

Water Committee Meeting

July 25, 2017

JIMMY GUIDRY: We'll go ahead and get started. I guess we'll start with a roll call and get this meeting under way.

CARYN BENJAMIN: Dirk Barrios, Vern Breland (absent), Ben Bridges (absent), Robert Brou, Jeffrey Duplantis (absent), Greg Gordon, Jimmy Guidry, Jimmy Hagan, Randy Hollis, Patrick Kerr, Amanda Laughlin, Rick Nowlin, Rusty Reeves, Chris Richard, Keith Shackelford, Cheryl Slavant (absent), Joe Young, David Constant.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Thank you. Welcome everyone to our water committee meeting. Our last one was obviously in December. Even though we didn't meet, several of us met at the capitol through the session and worked through a number of issues. Water has become our lives. Thanks to probably Flint Michigan and a lot of attention being paid to aging infrastructure in the country. Not to mention other water issues and secondary characteristics. A lot of things that we had to discuss and educate on at the capitol.

With that said, I 'm going to ask that we have a vote on the minutes. Do I hear a motion that we accept the minutes?

GREG GORDON: I make a motion.

RANDY HOLLIS: Second.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Any changes to the minutes? Anyone oppose to the minutes? Okay, the minutes will be accepted as written. We have quite a bit of discussion to do today. Hopefully we can get some things done that we've been working on for quite a few years. Hopefully we will be able to complete some of our tasks as we promised the legislators. We will start out by discussing an act 263 that occurred during the session. Those of y'all that were not as familiar with it, we started out with a bill, wasn't our bill, a legislator brought a bill forward that was going to require that all water systems meet secondary requirements, secondary characteristics and we worked through the entire session with Representative Hunter who wrote the bill and ended up with act 263 which is considerably different than what we started with. It's an opportunity for us to use this act to provide information to the legislature to educate them on the issues with water systems. Many of them are not aware of the fact that the issues we're dealing with as infrastructure ages and some of the smaller systems are unable to upgrade their systems or even maintain their systems. So I'm going to let Amanda kind of run us through the act a little bit. And what I'm going to ask the committee is

consideration as she discusses this that y'all assist us with meeting the requirements of this act. It does require input from stakeholders, from experts which I consider those here around the table, to address water systems in the state and report to the legislature those water systems that are in trouble or getting in trouble. For those of you that don't know all the details we have several water systems around the state right now that are struggling to survive and what we've seen in other states after looking at some of these systems some of them are combining because they have to have more customers to be able to maintain systems and support water systems. And so one of those systems in St. Joseph, which we discussed, and there were issues up in Northeast Louisiana where there are small systems and poor folks that aren't able to maintain their systems and it's becoming more and more of an issue as time goes on. This act was kind of where we ended up with the legislator who wants to address the water systems around the state, but mainly his area which is the Monroe area.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Like Dr. Guidry said, this is the second year in a row Representative Hunter introduced a bill. It was originally for the control of all secondary contaminants and as it went through the process we ended up with act 263 which is basically a reporting requirement

for LDH. On an annual basis we have to report sanitary survey results 30 days prior to the session commencing. And then after three years we have to provide a report that would give the legislature some ideas of things that we might need to change to make drinking water better for water systems. So in committee one of the things that was discussed is that we may have to go to the capitol on an annual basis and actually present the report to the health and welfare committee and go through sanitary survey results. Our staff is aware of the change in the sense that all sanitary survey items are going to now be reported to the legislature. So every water system that has a survey done that year will be presented at the capitol. And I think it ended up being on a three year cycle so it wasn't really any additional work on LDH in a sense we have to do a sanitary survey every three years. So by the end of three years we will have reported out all the results for every water system, every community water system. In the act it also is a resolution so both went through. But they are basically the same exact language. But part of it was they wanted us to engage input from stakeholders, agencies in regulation, treatment and distribution of drinking water, technical experts from universities, consultants, water utility owners and operators, community members, and state legislators from

areas with known water quality issues. So that's basically most of those people are already on this committee. We would like to ask for your participation going forward with these reports that we have to write. Especially the final report that has recommendations to the legislature.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Anyone need to discuss this a little further? Questions? What I see happening is the legislators are getting a little frustrated with the complaints they get about ground water. So we've had to do a lot of education about what color is water. Secondary characteristics, the failing water systems. Whatever the issue is with each water system they get the complaints. They're not sure how to respond to them. And the next thing they get some request at the capitol for capital outlay to replace the water system. St. Joseph's is costing 9 million dollars per 1700 people. We're talking about billions and billions of dollars if we would replace all the infrastructure in the state and obviously we don't have that kind of money. So they want a heads up when the system is getting in trouble. They want us to get more aggressive when the system is getting in trouble to make sure we're not allowing things to get out of hand like some water systems will do and then the next thing you know we have to replace the system, the pipes, the

treatment system. And so we've had a lot of push back. The initial bill was more about hey let's get rid of color, let's get rid of iron, let's get rid of manganese, let's make all systems meet all these requirements. Kind of like let's go ahead and spend a whole lot of money to get clear water. And the story I like to tell is we've had people complain about their water, complain about their water, we work with the system, they put in the necessary treatment. The same people call us back and complain about their rates. They have their water, but now why is it costing me so much. Well that's what you wanted. What I've seen, and it's interesting like in California when they require secondary characteristics, they actually have the people vote whether they're willing to pay for it. So they explain to them this is what you want, this is what it's going to cost. Now you vote. So the water system, the government, it's really up to the vote of the people whether they're willing to pay for it and they give them what it's going to cost and if they get over half the people saying they want it then it's implemented. If they have people saying we're not willing to pay that then it's not implemented. That appeals to me to some extent because in Louisiana they're a lot of people that will complain and complain, but as you all know nobody wants to pay anymore rates, anymore taxes. So

they want something for free. That doesn't exist. So anyway, this is going to be a little extra work I think, but it's really the future of water in Louisiana depends on our expertise and helping struggling systems. When we look at other states to see what's happening we're not alone. They have the same issues. Many little water systems are combining into larger water systems so they can have a larger customer base so they can do what it takes to treat water and take care of water in their states. They have other issues. When they combine and have larger systems they have more payers, but they seem to have more issues with disinfection byproducts. It's not a solution one size fits all and that's why it's going to take our expertise. But they're going to want at the capitol is guidance on what they can legislate to help us do our job. And that is a question you know like in some areas where we have a system that's failing and we want to put a receiver and nobody wants to receive that water system. So no one wants to take it on cause it's not a money maker. And so they want to look at legislation that's going to require making some of these water systems combine or whatever it takes to fix the problem. The more I look at it the more I realize some of these smaller systems in small towns they can't keep up with meeting the requirements and they're not willing to give up the

funding that comes with the water. So what that tells me is the funding is not being used for the water. They depend on the funding to run the town. Therefore the water system is not getting addressed. Some of the legislation I'm thinking about is if you collect money for water it ought to be spent on water. And probably local government is not going to like that because they don't have many sources of income. Water is one of those things people pay for and they use it for other purposes than water. But our water systems are not keeping up and so they're not doing the job they need to do with water systems in some of these small systems. As we talk about this it's going to impact you whatever legislation comes out of it because obviously if their fix to colored water is requiring secondary characteristics that impacts your ability to deliver water to the people. I kind of want you to throw some ideas back. I want to see if you're interested in helping us address this because I don't see this going away. I see it escalating. I see it every day more and more systems have figured out St. Joe got bailed out by state money and they want to be bailed out. And bailed out because they never invested a nickel of what they received back into the system. They want the state tax payer to pay for it and the state tax payer doesn't want to. It's really getting to be more and more

difficult to try and figure out how we're going to address this going forward. I'm going to need your help. Those of you that came to the capitol and helped us, thanks again. Very rewarding to have other people testify on our behalf. Very unusual, but very rewarding. I really enjoyed the fact that we were able to change that bill that seemed to be getting out of control into something doable. But that doesn't give me relief because I know this is coming back to haunt us. I know they're coming back with their ideas if we don't give them some ideas. And so we're going to all be dealing with this going forward and I need your help. So let me shut up and let y'all help me figure this out. Anyone?

JOSEPH YOUNG: Does DHH network pretty well with EPA region 6 and other areas of the country as far as what other states are doing when it comes to small systems?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Yes. Definitely. We participate in (inaudible) which is all the state drinking water administrators. So every once a year we meet in October and this is exactly what we do. We have a big round table and discuss all the issues going on across the country. I personally, and I know Caryn does too, we call other states all the time. Especially on the consolidation part of it because we do have states that have really good consolidation regulations. Alabama is one, Kentucky. So

they actually have mechanisms in place to force consolidation when systems cannot afford their upgrades anymore. So yes, we do that.

Like going forward I think it would be in a next meeting I think it would be beneficial if I gave a presentation on the enforcement side of how things work and common issues that we see across the state. Things like that. And so give you kind of an idea of statewide what we see, how we issue administrative orders, who is being assessed penalties. Give you some ideas of people that could consolidate, etc. So I'm willing to do that if that's something you guys would find beneficial.

RUSTY REEVES: Dr. Guidry I've been working with Jennifer and the staff of Northwest Louisiana on the merger of several little systems. One of the things we have been running into that's a hiccup is existing state laws that's enforced by the legislative auditor's office. A lot of times going to be a municipality and a nonprofit or a nonprofit to a public body. We thought we had one worked out where the system got 26 connections and a neighboring system got 180 and it's a no brainer. And their legal people stepped in and said well we need an evaluation of everything on both systems and neither system got the money to come up with an evaluation. So it's still sitting there with two old ladies in their 80s that text

me about once every two weeks. Mr. Reeves where are we at, when are they going to take over our system. When these two old ladies die up there the neighboring system is going to take it over. They already interconnected, already buying water. We've seen the water rate go from 2 dollars a thousand, to 3 dollars a thousand because the neighboring system couldn't pay it went down to 1.20 a thousand. But anything to keep from connecting together. All it come down to little legal issue for an evaluation. It's not getting nowhere. Somewhere or another there needs to be some laws. They're both 40 years old so they're both wore out. But we can get money to fix both of them easier than to fix two independent systems. The same thing little bit further down the line working on one the bond commission pops up the other day and puts the breaks on everything. The system that is willing to take this on has the capacity to take care of it, but the bond commission's asking questions because it's in another parish. So there's some legal issues beyond what this committee can deal with. And in both of these situations almost all the peoples in agreement till the attorney and the auditors got involved. Twenty-five customers that's using 5,000 gallons a month means 5,000 gallons a day roughly on a 30 day month. And the first question come up, well do we have the capacity. They leak more than

that in a day's time. Just some things Dr. Guidry. And we'll work with you any way.

