 know, we -- you know, that information is there. 12 have it. We put it out there. If we don't have it, 13 we can make it; so. . . 14 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 15 Is it -- I guess what I would then 16 like to see as far - is two things, is, number one, 17 there's no prohibition. I guess I want to make sure 18 that I understand the law. There is -- the 19 Commissioner does not have the legal authority other 20 than in the area of ground water to restrict the use 21 of ground water for a particular purpose; is that 2.2 correct? 23 MR. SNELLGROVE: 24 He has the ability to impose certain 25 aspects of restriction, say, locating - location of

2.

2.2

the well, for instance, or perhaps acquiring additional information on certain types of wells. It's a little complex, but he cannot impose a production rate unless it is in a critical area of ground water concern.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. So unless it's in an area of ground water concern, the Commissioner does not have the authority to regulate the volume of water that is used by a particular industry for a particular practice?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

That's true.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. I think that is - that's how I understand it to be. Okay. So what I'm particularly interested in seeing is that the Commissioner, as I appreciate it, because of good leadership has issued certain directives and guidance documents - not directives, by guidance documents, encouragements, the Ground Water Commission has done their business urging - urging companies that are drilling natural gas wells to use surface water instead of ground water, but there is little force of the law to mandate that, but trying

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

to impose our will by making surface water resources available, so on and so forth, and that has happened - that has happened in a voluntary capacity. It looks like from the information that we have that we require to be reported to us -- what is that; 77 percent? What was the number?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Yes, 77 surface water frac supply.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

Okay. So one of the things that I'm particularly interested in seeing is now parishes and operators. Okay?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Um-hum.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

I think it's public record, and I want to basically be able to detail what parishes and what operators are, again, not — there's no requirement for them to do this, but which operators are, in fact, heeding the guidance documents of the Commissioner, again, not for any purpose other than if we need to do a better job of reaching out with more directives in a particular area, then, you know, we need to have that data.

So, again, if we could just get that

1 by parish and by operator and share that with the 2. Commission next time. 3 MR. SNELLGROVE: 4 Sure. I mean, we could even share it 5 here probably when we get back to the office, as I 6 believe this information is already out there. 7 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 8 Okay. 9 MR. SNELLGROVE: 10 Now, the operator-by-operator 11 breakdown, that will take somewhat of - you know, 12 time to do but --13 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 14 Well, again, we only have -- as I 15 recall, we only have about 25 operators that are 16 drilling wells in the Haynesville Shale; and so we 17 have 476 reports of wells I think I saw. I don't 18 know if that's the right number. 19 MR. SNELLGROVE: 20 Right. That database -- that 21 database is not as sufficient as the one that you 2.2 saw earlier. Okay? We had to hurry up and put 23 something together and we did. We can track it, but 24 it will take a little bit of time to get that 25 information in a way that we can present it to you.

1 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 2. Right. Okay. That would be, again, 3 important if we know. What I'm particularly 4 interested in, again, just to give you a situation, 5 we have -- we have, you know, 20 operators that are 6 doing a good job of using surface water, and you can 7 show me that they're above at the 80 percent or so 8 level, okay, and we can five operators that are 9 ignoring the directive, then -- it's public record 10 to know who those five are. Not particularly 11 interested in making life miserable for folks, but 12 perhaps a visit and encouragement to those five would help, because what I don't want is -- I 13 14 believe the Haynesville Shale represents a great 15 opportunity for the State of Louisiana and for the 16 economy, and I don't want someone who may not 17 understand how important this is to basically ruin 18 it for everybody. 19 MR. SNELLGROVE: 20 We got it. 21 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 2.2 Thank you. 23 MR. SNELLGROVE: 24 Yes, sir. Chair? 25 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

2.

2.2

Yes, sir. I'm sorry. Mr. Loewer?
MR. LOEWER:

Yes. You mentioned that with the arm-twisting directives influence we have - now we're up to 80 percent using surface water. Is there a perception that with Act 955 this may reverse this trend?

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

No, actually -- again, Act 955 did not change water surface rights. What Act 955 did is allow companies to submit themselves to a transparent process from which they could acquire water rights.

The opinions of the Attorney General may be what you're referencing your question, perhaps, but Act 955 is in and of itself just a process that's on the shelf for companies to get a cooperative endeavor agreement so that they can use surface water.

In fact, to me, the absence of 955, without 955, you would take -- if you would take the results of what has happened over the last year, now we're up to the nearly 80-percent level, and then you have these opinions that were requested in issue that say you can't get surface water without some

2.

kind of written agreement, the absence of 955 would, in my mind, have forced companies to either violate the opinion or to - to not comply with the opinion, I should say, of the Attorney General or return to ground water.

So Representative Morris and Representative Burford were very, very interested in making sure as we had worked to establish surface water as an alternative that these opinions would not push us back. In fact, some of our testimony in front of the Committee was that this bill actually was a pro-ground water bill by allowing a process of surface water to be acquired from the State via an agreement; so I'm, you know, very, very involved in the drafting of 955 and thankful that we have it.

Otherwise, I think we would see those numbers. Because companies would say, okay, I have a -- I'm in a box now -- this is what I believe would happen: Companies would say I'm in a box, I have four Attorney General opinions that say I can't use this - the surface water unless I have a written agreement, and then the state government would say, well, we don't really have a process on how to give you that agreement, and we would end up being at a

22

23

24

25

1 stalemate; so I think we've pushed through on that. 2. Mr. Balkum? 3 MR. BALKUM: Gary, does the Commissioner's report 4 5 identify the surface water which is being used; 6 lakes, streams? 7 MR. SNELLGROVE: 8 Well, I don't believe it's in this 9 particular report, this version, but we do -- we do 10 track that. That's part of what is reported. 11 The operator is required to identify 12 the source of the water, whether it's ground or 13 surface, whether it came from a pit or a surface 14 pond. They're even required to provide the owner's 15 name. 16 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 17 And, furthermore, on the 1.0 version 18 of WH 1, we were allowing companies to say pit, lake Now we require GPS coordinates of the intake, 19 20 okay, and the name of the stream, okay. So that

And, again, the challenge will be to say, okay, how do we have this system that allows us to tabulate and run a report on that? But absolutely we are beginning to -- we are requiring

data is being collected on WH 1.

