

Water System Committee Meeting

November 19, 2013

J.T. LANE: Sheree, do you want to start with roll call please?

SHEREE TAILLON: Dirk Barrios, Vern Breland (absent), Ben Bridges, Robert Brou, Jeffrey Duplantis (absent), Greg Gordon, Jimmy Guidry, Jimmy Hagan, Randy Hollis, Pat Kerr, J.T. Lane, Rick Nowlin (absent), Rusty Reeves, Chris Richard, Keith Shackelford, Cheryl Slavant (absent), Delos Williams (absent). We have 11 present. We have a quorum. The only other thing I want to say, I did pass out these little sheets that have the upcoming meetings for y'all and I will also put those on the website.

J.T. LANE: Before we get started just a couple of reminders. As we are proceeding through this our nice person that's taking all the notes and the minutes for the meeting is not able to capture everyone's comments if you are not speaking into the microphone so we're going to start trying to make sure we are passing around microphones. So be sure that before you start your comments I'll recognize you to speak, but before you get started please be sure you have a mic in your hand and speaking into it going forward. There's been a lot in development that's been proceeding around disinfection and the amoebas that we have found in St. Bernard and Desoto systems and so what I thought we would do is start having a recurring update from Jake on what's going on in that state. I know you all, obviously, were sending a lot of information out, having a lot of conference calls with both parish leadership systems, a lot of your associates, but I also thought this venue might be one of the places we could give updates and see if you have any questions. So we're going to add that as we sort of roll through this, you know, obviously this has never been experienced at this level before. We're going to be learning new things as we go along. I thought until we deem it not necessary we just have a recurring update, a quick update at the beginning of each of these meetings into the foreseeable future. Before we get to that I think Dr. Guidry and I have a few things we want to say

in terms of a welcome and so I'll let him kick off and jump off that.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Since our last meeting where we came in and went over parts one and two been working with our folks and looking at the process. I want to share with you that it's not an easy process. If you look at we come in here and you got input as to delete a whole paragraph or delete a whole section, not as simple as us just saying okay with that. We have to look at it and see what importance it has. And I've asked my engineering folks, my technical experts, when I look at things from a state health officer I'm looking at it way up here. When engineers and folks look at a drinking water system they are looking at details and I'm not the expert. I don't want anybody to think what we did last time was get everybody's input that that's going to be the code. The code is going to be a work in progress that we come together, the experts around the table, and share what we like to see, when and what we can live with. I know what the law says, but I got to tell you we're struggling with the balance. The balance is the regulations that protect human health, public health, and the regulations you have to live with. So where you might want something that makes your life easier, or makes your job easier, I have to weight in and our experts weight in what protects health. We might not agree on that. And so I'm going to ask for discussions at the meetings where we don't agree because if you leave a meeting like last time everybody seems to agree, I don't want that to be everybody thinking we're coming back with the code that takes everything you said, writes the code and we have no input. It's a balance. And it's not an easy balance because what's technical and what we think might help protect it may not. There might not be agreements. So I want to have that discourse at the meetings because if we all leave here and think that's a done deal, it's really not a done deal. We really have a lot of work to do. I'm really concerned that we've taken on a year of work to change a code that has worked well for us for a long time and until we figure it out, until we have the new code, it's up in the air what we can enforce and what we can't enforce. I know what the law says, but I still have to weight in. I have got to make decisions about not letting people get sick and I don't want to wait till they get sick to make the decision. Not an

easy job. I'm merely starting the meeting off by saying that because I see us getting to more and more sections, more and more disagreements, a lot more detailed, a lot more stuff. Deletion of entire sections sometimes put some things at risk and it's real hard, it's easy to say well, I don't want to have to live with that anymore, but why we have it in the first place, or why we think it's important we need to look at. We need to decide. I really struggled with the fact that in a year's time we're going to change something that's taken 50 years to get to. We didn't get here yesterday. I've been around for 17 and I can tell you this has been a work in progress. It's been changing constantly. You have federal input, state input, and then you have to live with some of those decisions. This is nothing new. I'm seeing it all over the place. I've seen developments in Downtown where they're asking for less rules and regs so that people can move Downtown. Over time you've had years and years of legislation that has hamstrung us. What I'm asking is more discourse, more discussion. If it pushes us back some so be it. You want a good code. Let's have the conversation. Last time it was our first time going through it. It was valuable. I'm trying to get a handle on what people are unhappy with. I'm not going to make everybody happy, but we can do some things to make people happy. I'm also trying to make sure that I don't throw the baby out with the bath water. As we get rid of stuff I don't want to get rid of protection for human health. They are there for a reason. We might not know why they were there. We need to figure out can we throw that away? Was that important? In these deletions that's really what we're trying to figure out. What I told you at the last meeting when we come back to this meeting with writing of part one and two. That's not doable. It's too detailed, too many deletions. Not enough time for us to go through it point by point. Ask you for a little extended time to bring you back one and two because it just wasn't enough time with everything else we're dealing with. So I share that with you so that the expectation is not that I dropped the ball. The expectation is we want to do it right. And so I'm going to ask for your cooperation on getting it done correctly. And I just want to start the meeting with that going through a lot of discussion on the next two parts

getting that into the code, written in such a way that we all agree is a full time job. We brought someone in to help us with that. Many of you know Sydney. Sydney has helped us write code, knows how to write code. But again, we have to go through it in detail to make sure we're not putting health at risk. I just want to start the meeting with that.

J.T. LANE: To jump off that too. Honestly we know that, especially what's been thrown at us in the last couple of months, some very new challenges for us that we didn't anticipate having to deal with this year while also trying to have this committee be productive and helping write the new code that we are going to follow going forward and so we are on top of doing our analysis of all the feedback that we're getting through webinars and our meetings. We are actually looking at, for our capacity right now with staff between contactors and our full time staff is the analysis that we need to do to the point that it needs to be comfortable enough is one year enough to do this? And we are looking at that. I want y'all to know that we are looking at that because there are some concerns that we can get this done by August. And so, obviously, if in fact we do feel that way at the end of day we'll come back to you guys with what our recommendation is and seek whatever avenues jointly we feel like we need to do to extend that. I think as an example going back to Dr. Guidry saying deleting whole sections and maybe we can send a message to the group that would be helpful, or if you would prefer to work through your associations, but I think that sometimes when we feel like there are legitimate problems or challenges that people are facing or operators are facing in their day to day work that if that is the case, and certainly I'll tell you this. I've been at DHH five years and sometimes I think it's just human inclination to instead of trying to address the problem, get really honed in on what the problem really is, instead let's just delete the whole part instead of maybe let's not delete it, let's just edit it or provide alternative language. One thing as we got all the feedback and looked at it there was one thing that sort of jumped out at all of us. If there are alternative ways that we can address some of the issues that people have, or things that are giving heartburn, instead of deleting whole sections of the code. Maybe if it is deleting may be

things we can put in place that helps address what the actual things that are giving heartburn. With that I think our plan right now is to finish analyzing all of the feedback we received from chapters one and two and in the next meeting we will provide to all of you in advance in the next meeting our feedback and thoughts on it and the language that we feel should go in the code and then proceed going forward. And so before we get into, I guess, chapters, Jake if you would just provide everyone...

PATRICK KERR: Can we comment on the opening?

J.T. LANE: Certainly.