JIMMY GUIDRY: That's exactly what we're looking for. If there's a way to change some of the rules and regs to benefit consolidation than we should. We shouldn't be buying a treatment system for every little section. We should be combining and having one treatment system for larger areas. We can get around those things at the capitol. And there's legislators now going to get a report from us and look for recommendations and those recommendations are going to be we need this law changed. When I first had to deal with this I was a little upset the way they were going around doing it. But typically when you get them to listen it's an opportunity to use them to help us get what we need. I've been unable to do that until now. Now they're very interested what do you need from us. An opportunity for us to make some serious changes.

PATRICK KERR: Dr. Guidry there's a couple things going on at the federal level now I think are important. The Reauthorization of Safe Drinking Water Act is being discussed and marked up in committee right now. Thursday I think is the day it's going to go to the environmental committee. There's some good and bad in it. One thing that's being pushed for is quarterly CCR reporting instead

of annual. I don't think that's great. But there's some really good things in it. One is Good Samaritan Relief. So if a system helps another primacy agencies will be able to grant time to fix problems. So violations and compliance order won't follow the transaction. Another is that there is language being introduced, I don't know how far it will go, that will require systems receiving SRF funding to not transfer funds out of the water agency account, or I think the language they use is water enterprise account. So what you just spoke about if you raise rates for water it needs to stay in water and waste water because there are all kinds of transfers going on. Council of Mayors is not real happy about that as you might imagine, but EPA thinks it's something that's necessary. We shouldn't be giving SRF funding to systems that are charging water rates and using that to support other activities. Allows for back office stuff. Like a lot of cities actually charge their utilities fees for administering their human resources and computing and all that kind of stuff. That's okay, but buying a new police car for the sheriff's office is not. That's going on. EPA is talking an awful lot and folks at the environmental committees are talking about partnerships. And they call a partnership anything from two systems helping each other to acquisition consolidation. It runs the gamut. We're

trying to get away from using language of consolidation because partnership sounds better and it gives you all the solutions you need for various size systems and various issues. Then there is another thing that's getting kicked around, well two things, for funding. One is SRF funding. Will talk about some significant changes to SRF funding increases. What we need to do at the state level though is a 20 percent state match required for SRF funding. So if they do ramp up SRF funding the state needs to come up with a match. I think that's something we need to start talking about at the state level. If they ramp up SRF the states that do match are going to get the money and the states that don't aren't. It's a fix, but we need to figure out how to get the legislature. What we're doing is leveraging all that stuff we've been doing, but if they doubled your SRF allocation, which would be great, you got double the match. And there's another program called the Water Innovation Financing Infrastructure Act, something like that. It's a large, kind of like an SRF on steroids. It's got a 20 million dollar minimum project value. It's oversubscribed the first go. No one in Louisiana took advantage of it. We probably need to start talking about how we finance these issues. I think there's a lot going on at the federal level. If we can't fix it at the state level maybe we could fix it through the funding mechanisms

we have and things like that. (Inaudible) got this super duper new executive who came out of the American Water Works Association, Allen is his name. If you've read any journal articles from AWWA you saw Allen's moniker on many of them. He's now heading the State Drinking Water Administrator's Association. Really good work going on.

RANDY HOLLIS: Pat and I listened to a webinar on Kentucky's consolidation and it was a glowing report on their consolidation from 3,000 systems to less than 300. And it was a glowing report and everything was wonderful and then someone asked a question, who will remain anonymous, about disinfection by-products. And the whole tone of the meeting changed. His words were it is an unshirted nightmare of the federal government. So they've seen this consolidation. And Amanda you mentioned Alabama having these problems. Consolidation when you talk about physical consolidation we have to be cautious about that. Because especially Louisiana having the .5 milligram per liter chlorine minimum we're driving the disinfection by-products higher. We start consolidating it's going to be really tough. Consolidation of administration of workforce of man power, yes I think that's a great idea. But before we start piping water 10, 15, 20 miles we have to be very cautious about the problems we could create.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Good thoughts. Let me see a show of hands

of folks willing to help us since you're the committee that keeps telling me you work for me. I'm hoping you continue to work for me. Are y'all interested in tackling this monster? Great. Great. That's what I was hoping for. I think we helped create some of this so we need to help take advantage of it. I can tell you there's a lot of education going on about lead in the drinking water as a result of Flint Michigan. And there's a lot more that needs to occur because people have used that as a sounding board for all kinds of things. With that said, I think we're going to be able to deliver to the legislature hopefully recommendations on changing some laws in our state and keeping in mind the things that work best. At one time I thought, not that public health really promotes doing individual wells, private wells, obviously they can't dig them that deep and they don't get properly treated, but for 9 million dollars I probably could have given every home in St. Joseph a private well. Now we're spending it and hopefully address all their issues I'm not sure they're going to be able to maintain it. They're going to be able to sustain that. They are looking into hiring a 3rd party to operate it, which is good. But at the same time if people there are going to be able to afford it. As we learn more and more about that community there weren't that many children in that community, mostly

older folks. So that community is not thriving very well, it's not growing. And so we've given them a very expensive way of treating their water. And that's good, but how long will it last. Their plant was 12 years old and it was run in the ground. We're going to have to do some due diligence to make sure that we don't allow them to run it in the ground again. That's all I'm going to say on that subject matter. If we're going to spend money as a state we need to make sure there are things in place to make sure we're not wasting that money.

Okay, so let's go into new business. Unless anybody has any other comments about this legislation we will move on.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I just wanted to maybe discuss how we want to go forward with meetings regarding the legislation. I was just going to propose maybe we can meet in a couple months and the meeting would be specific to this act if that was something you agree on.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Let me share this. Because this legislator was so adamant about his legislation he's going to be invited and he's going to have other folks he wants to invite. It's going to change somewhat. We're going to use this as our way to get people together. But I have a feeling if he doesn't show up he will send people that don't normally attend. But I don't want to start this process without him being aware that we're starting this

process. So when we do get started this is going to change, the dynamics will change somewhat because it's going to be different folks coming to the meeting. Two months is September.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: We'll send out a doddle poll like we always do. September will be a good time to get started.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Y'all thought y'all were going to retire today. I thought I was going to retire today. But anyway. New business, the standards that we've been working on now for what, 3 and a half years, 4 years almost. Notice of intent was sent out by Caryn. We've been trying to discuss what does this mean, where are we in this process. We are very close to when you get to notice of intent that's rule making, that's the formal where we eventually get this into a form where people have input and then it becomes the rule by which we live. We voted on each section as we went through the process and we had our input. Now some of us may have gone back and found something well did we do that. I don't want to rehash it. I do want to somewhat discuss some things that we may have some issues with, burning issues with. But I feel like we're close to doing the hard part of the work which is putting it into the legal rule making mode and at this point we've done a lot of work and I don't want to spend another two years trying to fix it. So we can fix

some of it later, we can fix some of it now. What I would like to propose today we're going to have discussion of questions we have. We can have one more meeting cause you only had about two weeks to look at it. Can have one more meeting where you come with burning issues and we go through them. This is the new code and it addresses new water systems. It will to some extent address existing water systems. And we went through a lot of this in detail and I feel like we've done a great job of coming up with something that makes me feel somewhat comfortable. I still have issues when I have a water system that I'm dealing with like right now currently that the code may or may not address and yet I'm being the person that the legislature is looking at and saying how did you let them get into this condition. Literally when we go on site we have to tell people hey you have a problem here, it's going to become a bigger problem, it's going to affect health. If we don't do that then we're going to be the ones answering why we let them get, why did we get a St. Joes, another St. Joes. I am pleased with the amount of work we have done. I am pleased with the product. I think there's probably some things when we go back we're going to say whoa, is that what we meant, what do we mean by that. But I do want to bring this to fruition. The proposal right now is we go through the notice of intent.

The rule making process that takes a while. And then you have to allow time for people to become familiar with it before you start enforcing it. And so enforcement I'm saying once we pass the rule we give ourselves six months to start enforcement. It gives us time to go and educate folks. It's less complicated. It's pretty straight forward in my opinion. But for aging systems they're not going to be totally happy with some of the requirements. And so we're going to have to educate folks why the requirements are what they are, what we're trying to do and how do we get there. With that said Caryn I guess I will turn to you since you have been writing all of this. Thank God Caryn stepped up to the plate to help write this. We did the easy work. This is the hard work.

CARYN BENJAMIN: All right, so first like Dr. Guidry said order of business is to determine the effective date for the new standards. The notice of intent so far consist of just the new text of the approved parts that the committee has worked on and voted on. And so Dr. Guidry mentioned that we would give six months so I'm thinking July 1st 2018 would be in line with that six months. The rule making as it stands now tentatively going to submit the impact statements to the legislative fiscal office on August 20th and then the notice of intent I believe would follow on September 20th. And then there's a public

comment period, public hearing, and if legislative oversight committee is not called within the 30 days of the submittal of our response to any comments received from the public hearing then the rule could be, the final rule could be published December 20th. Now if there is any oversight called, which we haven't gone through before, there is a possibility of rule revisions due to those comments and the oversight on it. But if there is no oversight calling then we would go forward with the rule as is. And based on the timeline there is going to be existing sanitary code text that's going to need to be amended. And so that part of the rule making has not commenced so there will be additions do this notice of intent that covers the changes to the existing code. And so hopefully that will be ready for y'all to see at the next meeting prior to the August 20th fiscal. If we can't make it to the fiscal deadline we can meet later in August, but no later than September 10th is when I believe the rule would be due to the Louisiana Registrars Office to get it published September 20th. If we're good with the July 1st 2018. Even if we do have to push back the rule making by one month the final would be January 20th and that still gives kind of almost six months before all those new standards are effective.

RANDY HOLLIS: I have a question. I guess refresh my

memory. I thought these standards were for things going forward from now. So when I read this and there's a date there for them to acquire funding. If we have a system that only has one water well today that implies to me that you got until 2020 to put in your second source.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Right now we were only talking about the effective date for what's going to apply going forward. So that would be any systems being permitted, infrastructure, modification thereof. I haven't gotten to the second part which is anything that y'all deemed to be affecting current systems. So that would be a separate. That will be the next topic I was going to cover. We needed to vote on the effective date for the standards that affect new construction.

PATRICK KERR: I will make that motion July 1st 2018.

That's fine.

CHRIS RICHARD: Second.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Anyone opposed?

CARYN BENJAMIN: Now we can move on to Randy's concern.

RANDY HOLLIS: Just a clarification.

