

Water Committee Meeting

February 18, 2014.

J.T. LANE: All right, welcome. I guess we'll get started with roll call.

SHEREE TAILLON: Dirk Barrios, Vern Breland, Ben Bridges (absent), Robert Brou, Jeffrey Duplantis, 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.

J.T. LANE: Great. Well, welcome everybody. Good to see you all again. I know we had a month off due to the massive snow apocalypse from last January. It's all a blur. I actually think I set a record. I was in Shreveport and Monroe last week and there were several parishes that were closed due to the second wave of this. I think I set the record of having technically six days off even though they were not off. Six days due to snow in Louisiana, very odd. So glad to see you all. So I thought we'd get started again. There's still a lot going on across the state with...

RUSTY REEVES: J.T., can we approve the agenda and make some amendments to it before we go further?

J.T. LANE: If that's your wishes.

RUSTY REEVES: I would like to make a couple of amendments where it has discussion on part five and part six there where it says committee discussion that may be we go ahead and vote on some of this stuff so we can move forward.

PATRICK KERR: I'll second that.

J.T. LANE: So you're proposing to add a number to...

RUSTY REEVES: Make an amendment to the agenda to add discussion and vote on one and two and then under number five do business A and B discussion and vote on that.

J.T. LANE: So part nine and ten the way we filed it last time, to be clear, we didn't have to vote for B because that's included work that's been completed through both the webinars and then discussion here. And then for parts nine and ten you want to have the discussion about what y'all learned in your webinars and then vote on what you are presenting to the committee today?

RUSTY REEVES: Yes, sir.

J.T. LANE: Is it that the prior approach of us taking the feedback that you are reporting and then coming back with a copy to look at was not enough? Is that the part of the process you want to try and forego this time?

RUSTY REEVES: Well, for one thing send something for the committee that we've approved to send to them or whoever's rule making or write this up and then come back to, come back with it to us similar to what we sent forward.

J.T. LANE: So for parts one and two approving the text after discussion, got that. And then so for nine and ten get a motion to move forward with recommendations and the next meeting a printed copy to vote on again. Okay. Do you make the motion?

RUSTY REEVES: I make the motion.

GREG GORDON: Since we're talking about discussing adding other, amending the agenda for new business I'd like to also add an item about the discussion of certain policies and procedures by which the committee is tasked and takes action.

J.T. LANE: So from what I understand the first motion to add the agenda items, all the agenda items made (inaudible) to include that.

RUSTY REEVES: I'll make my motion to include the motion that Greg had.

J.T. LANE: Any opposition? Let me make those adjustments. Just so I'm clear that satisfies your requirements?

RUSTY REEVES: Yes, sir.

J.T. LANE: For part three there's still a lot that's going on across the state that our engineers are working. Many of you and all the water systems in the state continue the efforts regarding the amoeba and I thought we would ask Jake to give us an update on where we are, what's the latest developments to the committee and let y'all have an opportunity to ask any questions or request any further information.

JAKE CAUSEY: We certainly had a lot going on in February with respect to our amoeba response and emergency rule. We did our follow up monitoring in Desoto water system. Same ten sites we did monitoring originally and this time we did ultra-filters, but we also did one liter grab samples just for comparison as well as the testing we also, CDC also tested for thermophilic amoebas, in general. EPA ran a TOC test and CDC did a HPC test and then we did some, field measurements, temperature, free chlorine, PH conductivity so we could get a lot of water quality parameters in conjunction with the testing. Fortunately, there were no detects of the amoeba or thermophilic amoebas at all. The free chlorine residuals were between two and three and I think some even over three milligrams per liter. The water temperature, I think the maximum temperature we found when we sampled was about 11 degrees Celsius. Pretty cold, pretty extreme conditions for the amoeba. Keep in mind, I think it's western Australia, they don't perform any monitoring for the amoeba until water temperatures exceed 20 degrees Celsius. We got clear samples, none the less, so that was good. In St. Bernard we also did monitoring. We did 13 sites, three of those being inside the case patient's home from July. All 13 were negative for naegleria fowleri. We only had one sample that was positive for thermophilic amoebas and that was in the water heater in the case patient's home which was, the residuals at that home were right at four milligrams per liter free chlorine, but the sample from the water heater was from the bottom and did seem to include some sediment and other things from inside the water heater. It was a very dirty sample, but no detects of naegleria fowleri at all. So that was