PATRICK KERR: Just a couple of things and I think we might be heading in separate paths. My understanding of act 292 this committee is to write the rules for operation, construction, and maintenance and then DHH is to have its say and DHH has members of this committee, but I don't know that what comes out of this committee is certainly not the final product. And so I don't know that now is the time to argue about putting things back into, and I'm going to digress just a second. We hadn't started talking about the code yet, we're still talking about the ten state standards which isn't the code, never has been the code. It's been enforced as the code for the last several years and that's why we're here. I think, I hope what the committee can do is produce a document that the committee believes is protective of public health and then the dialogue continues with Dr. Guidry and the engineering staff about what needs to be put back in instead of argue about all the periods and commas now because I think that really will slow us down. Again, I think this is a two tiered approach that the law contemplates. And I don't know that we need to solve all of DHH concerns with this committee. The committee approves a document, DHH takes it and has times to promulgate it. My understanding is still promulgated administration procedures act with the full public hearing and everything else that happens when DHH promulgates a rule. Even if we argue parts one we may not get done with half of it if we do it the way I think you're suggesting Dr. Guidry, so it concerns me greatly. The other question I have is this is, I think, supposed to be a team effort.

Each of us has basically veto authority over the other cause the law says committee has to pass new rules, and DHH has to pass new rules, and somehow we need to come together and make it work and that's part of what this committee needs to do. Jake's going to talk about the emergency rule in a minute. I'm going to tell you our first shot out of the barrel we didn't do it. The law says the committee has to pass on any rule DHH promulgates. There's no primacy issue with the amoeba. I think you would have had a consent out of this committee if we had been asked. I think there's a disconnect. I don't know if it's a lack of trust in the department, the committee and the department, or just a lack of having to work through these things. But we're all here for the same reasons to protect public health and we're not here to make it easier to do our jobs because all that's going to do is end up in litigation with people getting sick. We're on the same side of this thing Dr. Guidry. Not a person at this table that wouldn't agree with that. I think if we just move forward knowing that we're working together we can get past some of these issues. If there's something that's important to public health it will get put in the code whether it's now or after we settle on the language that we're striking from the ten state standards. Thank you.

J.T. LANE: I concur and our comments weren't meant to say that there is a division. I think what I was saying one thing that could be helpful instead, again, this was directed to really a lot of comments we're getting, not just the work of the committee, all the comments we're getting through the forums. I was just saying one thing that's occurred as we went through the first duration of this that the one thing might be helpful is hone in on what's really causing heartburns as opposed to just wholesale taking parts out. But I completely agree with you. Really was maybe a time for us to really share with you where we are. We definitely think we're on the same page working together. I want to be really clear, we are learning as we go. There was not a handbook I could pick up and say this is how to start a water committee on rewriting states. We looked, I promise, but there wasn't. Just wanted to add that.

ROBERT BROU: I just want to explain myself. I didn't really do a good job why I was asking, but I was

one of the one's comments of deleting whole sections. My thoughts were ten state standards is not going away. The design world is always going to use ten state standards. That document's going to remain in effect and all the good language in there is going to remain. What I was looking at was it covered somewhere else, and for example a lot of sections talk about security. Chapter 12 talks about security of facilities. Maybe we can talk about whether it needs to be enhanced or beefed up, but does it need to be reiterated in each chapter. So I was saying delete that entirety. There was a lot of it operators, those types of things, that's covered by other regulations. Does not need to be part of this regulation for DHH. Strike it in its entirety. There's a lot of good language in there. Still needs to be a consideration when you're designing a facility, but does not need to be a part of our Louisiana water standards. That's the biggest part that I deleted the rest. I really just feel we need to know what is important, what things in this document that DHH feels need to be part then we can really concentrate on those issues.

J.T. LANE: I totally agree. One thing that I think maybe before sort of digging into this, and I think you are right, there are places where it is covered in multiple places. I agree in terms of streamline approach we should definitely be doing that. I also think this is an opportunity where we can, even though it's not comparing apples to apples, I often try to look at what I can learn. For instance, retail food inspections and sanitary code and how in many places it may be much more highly proscriptive and so it's easier for restaurants, in some cases, to know what is and isn't and I think that, not that we're comparing they are the same thing, but where we can, I think, through this process be more proscriptive about what requirements are the best for us because, again, one lesson learned I think looking back is we don't want to reference other documents, necessarily, in our sanitary code. If it's worth referencing then we need to put it, adopt it wholesale. And frankly, from y'all's standpoint, making it easier when you are trying to build your systems. Much better to go to one place as opposed to 50. I'll be honest, I don't care if the sanitary code gets two feet high and we have to get special binders for it. I'd rather it be very, very complete and have as much as

possible so that we're not having to go to many other places outside of it to make sense of it. Off something that's very complex already. That's what engineers have to design, highly complex. Anything else?

RANDY HOLLIS: The chapter 12 currently references ten state standards. What do we envision the outcome of this to be ultimately? Is it the sanitary code, this law will stay in effect? And then the ten state standards that we are going to adopt as Louisiana standards will simply be referenced as an appendix to it and any conflicts that the sanitary code will govern or do we envision one code? And what concerns me is we are addressing only ten state standards now. No one in any of those comments is going back and looking at chapter 12 to see where there are conflicts, and do we erase things from the sanitary code? How are we going to dove tail these together?

J.T. LANE: From my standpoint, again, going back to the timing issue I think that what we need to do, frankly, is address the request of the legislator first off. That's the priority for me. I think for what is stated in the law that is the immediate priority and so where we can adopt, you know, again Robert back to the meeting suggested we start there. Start with ten state standards. I think we start there. Again, my vision is that we have the entire 166 pages of a breakdown today, edited, the language is exactly where we all want it to be in terms when we take our vote, take a vote on that document, and adopting that entire document into the sanitary code. There will be no references. Now where there are I have no idea I could not tell you right now the extent of lead over into other parts of the code. I think that, again, that going back to my comments earlier about timing, I think that would then greatly go, really significantly go beyond what we have time for. My goal would be that we are taking, we're starting with 2012 standards and editing and altering that and adopting it as Louisiana standards within the sanitary code. We're going to adopt that content. And, again, we approve I think that would be, frankly, the most straight forward and easy thing to do. Certainly, if anybody has comments. Jake, if you want to comment, or Dr. Guidry?

JAKE CAUSEY: What I recall that's what we stated in the first meeting.

PATRICK KERR: That's what we agreed to in the last meeting.

JAKE CAUSEY: I was not here.

PATRICK KERR: Writing the standards for construction, operation, and maintenance, the sanitary code standards for water system operation are what we're charged with writing, not the ten state standards for Louisiana. The whole thing, it's the whole thing. That's what we're charged with. We're not here because of the ten state standards. We've chosen ten state standards, but at the last meeting we even discussed people are going to incorporate into their sections the portions of the relevant portions of the sanitary code and it should be one document. As you said when you started, I think we moved away from that again. One document and that document is how we're going to operate water systems. It's going to be the code for Louisiana. I think where we ended up last meeting, unless I remember incorrectly, Dr. Guidry is that not what we agreed to?