CARYN BENJAMIN: Yes, sir. And so the second comment here.

And so there are sections, there are parts that were voted on that included sections that the subcommittee designated as being effective to existing systems. There were a few that had a caveat barring any grandfather clause date or

whatever. But there was part 2, part 3 and part 7 had sections that were designated with an SS which meant that section could be cited during a sanitary survey. Now that was done 2014, 2015. At the end of 2015 we approved a list of significant deficiencies. And so if we're going to rely just on that list of significant deficiencies and not make any of these other sections affective to existing systems then we need to remove the SS designation to these sections that were voted on. And so that's what this second comment is. If we were going to make any of these effective we were proposing to delay that effective date so there would be time for compliance.

PATRICK KERR: A comment. Why wouldn't we make it effective at the same time but continue to allow systems to negotiate with the department about when fixes have to be made. That's how we've worked in the past. So if they come to you with a plan that says this is how I'm going to add a second source and it's agreeable to you then they work out a schedule. If we bifurcate the issues I think it's going to cause confusion. But if we're saying that a secondary source of standby power and flood protection are critical to the safety of water regardless of how old the system is then we need to get systems moving in that direction. If we give them a deadline of 2020 that's when they're going to call you. I think the census of the

committee was that these things are in fact important to existing systems to bring them into compliance with safety and health requirements of the state.

RANDY HOLLIS: I have no doubt they are important. They're critical. But I thought there was a lot of political push back of the cost that would be incurred by very small systems that have to put a second well in. And so that was kind of grandfathered if you will. I think they need it personally. Absolutely they need two supplies. I'm just reading this wondering about the political blow back we might get of requiring these to have two sources when you already have 200 customers on a well it's going to cost them 300,000 bucks to put in a new well. That's a consideration. I thought those were left grandfathered if you will.

GREG GORDON: I thought kind of the same thing. What we're basically saying is some of these sanitary surveys that have been in limbo now for a few years are basically going to come back and you have to comply by this date. I don't have any problem with that to a certain extent. We have a bunch of them it will cost us some money to do so, but I would say kind of what you talked about the act and stuff that we want to do moving forward with the state legislature. One thing is if where those exist in the region it would be good to LDH's help to make things

happen in the region so people would have something. Because I have been trying to do one with a small system and unfortunately the city uses chloramines and we don't. But I'm just trying to get it to where the people could have water to flush a toilet. And the city basically hung their hat on the LDH requirement that well your local person said since it's chloramines they couldn't use the water and so that's why we don't want to do this. I said I don't care if the people are still on a BWA, I just want to be able to flush the toilet and take a shower. The thing is that kind of relative to go back to what the future stuff is LDH really needs to get an idea and the regional people too. Hey we need to make these 10 or 15 things happen from a consolidation standpoint and we need to help these systems facilitate it rather than using a rule and stating a rule to one entity and having that one entity say we can't do it because of this. Kind of just back on this too if it's going to become a reality that we have some heads up and we know what's going to happen and the fiscal impact. But if there's something like the case I just brought up that LDH would be saying to that other water system hey you need to help these people. Because the comment I got back from the City of Slidell was what are you going to do if there was no water there for six months. I said I know what Dr. Guidry's going to say.

Run the hundred feet and take the water from the city. And they kind of looked at me and they went back to the disinfection rule and all that kind of stuff.

JOHN: I've been meaning to call you. I spoke with Slidell about that. Because you're a free chlorine system and they're a chloramine system that's no reason why not to have an emergency connection. You're good. You're on my to do list.

GREG GORDON: Just cases like that. So if we're going to say secondary connection even if it's while you're getting up and you're trying to find we have to do something in the future, build something. But if there is a situation where there's at least an emergency connection so you can meet that rule that it could at least be facilitated.

JOSEPH YOUNG: You can have an emergency connection being a similar oxidant. And we also don't require a boil advisory if that occurs.

CHRIS RICHARD: I think one of the issues that Caryn brought up is only a few of the chapters we kind of evolved as we went through the process and we changed. Initially we were coming up with things that would be design only or sanitary survey and then at the end we didn't do that. We don't have a consistency in the code. So since that time we came up with a list of significant deficiencies we stop citing them in the code so I think we

have to go back and I would think remove the citations that we put as sanitary survey from the code because it's not consistent throughout. We only did it for three chapters. That's one of the issues she was bringing up.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Is that a motion?

CHRIS RICHARD: Yes. I make a motion to remove the SS.

DIRK BARRIOS: Second.

DAVID MCCAY: Or is it intended to be prospective only.

Only for new systems or modifications for existing systems except for the ones listed in significant deficiencies list. Is that what you guys-- I'm just trying to follow.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: The significant deficiencies are basically things that would be potential contamination issues.

DAVID MCCAY: I'm not talking about what's on there. Is it supposed to be that I can pick up the code and know if I have a system permitted 15 years ago, I haven't made any modifications, I don't have to change any of the design standards except if they're on that significant deficiencies list.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Unless it's a significant health impact. Which that is one. Or anything else deemed a contamination issue.

JIMMY GUIDRY: The way I think about it David, it's a little confusing that's why we want to talk to people, the

significant deficiencies list is a list that's critical. And then if we go on site and we see something may be critical and easily repairable or replaced we still would let them know hey you need to be working on this because this is going to become a problem. The list doesn't limit us in telling them what they need to be doing. It just limits us to some extent on citing it and making it critical. But we really want to catch things before they become critical. We really want to notify hey you need to change that pipe, you need to change that gauge. Even though it's not listed on the significant deficiencies we still reserve the right to give people hey this needs to happen or you're going to get in trouble. The list is really to narrow it down, what people really have to focus on that's going to get them in serious trouble. There are other things that could get them in trouble eventually. I see a significant deficiency as something to work from. But on some of those older systems that aren't being maintained that's really not the only list I would work from. And I'm not talking about going and having systems spend millions of dollars on something that's not in the code or not in our significant deficiencies list. We should look at cost, we should look at affordability, we should look at consolidation, we should look at all these things when we're looking at a permit. Putting a two well

requirement on 200 connections it might be easier to say find an alternate source in case you get in trouble. Which might be a connection to another water system as opposed to a well. I think we have to use practical common sense in this. But you have a good question. When we go in there and we see an older system are we grading it differently than a newer system. And the answer is they have to meet these significant deficiencies list. That's minimum.

DAVID MCCAY: To give a concrete example, at least I hope a concrete example, section 135 standby power. It shall be required. Is that going to be inserted into the significant deficiency list under section 319?

PATRICK KERR: Yes.

DAVID MCCAY: So it's clear it's not prospective only for new systems. It's going to be maybe with a delayed date, but it's going to be in there in the significant deficiencies that all systems, even existing ones, have to meet at least at some point.

CHRIS RICHARD: We just voted to take the SS off so it's not required.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: We already in our code have significant deficiencies. But as Caryn had shown, go back to the first page, there are a few things that we do need to discuss that may need to be added to the significant

deficiencies list. Like standby power is one. So we're going to remove the SS requirement as far as because we defined what really is significant, but we may need to expand that to include some things we should be looking for on a survey from these chapters where we designated this.

CHRIS RICHARD: But as far as his question the code as a moving forward point if you need to address standby power or something else it will put in significant deficiencies. It won't be referred back to the code.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: If it's something that's significant we would look at it on a survey, right. It could be defined somewhere else.

RANDY HOLLIS: Are we going to define those as we go through today?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Yes. There's just a few that I pulled out for discussion. Standby power was one, secondary source was another, and then the 20 PSI was something else.

CARYN BENJAMIN: In case there are some that are not aware, the significant deficiencies that were approved in December of 2015 was codified on January 20th of this year with the groundwater rule. That's the new section here, 319 that David was referring to. It does list the deficiencies in section D. I did send this out to the

committee when the rule making was going through. So you should have it, but I could provide it again. The one that you have in front of you that is the version that y'all saw during the approval process and this is the codified version.

DAVID MCCAY: My concern whatever you decide is grandfathered verses not that it be clear. That I could pick up the code and know that all of this stuff doesn't apply to me as an existing system unless it's on that significant deficiencies list which includes a catch all. The state health office may cite something that could be critical even if it's not specifically itemized and listed. And otherwise I can look at these things and say I don't have to do them unless I do a modification. That was my thought. However you decide to do it what's on one list verses the other it just needs to be clear what part is perspective and what part is existing systems.

JIMMY GUIDRY: And maybe you can help us with language to make it clear. But to me when we go out and educate for six months that significant deficiency list should get everybody's attention. That's what you're going to be cited for on your survey. But it's not the end all. I don't want them to think it's the only thing they can be cited for. Those things are critical. Those things the committee came up with is the list of things that they

need to have. I get your point. Say I go to an older system they've been operating, then we cite them for something on a significant deficiency list that we never cited them before. And they argue hey I never had to do before it before, why am I having to do it now. The list has been really shortened to very critical things. So to me we educate when we go out there. Those are the things we're going to be looking for and citing you for and you need to be thinking how you're going to address them. And then we may also find other things that are not on this list.

CHRIS RICHARD: But you can cite somebody from the code. If plans are approved based on this code moving forward, this is going forward, and the system doesn't maintain it in accordance with those approved plans then they can be cited based on this.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Right. If they were constructed with a permit after the effective date of the code, yes.

DAVID MCCAY: Well, yeah. That's the easy question.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: But David is saying is it clear to people that when they open the code they don't have to currently meet that code if they were built 25 years ago.

DAVID MCCAY: I'm trying to pick another example. Chlorine storage rooms. That's one that was a hot button issue at least at some point. Storage room shall be constructed

and meet the following requirements. Shatter resist inspection window, yada, yada, yada. Is that going to apply to existing systems that don't have that?

PATRICK KERR: Look at subsection K under that. That's the other option and that's how most systems are constructed today.

RANDY HOLLIS: Let's use a more pertinent example. Let's say you have a system that's 20 years old that you were permitted and you have it in place and you have a single well. And you're sitting there single well everything's perfect, the well's in great shape. Based on the significant deficiency list he's going to have to have two sources. So now all of a sudden within several years.

DAVID MCCAY: Right now that's not even on.

RANDY HOLLIS: That's why we have to go through today and add these things to it so you will be notified through a deficiency if you don't have a second well and you have until 2020 to put it in. So you'll have some time.

DAVID MCCAY: What goes on the list, that's you guys. I just want to make sure it's clear.

CHRIS RICHARD: In the title we need to put design. Cause that's one of the things that's missing really is design. It's design, construction. It's really not even construction. It's design, operation and maintenance code. The design is found nowhere in the title of the

code. So maybe if you add that to the name of the system.