2.

through a WH 1 which we have a absolute right to require that information.

Now, again, you know, with all due respect, I will tell you that oil and gas companies are reporting more about the use of water in this state than any other single industry.

MR. SNELLGROVE:

I agree.

MR. BALKUM:

And, Gary, my only other follow up is, just as you're keeping an eye on the aquifers being utilized, if hypothetically you're seeing dozens of water withdrawals on a stream, maybe smaller than the Red River, would something like that be flagged or would that catch your attention?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

It's a good question. Part of Act 955 and what Mr. Heck had provided to you previously about their application process, part of that process, whenever they do get - when they do get this information through their Department, then they solicit our opinion on that particular location or that body of water and that water use, and we review it as staff from a ground water perspective, is, will use of this particular stream or body of water

1 have any impact on, say, the recharge of a 2. particular - a local aquifer or in shallow ground 3 water? 4 We've had a few come through, and we 5 did provide those - you know, that technical 6 information and feedback to the folks that are 7 managing that on - in the Department of Natural 8 Resources. 9 MR. BALKUM: 10 Okay. Thanks. 11 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 12 Mr. Coleman? 13 MR. COLEMAN: 14 Yes. Thinking back over it, I 15 thought there was - in the statutes it said that 16 casings over 10,000 - 10 inches that the 17 Commissioner does have some authority to regulate 18 the flow and use in wells that - where casings 19 exceed or equal to or excess of 10 inches. And I --20 have I misread that? You stated there was none? 21 But there is that, is there not? 2.2 MR. SNELLGROVE: 23 I'll tell you what, I don't have that 24 in my hand right now, and to -- I know it exists, 25 but to what extent, it's my -- you know, I'm just

1 going from memory, and what I recall is, is that, it 2. has to do with its presence in, say, an area of 3 ground water concern or perhaps a critical area 4 where he can -- where he has that authority. 5 going to ask our attorneys - our attorney here to 6 see if he has any information --7 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 8 So the question would be whether or 9 not it's not only limited to - volume restriction is 10 not only limited to areas of ground water concern, 11 but when there is a certain size diameter well that 12 that falls into the ability to restrict withdraw as 13 well. 14 MR. COLEMAN: 15 The question has to do with like the 16 deal we were talking about in Arcadia, it's 17 10 inches or more and it's outside the area of 18 concern. 19 MR. SNELLGROVE: 20 Right. 21 MR. COLEMAN: 2.2 But I thought the legislation was 23 intended whether there was large users that it gave 24 the Commissioner some restriction.

LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:

```
1
                     Well, let's get that -- let's get
2
     that checked. I'm assuming that -- I'm assuming
3
     that we can get an answer to that question before
 4
     the end of the meeting.
5
                MR. COLEMAN:
6
                     Now, it might have been used in this
7
     case within the course of. . .
                LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
8
9
                     Right, right. I'm sure you didn't --
10
                MR. COLEMAN:
11
                     For that reason.
12
                MR. SNELLGROVE:
13
                     Yeah. There is language about large
14
     volume wells and the limitation on production.
15
     know that exists, but, again, I think that it may
16
     have something to do with either an emergency
17
     situation or areas of critical -- but we're going to
18
     find --
19
                LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
20
                     The law will speak to that and --
21
                MR. SNELLGROVE:
2.2
                     That's correct.
23
                LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE:
24
                     And certainly we will provide that
25
     information. Okay. Any other questions?
```

1 Mr. Coleman, that's it? 2. MR. COLEMAN: 3 No. Thank you. 4 LT. GOVERNOR ANGELLE: 5 All right. And at this particular 6 point in time, because our court reporter has been 7 doing an excellent job, and as you all recall, prior 8 to August of 2008, we didn't even have minutes of 9 these meetings kept, and we now have a court 10 reporter taking verbatim notes. 11 And because all of us from time to 12 time have to walk away to take care of business, she 13 does not have the opportunity to do that. We're 14 going to take a break and give her a chance to 15 stretch her legs. Thank you very much. So we will 16 recess and we'll be back in ten minutes. 17 (RECESS) 18 COMMISSIONER WELSH: 19 Okay. Let's get started now. 20 Governor had to take a leave of absence; so I'm 21 going to finish up the meeting today. I think 2.2 before we continue on the agenda, Attorney John 23 Adams has an answer to the 10-inch pipe that was 24 questioned by Mr. Coleman. So, John, can you --25 MR. ADAMS:

1 Yes, sir. Mr. Coleman, the section 2. you were referring to is in Louisiana Administrative 3 Code Title 43, Part IV, Subpart 1, Chapter 7, 4 Section 705.B, which basically provides if large 5 volume wells, which is defined as a well with an 6 8-inch or larger diameter screen size so that it can 7 produce greater than 1,500 gallons per minute, the 8 Commissioner may within 30 days after receiving 9 prior notification pursuant to Section 701.B issue an order fixing the allowable production, the 10 11 spacing, or the metering. 12 MR. COLEMAN: 13 Production is the key word --14 MR. ADAMS: 15 Yes, sir. 16 MR. COLEMAN: 17 -- that I was looking for. So there 18 is the ability to restrict production outside the 19 critical areas. 20 MR. ADAMS: 21 Yes, sir, for large volume wells, 2.2 that's correct. 23 MR. COLEMAN: 24 Thank you. 25 MR. ADAMS:

Thank you for that correction.

COMMISSIONER WELSH:

Okay. Let's continue on the agenda. I believe we're down to Number 8D, Statewide Water Well Notification Audit Enforcement Update.
Mr. Snellgrove?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Oh, yes. Thank you, Chair - acting Chair. All right. As we have been in the past providing members with updates on our audit process that we have started in January of 2009, this slide provides information to let you know that we to date have completed 44 of the parishes audited, and we are now in the month of July, reaching out to Beauregard and Vernon Parishes. We are near complete with that; so we'll be back into August here shortly, probably by the end of the week; so we're moving right along as scheduled.