JIMMY GUIDRY: How we get there is where we're struggling. We're using ten state standards as a guide and picking those things that we feel belong in the code and those things that don't belong in the code. We're trying to get to a code, one code. So I think we all want to get to one code. How we get there is what we're struggling with because ten state standards goes off on a lot of tangents, but it also touches on some things we have in the code and we're trying to figure out what already exist in the code that we already address in ten state standards. If you look at your citation, if you look at surveys a lot of the reference is back to ten state standards. If we're going to have a code then those citations, which are things we think are important, have to be part of the code now. And I think that's why we're struggling. Went back with all the suggestions and recommendations and Sydney's sitting there writing it and looking at part XII and trying to integrate the two. It's not that easy to integrate unless you write it all out which is...

PATRICK KERR: What we need to do.

J.T. LANE: I'll amend and add to what I said earlier. When there are opportunities through the discourse of this committee to make those changes, as well I certainly we should do it outside of

that. I think we got started because of the ten state standards. We got started because no one liked it. That was the precipitate of the bill initially and so that is the primary driver based on everything I've heard from everything over a year since last fall, last August, actually. That is what's gotten us here. Again, I agree with you on the fact that there are opportunities to clean other places up. Where we can do that in a timely fashion, unless the legislator decides that, again, they want to give us more time to take on. Again, I don't think anybody in this room could have ever calculated or anticipated how expansive this code got in terms of doing this in one year, especially since so many other things of similar size and scope and breath have taken a whole lot longer. Even as we consulted our experts to deal with the amoeba issue we found out Arizona had a similar issue. Not quite the same, but very similar. It took them five years. From my vantage point, and I imagine there's still work going on, from my vantage point I can't imagine anything taking that long. I think that we're going to identify places throughout this that we can improve. Any crossover and where we can let's do that. Let's get as much done as we can by our deadline and then move on to other things after that. We have until August and so I don't want, again, if we keep coming back with more and more things to throw in I fear we're going to miss our deadline and that's not something I find acceptable, nor do I want to go before the committee and have to explain to them why we're late. And so we're all really busy. You all have tremendous jobs yourselves that you have to do and so I wanted to make sure that, again, that we're using our time in the best possible way. We're operating from the same spirit of openness, but I don't want to keep having a conversation every meeting about what exactly we're doing. It was started, we agreed with Robert's recommendation, I fully supported it, of starting with that text and making amendments going forward. If there are places where it is duplicated and we can show that, document, and have that discussion in this meeting let's do that. There are things we need to cover, set as long term goals then we need to do that. But I would suggest that if there's anything big that people want to discuss and accomplish before August that everybody come up with that list now. There is not

going to be any sort of oh, we're now in June and then there are more issues we want to discuss. If there are other things that you think if there's duplication somewhere, or there's other big issues that could be covered within the scope of the law then I would suggest that every committee member submit that list of topics. Be very specific and submit that possibly before the next meeting. Otherwise, I don't know of anybody that's done a complete analysis of the entire sanitary code related to what's regulated to you to know exactly what's going to be crossover, what's bleeding over, etc. I think you all may know antidotally and experientially, you may have experienced well, it's here and there and I don't know which one to follow and whatever. The thing is everybody already knows that from your experience. If there are the things I would say the next few weeks is the time in which we need to understand that and start to address that as well. Because I don't want to be integrating new issues and more work for my staff that's already stretched statewide already because, as you all know, plan review has taken longer just to get projects off the ground and then on top dealing with how to handle the disinfection requirements for the state. Which we envisioned people are going to learn a lot over the next three months of that. Tweaks and changes after that process. We're open to that, but everybody really clear if there are other things that fall within the scope of the act that you want to cover outside of that then we need to do that. Get that list so we can integrate into our workflow and be ready to help you address that. Cause every time we do add something, and I'll be honest, the request then comes from me to my staff y'all need to get this done now. That means that they are working not 60, 70 hours a week, we're working another 80. At this point I'm concerned about their health and the time they are putting into it and I'm already asking a lot of them, me and Dr. Guidry both, and I don't know if we should ask more. Which is why I'm saying if we don't get down exactly and precisely what other concerns address covered in the 2012 standards using as the basis of our work then we need to know that quickly so we can find a solution for it. Again, I'm open to doing just about everything we can from a public health standpoint to find resources to help us. Trying to squeeze more blood out of a

turnip, out of our budget, to see if we can do additional contracts, bringing more expertise to assist us with this. I would recommend if there are other things you would like to see addressed that aren't explicitly stated in 2012 standards or talked about already, then y'all prepare that list so we can make the appropriate assignments for staff and/or us as committee members. Any other comments? Jake give us an update where we are in emergency rule and how the emergency rule and how Desoto and St. Bernard are doing as of today.

JAKE CAUSEY: So on the emergency rule we did hold some initial webinars after the emergency rule was issued. Water systems had about a 150, I think, participants total between the two webinars, which was certainly good considering it was about half a days' notice. We definitely had some folks emailing afterwards wanting to get information. We definitely had a lot of question/answer on the webinars which was helpful. Since then we have created a webpage for our emergency rule that we have really all the information you need relative to the emergency rule there including a timeline. And so we've also set up a whole month of individual workshops to help water systems submit their monitoring plans. That's really the first deadline in emergency rule is to revise the TCR and chlorine monitoring plants. We actually have it set up where we can click on a location and basically submit a sort of attendance for class so that we can schedule you for a time at the workshop. Really we just envision being there eight hours and having water systems come and go during the day to work with someone on the computer to submit their plans. Rural Water Association, as well as TNB, ourselves, and Jacobs Engineering that's going to be all of those providing assistance. Have lots of one-on-one assistance available for that activity. And so water systems can go on the website and sign up for all of that. So I did send out a notice on Friday. We're going to hold our next webinar this Thursday at 1:30. We're actually just going to do it as one webinar all together. I think it can support up to a 1,000 people on the webinar. More than sufficient to do it all at one time. And we'll really be covering a lot of this information on the website to do the calculation on the sites and the additional chlorine. Basically, put that in a spreadsheet here as you can all see to make it easier

for water systems to look at what current TCR schedule is and readily do the math for them and tell them the sites and what the chlorine residual requirements are. We've been getting some emails and kind of request really for this just wanting confirmation. I'm this size system doing XYZ with the numbers in the email and we've been responding that's right, you got it right. Really haven't had a whole lot of other comments than that. With respect to St. Bernard and Desoto they are both doing a 60 day burn and they have both achieved a one milligram per liter chlorine residual throughout. St. Bernard probably achieved that this past Thursday. I will say certainly Desoto got there much quicker than St. Bernard. Desoto had four tanks in the distribution system. One they were boosting and now they are boosting at all four. St. Bernard originally was not boosting at any tanks. They did start boosting at one tank. Both these systems are long expansive systems. To maintain these residuals there was definitely a need to boost chlorine in some of the tanks in the distribution system. So they are there. In fact, we're going to be monitoring both systems this week for residuals throughout to make sure they are maintaining that level. I know this, both systems said they could never do it and they have done it. Honestly, they really didn't feel they could achieve that kind of residual. I think there was definitely a mentality there that I don't know they were trying to achieve it because they had struggled so hard and couldn't. Maybe they did have some nitrification going on and the fact, maybe they did need to be boosting in some sites where they were not, you know, permitted them from getting there. They are both very impressed and proud of what they have accomplished. A lot more work to do, but it's definitely been an interesting journey for them. They have learned a lot along the way. I know that Desoto indicated, certainly to the media as well as us, they are really going to be looking hard at staying on free chlorine, but again disinfection byproducts are going to have to do some additional treatment to accomplish that. See what they may do to accomplish that. So that's where we're at. So Jacobs is developing a monitoring plan portal where all the monitoring plans would be submitted through that portal online. That portal is set to be live and available December 9th. Each water system will