good. We did all the same parameters that we did in Desoto as far as the one liter grabs and ultra-filters. And then we have since performed some sediment sampling in one of the tanks in St. Bernard. They had recently cleaned and inspected all of their storage tanks except for one ground storage tank that also served as a booster for pressure and disinfection. We recently collected some samples from that sediment and sent them to CDC last Monday and are being analyzed. We have planned sampling for this amoeba in St. Bernard and Desoto when the water warms up. April, May timeframe, but then again July, August timeframe so that we can have confidence that the burnout and maintaining these residuals is being affective. The remaining items we're still working on, developing SOP's lab methods for our lab to perform this analysis. Public water system monitoring plans kicked in February 1st. The water systems are now monitoring accordance with their advised plans. And we've started receiving the nitrification plans this week, last week I'm sure there are a few more still coming in. We didn't specify that the nitrification plans required DHH approval, but we are trying to look at them and get an idea how systems are developing their plans for their system. Giving some feedback based on what we have seen, etc. Anyway, that's basically where we are at with our amoeba response and emergency rule. We will be renewing, extending, whatever the right term might be, the emergency rule for another 120 days. See how we can get some of this additional sampling and the water temps warm up. I think that's about all I got.

J.T. LANE: Questions?

RANDY HOLLIS: With the increased levels of chlorine in both of these systems three and up to four is what you've reported, I'm curious you've gone through quarterly sampling now so both of these systems (inaudible) byproducts are you seeing increased levels of those in both of those systems or not?

JAKE CAUSEY: So in both of these systems we're on chloramine disinfection so now been on

free chlorine for a quarter or a little more. Certainly the monitoring that occurred in the fourth quarter since they were on free chlorine was much higher in disinfection byproducts. I know that St. Bernard has since switched back to chloramines. I believe Desoto is working on a strategy to stay on free chlorine. I'm not sure if that's going to work out for them or not. I think they are looking at some other options within the treatment plan. Maybe some minimal improvements. They are still evaluating if they are going to switch back to chloramines or try to stay on free chlorine. Certainly the levels are much higher.

PATRICK KERR: Two things, I would like to renew my, not really objection, but my statement that I think this rule should have come before this committee and the law that was passed last year to be talked about and voted on. I hope we can do that. But I'd also like to say we have been working a lot with your staff J.T. and with Caryn and Jake and others and it's been a pleasure. I don't know if everybody's getting the same response, but the water systems I'm talking to we're making this work. And we do appreciate it. It's been a big deal for all of us. Thank you for your effort.

J.T. LANE: Thank you for that. I appreciate it. It is definitely, I think everybody in this room has learned a lot through this process. Certainly something that was really unprecedented for us. We all know we had to consult first with the only case we could find that has occurred in the world was Australia and then we found other cases that were similar in scope and type in Arizona and others. So this is definitely I think been a learning process for all of us. Thank you all. Thank you Pat for saying that. I definitely know that the staff has worked lots of long hours trying to get this right and trying to be as responsive as they can even as they have fewer in numbers than they did over the past few years to really try and provide as much education as possible. So thanks. All right, approvable of the minutes. Sheree has sent a copy of those. Did anyone have any questions regarding the minutes from last meeting? With that do I have a motion to approve them?

GREG GORDON: I'll make a motion.

JIMMY HAGAN: I'll second.

J.T. LANE: Any objections? Thank you. Okay, now on to number five, old business which was revisiting our discussion of parts one and two. I think you all received a revised copy of the rules based on the feedback we've had in the previous and our last meeting where we discussed the feedback we had with webinars. At this point if it's okay with everyone we sort of talked about it at the discussion and going through it last time so I think what I would like to do in the interest of time is get straight to everyone's comments about the draft before proceeding with the vote if that pleases everybody. Any objections to that? So with that I'll open it up for the first volunteer.