We've only got a few parishes left in our audit process year, and being on schedule, we anticipate that in December we will have concluded fully the two-year schedule there as we show. And then we will go into an annual statewide audit where we reach all 64 parishes in one calendar year.

And we don't expect that that will

2.

be -- we hope that we have gotten the water well owners that, you know, need to comply educated and knowledgeable of our rules and regulations so that when we come back the second time around through their parishes we will see a drastic reduction in the number of enforcement actions that we will have to levee.

And this gives you a breakdown as we did last time - the last couple of meetings. This breaks down parish by parish the number of actions - enforcement actions that were issued by parish.

Next, please.

And that gets you through your 44 parishes. Okay. Areas of ground water concern, as the Secretary - or Lt. Governor had mentioned earlier in presentation - or in this meeting, we discuss, you know, how we've, you know, began to really ramp up and aggressively pursue enforcement and implementation of the regulations, particularly in the areas of ground water concern where we had water well owners that were not providing the data in previous years.

So in January of 2009, we -- prior to that, we changed the form, and we put some -- we put a little bit more legalese in the form; in that, the

2.

forms are now authorized by certification, by signature, by well owner, so that we could have better confidence in the reliability of the data that is being provided to our agency.

And as we had mentioned in previous meetings, the information that we were collecting through this process, once we had — once we were able to populate the database with water well owners and their reporting information, we would establish a baseline. And so from July — from January of 2009 to the end of that year, we have now established what we believe to be an accurate and reliable accounting of water well use and water well production.

And these series of graphs are going to give you a breakdown by the type of user in these three areas of ground water concern and where they fit into the big picture of total volume of water used.

So, in this particular graph here, we're looking at the Jonesboro-Hodge area of ground water concern and water use. There's ground water usage in there. The scale on the left is in gallons; so starting -- you know, looking at it -- seasonal variations, what have you. Now, realize

that this goes through April '10. It starts January '09 and goes through April '10. And I'm going to get to other information about the calendar year while we do that. It's considered a baseline.

But what we're seeing here is -- it looks like normal seasonal variation in the water consumption, or water use. Of note here is the fact that in this particular area Jonesboro-Hodge, industry is the largest volume user, nearly - you know, far out - far out, you know, producing the public supply volumes. And also interesting to note here is that there are no particular -- in this particular time period, from January '09 to '10, there were no active irrigation wells in this particular area of ground water concern.

Another piece of information that's not on this slide that is of particular interest is that there's only - there's really only one -- these bars represent for industry, really, one user, and that's Smurfit-Stone. There are three other users that report, but their numbers are so low that they're less than .5 percent - much less than .5 percent of the total of what's being used by industry. Next, please.

In the Monroe area of ground water

concern, we see more of a - closer to an equal use between industry and the public supply users, with only a few irrigation users being reported. You can see that on the very bottom of the graph, but it looks like there's more of a - somewhat of a -- not quite 50/50 but 60/40 maybe on industry; industry still being the greater of the two.

Interesting to note here is the fact that soon one of the major users in the industrial use, that being graphic packaging, will be - will continue - will implement their plans to utilize recycled water, what have you, which will greatly reduce their dependence on ground water in this particular area of concern; so we've got a means now to track this and we can see that impact as time goes on. Next, please.

In the particular -- in the Ruston area of ground water concern, this graph shows the public supply users are far exceeding any of the other categories. Industry is, you know, right along the bottom. The -- you know, with very low volumes relative to being public supplier or the total, and the irrigation, they're really difficult to see. They don't show up very well because they - there's just not a lot of that activity in that

area; so I put a footnote on there that the largest irrigation volume was 176,020-gallons during this reporting time period from January '09 to April '10.

So looking at further breaking down public supply of what was reported to us, this pie graph here depicts, you know, those users and the volumes in the public supply use category of - you know, of their percentages. And, of course, Ruston is -- the City of Ruston is using about 77 percent and, then, Grambling - the City of Grambling is coming in second, about 8 percent, and the rest are falling in line thereafter. Next.

So, again, I just want to reiterate the fact that we promised that we were going to evaluate this information, but we needed to have some confidence in the data. We believe that we have the confidence in the data, with the changes we made and to get, you know, these forms that are coming into us certified and so -- and, of course, working with the information on a day-to-day basis, contacting the water well owners when we're not sure what they've reported to us, you know. We've had staff dedicated to that to really focus in on the quality of information that's being put on the forms.

So, with all of that being said, we feel like this data is as reliable as we can get without having each individual well owner have a monitoring well - I mean have a meter on their well and provide metering information to us, which is not required at this time.

So it provides to us and it will give us an opportunity to use this as a baseline to see how trends are developing from this point forward.

And the next piece of information that we -- you know, kind of hand in glove, once we looked at the areas of ground water concern and were able to develop statistics and a baseline, you know, the obvious question now is, okay, how does this fit into the bigger picture which is to help the Sparta Aquifer?

So last meeting we went through a process where we provided members information about the different databases that are - ground water information that is available through public record by various agencies, USGS being one with their monitoring wells that grab in some cases water quality and in other cases water level data and in some cases both, but also DEQ and DHH, all these different agencies came forth and provided that

2.

information to allow you to understand that we have a network - we have a data network in the State and it's there, of course, as public record available for use.

So we tapped into the USGS ground water monitoring wells in the Sparta Aquifer area and started running some information to try to assess, you know, what's going on up there. And this is what we came up with as an initial compilation of the information from USGS website and their water wells.

I'm going to go through this and explain what all of the dots are, and, so, focusing in on all dots blue, on the bottom left-hand corner, you'll see a reference to the varying shades of blue, the darkest being the greatest level of recovery that was noted in the database, and the lightest shade of blue being the least amount of recovery in feet that we found for a time period from a water level database coming from 2000 to 2010.