get a login, user ID, and password. If you own multiple systems just have one and be able to submit plans for multiple systems. It's going to be really nice and we'll also have, in addition to the training workshops, definitely hold webinars with the Jacobs' folks. Really the goal is to encourage most systems just to go online and do it from the comfort of their office and it's going to be a fairly simple process to accomplish that. We definitely knew that we needed to get out and have some workshops with computers. There may be people who may not be comfortable doing that, we can help them. Definitely putting a lot of time and effort and energy to making sure we can get all of those submitted by January so by the end of December 1st of January so we can review them. During January get feedback and have systems begin monitoring in February. And the whole plan review process, the monitoring plan review process managed in that website so you can always go in and check the status, comments, etc. all be managed right there. More to come on that, but we are continuing making a lot of progress. We're also going to be working with Jacobs. We're going to be scanning a lot of our historical chlorine residuals from our lab forms for the previous couple years so we can do some historical analysis to see where we've had more chlorine residuals in systems and also look at TCR violations to maybe target systems that may be more at risk to some extent. A lot of work going on.

RANDY HOLLIS: Jake, just for our benefit, because we are so closely associated with Desoto and St. Bernard, to what extent are they flushing to get the residual out of the perimeter of the system? And are they having to continue to flush to maintain the residual? And then what consequences are they facing with discharging a 1.0 or higher free chlorine residual. Are they having to dechlorinate? And just a few more specifics about how they are achieving the 1.0.

JAKE CAUSEY: And I'll say both are different. I know that St. Bernard is still flushing very extensively. I think it took them a while because they seem to have very few staff available to go out and do flushing activities. They have a plant they are manning 24/7 producing water. I know that they finally got their fire department on board to assist them to try to accomplish flushing. A lot of their

efforts initially was just dumping water, not necessarily flushing. They are very different. May be some turnover. They do have some very old pipes that have some sediment and other things built up. What they have seen they did start (inaudible) actually some unilateral flushing, things with velocity, scouring and they saw improvements in residuals at that point. Frankly, they are still in that process. They are moving from one end of the system to the other. They are still in that process in St. Bernard. I know in Desoto they did install some automatic flushing stations at some of their lines. Frankly, the initial burn they set up some mobile units with hydrochloride drum and a pump on some basically dead end line and flushed out the end because it takes so long for that part of the plant to get through the system so they kind of maybe speed up on getting residuals up. They are monitoring residuals and flushing daily. I don't know how much flushing is required, but I know they are spending a lot of time and effort to get to that one and maintain that one. They are trying to achieve the 1, not necessarily the .5. I don't know; they're kind of still in that burn trying to maintain one. I know that Desoto did such a great job most of their residuals are almost four. You got to start backing down, frankly. I guess they are really still in it and once they get throughout the 60 days and try to maintain that .5. What level of effort is going to be required at that point? Like I said, they are still working it. Really the best info I got.

BEN BRIDGES: They are down to one at that site now.

JAKE CAUSEY: Okay. I knew, it's kind of like they really had a break through maybe with the chlorine was staying really high so I know they had been backing down on that. Trial and error.

GREG GORDON: Jake, I heard you mentioned troubled systems. Are your local regional offices going to notify local governing authorities if there's a public water system having problems doing that, maintaining, getting to where you want them to be at residual. Smaller water systems, privately owned water systems, are you going to notify people? I work with parish government. Council people are worried that people come to them first and they have no answer or no information.

JAKE CAUSEY: So yes, we will be monitoring February 1st is when the higher residuals, sort of the

compliance start date, if you will. So yes, we will be monitoring that and then we will be tracking compliance so that information will certainly be made available to parish governments. Typically, we have this water task force working with parish OEPs (inaudible) emergency response mode. Typically, the most effective way to get into parish government is through the OEP and the emergency response process.

J.T. LANE: All right. I think next we're going to move on to the next agenda item which is old business and approval of the minutes. Sheree, does everyone have a copy?

SHEREE TAILLON: It was online.

J.T. LANE: Hopefully everyone's had a chance to review that. Any discussion needed? Do I have a motion to approve them?

GREG GORDON: I'll make a motion.

SPEAKER: I'll second.

J.T. LANE: Any opposed? All right, beautiful. Let's move on to the next agenda item five, review of part three. Greg is going to make his presentation on his recommendations and what he heard from his webinar and then we'll have discussion.

GREG GORDON: Thank you. First of all I want to thank DHH folks, Sheree especially, for making me look half way intelligent doing it so that helped a lot. In terms of the facilitator recommendations just to start off y'all got it in front of you 3.2.1.2 number of sources. Again, existing single source wells need to be grandfathered in, just again my recommendation. In many instances a single source well, operating utility may not be able to secure the necessary property to locate a new well. An interconnection may not be financially and physically feasible. If an interconnection is not possible, but the utility can find property to locate a new well and has the financial means the development of a matrix to determine the size of the new well should be developed based on the size and flow of the existing primary well. 3.2.1.3 standby power. The need for backup power in an emergency is apparent. The word "shall" could be construed as creating a mandate. Though I

also know there involves a “should” in the language also. The ability to acquire development dedicated generator plan in reach of most utilities DHH needs to understand that many will not be able to have a generator for each and every well site. Also, the rule needs to be tailored to take into account storm season issues with regards to loss of power. 3.2.3.1 well locations. Already covered part 51, part 12. And set same with grouting requirements, however the grandfathering of the existing wells should also be considered. In terms of the top five comments received, and thank you for everybody who turned in all of their comments. They were quite easy to discern and to follow. 3.1 is surface water. It reads currently as surface water source includes all tributary streams and drainage basins, natural lakes and artificial reservoirs or impoundments above the point of water supply intake. A source water protection plan enacted for continued protection of the watershed from potential sources of contamination shall be provided as determined by the reviewing authority. Comments were that is this possible for large waterways that cross state boundaries such as the Mississippi and Pearl Rivers. Another comment was "as determined by the reviewing authority" was ambiguous and the Department of Health and Hospitals needs to determine how it would be documented, approved, and also the frequency. That would be, in my opinion, referring to the protection plan. Also, another commenter felt to delete the definition since it was too broad. 3.1.2 quality. Under a study shall be made of the factors, both natural and manmade, which may affect water quality in the water supply stream, river, lake, or reservoir. Such a study shall include, but not limited to. The comments were in the first paragraph strike “a study shall be made of” and replaced with "an assessment should be made of" which is more consistent with language in the groundwater source section. Also, the question about who would conduct the study. What would be documented and how often would that study have to be reassessed? 3.1.5 zebra mussel control. Chemical treatment shall be in accordance with chapter five of the recommended standards for water works and shall be acceptable to the reviewing authority. The comment was to strike the language chapter five the recommended standards for water works and

replace with title 51, part 12 Louisiana sanitary code. Another comment was the zebra mussel treatment is not the same in some cases. Another quote, another comment was intake can affect cooling water as well as drinking water systems. I guess last time I don't know if we had so many questions. I guess I'm reading if someone wants a question they are going to throw something at me. I'll look up every so often. Again, to repeat 3.2.1.2 number of sources. What I said earlier the comments that I received though is a need for the grandfather clause for existing single source systems. Strike "shall" and insert "should". Another comment was small systems cannot justify two sources. And another one was to insert language requiring two sources if financially feasible.