PATRICK KERR: Let me ask a question and this is something I wanted to talk about a little bit. For example, when I go to replace the paint system on a water storage tank that already exist do I do it the way I permitted it 25 years ago or do I meet today's code requirements?

CHRIS RICHARD: If it's maintenance you don't have to permit it.

PATRICK KERR: Is painting a tank maintenance?

RANDY HOLLIS: No. Painting a tank is not maintenance. You have to get a permit.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Interior. Anything that touches water surface.

CARYN BENJAMIN: There are some coatings that are no longer certified as well.

PATRICK KERR: My reason was to say when I make those significant upgrades, that's a capital item I think, do I meet the present code or the code originally permitted. I have some tanks that was legal for me to use lead paint on. Can I go back and use that paint. No. And never on the interior. We need to define what will be significant deficiencies going forward, but what triggers bringing a system in compliance with the current code.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: When you get the permit.

PATRICK KERR: Right now the way this is written I don't

need a permit to paint a tank. We get it, but there's nothing in here that says I have to. My point is it doesn't change the hydraulic characteristics or anything else. I understand what you want. My point is it's not just tanks replacing pumps, changing quantities. What exactly do I need to bring into compliance with the current code if I for example remoter and put a new pump in a well and increase the hydraulic capacity of the well. I should get a permit from you for that. Do I meet the permit requirements when I built the original one or today's?

SPEAKER: Today's.

RANDY HOLLIS: That's covered under the very first paragraph general requirements.

PATRICK KERR: How much of my system do I have to bring into compliance with the new code by making that change?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Whatever you're permitted.

CHRIS RICHARD: If you got 50 wells and you're doing one that one well has to be brought up. Not the 49.

PATRICK KERR: Okay.

RUSTY REEVES: Chris' statement about this being design, operation and maintenance. Having went through a major construction project with our water system it ought to be construction also. Because our operators we lost one during the project cause he just said I ain't losing my

license. The contractors attitude this is our project, it's your problem if you can't serve people water while we're working on the system. We've issued a number of boil advisories for line breaks, lines wasn't installed properly, lines dig up by the contractor. The electrical contractor dug up the electrical lines to the well.

Didn't ask nobody nothing.

PATRICK KERR: What are you suggesting?

RUSTY REEVES: That it also apply to contractors too during construction. Pat when you have to issue boil advisory after boil advisory because they didn't isolate a section of pipe and dug around an 8 inch line and didn't blow it out and the next day the chlorinator goes down because the temporary line didn't hold.

PATRICK KERR: But as the certified operator you're required to make sure that that contractor is doing the maintenance in accordance with the rules. He's working on our system.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: And your consulting engineer.

RUSTY REEVES: I understand that. I'm telling you we lost one operator over it.

PATRICK KERR: But that's a contractor issue.

RUSTY REEVES: They do not have a license to break these little water systems.

CHRIS RICHARD: But the code doesn't address construction

techniques.

RUSTY REEVES: But it says in the first three pages what should be done. And all I'm saying part of that he should be-- our operator fought tooth and nail with them. They laughed at him. Made fun of him.

PATRICK KERR: Are you suggesting that contractors need to be certificated to do construction on water systems?

RUSTY REEVES: That wouldn't be a bad idea. Should at least follow these codes.

CHRIS RICHARD: It's a problem, but you don't address it in this code.

JIMMY GUIDRY: I'm not sure we have resolution on this. I think by law it's clear what we have authority over and I can't add that I don't think. But anyway, you want to go into the things we want to discuss in detail as to we need some guidance.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: We need to move what would be for existing. So standby power was going to be a new significant deficiency, correct. I think we said yes.
135.

JIMMY GUIDRY: The highlighted lines.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Standby power and then flood protection and access. Number of sources we discussed. And then the minimum pressure in a system from 15 to 20. That actually is a significant deficiency already, but we have it

defined as 15 PSI so we would have to change it to 20.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Let me walk us through standby power. I'm not the technician here so y'all can laugh if you want. We go to a small system and they say I got standby power. I have a generator back at the warehouse. Acceptable?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Yes. If it's portable. The issue is we still have a lot of systems in the state that have nothing. Which is why we have so many boil advisories.

JIMMY GUIDRY: We're not talking about a huge expense, but for a small system it may be unaffordable.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Yes. It depends on what type of generator you need. If you're a large facility you need a large generator and it will cost more money. Some of the smaller systems can either barrow one from someone or it's portable and it doesn't require as much power.

JIMMY GUIDRY: So the committee I'm saying we think this is important enough to make it a significant deficiency. Which means we're going to have to enforce it which means we're going to get some push back that I have to be able to say why I think it's important.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: If a small utility had a standing rental agreement with a firm to bring a generator out and hook it up would that satisfy the requirement. And they can provide a copy of that agreement.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: When I was an inspector it was fine with

me. I felt like if they had access to one and they could prove that they will have one in an emergency event then I was okay with that.

RANDY HOLLIS: When we changed these standards we put in item C. Alternatives may be considered by the state health officer with proper justification. We talked about that if you have a lease agreement with certain teeth in it then that was added in. I think we've addressed that in here. So as far as adding it to the significant deficiencies it shouldn't be a big problem.

PATRICK KERR: It's going to be an issue, but I think the consensus of the committee is it's important enough that we need to push back and say having water after a storm is important.

GREG GORDON: For example, like what Keith said, we have generators in a warehouse. We may just get after the well, but by the time we bring the generator from the jail down and start it up and hook it in. But over time it might be when you're doing sanitary surveys maybe you should start thinking about a quick connect. So when you do have we're going to allow you to have generators at your warehouse when you bring it you're not messing with all the electrical when you finally bring it there it's graded correctly and it's going to make your well operate properly.

JIMMY GUIDRY: That one we will add to the list. The second one.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Caryn could you pull up section 161 flood protection.

DAVID MCCAY: Is that added with a later effective date?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: This will be under July 1st.

JIMMY GUIDRY: It will become effective July 1st, but they have to give us a plan on how they're going to have to address by when. If it's a rental agreement it shouldn't take till 2020.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Section 161 flood protection. All water supply facilities shall be protected to at least the 100 year flood elevation. This was about accessibility. You have to be able to access your facilities during a flood event.

PATRICK KERR: Can I suggest we put critical in here again. There are systems that have redundancies and don't need to have all their facilities available. So in A and C I would like to say all critical water supply facilities shall be protected. And maintain it's critical water supply facilities during floods or high water events. We talk about criticality and I think it's important. Cause systems can make decisions about what's critical and what's not and focus their efforts on the critical and get them fixed.

RANDY HOLLIS: All critical water supplies.

PATRICK KERR: And I would do that in C also. We're going to have to define that I think. And maybe critical is what's required to meet the maximum demand.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I think we need to define what critical is because it's going to be different to different people.

RUSTY REEVES: Is that new systems going forward or existing systems?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: These are things that we're going to add to our significant deficiency list that we will require on existing systems.

RANDY HOLLIS: So on A to raise my pump station up it's going to cost a half a million dollars. But if they came to you and said we're going to put a berm around it, wall, whatever to protect it from hundred year would that be an acceptable alternative? It says protected, not raised.

PATRICK KERR: It won't be acceptable for DNR. But I don't think we can build such facilities in a flood plain.

CHRIS RICHARD: If you have an existing facility you can protect it from flooding without having to raise the whole facility.

RANDY HOLLIS: If you have a generator to run the sump pump. Okay, thank you.

PATRICK KERR: We could do protection of individual.

RANDY HOLLIS: It says levy systems. We're okay.

PATRICK KERR: We're not Randy. I think if you built a levy around a multi acre facility in a flood plain you're going to get sued for flooding your neighbors. At least. But the question is can you protect just the critical infrastructure. Can I raise the switch gear above a hundred year flood plain, can I raise the well head above the hundred year flood plain, can I service it by boat. Is that acceptable by the department. I think it is. It doesn't say we have to make the whole facility flood proof. Protect the critical infrastructure.

CHRIS RICHARD: Whatever way you need to do it.

RANDY HOLLIS: You can put a dozen levy structures to be protected.

PATRICK KERR: We went through this about our facility in Baton Rouge that flooded and there's big push back about increasing flooding on your neighbors. And so we can't just levy our facilities. But we can raise the electrical equipment. It doesn't change any of the footprint for displacement of water. It's already there.

RANDY HOLLIS: I think you're covered.

JIMMY GUIDRY: So you got to buy a generator and a boat.

CARYN BENJAMIN: So 213 is added to the significant deficiencies?

RANDY HOLLIS: 161.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: 213 would be the systems answer to that

deficiency.

RUSTY REEVES: The floods of 2016 put a whole bunch more water system in its flood category.

RANDY HOLLIS: They did not change the 100 year flood elevation.

RUSTY REEVES: But the floods of 2016 flooded out a whole bunch of water systems across the state.

RANDY HOLLIS: But they declared that was either a 1,000 or 10,000 year event so it did not apply to 100.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Ready to move on?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Yes. Next one is number of sources per 169. Number of sources does include a connection to another water system. So it doesn't necessary have to be two wells. Anyone have any comments on that?

RANDY HOLLIS: I think it's critically needed, but I think making the date of 2018 is really going to push some people really hard for another well. Especially if you have a really small system.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: In the past when it was cited on surveys we were giving an extended amount of time like several years. So we would be willing to work with systems on that cause it is an expense.

RANDY HOLLIS: That's the biggest concern I see. Raising the rates that would allow them to support that well.

CHRIS RICHARD: Basically they could enter into a

compliance schedule once they're cited and give you a schedule they can work with if it takes three or four years to get there then.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: And it could be they can do some planning with any neighboring water system as well to get another connection. Or if you know that something's happening in 18 months like a water system's running more lines your way. If you just had an emergency connection that would be your second source.

PATRICK KERR: Why are we limiting it to ground water and not surface water?

CARYN BENJAMIN: Normally the surface systems have a tremendous amount of storage.

PATRICK KERR: Like New Orleans.

CARYN BENJAMIN: At the plant.

RANDY HOLLIS: There's no other source close by. If you have a river there's not another second river close by so you're stuck with one river there.

ROBERT BROU: You typically have multiple raw water pumps on your intake. You have the storage when necessary to cooperate with neighboring communities. You are limited. You don't have a choice of going through another well.

RANDY HOLLIS: Morgan City has like three different intakes and yes they had a diesel spill in one area. They were able to swap intakes and go to another one. But they're

fortunate they have two to three different supplies that they can pull from different rivers. But most of you don't. You have Bayou LaFourche. That's it.