So as you can see on the map here that - as expected due to the efforts in Union County, Arkansas and their efforts to reduce reliance upon ground water, wells in Northern

Louisiana are showing, you know, recovery. They're showing that the wells — the well levels are rising as a result of that effort or and I'm sure other efforts too. We're not here to report why. I guess it does beg the question, but what we want to report here is, you know, an accurate depiction of the facts as they are, as the aquifer is — you know, as the water well level data is being reported.

So, again, looking at the dots on the map, each one of the dots represents a USGS monitoring well, screened in the Sparta Aquifer and where we've had data that was - where we see data has been reported from 2000 to present.

Looking to the right-hand side - the lower right-hand side of the graph - of the map, you'll see a legend where a white dot, or a white circle, represents what we found to be water levels that have basically flattened.

In other words, over time what we saw in the white - the wells that - depicted by the white areas is that the '70s and '80s showed a rate of decline at those locations, but that rating decline tapered off in the '90s and up to present time. And we found that, say, over a decade from 2000 to now there's a very short window of feet that

1 the well - that the wells - that the - the water 2. level is varying within. In other words, one to 3 two feet on the scale is the variation across time, 4 from 2000 to present. 5 So we consider those locations to be 6 basically -- I don't want to say stable or 7 stabilizing, but they're certainly flatlined. 8 They're not -- they're not decreasing -- we're not 9 seeing any significant decrease. We're not seeing any increase in water levels and -- yes, sir? 10 11 MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH: 12 Is that primarily due to what 13 Arkansas has done? 14 MR. SNELLGROVE: 15 I wouldn't expect that -- well, these 16 locations being -- if you look where they're 17 located, I just think that it may be something more 18 of a local regional phenomenon, that whoever was 19 using the water, you know, at a much more rapid rate 20 in the '70s and '80s aren't doing that any more, and 21 that, to me, would be my opinion without having 22 fully evaluated that. 23 Again, it's difficult right now at 24 this point in our evaluation in looking at the data

to make connections as to why we see what we see.

1 My point here is this is just to let you see what we 2. see to educate you as to what we believe is the 3 current conditions out there. Certainly if we've got some 4 5 information here that would contradict what we're 6 reporting here, we need to know it so that we can 7 correct this and get it right. 8 This is -- it's not a first draft. 9 We spent about three weeks back and forth looking at 10 different was to display this information and making 11 sure that we got accurate information. But we're 12 human and we could make some errors. So some of 13 these dots may not be blue; they might be white. 14 Some of them may be green. But we just -- if you 15 see something that doesn't look right or whatever, 16 then we'll - we're certainly going to go back and 17 reevaluate and see if we need to revise it and we'll 18 do so and report it. Yes, sir. 19 MR. COLVIN: 20 So, Gary, these are only -- these are 21 only USGS wells? 2.2 MR. SNELLGROVE: 23 That's correct. 2.4 MR. COLVIN: 25 Are these representative of what's

1 going on? Are these just -- you just took two 2. wells, say, in the Ouachita --3 MR. SNELLGROVE: No, sir. This is it. This is what 4 5 This is our network. This is the we've got. 6 available information that we have in the State 7 current. 8 MR. COLVIN: 9 So you can't extrapolate or you don't 10 exstipulate from private well reporting, the monthly 11 reporting that goes on? 12 MR. SNELLGROVE: 13 We don't get water level measurements 14 from those areas of ground water concern; we get 15 water use. 16 MR. COLVIN: 17 You get water usage but not levels. 18 MR. SNELLGROVE: 19 Not levels. You know, it would be 20 nice if we did, definitely. It is required in the 21 order that when they do take water level 2.2 measurements, well owners in the areas of ground 23 water concern, they provide it, but it's not very 24 frequent that that happens. 25 MAYOR HOLLINGSWORTH:

1 Gary, none of these monitored wells 2 are in a cone of depression, are they? 3 MR. SNELLGROVE: 4 Well, now, interesting point. 5 jump to that. I'll go from the circle shaded white 6 to the two black dots that you --7 COMMISSIONER WELSH: 8 I would like to ask all of the 9 members when you speak to speak into the microphone. 10 MR. SNELLGROVE: 11 Thank you. I jumped over 12 and I didn't go through that, but, yes, there were 13 two USGS monitoring wells, one in Bienville Parish, 14 and the one it looks like right on the border of 15 Jackson and Bienville that -- especially the one in 16 the Jackson area - I'm sorry, the Jonesboro-Hodge 17 area of ground water concern was located -- well, 18 there's another large volume water well user that's 19 located in close proximity, and the numbers are 20 bouncing all over the place. 21 So we don't believe that because of 2.2 that outside influence that that's not a good well 23 or a good indicator well for what we're trying to 24 establish here. We're looking for the general area. 25 Yes, sir, it's a good point.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

The same thing on the Bienville well. We see some - that well located in the middle of the parish. Can we get the PowerPoint back? It's located pretty much in the middle of the parish, and we're not quite sure why that well is showing some erratic fluctuations in water levels, but it is -- it may be due to its proximity to the recharge area and seasonal variations on water recharge. But definitely we see a registered water well near the Jonesboro-Hodge well; and so, therefore, we had to throw that out as a reliable water well to show the general conditions. So --COMMISSIONER WELSH: Mr. Coleman has a question? MR. COLEMAN: I just wanted to point out that in discussions with Ben McGee, and I appreciate what

Yes. I just wanted to point out that in discussions with Ben McGee, and I appreciate what y'all are doing and certainly encourage it and we had anticipated the reports across the top up there, like 149 and 83 and 84, and over at Morehouse Parish that those would increase, and it's primarily as a result of what Arkansas has done.