3.2.1.3 standby power. The comments were to add in "to meet the average day demand" at the end of the sentence. So I guess after connectivity. A generator plan with dedicated generators should suffice to meet requirements. Another comment was delete "through a dedicated portable or in-place auxiliary power of adequate supply and connectivity." And another comment was if a non-transient or non-community well will there be a variance process? The rest of the comments, 3.0 general. Comment was to strike "to the satisfaction of the reviewing authority" from the first sentence being it was considered too open-ended without definition. Under 3.1.1 quantity, subsection D. Comment was to delete as being too broad. 3.1.2 quality, subsection F. Comment was to strike "in ice conditions" since not considered a factor in Louisiana climate. 3.1.3 minimum treatment. Comment was to delete this since it is covered in part 12 of the Louisiana state sanitary code. 3.1.3 minimum treatment B. The comment was to add language to read "the minimum treatment required shall be *as established by USEPA* and the reviewing authority." So obviously this section in italicizes *as established by USEPA* was the comment, was that language in that sentence. The other comment received was, is minimum treatment documented by law of removal or more stringent method? 3.1.3 minimum treatment, subsection C. Comment was surface water filtration already covered in 51 part 12.323.A. The comment was requirements of the subsection should be deleted and replaced with reference to the safe drinking water act. Under 3.1.4

structures, design of intake subsection C. The comment was to strike subsection C since it is not applicable in Louisiana. 3.1.4.2 raw water pumping wells shall subsection A. Comment was to strike "as required by the reviewing authority" and the need to establish a minimum elevation. Subsection B, comment there was a need to define accessible should it be by foot, vehicle, by foot path. Subsection E, comment is it applicable to all sources, define occasional. In some plants it may be too difficult to take the line out of service, the intake line out of service to clean and what is driving the need to clean the intake line. I have to also apologize, some of these I organized it and then I got some late comments so I had to go back and reorganize it so sometimes it doesn't all look the same. 3.1.4.3 off steam raw water storage reservoir. Comment was to delete and utilize the definition in part 12 of Louisiana sanitary code. 3.1.5 mussel control B. Hence my previous comments. See I'm wrapping around since I received some late. Subsection B, comment was to strike plan and replace with "facility." 3.1.6.1 site preparation, subsection C. Abandonment of all wells which will be inundated in accordance with requirements of the reviewing authority. The comment was to add "appropriate" before "reviewing authority", also that this may require LDEQ and/or DNR review for abandonment. So I guess there was a feeling that it was going through so many different agencies doing abandonment that it should at least denote that those agencies are involved and their approval may also be needed. 3.1.6.2 construction. The comment was delete in its entirety. 3.1.6.3 water supply dams. The comment was to delete in entirety. 3.1.7 comment was to strike all references. Keith this is one of yours. I don't know if you want to explain, if I caught that correctly or not?

KEITH SHACKELFORD: Well, title 12 calls out the minimum security requirements, so if we already have that why do we need to expand on it in operation and maintenance?

GREG GORDON: I just wanted to make sure I got your comment correctly. 3.2 groundwater. Comment was to delete the definition, utilize definition of part 12 Louisiana state sanitary code. 3.2.1.1 source capacity. Comment was to delete "unless otherwise specified by reviewing authority."

3.2.2 quality. Comment was to delete relevant portions covered in part 12. 3.2.3 location, 3.2.1.1 well location, I'm sorry. The comment was to delete all and refer to sanitary code part 12, sub-part 327.1-5. 3.2.3.2 continued sanitary protection. Comment was the last sentence delete "may" and insert "shall." Also, sub-part 315 and sanitary code. 3.2.3.3 wellhead protection. Comment was to delete "as determined by the reviewing authority" and establish wellhead protection plan minimum requirements. 3.2.4 general well construction. The comment was to delete section since it's covered in part 12 and add reference to Louisiana water well rules, regulations, and standards. 3.2.4.2 minimum protected depths. Comment was to delete entirely and refer to the sanitary code part 12, sub-part 327.6 and 7. 3.2.4.4 permanent steel casing pipe A-F. Comment was to delete entirely and refer to section 2.4.0.0 Louisiana water well rules, regulations, and standards. 3.2.4.5 PVC well casing. Comment was to delete and refer to section 2.4.0.0 of the Louisiana water well rules, and regulations, and standards. 3.2.4.8 screens. Delete refer to section 2.5.0.0, that's a document. 3.2.4.9 grouting requirements, subsections A through F. Comment was to delete and refer to section 2.6.0.0 of Louisiana water well rules, regulations, and standards. 3.2.4.10 upper terminal well construction A and D. Comment was to delete A and refer to Louisiana sanitary code part 12, sub-part 327.7. Comment to delete "or as of the reviewing authority directs" since it is too open ended. 3.2.4.11 development. The comment was to delete and refer to section 2.7.0.0 Louisiana water well rules, regulations, and standards. 3.2.4.14 well abandonment. The comment to delete and refer to chapter three of Louisiana water rules, regulations, and standards. 3.2.5 testings and records. Comment was it was a good practice, but doesn't belong in the Louisiana standards document and/or maybe enforcement. I would think, if possible.

J.T. LANE: (inaudible) recommendation?

GREG GORDON: That didn't get any recommendation. That was somewhat of a late comment, but I can go back to the commenter and ask via email. 3.2.5.1 yield and drawdown tests, subsection H. Comment was "at the discretion of reviewing authority" is vague and what additional testing may be

required. 3.2.5.2 plumbness and alignment requirements. Comment was to delete and refer to section 2.3.2.0 of the Louisiana water well rules, regulations, and standards. 3.2.6 Aquifer types and construction methods - special conditions. Comments was a potential for conflict since this is already mentioned in part 12 for the reference to Louisiana water well rules, regulations, and standards. 3.2.6.2 gravel pack material subsection B. The comment was to delete and refer to Louisiana water well rules, regulations, and standards. 3.2.6.6 naturally flowing wells, subsection A. Comment "shall require special consideration." There is a need to delineate what special considerations will be required. 3.2.7 well pumps, discharge piping and appurtenances, subsection C. Comments was relevant portions are covered in part 12. Delete ANSI/NSF requirements for lubricants. 3.2.7.6 casing vent. Comment delete and refer to section 2.8.1.0 for Louisiana water well rules, regulations, and standards. Those were all the comments that were received. I'll go back and do what I'm supposed to do with the remainder of this. I guess the one thing that J.T. you mentioned earlier about people wanting to delete entirely, I just noted from my own thing of doing this part of it. If people did they usually had some other thing that they referenced to. So they typically had a direct reference to something else and I guess either be referenced in the standards, or we would take that part wholesale and copy it in there and note that it's actually coming from that document. It would all be one defined standard look.

J.T. LANE: If I could just comment on that. It seems to me based on all the comments we've heard over the last year, plus it seems to me outside of the specific, a lot of the specific issues we've heard, the other frustration, and I share it, is that everything wasn't really in one place. So if we are going to reference other places I certainly am in favor of making the documents clear as possible. Just to save time on behalf of those that are doing the work across the state who we serve I think that's part of our job try to make that as easy for them as well. Where we can't pull in some other places where it makes sense, then absolutely we should do that.