PATRICK KERR: Cost is not a factor for ground water systems, but basically what we're saying it is for surface water systems if we don't put the same requirement on them. We're saying a single source is okay for a surface water system. Okay.

GREG GORDON: On the two sources we have about nine or ten single wells. 2020 from a rate prospective would be very difficult to do. Especially if you have just convulsions and other sales tax elections that makes political people say I don't want to even touch rates anymore. I still need to get this other tax money before I do anything to the rates. That at least they be cognizant of that because we have some too there's only 25 customers. It's a small thing that never build out. Now I would have to go build a second well. There's nothing around them at all. It's out in the country.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Sometime in the future there will be more places to connect to as a backup?

GREG GORDON: Growth ain't just happening out there. It was supposed to be a great dream and it never materialized into anything. It's just like 20 apartments. Supposed to be this giant thing.

RANDY HOLLIS: One thing that's hampering St. Tammany so bad is you've got wetland's issues, discharge permit issues. So you've got so many encumbrances right now for growth. And I can't say he's going to see a tremendous growth in the future because of all the regulations piled on the developers now. Which it's really put a halt.

PATRICK KERR: So do we give them a referendum out.

RANDY HOLLIS: Do you want two sources or not.

PATRICK KERR: Do you want to pay for two source or not.

JIMMY GUIDRY: I have a really hard time telling a system with 25 customers they have to put in another well.

GREG GORDON: If it's part of a larger system I mean obviously they're rate based. But when you're prioritizing your capital needs and you go like I really have to go out here now I have to drill another well for this one little section and things I could have been doing I could be spending money connecting three wells I have down here to a larger system to make one big system. If I had that money I could make that one big system faster. Maybe as part of these things back to the other legislation we talked about earlier maybe be good for like LDH a lot of expertise and assistance getting an idea of what the master plan for those communities are when you're talking about sanitary surveys. So if you're doing this what is your plan in the future to make this no longer

secondary source. Is there something from a sanitary survey that we have down. Does this make sense for us to keep this on the books. Does this really make sense, is it really helping this water system in general to get to 95 percent where they should be or are we going to be focusing on these little things we're going to be spinning our wheels on in terms of money and design and all that kind of stuff.

PATRICK KERR: Should we be focusing on what actually fails normally which is the pumping equipment and maybe. We do have screen failures and we have contamination issues. They're very, very rare. But could you get the 90 percent solution by requiring an ability to replace submersible pump within 24 hours or not.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: It's hard. We've had some single source failures and then well drillers out there and can't fix it. We have people without water for an extended amount of time. It's not like we don't see it. I see both sides.

GREG GORDON: We had that situation a subdivision Savannah Trace at Thanksgiving the well gave out and people had sandy water all throughout the holidays and we basically just had to bust our butts and have an emergency contract. Luckily we had a water system not too far away and we got a main all the way down there and LDH worked with us

really well. It's not a good situation.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: It took you how long?

GREG GORDON: I would have to go back and look. Only a couple weeks. Two or three weeks.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Twenty-four hours is never how it works out. It's always at Christmas.

PATRICK KERR: Maybe it shouldn't be, maybe this is one we shouldn't force existing systems to do.

JIMMY GUIDRY: It makes sense to have it as a requirement especially for systems that can afford it. It doesn't make sense for a system that's never going to be able to afford it. Some of these wells cost a fortune to dig. But when you're without water we get the grief because we don't have another source. We have to find another source. They put us in a bad place when they don't have water.

PATRICK KERR: We did something on the fluoridation act that was passed years ago that basically said, it killed the intent, I apologize, said that we had to come up with funding to do it. I wonder if we couldn't build something in that puts SRF on the hook to help with something like that if they meet all the other requirements. Or make known to the systems an SRF loan is available for such improvements.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Let's say you had planned where you're going

to put it, what it's going to cost, but you don't go through the expense. How long would it take if you're out of water to drill a well. A long time.

GREG GORDON: You really need to have two sources.

SPEAKER: Even for a 25 house subdivision it's not hugely expensive, but it still takes time to get it in the ground. You can't wait till you're out of water to start.

RANDY HOLLIS: You want to bring this to the people and let them decide if they want it or not financially. Could it be a requirement we put in the CCR. Once a year that says you are served by a single source. Just notification. So they're aware of this once a year and if they have a problem they could go to their water supplier and say you know what I want a second source. But at least they've been notified in the CCR.

JIMMY GUIDRY: I think people need to know that they don't have a backup so they don't complain to us when they don't have water. And I think they need to know what it would cost to have a second well and are they willing. I think it is a personal decision. It's the same thing if you're going to go complain to government you want less government then you best figure out how to take care of yourself. That's where we're at. It would be something on these smaller systems that are refusing to do it we would encourage them to find a second source, doesn't have

to be another well, could be emergency line. Or when that's not an option the people on that system need to know they may go without water for weeks and months and can't flush their toilets. It's not just about available drinking water cause obviously you can get bottled water, but you can't do all the systems.

RANDY HOLLIS: So could you put in the CCR you're served by a single well. The cost of a second source is approximately 400,000 dollars. Based on your current customer count your bill would go up by 25 dollars per month. You've notified them they are only a single source, you've notified them of the estimated cost, and here's the impact on your rate.

JIMMY GUIDRY: What do we do with a new subdivision?

RANDY HOLLIS: They have to have two.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Not an issue. So it's really an issue for little systems right now that we would come around and say you have to have it.

PATRICK KERR: So we don't make a mandatory compliance.

This is not retroactive, but we put some language in that requires education.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Or I guess just from our prospective on the survey we would cite it with a caveat if you choose not to add a second well you have to do public notice annually.

ROBERT BROU: I would recommend taking it out of the significant deficiencies, make it as a recommendation and we can discuss it further while we're discussing with the legislature from act 263 we can put a recommendation and maybe get some guidance from the legislation to maybe SRF funding or some other type of mechanism. But put off that discussion. Everybody seems to think it's very important, but it's going to be a hot button item. I think we defer for right now. Make it as a recommendation on your sanitary survey but not a significant deficiency. If we can come up with something more definitive in our discussions on 263 move forward.

RUSTY REEVES: So what do you do when a system has two wells and the second one breaks and say we can't fix it. You're just going to say you ought to fix it.

ROBERT BROU: They were permitted with two.

RUSTY REEVES: They're going to come back and say you let so and so.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: That would be significant.

RUSTY REEVES: That was the whole purpose of the thing that people have quality water all the time or you refund when they didn't have water. Opening the door for this to come back around to us.

CHRIS RICHARD: This would be whenever you do your sanitary survey so realistically once it's implemented some systems

we cited the first year, some cited three years down the road. Not everybody's going to be hit at the same time. You're not going say everybody's got to have a new well right now. It depends where your cycle is.

RUSTY REEVES: And really and truly they've had years to work on second source.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I'm just going to throw this out there from my prospective, from the regulatory side. We spend a tremendous amount of time on these problems, like a lot of time. It's hard to even quantify how much time. So while there may not be that many and it may cost people money in the same situation you're looking at hauling water which is extremely expensive too. You're looking at pretty much an emergency situation which I feel like it's every other day. And some of it is due to single sources. And then we get notified probably once a quarter of somebody I think my well is going down and I only have one. And then we're like how are we going to fix it. I just kind of wanted to say that because I understand all the opinions in the room. But statewide it's an issue. It's an issue. They're only going to continue to fail. The infrastructure's not getting younger. It's getting older. I feel like the failures are it's almost exponential at this point. It's constant.

CHRIS RICHARD: We've seen a lot of the shallow wells get

blind and it takes a week to get them cleaned. If they have one well they got no water unless you have a week's worth of storage. It's happening a lot more now.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: And it is a public health issue when they don't have water they can't flush their toilet. Other issues besides I can't wash my dishes. Just want y'all to consider those things as well.

GREG GORDON: I agree with you. What you just said we have two wells one for some reason was 250 feet and the screen went out on the other one and that one's been mainly feeding the system. We had to get that other shallow one people started getting sandy water. We're in the process of bidding out a connection to a much larger well so we can take those both offline. It's not a good situation to be in. I'm not against needing a secondary source and having a sanitary survey kind of what Pat said and Robert. But if that can help you get SRF money. Or this situation I discussed earlier LDH coming in and compelling emergency connection so you at least have water. You're here and you're here, they can get to you, they have money, you have to allow them to connect something. Even if it's double backflow prevention and you have a written agreement and they're going to pay you for everything. You need to start doing these things. I'm more than happy to do that because I don't want people to get stuck

without water. It can actually help from a prospective of council's you need to pass a rate, we need to do something, we need to invest in this. Like what Pat said earlier we're an enterprise fund in St. Tammany. They can't touch our money other than that 15 percent overhead. The norm in corporate America. But just to make those things happen so you can say you need to properly budget, you need to get this on your five year capital plan. You need to show us that you're moving forward.

PATRICK KERR: Can I make a suggestion. I don't think any of us are really passionate as you are, as the department is, why don't you present language Dr. Guidry's kind of taken a little less strict interpretation of this and let us take a look at it.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I just wanted to throw that out there just because we're always in a emergency situation. Some of it does have to do with, well it's always usually around failure infrastructure and here we are saying well the failing infrastructure you have is okay. But I do think that since it is a cost and the flip side of the coin nobody can afford to upgrade their infrastructure. If the public notice was specific enough that said FYI you're on a single source system, you need to be aware that we're not putting in another well at this time, or this is how much it would cost you. And let the people

decide. Because they are upset. They call us when they don't have water. Just my opinion on it.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Well what I'll say I think more and more we have to put it back on the people that are paying for it. They have to decide what are they willing to pay for. I'm more about them being told you are at risk if your well goes out and you will be without water. It may take weeks or months to address. A new well would cost you 300,000 dollars which means your rate will be increased significantly. They just need to be made aware because we're all in the same boat when it comes to somebody being without water and all of a sudden it's an emergency they want somebody to come to the rescue. But they helped create the emergency.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Would we cite it as a significant deficiency with the option, like kind of an opt out option if they do a public notice?

JIMMY GUIDRY: I think they should tell us, yeah. I think they should tell us though what it would cost and they should research what it would cost to put in a second well so they can share with their customers. Otherwise just a notice you're on one well doesn't answer the question why which is we don't have 300,000 dollars to put a second well.

RANDY HOLLIS: I think we would be remised if we don't say

it's a significant deficiency. It is. But at least have the option there of notify the customer. Go to public notice.

RUSTY REEVES: The owner chose not to drill the second well based on the customer opinion.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Right. And that would all be with documentation that would come back to us to address. That's section 169.