But my understanding was that outside those areas that we talked about there that there

1 was still a continue decline of one to three feet 2 throughout the Sparta area by then, but we'll try to 3 get some additional information, and if there's 4 anything -- if this is true, this is certainly 5 encouraging and -- but just a minute. 6 Some people from Sparta are here. 7 Does anybody -- do y'all -- have y'all heard of any 8 increases in the Ruston and Bienville area? No? 9 No? 10 COMMISSIONER WELSH: 11 We'll have time for some public comment in a minute where it is appropriate. 12 13 MR. COLEMAN: 14 Right, right. 15 MR. SNELLGROVE: 16 Yes, sir. And regardless of what we 17 get here, we will go back and look at the data and 18 assess --19 MR. COLEMAN: 20 We want to work from true facts. 21 MR. SNELLGROVE: 2.2 Yeah. Absolutely. We don't want to 23 put out anything -- in fact, we'll hold putting this 24 PowerPoint presentation out to the public on our 25 website until we have, you know, USGS review the

same information that we're looking at to make sure that they agree with it.

But we felt it was prudent at this time to give you some feedback to let you know that we are going to continue this process. We are going to use this as, you know, a fundamental statistic or approach to look - to use our network that we have available to us and to report that information to the members so that you can see and we can track as these wells - as conditions change.

What we hope and what we expect to some degree is that we'll continue to see an improving situation here with - especially the graphics packaging project when it gets up and running, and, of course, the continued - the continued improvements in the aquifer from the activity that took place in Arkansas in Union County. And we'll take whatever else we can get. But let me get back through the process. Yes, sir?

I caution you in comparing static levels to recognize seasonal variations in static levels, and that's in many aquifers. I'm not an expert on Sparta. That's important.

MR. SNELLGROVE:

2.

2.2

Yes, sir. And that may be -- we need to revisit the situation with those wells in particular and see if we're not - if we're using a method to evaluate and report that doesn't take into consideration the seasonal variations.

MR. COLVIN:

Gary?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Yes, sir.

MR. COLVIN:

Can I also go back to -- I want to just comment again on this idea of water levels versus water usage. I mean, I know your well -- you can't get that information from private well owners, at least you don't currently, but shouldn't a methodology be developed to compare the rise or decline of water levels in the Sparta with the annual water usage levels such that there is some correlation.

For instance, you mentioned that IP shut down in Morehouse, and, of course, you got a 9-foot rise in the cone of depression. That was probably up there. So there is a cause and effect. So can't we add more information to this to show us first, for instance, in Wash -- you know, there's

got to be some reasons, and I bet you that part of the factors include the lesser use of water or other means of - alternative uses of water.

You know, we need as a Commission to track if people move to alternatives; for instance, surface water use, that that's not going to be reflected — and I don't know. Maybe this graph isn't for that purpose. But overall do we — do we have a graph or a sense of trends that we can look to as a Commission and say, well, this happened in the last ten years; therefore, the water levels are now this?

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Well, I think that as time goes forward, us - our efforts today in trying to get a handle on that -- and this may not be the best way to present this information but -- right. I mean --

MR. COLVIN:

I want you to explore it, because, for instance, graphic would be a good example of when they come online, when they're a cooperative deal with the City of West Monroe comes on line, the plant that they're now building. It might reduce it six, seven million. They claim up to 10 million-gallons a day.

2.2

Now, you're going to see that as a blue or a light blue on your maps, but that's not going to tell us the full story of why that is. And I know you want to just present facts, but if you want to present facts, let's put water usage levels or develop some baseline of water usage in the last ten years so that we can gauge what's going on because it's not just recharge.

MR. SNELLGROVE:

I agree. I agree.

MR. COLVIN:

And for those of us that work in industry that want to see our efforts in conservation and new technology or new projects that the State is also funding that we get some benefit by the fact that, well, we've reduced five or ten million gallons a day; therefore, the map looks better, and I think that ought to be acknowledged wherever it occurs and how it occurs.

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Yeah. I will say this, I don't have - I don't have all the answers as to why. You know, I have explained that earlier. As a scientist, I'm very curious to know the cause and effect of things.

1 Certainly, when we know that --2 whenever we're able to connect a date of an activity in a data point that shows, you know, a recovery, 3 4 we're going to make a lot of noise about that. 5 MR. COLVIN: 6 Sure. 7 MR. SNELLGROVE: 8 You know, absolutely. So -- but 9 right now --10 MR. COLVIN: 11 I know you have drought conditions; 12 you have seasonal variations; you have irrigation. 13 You know, for instance, graphic does a lot of work 14 in the Summer working for the Fall Beverage sales, 15 and that's probably why you see an increase in water 16 there, for instance; so, yeah, I think we need to 17 get more specific about why these - what are the cause and effects of --18 19 MR. SNELLGROVE: 20 And I agree, and I think we're trying 21 to establish a basis that we can build upon and get 22 there as we, you know, learn and get more and more 23 information. 24 MR. BOLOURCHI: 25 Gary, in Union Parish, you indicated

```
1
     a rise of 90 feet. Do you think that's related,
2
     perhaps, to the closure of that chicken processing
3
     plant?
 4
                MR. SNELLGROVE:
5
                     It very well could be, yes, sir.
                                                         Ι
6
     think that would - that would be a contributing
7
     factor.
8
                COMMISSIONER WELSH:
9
                     Mr. Johnston, you've been waiting for
10
     a question.
11
                MR. JOHNSTON:
12
                     First off, I think that we need to go
13
     back to the database and show -- I would like to
14
     know what's the activities around these wells.
15
     would be one way to look at cause and effect. And I
16
     agree with what you said; you know, we need to look
17
     at all of it. I think it's a great first start of
18
     tracking this and seeing what's going on.
19
                     So my question would be, you know, I
20
     don't know if USGS has a comment on this or not.
21
                MR. DEMAS:
2.2
                     Yes, if I could.
23
                MR. SNELLGROVE:
24
                     Sure.
25
                MR. JOHNSTON:
```

The other question I have, you can answer this one, too, Charlie, is, we have this data in this area. What about the other areas of concern? I mean, do we have any other data set similar to this any place else?