CHRIS RICHARD: I have a couple of comments on the references on the water standard and things like

that. I believe we need to refer each time. It's kind of like we're trying to keep ten states and refer to other sections. Like the water well standards, right now it just says in the sanitary code talks about the water well standards. I think that kind of covers. There's something more that needs to be added. We don't need to reference it and try to keep all the ten state sections in every heading that refers to something somewhere else. I don't think we should copy codes either. I think you have to be very careful when you copy, especially when multiple people have jurisdiction. If it's something you like and not enforceable that's fine, but when you start copying you end up with conflict when the other codes get changed and yours didn't. So you can reference. If you need to modify it you start copying things, the other code changes, yours doesn't. Who's in charge when it comes time to enforce that regulation? Just have to be careful on copying other codes.

PATRICK KERR: The ten state standards was never a code and therefore if we want to put it in the code we need to. I don't think I ever argued that we need to incorporate all the other codes into the sanitary code because the well standards they do change. There's going to be a conflict in the future if the changes are made by the responsible department and then we don't change the sanitary code. I don't think it needs to be this thick, although (inaudible). The things that are not written in the code right now they enforce (inaudible) because we're enforcing the ten state standards need to be in the code and ten state standards needs to go away was my only point.

J.T. LANE: Yeah and my only thought, I guess my sentiment, I guess try and figure out how to make it easier on y'all. Because, frankly, it isn't that great on me and I don't have to do it, I just have to read it. From my vantage point it's pretty big.

JIMMY GUIDRY: And this is where I'm struggling. I'm hearing from different experts ten state standards is what engineers use as recommendation to look at so it doesn't go away. What we're trying to get at, I think, is what it is that we think is important enough for us, say in the ten state standards, that we want to see. I really think that's what we're trying to do. There's a lot of stuff in there that doesn't apply, we don't want to see, so really clarifying what part of ten state standards

we feel is important. I think we have a descent code. I don't think there's a problem with our code. I think there's a problem with citing ten state standards. Parts that people don't like.

GREG GORDON: Citing under enforcement document and then you have to live up to that.

PATRICK KERR: When it's not in the code. So the stuff you want to enforce we'll put in the code even if we reference the ten state standards?

JIMMY GUIDRY: It's kind of like it's really hard because number one you got a lot of input, which is what we want. Get a sense of what people are upset about. What if one person has heartburn about one thing, we went through a whole bunch of stuff, and we're going to now say this is what we agree to because one person had heartburn, but the rest of us don't necessarily agree with that. It's really like I'm trying to get consensus and I don't know how you do that with webinars because all you are doing is getting input. Really the consensus part is where we have to look at. Does it make sense that we don't think it's important because one person thought it was important. I can see one heartburn, wow nobody likes "left up to the authority" as to what it should be. Leaves it opened ended and nobody likes that, but that's a given. Some things in here I don't know how important they are because somebody mentioned it. As we go through it and try to figure it out we'll probably have to come back and see how much heartburn there is and where we have heartburn. But I'm not trying to rewrite the code. I am trying to figure out what are the things that we can fix. That's really what I'm trying to figure out. As you can tell rewriting the entire code is not what we are set up to do. To set up where ten state standards was heartburn. I think that's what started this. If I'm wrong tell me cause I need to know. We're trying to fix the references in our surveys. That's what I'm interpreting. Good job, a lot of input. At some point we got to bring back some stuff and say how much heartburn is this? Does it make sense? Because it might be one person's interpretation. I really don't know. But I like it when the facilitator comes back with their recommendations because then I know they have put some thought into it.

RANDY HOLLIS: I'd like to get down to some specifics here. Thank you Greg for the good job you did.

On section 3.1.4.2 under raw water pumping wells, the references made in there to protect from flooding and that's very arbitrary. Previously in part two we discussed that we should protect everything from 100 year flood elevation or maximum flood of record. Can we be more specific in this part so that for DHH's part, as well as ours, designing, we're on common ground. So do we say raw water pumping wells that the top of the station should be at least at the 100 year flood elevation, or the maximum flood record, or a 10 year elevation? I just like to try and get some consensus on that so that we don't end up with arbitrary in the code.

PATRICK KERR: Top of the station or critical equipment, big difference?

RANDY HOLLIS: Yes, well in many cases what we'll do is we'll design the electrical equipment three foot above the 100 year flood elevation, so that's electrical equipment. The base of a pump doesn't need to be above because a turbine pump can be below, but the motor definitely needs to be above the 100 year flood elevation, or three feet, in some cases two feet. So if we can get common ground on this. I would suggest the top of the concrete structure at 100 year flood elevation and then all electrical equipment three feet above that. That's a suggestion. For new construction. Let me cover one other item. Under the number of sources right now a number of small communities are being hit with having to provide two sources. And I understand the importance of that, by all means, so you don't have to have boil water notices or anything. But a lot of small communities cannot afford a half a million dollar well right now. Could we consider, for small communities, that they would not have to have two sources as far as water wells provided they had a stand by pump, stand by motor, and stand by equipment in inventory such that a well driller can come in and have that well back and running within a say 24 or 48 hour period of time.

JIMMY GUIDRY: That's really a tough call because the cost of putting in an extra well seems overwhelming, but the cost of not having water is way more. So you're trying to balance the fact of what it cost to put a well. I think, in my mind, the cost is starting to compromise our ability to

protect the public. If a well goes bad and you don't have a secondary well bringing water, bringing in bottled water for that community, and we've had to do that sometimes for small communities because they can't afford it. Sometimes for as long as a year, a year and a half, two years. To me it's much more affordable to have a second well. I don't know why it has to cost so much for that well. That's the part I don't understand. Why does it cost so much to drill a well? I don't understand why it would be half a million dollars. Jake speak up.

JAKE CAUSEY: What we've seen many systems have installed second wells. The cost of the well will vary with the size of the system. Not every system needs a half million dollar well and so generally the cost of the well will be relative to the size of the system, the number of customers served. I know that we can readily identify which systems only have one well. We're not working with some unknown number. I think having backup parts maybe, in my mind, a good interim solution until you get a second well installed, but I would hate... I wouldn't support that being the plan. That we build single source systems throughout Louisiana as long as we got spare parts on hand so that in a few days we can get it back up and running. I don't think that's a good idea or good approach, but I think that working out, what do you call it, a matrix for some interim solution and what amount of time is needed for some systems I think is going to be different based on the system too for the cost of the well. To me that's something you can more readily look at on a case by case basis, rather than saying it cost a half million dollars for every system. I would prefer to look at it by case by case and what's doable. We've had many systems install second wells. I know some others that have gotten financing are installing second wells now so they can be compliant. I don't think it's unattainable, I just think we need to be reasonable in the expectation of when they might be achieved. And I know maybe initially there was some preliminary conversation as far as having some phased in timeline to give systems time to get funding and things in place to get there, and not necessarily be considered out of compliance during that timeframe. I would support looking at it more from that direction. I believe having a backup water supply is absolutely critical. I think that

we need to construct, build, and operate water systems so that they don't fail. Parts will fail, but the system shouldn't fail. We need redundancy. We need power. We need wells. We need to keep the system operational. Any time the system has no water that is a major, major issue. I think looking at a second source issue, again that's not an unknown. We can generate lists of who has what, etc., etc. as what's needed to better evaluate where to go on that issue. But I think at the end of the day somewhere we need redundant systems.

RANDY HOLLIS: Thank you, I appreciate the discussion. I think because at the end of the day someone's going to ask why didn't you look at that. So I do agree with redundancy, but we need to cover those types of issues.