GREG GORDON: I guess the final thing is what happens if that entity, if it's a private entity, can't get the public service commission to do anything with their rates even if they want to do something.

PATRICK KERR: I don't think that will ever happen. If the department considers it a significant deficiency the commission will find a way.

JIMMY GUIDRY: I think that's what makes them move usually. Anything else Amanda?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: We need to discuss, we already have a significant deficiency related to the minimum pressure at 15 PSI. But the new code is 20. So if you guys are okay with moving that significant deficiency up to 20. It basically will change when people issue boil advisories. I don't anticipate that it would increase that much.

PATRICK KERR: Suggestion, every place you have PSI put a G after it please. It matters. There's a lawsuit going on

in Concordia Parish the plaintiffs are claiming that 15 PSI is atmospheric and so you don't have to have any pressure at the meter. So we need to use gauge pressure. He's an engineer and a lawyer. Can you believe it.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Strange combination.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: So if you go in the document we can go through some. Page 11 we already discussed 135. And 137 we pretty much already look for in our significant, it's already a significant deficiency about laboratory requirements.

CARYN BENJAMIN: What did we say about PSI, keep with 20?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Yes. Caryn did you get everything we need before we keep going. 161, 169.

PATRICK KERR: Could we start at the beginning and go through each section because I think there are some errors.

RANDY HOLLIS: Start on the first page. Under general requirements you've got A, B, C and D submission of plans for maintenance and replacement of existing facilities. Can we add a sentence in there that states however the interior coating of potable water storage tanks is not considered maintenance and shall be submitted to the state health officer for approval. Mississippi does not require that. We're getting a number of tank companies coming from outside the state that come in and convince owners to

paint tanks and they never submit anything. And I can name three of them right now. It will help us give teeth to say you have to submit this to the state. Section 111 D. Just help us out.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Let me get a sense because I really don't want to go through this entire document again. I would prefer that y'all submit some stuff in writing, we review it, and we present it at another meeting. We voted on it and there might be some minor changes that we can all agree to pretty quickly. But if we're going to go back and do what we did before I'm not interested.

RANDY HOLLIS: We really don't have that many items. Caryn has done a phenomenal job.

JIMMY GUIDRY: We could wrap it up today?

RANDY HOLLIS: Probably take an hour.

JIMMY GUIDRY: I'm not rehashing everything. But if it's a few things I'm fine.

PATRICK KERR: I have a few and if we started and went right through the document.

CHRIS RICHARD: Number 9 under 111 under E9. Can we add where applicable after. If you're just extending a waterline you don't need to.

RANDY HOLLIS: The next one I have is under 120. Actually 119.

CHRIS RICHARD: If we can on 115 H. LAPELS changed the

rules on what's required to stamp plans and they have a statement now about for permit only. And you run into issues now, especially with electronic drawings, where you stamp plans and you have too many not final plans. If you submit something to the fire marshal DOTD and LDH and someone requires a change you have stuff floating around. They have a statement you're required to put your name and license number and says for permit only or for review only, something like that. That requires you to stamp it and I'd like to change that to what we said earlier to be in compliance with LAPEL. I would like the I to be the same. That language be on H. See how it says or registration requirements. If you go to 115 A 1 H?

CARYN BENJAMIN: Add or.

RANDY HOLLIS: Number 13 under 119 there is an M needs to be taken out. Next thing I have under section 143.

CHRIS RICHARD: On 125 just a question. A it says the system including the water source and treatment facility shall be designed for maximum day demand at the design year. And I think everywhere else we said everything would be designed for the average day and maximum month.

CARYN BENJAMIN: I have a whole handout for that.

PATRICK KERR: But this one should be for maximum day.

This one you should design the system to meet maximum day requirements. I think.

CHRIS RICHARD: But what's the system, the plant, everything. And then the components of the plant are designed for the average day maximum month later defined. They conflict.

PATRICK KERR: If you're building an entire system you got to design it for the max day of your design. So if I'm building a system that I think the build out's going to be 25,000 customers in the year 2020 design I need to design the system for that even if I phase it.

CHRIS RICHARD: I guess I read this anything you submit the design has to be designed on that basis. If you're designing a component because this covers everything you do. It conflicts with other parts on individual design requirements.

PATRICK KERR: So put the other language in there. Average day maximum month, right.

DAVID MCCAY: Same language as 135 A?

CARYN BENJAMIN: All the different sections that have design demand listed. So the last one we decided on was this one in part 4 average daily flow maximum month.

PATRICK KERR: I think that's what we should do here.

CARYN BENJAMIN: That's the one you want. That's the one we wanted to define.

RANDY HOLLIS: Go to 129 right below that number 10.

Chemical storage feed equipment. What we would like to

put there is if rooms are used. Started out if rooms are used. Cause we put in caveats where we did not have to have them. 143 under facility water supply. Should we look at this the last sentence of that part of A and the required disinfectant contact time has been achieved. That varies between different types of systems, surface verses groundwater, verses under the influence of groundwater. Should that say achieved for surface water plants or groundwater under the influence of surface water plants.

CARYN BENJAMIN: Or groundwater systems (inaudible). So yeah it does vary.

PATRICK KERR: But I think the required covers that. A system has four requirements their requirement is CT prior to first service.

RANDY HOLLIS: Next section 149 under ozone. Ten state standards has this as yellow with an orange band. We're saying orange with a yellow band.

PATRICK KERR: Can I add one other thing to that table and that's light gray which is the ANSI standard for other liquids. At the very bottom. And diesel fuel in a plant, for example, would be light gray and labeled. So I think if you put under there a fourth one that said other liquids and then just light gray and label.

RANDY HOLLIS: Section 167 first sentence. The last

sentence why did we add in located on the surface of the earth. I don't think we're going to the universe are we.

PATRICK KERR: Can it just say surface water includes colon.

RANDY HOLLIS: Next section 169 D, A, I. Says shall in no case be less than 50 feet potable water supplies. So what you're asking us to do is for the entire well footprint, the entire area, 50 feet diameter has to be above flood plain. We could build a well on a platform.

PATRICK KERR: Can we strike the whole thing cause it's covered in a future section.

RANDY HOLLIS: Strike I in its entirety. We agree the well needs to be above it, just not the whole 50 foot radius.

PATRICK KERR: 167 E7II really says what we should be doing as opposed to this one.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: It does discuss how it's supposed to be grated and drained to remove water. That's a problem.

PATRICK KERR: That's also covered in the well base language that has to be grated to drain away from the casing. Can't tell you where exactly.

CARYN BENJAMIN: Existing in the code?

PATRICK KERR: Yeah. It talks about drainage and the concrete pad you have to pour.

CARYN BENJAMIN: Either we strike it where it exist now and leave it in here as designed.

PATRICK KERR: The ground surface in a 50 foot radius is too onerous I believe.

JIMMY GUIDRY: How about you just take out that sentence, the last sentence.

PATRICK KERR: Sure.

CARYN BENJAMIN: You're talking about the distance from source of contamination.

PATRICK KERR: Shall not be subject to flooding.

PATRICK KERR: It's saying the whole 50 foot radius has to not flood.

PATRICK KERR: The ground can flood around the well as long as we build the well head above the inundation level. And the vent and the seal.

RANDY HOLLIS: You still got that in the first sentence. Shall not be subject to flooding. Ground surface.

PATRICK KERR: We need to strike the whole I I believe. It's spelled out other places in the code.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I need to know where that is else in the code because I think that is our code.

PATRICK KERR: So 167 E7II talks about.

RANDY HOLLIS: If you go to the table right after this under foot note number 4.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: The table is addressing particular types of contamination. AI is specific to basically standing water.

RANDY HOLLIS: I understand, but on the table under footnote 4 it says horizontally measured from the water's edge to the well at the highest water level which may have occurred 10 year period. So that's a 50 foot radius around the well.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: That's measuring to a drainage canal, ditch or stream. That doesn't address standing water.

PATRICK KERR: What is your objection to standing water at the well site?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Because people have cracks in their well slabs, sink holes. Seen a few of those.

PATRICK KERR: Can we reduce it from 50 to something?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I don't think in terms of the distance. To me it's like if I'm walking up to a general area of the well site and there's standing water everywhere I would cite that as an issue because it's going to cause an issue. If they have any kind of hole anywhere it could get surface water draining into it. I'm not really concerned about 50 feet as much I am I want it to be grated.

PATRICK KERR: Can we say 35? Would that be reasonable? I think if the well casing is not properly sealed flooding is not the issue. Rain is an issue too. Mice and everything else.

RANDY HOLLIS: I think 10 foot is reasonable if your

electrical panel there and everything give you space with your panel. A radius around the well.

PATRICK KERR: I'm fine with that. Just 2500 square feet is a lot additional fill.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I'm fine with 10. I just don't want to take it out.

PATRICK KERR: In G 1C of that same section. Big G. So two things, can we say that if a temporary casing is used it shall be completely withdrawn. If a surface casing is used it shall either be grouted in place or completely withdrawn. We use permanent surface casing, a lot of systems do.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I'm fine with that.

PATRICK KERR: So if a temporary casing is used it shall be completely withdrawn. And if you want to keep it you would put if a surface casing is used another sentence it shall be completely grouted or withdrawn. The last sentence of that part 170 sentence 8. The last sentence in this section. Liners may be. Page 31. Two concerns. I think the fix for this in my mind would be liners shall meet ANSI/NSF requirements. When we get into a situation where we need to install a liner I don't have 60 days to get it approved and submit plans and everything else. We go into a hole not knowing what the problem is, find something that we need to fix. I think if we just made the

liners have to meet the ANSI/NSF requirements the department should be indifferent. Shouldn't be a permit for that. ANSI or NSF. Whichever. Right now it says liners may be acceptable at the discretion of the reviewing authority which means I need to get permission which can be a 60 day process.

CHRIS RICHARD: It's a repair.

PATRICK KERR: Yeah, but it changes hydraulic characteristics if you put a liner in a well. Would that be okay to the department?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I'm not sure that wouldn't require. For instance, if you put that in there who's reviewing that it is ANSI approved?

RANDY HOLLIS: What if you put liners shall meet ANSI NSF requirements and notification shall be sent to the state health officer.

PATRICK KERR: I just want to make sure we don't have to get a permit to put a liner in a well.

RANDY HOLLIS: Requires notification.

CARYN BENJAMIN: Considering it maintenance?

RANDY HOLLIS: Yeah it would be a repair or maintenance.

CHRIS RICHARD: Like you said, it is altering the capacity of the well. It's going to change it cause you're making it smaller.