COMMISSIONER WELSH:

Charles, if you're going to testify, identify yourself.

MR. DEMAS:

I'm Charlie Demas, I'm the Director of the Louisiana USGS Water Science Centers, and we operate these wells here. A couple of things.

Question on water use and pumping wells, you can't get an accurate water level if the well is continuously pumping; and, so, that's why you don't see the two often put together, because a lot of times they won't shut down the well long enough to get it stabilized so you can get an accurate water well. So that's why you've got to marry the two data sets, which we are collecting the water used data.

It can show -- for instance, in the reports we do for DOTD, you can show when they shift from surface water or ground water to surface water vice versa, and that trend data is available. Okay?

```
1
     And that's published. Basically we collect it
2
     yearly and try to get it published every five years.
3
     That's been going on since, what; '63?
4
               MR. COLVIN:
5
                     Is that available on your site?
6
               MR. DEMAS:
7
                     Yeah, it is. But we share that data
8
     with DNR.
9
               MR. COLVIN:
10
                     So it's out there?
11
               MR. DEMAS:
12
                     It's out there. And this data is
13
     available whenever we collect water levels. It's
14
     there and we collect water used data by parish by
15
     category statewide.
16
                     And, then, the question on not
17
     showing any water level negative changes in the
18
     Sparta, I think if you look at his graph - or his
     diagram, it's pretty clear. If you can bring that
19
20
     up. The colors kind of -- the map, please.
21
     light green, if you read there, the decline has
22
     lessened but it's still declining; so it was kind
23
     of -- we were sitting in the back trying to figure
24
     out what exactly is it because the colors are so
25
     close. But the light green is a decline, but it's
```

1 not as sharp a rate; so --2. MR. COLEMAN: 3 I understood that. It's got that on 4 the side. 5 MR. SNELLGROVE: 6 Yeah. I hadn't gotten to that. 7 MR. COLEMAN: 8 But I want to maybe just mention a 9 couple of things. I think it's good that we get it 10 I'm not being critical, you know, but what started. 11 I would say is that one of the things is, is, 12 Smurfit-Stone spent a ton of money recently reducing 13 their consumption down there, and that should have 14 some positive impact on the situation. 15 We've had three or four 16 municipalities that were pumping about 50 percent 17 more than what they were using, and they've updated 18 their system so that they're now down in the 10-15 19 percent category; so there's been some conservation. 20 And then there's been some education 21 that's been going on up in the Sparta area, and I 2.2 think that a lot of things that's contributing to 23 some improvements and the -- like you were talking 24 about the deal over in West Monroe. There are a lot 25 of industries going about doing a lot of positive

things, I think, that's contributing in a positive way to a situation that would otherwise be much more negative than what it is.

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Okay. And to answer Mr. Johnston's questions, we do intend to move about the State with a similar approach, but we felt it was only prudent as far as the Sparta, considering that's where our areas of ground water concern are, but certainly we would — you know, the Chicot has some areas where there's some drawdown activity in that area there that we want to keep a watchful eye on, and it would be nice to know if — you know, to have this same type of data set that we can use as, you know, a help with the Chicot Aquifer down in Southwest Louisiana like we're going to do — like we're establishing here with the Sparta, and likewise with the Baton Rouge area right here with the Chicot equivalent in this aquifer system.

We're just keeping a watchful eye, using the existing data that we - you know, the network we already have out there, put it to use. That's the idea.

MR. JOHNSTON:

Let me get my last question before

1 you step down. 2. COMMISSIONER WELSH: 3 All right, sir. 4 MR. JOHNSTON: 5 I noticed on your action report here, 6 the Statewide Well Notification Audit and 7 Enforcement Results. I live in a parish that evidently we're going to hell in a handbasket. 8 9 had 471 actions, 471 actions total. Nobody's even 10 close to that. And when I see the word actions, 11 that normally means something bad. 12 MR. SNELLGROVE: 13 What action means, that's correct. 14 It was --15 MR. JOHNSTON: 16 So what are you doing --17 MR. SNELLGROVE: 18 There's no way to sugar coat that. 19 St. Tammany Parish has its issues with a lot of 20 small public supply providers, and we knew when we 21 got to that parish that it was going to be a 2.2 challenge to get all of the paperwork out. 23 Compliance orders and notices of violation are what 24 we issue to those providers. 25 You recall that whenever we went to

1 that area, prior to that audit, we made it very 2. public - publicly known, that we're - you're coming 3 up on this audit process. Of course, you know, only 4 those who were in attendance probably heard that 5 message, but we do encourage any well owners that 6 are not compliant to come through and get compliance 7 so that when we go through this audit process they 8 would have already resolved the issue and they won't 9 be issued anything. 10 But that's what we're seeing over 11 there, is a lot of small - a lot of subdivisions are 12 growing there, you know, Mandeville, Covington. 13 There's a lot of population growth, a lot of small 14 providers, small community public supply providers 15 out there, and that's -- that accounts for a large 16 portion of it. 17 MR. JOHNSTON: 18 471, that's a lot. 19 MR. SNELLGROVE: 20 It is a lot. Caddo had a pretty 21 good - pretty good list too, as a matter of fact, if 22 I recall, not quite the volume y'all had, but --23 MR. JOHNSTON: 24 These would be individual wells for 25 people who own homes.

2.

2.2

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Those are individual well owners.

No. This does not reflect any actions against domestic water well users. They're not part of the audit. I mean, these are only ones that require - that is required that they notify us 60 days prior to installation.

MR. JOHNSTON:

Okay.

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Okay? So, yeah, if we went the domestic route, we wouldn't have enough paper in the building to issue compliance actions against. And we prioritize those out of the process because it's just -- and we do have a game plan that will address - to address that situation and what we'll -- we don't see the need for a water well owner that's a domestic water well owner to provide basically the same information that a driller is going to provide us to now that it's all under one house. So we're going to take some steps to try to eliminate that from - that requirement, and we'll do it by these notices I mentioned earlier about rule changes.

