

Groundwater Advisory Committee (GAC)
Meeting Minutes: April 6, 2006 10:00 – 1:00
Boardman Law Firm Conference Room
1 South Pinckney, Madison

Committee members in attendance: DuWayne Johnsrud, Ron Kuehn, Lawrie Kobza, Andrew Graham, Carol McCartney, Keith Meyers, Mike Carter, Doug Hahn, Robert Nauta, Jodi Habush Sinykin and Todd Ambs.

Welcome and Introductions: Ron Kuehn welcomed the group and introduced Steve Born as facilitator for the update presented by the GMA subcommittee. Jill Jonas introduced Larry Lynch, Barb Hennings, and George Mickelson as DNR staff hired for Act 310 implementation.

Agenda Repair: 1) Additional item added to the GMA update: Determine consensus on issues listed in Attachment A. 2) Add discussion of statewide well network.

Approval of [February 2, 2006 meeting minutes](#): Approved unanimously with Bob Biebel's (SEWRPC) modification to notes about his presentation in the first paragraph of item 3.

Update from the [GMA Subcommittee](#) – **Lawrie Kobza**

1. Determine consensus on issues listed in [Attachment A](#) – The group reached consensus on all eight items as written with the understanding that the GMA rules would refer to strategies or tactics rather than best management practices (BMP) since the term BMP has an already established meaning and understanding.
2. Use of enforceable limits vs best management practices (strategies/tactics) – Discussion focused on the nature of Groundwater Management Plans developed for GMAs and the extent to which they would rely on strict enforceable limits (e.g. some degree of water allocation or appropriation) as opposed to suggested strategies and practices. There seemed to be some agreement that the plans would most likely need to include a blending of the two approaches. Other key concepts included the need for plans to be flexible and recommendations that they incorporate adaptive management strategies, ongoing monitoring provisions and periodic evaluation of progress and adjustment as needed. For the next meeting: McCartney will compile information from other states; DNR will assemble information from comparable regulatory programs that combine enforcement limits with BMPs; Biebel will provide a list of practices/strategies/tactics contained in the draft SEWRPC document..
3. Designation of other GMAs – Discussion centered on the process for GMA identification and resulting groundwater management planning. Issues included chronic and acute problems, large and small watersheds, and whether the proactive planning done in GMAs should take place in those limited areas or be encouraged statewide. For the next meeting Gross will present screening criteria for GMA designation and will also include a statement of the philosophical issue of how proactive and inclusive the committee should be in terms of designating additional GMAs.
4. [Funding for groundwater management plans](#) (pg 5-7) – Planning costs are high but technical services to develop and implement the plans can be substantial as well. Potential funding sources include sharing among local municipalities, assessing some sort

of fee on all water users (public and private) within the GMA, DNR Act 310 revenues and combinations of various options. It was suggested that a financial feasibility analysis for implementation should be a component of any plan. For the next meeting Kobza agreed to develop additional information concerning funding options to help guide the discussion.

The GMA Subcommittee will meet by conference call on May 11.

Update from the GPA Subcommittee – Ron Kuehn

Kuehn will meet with DNR staff to discuss: whether the Act 310 definition of a spring is adequate; and the meaning of significant environmental impact as used by various states and the Federal government. Kuehn recommends creating “bright lines” to the extent possible.

Ambs indicated that the definition or characterization of the concept of “significant environmental impact” is of greater importance to the department at this time than is refining the definition of a spring, since the law defined a spring for purposes of its implementation.

Ken Bradbury (WGNHS) explained that the Spring Projects Coordination Group coordinates the ongoing WWF and DNR springs research and inventory projects. They have never discussed the merits of the Act 310 definition of a spring. The group will meet on April 12 at the DNR Fitchburg office and will report at the next GAC meeting.

Drawdown analysis for all high-cap well applications – Carol McCartney

Discussion concerned the need for a pumping test or other analyses for all wells as required in other states such as Minnesota. A number of committee members agreed this type of information is needed and would be of particular benefit in the GMAs. There was general agreement for further investigation including an assessment of the current practices, possible improvements or additions, and the reliability and usefulness of the information gathered. At the next meeting, Mickelson will provide a briefing on practice in Wisconsin and also Minnesota requirements including costs and administrative resources needed.

Statewide Well Network – Carol McCartney

McCartney will draft for consideration a statement to the legislature encouraging funding support for the [statewide well network](#).

Procedural reminder: Ron reminded the group that a proposed motion must be presented at one meeting and voted on at the next meeting.

Items for next meeting: Waukesha conservation initiatives – Dan Duchniak; DNR implementation issues; update by Springs Coordination Group.

Adjourn

Next meeting: June 1, 2006 in DNR GEF 2 conference room G09