BEN BRIDGES: What if we're dealing with a very small system and the customers on that association taken to account they know they may be without water. They have one well, their next nearest customer has worse water, THM violation wise, what they're experiencing and they don't want to spend 40 50,000 dollars to tie onto a lesser quality water. They are willing to do without. They have an alternative to go back to town to their other house, if you will, and to make them do that if they are willing to... I understand the need to have the backup and a second well, but if they are willing to take that chance or do without as they did in the old days, is that necessarily wrong? Are you going to force them to spend the money when they don't want to, or tie to an existing system that may not be as good as what they have? If your pumps and your wells... and I appreciate standby parts and pieces, but I know several occasions we have lost wells at 9:00 in the morning or 10:00 at night, call wholesale pump in Shreveport, go get it, come back and have it in the next day. So you're talking about a 24 hour time (inaudible) so you're going to be down a little while anyway. And having some of that on hand could facilitate and expedite some of that. Tie on to another system that is not as good as quality of what you have, or force them to spend a lot of money that they are willing to do without for a while. That's a question they've asked me. Why do we have to do this? Because it's prudent, but they have to do it.

JAKE CAUSEY: I don't think that understanding the need for potable water is a terribly complex thing, right. If you go without water, somebody turns your water off in your home you quickly realize what you can and can't do like flush toilets. There's lots of basic things. And then if you have lots of people without water you create an environment that is not safe, not sanitary and so this is a fundamental requirement. And we do see a lot of times, I guess, proposals to sort of go backwards in a sense. We've had a lot of proposals people just want to start installing rain water cisterns in New Orleans, composting toilets, and all these things that create an environment for cross-connections and unsanitary conditions in an effort of conservation and green points. We have plenty of water in New Orleans. I think that was the problem was the amount of water. Creating cisterns and these other things grow mosquitoes and spread disease is completely unnecessary. Again, if there's a system that we're talking about that only has one well, again we're only talking about community systems, not talking about non-community systems. And I would say that, frankly, if there's a nearby system and the concern is maybe out of compliance so we don't want their water, well the point of having that redundant source is you don't have to use it all the time. It's so that it's available in an emergency. I guarantee you if they don't have water they are going to want their water. Not worried about THM's. They're going to want to flush toilets and take showers. I just wouldn't see that as a very good argument, frankly, cause we don't like the water next door so we would just prefer to have to go without if our well fails till we get it back online. And that's not the message that I would support as a health department. Hey, if you decide you don't need sanitary conditions just raise your hand and you get to not have sanitary conditions.

BEN BRIDGES: We're talking about 25 houses and half of those were full time and so when we looked at the monies what it cost to go back and tie to the existing systems they weren't willing to come up with the 40 50,000 dollars and the system that would take them over was not willing to spend it because they'll never recoup their money on 12 or 13 houses. Where they were, we're okay with

our one, we know we can lose power, may be down for a day, or two, or a week if we lose electrical power, or they have a generator. But again, I hate to see it be all inclusive that every system has to have that back up redundancy where you're dealing with 25, 15, 25 houses as opposed to a city or metropolitan area. Obviously, that would be a larger scale.

JIMMY HAGAN: I would think that in this day and age even for a small system with systems that have one well having a single source and supply in 2014 is a little bit important to me as an engineer. We have systems that have either single wells that can't meet demand, and we have systems that actually have more than one supply that can't even generate enough water from that supply to properly flush their lines. Jake talked about flushing earlier. It completely just baffled me that we would allow, as a state, a supply that's completely inadequate. The cost of a well is relevant to the size of the well. We do small wells, we do large wells, we do 30,000 dollar wells, and half a million dollar wells. It is relative to the size of the well. Another comment is that when a well does fail, like Ben says, sometimes you can bring that well back up 24 hours. It's not always a mechanical problem. If you have one well and something besides a mechanical problem it doesn't matter how much spare equipment you've got. You're not going to bring it back up. We've been in situations where days turned into weeks, and weeks turned into and months, and months turned into six months before things come back.

J.T. LANE: To me when we talk about these issues, in particular, it always reminds me of at the end of the day, and especially in public health and other particular fields, you really honestly have to weigh... we all can sit here and say if we had all the money in world what we would do. I think that often times what happens, and we lose sight of this, all over the world that what is the cost to do something verses the benefit to society. And I think that large systems are going to have different issues than small systems. And even for the loss of water, we were talking it seems like for the first few hours it's a customer service issue, and then as it gets longer and longer it becomes a public health issue. Either from if you want to count drinking water as the first thing or even sewage.

That is where, to me, it's not the most straight forward thing. It's going to be very episodic and depend on so much. And I certainly think about this constantly, to what extent is it acceptable for everyone to invest in, based on the expectations that customers or our constituents have, that's always going to be the very natural push pull of what we do. I don't want us to lose sight of that as we talk about these issues in particular. They are very critical, but I think the real natural tension is exactly that. What are we as a department requiring, verses what is everyone willing to pay for either through their water bill or through taxes to fund projects like (inaudible) programs and things like that. Really, globally, that's what's going on. I just wanted to say that.

JIMMY GUIDRY: We've all been around long enough to know what's ideal isn't always the smart thing to do. Having two wells if you're starting out developing something it's the cost of doing business, but if you know you can get away with it, that you don't need to put a second well it makes sense to save that money. Having two wells is a way of protecting health and it's a good investment. So we're kind of sticklers. If you have your own well you can live in your own problems. Many times I'll have a problem where I have a whole subdivision that things aren't moving and I have to decide whether I'm going to evict people from their homes because of the risk of health because they don't have the proper sewage because they don't have a proper pump station, proper water. But it's easier to have redundancy. So the question becomes systems are building up and that's why we like large systems where people can help pay the bill. You really want to do what's right for their systems. It may start out as 12, but the next subdivision's another 12 and pretty soon they are not tied in and they don't have redundancy and every one of those... that's what we're seeing. It's not a real problem where we were living back in the day where people weren't close together. Right now people are living closer. We're developing systems around the state where we had individual mechanical sewer plants and we charge the best, you really want community systems but they're expensive. Same thing with water systems, you want community systems. You don't want one well for one subdivision to be the model. It becomes hard for us as regulators to make sense of

what people can afford and what's the right thing to do. And I think that's what J.T. was saying. If you're going to borrow money to develop a project the cost of doing business is having two wells. That's the right thing to do. If you're a good citizen, that's the right thing to do. It might cost you another 50 grand, but having a second well, having a second option tying into the community system even better. And that's where I would be looking for hey, I got a well. I'm serving 12 homes. We're two years away of having a community system here, but we really want the community systems. We don't want a well for 12 homes. That's really not our goal. I don't know how you enforce that other than have requirements that make people think hey, what am I going to do. I can't afford a second well. I can't get this development off the ground with one well. Trying to get people to think more and more about community systems, large community systems.

JAKE CAUSEY: And I'll mention we also require systems, customers, residents, businesses to connect to community systems when they are there and available. We've had many episodes where community systems have become available. We require people to tie in and then times we get people wanting to go back on their private well because they're dissatisfied with the water quality they're receiving and sometimes the water availability as well. We're putting people on community systems and building community systems. They got to be a lot more reliable and a lot better than their private well. The waters got to be there and I know we get a lot of issues with iron and manganese throughout the state and systems that aren't spending money to treat that and we get tons of complaints every month on those issues. Which we acknowledge are not specifically health issues, but when you're in a home and you fill a tub full of brown water it's an issue.