COMMISSIONER WELSH:

Okay.

2.

MR. SNELLGROVE:

Okay. So we went through the blues, the whites, and the black dots; and so now we're going to the shade of green. And the shade of green represents, again, an optimistic look at what's happening. Although it is declining as it was discussed earlier, the rate of decline from 2000 to 2005 is different than the rate of decline from 2005 to present.

So what we see there is a trend that the decline is lessening or it's decreasing. It's still declining and it's still -- you know, but at least the rate of decline is getting closer to flattening out and becoming more of a shade of the white or the neutral situation. And then, of course, we've got the long circle there that's brown, showing that the actual level of decline has decreased in comparison from 2000 to 2005 to - from 2005 to present.

So we believe that that -- again, trying to put cause and effect, we believe that that phenomenon is due to the proximity of that well from the area that is showing the significant recovery, which would be the northern part of the state and,

of course, Union County in Arkansas and the fact that it's in between, if you will, the three areas of ground water concern where we've had, you know, larger volume drawdowns and also the fact that it's in the farthest reaches of the aquifer from the recharge area.

So the water's got a long way to go. It's had to go through three cones of depression to get to it; so it's kind of one of those — that's what we think is happening there. But when we do an area of review around that location, we don't see — we do not see any large volume users anywhere near that register. Now, there may be an unregistered irrigation well or something of that effect nearby that we don't see, but that's what we see on the record as being the possible cause. Next.

That leads us now to the section of the meeting where we talk about public outreach and education, and we've kind of regrouped and assessed, got with our public relations folks and brainstormed and came up with this short list of things we want to achieve in the next fiscal year, if you will, from now until the end of mid next year; one being on the top of the list is to send out notice to State superintendents and develop a curriculum guide

for water conservation purposes that is focused on middle school and put that out on our internet, on our website and send that message out.

In speaking with Lindsay here earlier with the Sparta Commission, I see the need that — or see that we need to tap her in her knowledge of this process as she — I think the Sparta Commission has already investigated or maybe even put some things in motion on this front, and we certainly want to, you know, learn from her experiences and partner with the Sparta, because a lot of our effort will be focused on the Sparta Aquifer on water conservation purposes. But this will be a statewide approach that we're looking to send that out.

Secondly, we -- you know, we've got staff surveying public supply water companies for their billing cycles and whether or not they're providing information on water conservation tips, brochures, whatever, some type of message that gets out to the individual consumers that gets the message out for water conservation, good water conservation practices and things of that sort, and we are finding -- we just really started this and I've asked that we put together a plan that would reach out to the major suppliers statewide that are

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in areas where we know they're providing ground water resources for public supply and for those who -- you know, right now we're finding some of them already doing it, which is great, you know, but there may be some that we could, you know, get on board with in giving them some information that they can start putting that in their billing cycle.

Thirdly, I've discussed this before and it doesn't materialize in the sense that we hit the ground, but we're near that point now with LSU's AG center and NRCS partnership on their outreach efforts and their education efforts with the agricultural community. We want and have been in discussions with Mr. Ernest and in their efforts there. We want to ride on their coattails, if you will, and be a part of that process so that we can get our message out on ground water notification and registration and maybe some of this - you know, some of the use of the database now that we've got that ramped up, you know, educating that sector on all things ground water conservation. And we are going to meet with the LSU AG center and NRCS here soon. I think we've got a meeting in a couple of weeks to initiate the process and implement it. We've got the information. We just need to partner with them

2.

and make it officially - make it official and get out there.

And the last that we came up -- the fourth item that we came up with is to seek a public service announcement partnering with Southern University and their -- I guess it's in their Journalism Department, but our public relations folks are kind of coordinating this effort, but we -- the objective there is to see if we can't, you know, utilize their production facilities and what have you to create a water conservation public service announcement.

And, again, our DNR public relations folks are helping conservation with this effort, and it's very preliminary. We haven't -- I don't know if we've gotten a commitment yet, but we're certainly pursing it, and we've made contact, and it appears that it's a positive thing that we may be able to get something here shortly. Hopefully this Fall we'll be able to put out the PSA. And, of course, once we get the public service announcements -- the cost is the production. Once you've got it, then I think it's part of, you know, requirement for broadcasting that they provide these snippets out there on periodic time periods, you

know, especially like on channels like LPB, what have you. So that's the game plan on that item. Next, please.

And, of course, we touched base a little bit of the Commissioner's report. This is the second report that we've put together. The game plan back whenever we did this in July of '09 was to provide it semiannually.

We had -- for whatever reasons, we did not meet that objective in getting it out by January of 2010; so this report here is an annual report, if you will, from the point in time where we left off with the July '09 report. And hopefully, you know, we'll be able to maintain a semiannual report moving forward.

But, at any rate, we did make some changes. We improved the look of it a little bit, I believe. We've also added an appendix on the Haynesville Shale. We've included the Sparta areas of ground water concern water use reports. We've got tables there; whereas last time we were not at a point where we could report that information because we didn't have confidence in it. We were still trying to enforce.

And, by the way, our enforcement

2.

activities with water well owners in the areas of ground water concern is near 100 percent. There's only two out of many. I don't know the exact number, but if you look at the -- if you look at the spreadsheet, you'll see what I'm saying. There's only two water wells that we're lacking reports on. So it's near 100 percent compliance with water well owners in the areas of ground water concern; whereas, you know, when we started this process, the percentages were more around 50 percent. So we've made tremendous strides in getting the information, and now we're presenting the information. We're at that point.

Unfortunately, when we produced this report, the graphs that you saw earlier in this presentation were not included, but moving forward we'll include the raw data tables as well as the graphical description or depiction of that information moving forward.

Haynesville Shale, the same thing.