PATRICK KERR: Anyway, I don't care. I'd like to have a

way to do it quick.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I understand what some of y'all's frustrations are. It's just that not all submittals are created equal. If you can only imagine what we get and what we don't get. It bothers me that we would be taking out something that we might need to look at.

PATRICK KERR: I withdraw my objection.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Can we expedite?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Yes, the staff should.

RANDY HOLLIS: On critical items they have been doing that. We are so grateful and appreciative.

JIMMY GUIDRY: What bothers me if you make it meet some criteria and you have no oversight you don't know what's being put in and somebody doesn't do what they're supposed to. Not everybody knows what they're supposed to do.

RUSTY REEVES: I understand what Pat is saying, but 95 percent of water systems are at the mercy of the contractor. I don't have to have that approved. He sticks it in there and gets his money at the end of the week and he drives off. Has not been reviewed by nobody, not even the system's engineer.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Hour's almost up.

RANDY HOLLIS: Section 177 filtration design. It's going to be item number C6D. Section 177 go down you have A 1,2,3,4 go to the next page. Go to 6. Types of media.

There's number one. So go down to number two which is next one sand. Now 10 state standards had in this other media so I really would like to add 5 to match 10 state standards says other media will be considered based on experimental data and operating experience and shall be submitted to the state health officer. What if ceramic media comes in from the fracking industry, it's approved, it's NSF and it's much better than anything we've been using. We can't use it. I really want to have a provision to allow us to submit something that's other than those four types. A little V right before torpedo sand.

PATRICK KERR: Right after the highlighted portion.

RANDY HOLLIS: Right out of 10 state standards. I think that would work.

PATRICK KERR: Y'all doubled the 10 state standard requirement, or somebody did, from a 16th or 10th of a pound per square foot to 8th. It's in 6B in this same section.

RANDY HOLLIS: There are some typos. Instead of piping it's pipping. Which is in the next section we need to go to. 179 disinfection. Go down to G chloraminations. Item number 6 piping material. The pipes carrying anhydrous ammonia shall be black iron. Stainless steel has worked well for us. I hate to tie ourselves to only

black iron. Black iron or stainless steel. And then under aqua ammonia we use schedule 80 PVC for aqueous ammonia. I would like to add that. Or schedule 80 PVC.

PATRICK KERR: Let me ask a question. Aren't aqueous ammonia and aqua ammonia the same thing and shouldn't we use one or the other. Cause it makes it look like there's a difference. Aqueous ammonia and aqua ammonia are a mixture of ammonia and water at some level. Could we go through this whole thing and strike aqueous and put aqua?

CARYN BENJAMIN: You want aqueous instead of aqua.

PATRICK KERR: If we use aqua it will shorten the code.

RANDY HOLLIS: Next section. I think under the same section chlorination. Keep going back to number 3, 4. Instrumentation, safety. All the way back to under chlorine dioxide. Our favorite topic here. You have generators, we're good there. Under C. C it's a little confusing the sentence that was put into the last sentence. The RMAP shall identify actions to be taken by properly trained certified operators in the event that chlorine dioxide or chlorite residuals meet specified maximum levels. To me it should say meet or exceed specified maximum levels so it will make more sense. That's as though you're trying to achieve a goal. I'm trying to put if you meet or exceed.

PATRICK KERR: Just exceed ought to be there probably.

RANDY HOLLIS: That's fine.

CHRIS RICHARD: 185 under 4. Item 4 under pressure aeration. Pressure aeration. Shall be used for oxidation purposes only. I would like to add we're using that for the biological filtration as well so it wouldn't be allowed.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: It's actually used in biological filtration.

RANDY HOLLIS: Chris where would spray aeration for triella methane for VOC reduction fall in this. If you're using spray aeration to reduce your triella methanes would it fall under this one?

CHRIS RICHARD: I don't think so. Under 3 spray aeration. Under a pressurized system we're adding air to the water. Like in a biological filter.

RANDY HOLLIS: I'm sorry. I thought that was under spray aeration.

CHRIS RICHARD: No. It's under 4.

RANDY HOLLIS: Got you. Never mind.

PATRICK KERR: I got something in 190. Go to 191 and go up one sentence. So two right above that. So it says that we have to maintain a residual unless we can demonstrate that bacterial growth is not possible. And then the phosphate is being fed from a covered shipping container. I don't know why it matters what container it's coming

from if it doesn't support bacterial growth. I would like to strike and the phosphate is being fed from a covered shipping container. Many of us transfer it to bulk storage containers and feed from them. I think the rest of it is fine. Thank you. Three right below what we just changed. I don't think it's necessary in the code. You have to maintain chlorine residuals whether we have phosphates or not. So just take the whole sentence out.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I agree. I was just thinking the same thing.

DIRK BARRIOS: Under 179 talking about chlorine dioxide. Under 179 disinfection the chlorine dioxide on 56. Again, just reading it. I read it earlier. It just seems to address the systems that use chlorine and sodium chlorite. It doesn't use any other type of system. Remember we had talked about that there are other systems chlorine dioxide out there. Unless I missed it when I read it. Basically we don't have to worry about it. Or it's not going to be allowed.

CARYN BENJAMIN: I thought that was in here.

DIRK BARRIOS: It may be and I just missed it.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Number 2 is that what you're talking about?

RANDY HOLLIS: Dirk, explain again what your problem is?

DIRK BARRIOS: We use a different system for our chlorine

dioxide. We use an acid, sulfuric acid (inaudible) as our two chemicals. In here if you read it it talks about chlorine.

SPEAKER: Under feed and storage facilities I think that last line covers everything.

DIRK BARRIOS: Just wanted to be sure.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: It's in there.

ROBERT BROU: You have some of this section does not apply because you don't have the excess free chlorine, you don't have some of the other issues that are in here. But you still need to meet most of these.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: You still have to meet all of one. And then two you have to meet feed storage facilities of 179 I5 and I6.

PATRICK KERR: I got something in 202. Number 6 they're called safety data feeds now.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Take off material.

PATRICK KERR: Then 203 J4. Can we say that liquid storage tanks holding chemicals that are affected by sunlight would be covered.

ROBERT BROU: I think the intent was for more for sunlight though because that's why they're talking about it could either be curved or have manways that are bolted down to prevent contaminants, rainwater, whatever.

PATRICK KERR: I'm talking about the tanks. That's for

manway openings. I just don't think all liquid storage tanks need to be covered if it's not holding a photosensitive chemical or it's not an opaque tank.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: But if it's open to the atmosphere it's not going to degrade?

PATRICK KERR: I'm thinking of a cover.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I'm thinking of a tank that has a lid on it.

RANDY HOLLIS: For example, an alum tank at your surface water plant doesn't need to be covered. Does it? This would require you to cover it.

ROBERT BROU: That's not how I'm interpreting it. I'm saying you not having an open cylinder that water's just pouring into and anything's pouring into.

PATRICK KERR: We've been going at this for years about putting covers over tanks. I apologize. I got you.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I'm thinking lid on a tank.

RANDY HOLLIS: Go down to K right below that. Go on down to number one, end of number 1 under K. Oh, you corrected it.

CARYN BENJAMIN: There were still some that were not accurate. I'm still fixing those.

RANDY HOLLIS: Section 207 under operator safety items 1, 2, 3, 4 compressed air. Oh, y'all combined some of these together.

PATRICK KERR: So number 4 could be a cartridge respirator, could be a positive air pressure regulator. Neither of which use compressed air.

RANDY HOLLIS: Here's what we would like to do. For changing cylinders or working on chlorine you don't have to have full compressed air unit. We use pappers which are the cartridge units. This doesn't address cartridges at all because they don't have a 30 minute capacity. They're used for escape respirators. We'd like to add a 5 in there.

PATRICK KERR: Could we just say that if compressed air is used will have a 30 minute capacity and leave it at that?

RANDY HOLLIS: That would work. I just don't want to limit where we have to use compressed air because so many of us use cartridges and the pappers. That's fine. I just didn't want to limit us.

PATRICK KERR: I have some stuff in 209. So could we say in A, and we'll do this for several other chemicals too, but chlorine gas if housed in a room, and this is going to take a lot of repagination Caryn, but when you drop down to L, let me just explain where I'm going with this. If you drop down to A through K is all about chlorine that's stored or feed through a room and L is about chlorine that's not fed or stored in a room and then it has a subset of requirements. What I would like this to say

overall is that chlorine gas can be stored and fed either from a room with all these requirements or other than from a room and these are the requirements. So it's not an exception, it's not a waiver, it's just one of the two ways you can store and feed chlorine. And I would like to do the same thing for anhydrous ammonia and aqueous. So basically it will say chlorine gas. 209 A will say chlorine gas if housed in a room and then it will have one all the way down through K as a subset of that.

CARYN BENJAMIN: Should it be should or a shall?

PATRICK KERR: Shall. And then it's chlorinator should be housed in a separate room and then 1 through K applies. All that applies to that. And then B is through K. So it will say chlorine gas housed in a room shall meet the requirements of chlorinators. One will be chlorinators housed in a room separate. Two will be chlorinator rooms should be heated. Three will be chlorine gas feed storage rooms should be located and we just go through a whole list of things. And then B drop down to K. That's the last of it. Before L it will be B and it will say chlorine not stored in or fed from a room shall satisfy the following criteria and then goes through the whole list. I'm not changing the criteria I'm just taking out the exception. I would like to do the same thing for anhydrous and aqua. I would like to do one other little

tweak.

ROBERT BROU: Does number 4 need to be repeated in both A and B?

JIMMY GUIDRY: Go back to number one where you were. Under B how did you get to 4, 5 and 6 cause we just did 1.

PATRICK KERR: We're going to have to renumber this.

JIMMY GUIDRY: You want to get it right today, let's do it.

ROBERT BROU: Four, five and six apply to both A and B. So you do need to change that to C.

PATRICK KERR: Then the shatter resistant inspection window in the room would y'all humor me and put something in there that says something like unless secondary containment is provided for the chlorine. It's really just a personal thing. We're putting secondary containment on all of our chlorine and I don't think a shatter resistant window is required anymore and I'd love to see more systems do it but. It's the original 3A chlorine gas feed and storage shall be enclosed. Can we make that inspection window just add to the end of that unless secondary containment is provided for the stored chlorine.

CARYN BENJAMIN: What kind of secondary containment would that be?

PATRICK KERR: Like they're using in Morgan City. Not a scrubber.