PATRICK KERR: One more comment about this, and I mean this sincerely, I want to make sure we don't go down this path and change. That's one of the things I think is wonderful about DHH and the way you deal with us. All of these issues where you need a second source of supply, or you need to make a major change, they've given us plenty of time and latitude. They ask us for a plan, they ask us how much time it's going to take. If there's a community system coming in a couple of years that's

usually a good enough solution. That willingness to work with us has been welcomed. I just hope we don't write into this something that changes that attitude. I think it's helping. We don't get there tomorrow, but we get there in a couple years.

J.T. LANE: All right, any other comments on chapter three? Does anybody feel they need any more information for any further analysis from the committee's standpoint?

PATRICK KERR: So now what's going to happen, like Keith did with chapter one, we're going to redline and get a draft that has these incorporated. Is that the next step?

J.T. LANE: Yes.

GREG GORDON: I follow with what Keith did. I don't think you put that together yet, have you?

KEITH SHACKELFORD: Yeah, I sent it out to the committee several days ago.

(council speaking simultaneously)

SPEAKER: I didn't get it.

SHEREE TAILLON: I thought Keith sent it out.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: I sent it to the committee.

SPEAKER: I didn't get it.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: I'll do it again.

GREG GORDON: I'll follow what Keith did and put all those additional comments.

J.T. LANE: All right. Now we'll move on to part six, Jeff.

PATRICK KERR: Do we really need to read updates though? They are on the website.

J.T. LANE: Let me ask this. If you've read six do you want to have a discussion about it?

PATRICK KERR: I'd like to discuss it. I just don't think there's a lot of utility sitting here... I just wanted to wait till you were finished to say that Greg.

GREG GORDON: Cause you got to read it twice. You got to read it at the webinar and here.

J.T. LANE: Was there anything that stood out worth discussing?

RANDY HOLLIS: I have a comment. On this particular part ten state standards really addresses

permanent pumping facilities that were built and in several places we've installed, and I know other engineers have as well, are floating intake structures for rivers. If you read this specifically you can't build one. I would like to see us incorporate into part six at least the ability for an engineer to submit a floating intake structure that could be considered. I think the way I commented on that was that floating intake structure should be considered and all pertinent items that do not apply should not be considered. Something to that affect.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Something floating on the surface would be more at risk for a spill, no?

RANDY HOLLIS: You still got your intakes are mounted below it. What we have found on floating intake structures is they work much better, because in many cases the best water quality usually is below the surface and it's fairly stable throughout the year. So your screens are mounted to the floating intake. They go up and down with the river as it goes up and down. We've had one particular structure in place for over 30 years in Tennessee, a river that changes dramatically in elevation, as well as the current. It's operated perfectly for over 30 years. I strongly recommend. They have a number of good features and much more economical to build than a permanent structure mounted on the land. As far as economics they are much better.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Learn something every day. Thanks.

RANDY HOLLIS: You could not build it if you went exactly by part six of the ten state standards.

PATRICK KERR: Louisiana code doesn't prohibit it though. That's something you would...

JAKE CAUSEY: Yeah, that's something we definitely need to look at. I'm not sure if it's like flood level issue being the restriction, or I'm assuming it's just the number of parameters that would sort of prevent it from being. I guess the other question, A I don't know that we have any currently for public supplies in Louisiana. And then B you have experience with the one you mentioned. I guess is that something that you would see only applicable in certain sources such as a lake verses a river? We can have some more dialogue. I would be certainly interested in seeing what you're talking about. I think there is a lot to consider, definitely open to looking at it.

RUSTY REEVES: Jake, I think it would help you best like in the Toledo Bend area with drought season.

Here a few years back (inaudible) intake come out the water (inaudible). Had to have a floating intake, helped a little better. I know a couple times water systems in South Park they've been very concerned because number one intake actually got down, the water level got down to it, rely strictly on the bottom two from that point on until the lake covered it again. You see Toledo Bend Lake fluctuating pretty regularly. That was one of the suggestions when they called us is floating intake that you could float, get it down lower.

JAKE CAUSEY: You do still have to have water to float on. And the pipe is still going to have to go further out under the lake to get there. That's what I think some systems, in fact I think the Desoto was built they moved the intake further out into the lake and I believe some, like you said, during the drought season did have to extend some pipes. I'm not sure that floating intake is an extendible intake so, but it probably has merits for many reasons. Definitely something to look at.

RANDY HOLLIS: Pat, to answer your specific question, when you go through the code it, excuse me, ten state standards, it talks about means to allow each suction well to be taken out of service. Well a floating intake structure does not have a suction well. So therefore say well, how are you going to take it out of service if you don't have one? It's not allowed. It's those very specific things that would knock out floating intake structure.

JAKE CAUSEY: Just let me ask this question. A floating intake structure would have the pumps mounted on it, or you just talking about pumps may be land based and the pipe and the screens being a part?

RANDY HOLLIS: The particular one I'm talking about, and there are a couple that I can reference. One in particular is vertical turbine pumps mounted on the barge, below those are suction headers, and those suction headers have duplicate headers have screens on them, intake screens. The Tennessee River those are eighth inch opening screens with a flush back and cleaning mechanism on each screen. So you've got a large header with three pumps on one, another header for duplication

with cleaning mechanisms on both and everything rides up and down with flexible pipes from the barge to the land. I would be glad to take you up there and look at it.

JAKE CAUSEY: I would be glad to go.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: To answer your question, or to extend the answer to the question, and this is kind of incestuous arrangement because I worked at (inaudible) for 27 years. Before I left we did a project up in Kentucky on a lake where we had a floating barge that had a screened intake suspended beneath that that then had a pipe over to submersible pumps in the piping on the bank. You can have it either way.

J.T. LANE: All right. Anything else? I think we'll move on to the public comment period for today's meeting. If we can grab a mic. So anyone out there attending the meeting today have any comments, or questions, or comments for the committee? All right. Anything further from the committee? All right. So do I have a motion to adjourn?

RANDY HOLLIS: We need to talk about the next two parts.

SHEREE TAILLON: Parts seven and eight. Seven is Jimmy Hagan. Eight is Robert Brou. I will send y'all the power points that y'all need to get started with and y'all make a decision on the date you would like to do that and we'll get that started.

ROBERT BROU: Are we still looking to do it at 6:00 in the evening? I find between the first section and second participation fell off dramatically. I know the later time definitely works better for some of the smaller systems. I think you'll get much more participation from larger systems during working hours, or at least immediately following. Not such a large gap. Earlier in the afternoon.

J.T. LANE: What about three or four?

ROBERT BROU: I think that will work better. That's what I'm suggesting.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Right after lunch.

ROBERT BROU: That would definitely work well for me. I wanted to see what the other people thought.

PATRICK KERR: And the air conditioning will even be on.

J.T. LANE: Try working on the weekend.

BEN BRIDGES: It does conflict on Wednesday with church for some.

SHEREE TAILLON: And it doesn't have to be on Wednesday. We didn't make this decision.

Whenever the speaker is, whenever they are available.

J.T. LANE: So for the next two we'll work on making it earlier. May be mid to late afternoon, 3 or 4:00 to start. Not on Wednesdays. So we'll work on that. All right, motion to adjourn? Thank you everybody.