The Lt. Governor was looking for information that I do not believe I included in Item D, but we will — we do produce that information on a parish-by-parish breakdown on percentage of different water resources being used parish by parish and we'll get that

1 information out to all soon. 2. The other side, though, as I 3 explained earlier, is going to take a little bit 4 It won't be so quick that we release more effort. 5 that information. But getting the 6 operator-by-operator breakdown parish by parish, we 7 can do it. We've got the information in the 8 database. It's just going to take a little bit more 9 to get it in a format that will be presentable. 10 And, of course, last, E and F on 11 there, we report accomplishments on public ed and 12 outreach and other accomplishments of significance. 13 And that pretty much concludes this PowerPoint. 14 The next meeting date is scheduled 15 for Wednesday, October the 6th and - for 11:00 16 and the location will be --17 COMMISSIONER WELSH: 18 Mr. Mays? 19 MR. MAYS: 20 I have a comment and a request. 21 good report. Excellent information. I would like 22 to make two comments on the - it looks like that the 23 Ruston area of ground water usage there has been 24 coming down, and the reason that you're getting 25 100 percent reporting is probably because of the

1 education in that area, basically because of the 2. Sparta Commission and Kelly and a lot of work has 3 been done over the years. 4 I would ask the Commissioner and 5 yourself if you would add to Number 5, perhaps, 6 grants, educational grants, especially in areas of 7 If you have some funds there, concern. 8 Commissioner, that you might can request, that would 9 help us out in the educational process with the 10 Sparta. 11 MR. SNELLGROVE: 12 Okay. Yeah. To make sure I 13 understand correctly. You're talking about the four 14 items on our public ed and outreach that I discussed 15 earlier? 16 MR. MAYS: 17 Yeah. 18 MR. SNELLGROVE: 19 Okay. And the item would be to 20 pursue grants and --21 MR. MAYS: 2.2 Grants. 23 MR. SNELLGROVE: 24 Okay. We can certainly do so, but I 25 would say this, that part of the contract we have

2.

2.2

with Eco - Ecology Environment on the Statewide Water Management Plan is for them to identify all, you know, available funding; so we're certain to -- I'll certainly get that message out to them, too, to really focus in on that aspect of it to identify potential funding sources. Fair?

COMMISSIONER WELSH:

Okay. That kind of brings us to the end of our agenda. At this time, we'll take public comments if anyone with the public would. State your name for the record, although everybody knows Buck.

MR. VANDERSTEEN:

Mr. Acting Chair, Members, my name is Buck
Vandersteen. I'm with the Louisiana Forestry
Association, and I'm also a member of the Ground
Water Advisory Task Force Committee, and my comments
today are on the Advisory Task Force Committee on
how that committee can help you looking at the
issues that you're looking at.

I'll still identify myself.

There's 47 members on the Advisory
Task Force. Twenty-eight or so are very active and
are very eager to help you in the process that
you're going through right now, maybe even so much

1 as to have maybe our Chairman of our Advisory Task 2. Force at future meetings have an opportunity to 3 bring forward to the full Committee here some of the 4 things that the Advisory Task Force is talking 5 about. 6 But we don't want to be operating in 7 contradiction to what you do, and I don't think 8 we're doing that, but we want to be sure that our 9 energies are parallel and helpful to this Commission. 10 11 COMMISSIONER WELSH: 12 Very good. Thank you, sir. 13 MR. COLEMAN: 14 I think there's been several 15 Commissioners mentioned that they would like for 16 y'all to be at the workshops. 17 MR. VANDERSTEEN: 18 Thank you. 19 COMMISSIONER WELSH: 20 Any other comments from the public? 21 Lindsay? 2.2 MS. GOUEDY: 23 Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, 24 Commissioners. My name is Lindsay Gouedy. I'm 25 currently contracted to the Sparta Ground Water

2.

Commission, and I'd like to take just a minute and again begin by thanking y'all for your continued support and push for education across the State, not just in areas of ground water concern, but across the State.

We all know in this room that education is the key to making a generational shift between where we're at today in our water usage, how it's very easy to the next generations and how they need to make changes in everyday life for ways to conserve our water use, our water.

I would like to also take a brief minute and let you know some of the things we are pushing in North Louisiana. I am currently the education coordinator and are at this time developing several different programs. We're pushing Waterfest now in Lincoln Parish. That will be going on in October. This will be following the pattern of one that has been put in play for several years, and we are asking the Department of Natural Resources to join in and be a part of that.

We are also looking at community events. We are putting on the first annual Sparta 5K run as a community regional event for all of the Sparta parishes and anybody out of the Sparta

1 parishes. If anybody likes to run, you're welcome 2. to come join on November 13th. 3 But we are looking at every venue to 4 put forward water conservation education as our 5 primary concern in North Louisiana. 6 In saying that, I would like to 7 extend on behalf of the Sparta Ground Water 8 Commission that any long-term support that this body 9 might be willing and able to extend, we would like 10 for your consideration to look at that in the 11 Thank you. future. 12 COMMISSIONER WELSH: 13 Thank you. We know about your good 14 work, and we thank you very much. 15 MR. COLEMAN: 16 We've got a website up, and we've got 17 billboards on the conservation issue. 18 COMMISSIONER WELSH: 19 A website and billboards. 20 Anyone else, public comments? I see nobody and no 21 lights are flashing. So if there's no further 2.2 business the meeting is adjourned. Thank you all 23 for coming. 2.4 (MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:00 P.M.) 25

CERTIFICATION

This certification is valid for a transcript accompanied by my original seal on this page. I, Michelle M. Dardeau, a Certified Court Reporter, License #21014, in and for the State of Louisiana, as an officer before whom this testimony was taken, do hereby certify that the witness to whom the oath was administered, after having been duly sworn by me upon authority of R.S. 37:2554, did testify as hereinbefore set forth in the foregoing pages; that this testimony was reported by me in the stenographic reporting method, complemented audio-sync recording, and thereafter reduced to computer-aided transcription by me, and is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not an attorney or counsel for any of the parties; that I am neither related to nor employed by any attorney or counsel connected with this Action; and that I have no financial interest in the outcome of this Action.

2.

MICHELLE M. DARDEAU, CCR

Baton Rouge Court Reporters, LLC 225-292-8686