RANDY HOLLIS: Go to the bottom of page 76. D sodium hypochlorite. You guys that do a lot of operations go down number 2 sodium hypochlorite feeders. B to avoid air locking small installation suction lines shall. That's a requirement, shall. If you have a positive head on your pumps, LMI pumps and your tank is elevated the degas in pump heads will cause you fits by returning a lot of product back to the tank and you don't know what you're really feeding. I would just as soon say degassing pump heads if needed or as required. But to require it on every installation tank.

PATRICK KERR: Should we just make it a should, whatever.

RANDY HOLLIS: Yeah, we need a foot valve. But the degassing heads is what really causes more issues than good.

PATRICK KERR: So down a few paragraphs to aqua ammonia or ammonium hydroxide. So it's an E2. So my saying about the rooms and no room goes in here, but also E2C I don't know there's anything wrong with carrying a pressure above atmosphere on top of aqueous ammonia to keep it in solution and keep degradation from occurring so I would like to delete that. You may vent at the atmosphere and you got to deal with the solution changing, but we keep several inches of water pressure on it so the ammonia doesn't evolve and I would like to be able to do that. C

bulk storage tank shall be designed cause ammonia vapor pressure over aqua ammonia to exceed atmospheric. We actually do carry a couple inches of pressure on top of it just for the water column. I don't see any reason why you would not want to have.

RANDY HOLLIS: You could change it to should instead of a shall.

PATRICK KERR: If that's okay with the department.

RANDY HOLLIS: There's a conflict in here. The first thing says that you shall have a trap. For bulk storage that trap creates a blanket on top of it whether you like it or not it does create a pressure. So this is written with a built in conflict. If you just change that to should you can have two or three inches of water column on top of it. There's a natural conflict built into it the way it's written.

PATRICK KERR: I'm fine with it either way. The other nice thing about carrying a water trap is that until it's saturated you don't have any off gas in the atmosphere of the ammonia so you don't get a whiff of it when you walk by.

RANDY HOLLIS: A requires liquid trap, which is water, so it requires that to a high point outside. So when you look at C it will hold atmospheric pressure.

PATRICK KERR: Then just delete the whole thing. And

you're going to be able to do that room no room stuff
Caryn.

CARYN BENJAMIN: That one and one other one.

PATRICK KERR: Anhydrous will be the same thing. We need to do the same thing with anhydrous. Section 213 A5. Can we just label the pumps and not all the valves. Does that bother anybody? Thanks.

RUSTY REEVES: A lot of these small systems that label is going to come in handy. The pumps and the valves. No diagrams from 40 years ago. Just helps. When we get called out there the other day operator couldn't tell us nothing nor anybody there. And basically what we found was he was pumping straight distribution unchlorinated water and nothing to the storage tank. Somebody opened one valve and he closed the other valve.

PATRICK KERR: I withdraw.

RANDY HOLLIS: Section 223 on the next one. Talks about valves each pump shall have, so that's a mandatory, talks about the different types of pump. And then under B, 2B surge relief valves or slow acting check valves shall be designed to minimize hydraulic transients. It's mandatory that I'm going to have a surge relief valve or slow acting check valve. In many cases we don't need those. So that's a mandatory requirement that's putting a lot of money into a job that may not be required at all.

PATRICK KERR: Can we make it a should?

RANDY HOLLIS: It would be good to make it a should, but now you're making everything in that paragraph a should.

CHRIS RICHARD: So just say if surge relief valves are slow acting they shall be designed to minimize transients. Just like above if a foot valve is used.

RANDY HOLLIS: Surge relief valve or slow acting valves should be incorporated if necessary to minimum hydraulic transients.

PATRICK KERR: Or as Chris just said surge relief valves or slow acting check valves if used shall be designed to minimize hydraulic transients. Use the same language as the one above it.

RANDY HOLLIS: Okay. That's fine. Just didn't want it mandatory. And then right below that B you have pipping again. Section 225. In going through this steel structures number B shall be in accordance with the most current. Steel structures shall be constructed in accordance with. Shall be constructed in accordance with. If you go to H under that same section, H number 2 I think this doesn't belong in here. That's not a design part. So where loss of chlorine residual below .5.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: That's in our disinfection rule.

RANDY HOLLIS: I would delete 2. Only two more. Section 241 hydrants.

PATRICK KERR: I got one at 226 right above 227. The last sentence ends inappropriately. Properly disposed of it would be fine. Whatever. This is a recommendation so I don't know we need to cite the other section. Could we just say be properly disposed of. Probably just dechlorinate it and dispose of it.

RANDY HOLLIS: Okay 235 materials B1. Under materials which would be number B. So keep going down there. Number one. Are we saying this thing has to meet all of those?

PATRICK KERR: Should be or.

RANDY HOLLIS: 237 next. Distribution system design 20 PSI. You got the G on there. Good. Go down to hydrants 241. Go down a couple. Hydrants C within 106 feet. How about 6 feet. That will match everything else. 245 on water banks.

PATRICK KERR: 245 C2. Can we say there will be after cutting into, repairing existing mains something about current AWWA standards. And I know this is a conversation we need to finish, we haven't started. But bac T samples after putting a repair clamp is not necessary. Bac T samples this is really onerous and I really do think in the state we're issuing too many boil water advisories. AWWA has completely rewritten the standard on repairs and bac T sampling and disinfection requirements. So I

understand the health officer wants to continue bac T sampling, but I wonder if we couldn't cite the current AWWA standard and maybe add something about the things you're passionate about that need to be sampled.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Doesn't the new standard have certain types?

PATRICK KERR: It does.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Designate all that.

PATRICK KERR: You couldn't just reference the standard?

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: What is the standard?

SPEAKER: 651.

PATRICK KERR: I don't think it's 651. It might be. Can we take this offline maybe and get you some language.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: Yeah. Most water systems in the state are going to have to do testing. I realize you guys are different and you have the technology and the knowledge to do that, but a lot of people don't.

PATRICK KERR: But if you dig a hole in the ground and find a break and put a clamp on it bac T sampling is unnecessary, boil water advisory is unnecessary.

CHRIS RICHARD: If you maintain your pressure.

PATRICK KERR: Even if you don't. Anyway, I just wonder if we can't.

CARYN BENJAMIN: Unless approved otherwise by the state health officer. System can request.

CHRIS RICHARD: You submit your procedures.

PATRICK KERR: If you could work something into that that would be great.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I realize they changed the standard. But I don't want to necessarily put something in there that someone would read and say I never have to take a bac T sample anymore cause a lot of people would do that.

PATRICK KERR: The standard is very, very specific.

RANDY HOLLIS: 261. Last one. I promise. Under A control the rate of discharge. Well that's not right. Regulatory agencies will control the rate of discharge and the discharge parameters. If you want to put NPDES, but that implies they're just going to tell you the rate. That's not right. The rate of discharge and discharge parameters.

PATRICK KERR: I think you should say to NPDES permit requirements.

RANDY HOLLIS: That's fine. The intent is it's more than just rate of discharge.

CHRIS RICHARD: It's LPDS for Louisiana.

RANDY HOLLIS: That rice farm in Vermillion Parish.

PATRICK KERR: Nonpoint sources don't have the same requirements.

RUSTY REEVES: About 10 miles away. Too salty. For them it was like a million dollar project to go to Vermillion

River.

CARYN BENJAMIN: Definitions. Can we do this to make sure everywhere we cite. Where we have design set by the flow that is what you want for each section that has that provision. Or changed to what we settled on with part 4. So looking at part 1 water consumption and the projected average and maximum daily demand. Which is repeated also in design criteria.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: The average daily demand during the month of maximum water use.

CARYN BENJAMIN: We didn't do definitions. I thought this one was needed to be added for sure.

RANDY HOLLIS: Do we want to try to be consistent throughout the entire document.

RUSTY REEVES: I don't know you can cause each is a different application.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: We definitely need to define what that means, average daily demand during the month maximum water use.

CHRIS RICHARD: You already have it defined. It's just worded differently.

CARYN BENJAMIN: Those were some of the suggested definitions that were found. If you like one of them.

PATRICK KERR: I think where we're using month we ought to use calendar month and not any 30 day period. I can see

myself picking the wrong 30 days.

CHRIS RICHARD: Where we have average daily demand during the month of maximum water use you could just put maximum monthly average daily flow with the definition you have.

PATRICK KERR: Except calendar month.

CHRIS RICHARD: Wherever we say average daily demand during the month of maximum water use. It's already defined in your definitions as maximum monthly average daily flow except use a calendar month for the 30 days. Maximum monthly average daily flow. Except with calendar month.

CARYN BENJAMIN: All the ones that are referenced in here are good?

CHRIS RICHARD: I think we changed 125A already previously.

JIMMY GUIDRY: The last thing on the agenda, public comments. Anybody in the audience still here? Let's see what we need to do going forward. We did a lot today. Pretty good with making that our final? So with the changes made I want a vote, a first and a second that we will go forward with rule making with this being our final. That means if there's something you really have heartburn you'll have to come do it in public comment period.

CARYN BENJAMIN: If we have to change the rule after it's already gone through notice of intent we actually have to redo the notice of intent if there's changes required. It

lengthens the rule making process. It's better to have it all done prior to the notice of intent.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Give me a deadline if they see something really have heartburn with.

CARYN BENJAMIN: Let's try to meet again in August so that whatever is submitted on September 10th is final or good to go.

PATRICK KERR: And if we see anything after you circulate this let you know before the meeting.

CARYN BENJAMIN: Yes. I plan to circulate this as soon as I'm finished with it. It's going to include the revision to 105 section that currently cites 10 state standards as the document to use for permitting. It's going to cite these sections. That revision will be added after definitions and prior to 111. So you will see a new section. And also I'm going to have a table with all the referenced standards probably at the end. Those are the changes. I'll point those out in the email for you to look at.

JIMMY GUIDRY: This is what I'm getting at, if we're going to have another meeting and that meeting is to sign off that's not a long meeting.

CARYN BENJAMIN: It should be quick.

JIMMY GUIDRY: We might add some more agenda items and other issues on the new work we're doing.

CHRIS RICHARD: Give a deadline you need to have it fixed before the meeting. And I don't know if you want to pick a meeting date now or later, but she's going to need time to incorporate.

CARYN BENJAMIN: The deadline to get it to the registrar is September 10th, I believe. But the fiscal office has to have the impact statements by August 20th. We can meet after the August 20th if we need to. As long as it's before September 10th. Whatever changes y'all have during this next meeting won't take me long.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Let's go for the last week of August and we'll send out a post. That will give us time to get ready for the 10th. All right, do I hear a motion that we adjourn.

RICK NOWLIN: So moved.

AMANDA LAUGHLIN: I just want to say one thing. Thank you very much to Caryn because she literally drafted a hundred pages of code.