RANDY HOLLIS: I'll start off I guess in that there were a number of comments on parts one and parts two and what I see in this format is not really what the majority of the comments came in as being. The number of the comments were to delete entire sections and what we find is those sections are included and if not more. And so I'm not sure as a committee how we can even more forward with this because it doesn't reflect, in my opinion, the majority of the comments that came in. Don't mean to hurt anybody's feelings, that's just the way that I perceive this.

J.T. LANE: And I anticipated that there would be things that came in as suggestions that would not make it into this draft and may be even additional things that might be made (inaudible). This is meant to be an interterm process, obviously, and so that's why I'm not happy again to have that discussion now. At the last meeting we did not have enough time to review it so this time around everyone did have a chance to look at the changes that were made, the modifications that were made and then put on the agenda today to talk about that again. If there are specific things that you'd like to go over to start out we can, or I can have Jake review the major changes that from part one and two that were made based on those

recommendations.

PATRICK KERR: I think there's a disconnect going on right now J.T. and that is that my impression is that the staff for this committee is working for the department instead of working for the committee. The committee when we discussed one and two made some recommendations that I think should be deleted and the department, of its own volition, decided that wasn't okay. And so I think this is a process that as far as this committee is concerned the department has two members of this committee and is staffing it that I think y'all are getting directions to staff that is different than what the committee's talking about. So when we sit down with that list of comments and we get this general consensus cause we're not voting on each one that the committee supports that section being deleted. What I've heard and when I've come back weeks later to another meeting is that's not what the department wanted and we're not going to do it. I think what should be happening, in my opinion, is that the committee should have its input and the staff works for the committee, wears two hats, probably more than two, and then when the committee's done with this process the department has a process through which it reviews the committee's work and says yea or nay. And then I would imagine before August 1st there should be some kind of a, I don't want to say mediations, but that could be the way it's done, not just the committee, but the committee and the department talk about why things should stay or things should go. But what we see talking after meetings with folks and before meetings is the department is just making decisions about what should stay and what should go instead of letting the committee do its work. What I was given from one and two the draft does not even come close to what the committee suggested it should be. I appreciate Rusty putting in that we should vote on it and if I were asked to vote I would say that my motion would be that we reject that and ask the staff to review the minutes of the meeting during one and two and bring us a draft of what the committee wanted. The work you've done

isn't wasted because that would be what we compare it to to have this after the fact. I think the way the rule is written, excuse me, the act is written, the law is written is that for a new rule to pass the committee has to approve it and DHH has to approve it. There's no veto, or superpower, or anything else, but if both you and we don't approve it the rule can't be promulgated. David would be better to answer that question than me.

DAVID MCCAY: That's exactly right.

PATRICK KERR: So if we have something that you guys can't live with as a department that comes out of the committee that's okay. But I think we're trying to do the final product now and y'all got too many votes J.T., just my impression.

J.T. LANE: And that's fine. Number one, I'm not offended by that at all. I think what has happened, again, as I've pointed out this was how to get such a big assignment completed is something we spent a lot of time about. And from my vantage point, and we had some discussion about this early on, was whether or not we would try to get each part in a place where everyone could agree in this meeting as opposed to wholesale adopting every single recommendation and then waiting till August to go through all the differences because this is going, again, being an interim process, I would hate to see that we save all of our disagreements until August when we're up against a deadline. The purpose was not to not be responsive. And I'll tell you, I've made it clear to our staff when there are disagreements that we have a solid, logical, rational based on science that we know insures public health. This committee's always been about having that debate and working through those issues. I have absolutely no problem with that. I think that is what's going on. Anyone who has a characterization again that we are doing what we want to do instead and who is not sure that would be directly, except for now, I would really appreciate that if someone feels that way you all have my cell phone number and my email address if you have concerns with this you let me know so that I can address them more quickly than just in this forum because I

don't want any of us to waste our time. We have a lot to do. I anticipated, and I think we all felt this way, that there would be debate and we've had really good debate before on particular issues and not every member, and it's not just, again, I don't want to set up a, I think characterizing things as department verses committee and what other committee members think is not the right way to characterize it. I think there's a lot of people in this committee that don't share the same opinion on every single part of this either. Again, I have been fully transparent about asking for feedback either in this forum, or online if you're not comfortable sharing your personal thoughts about how it's being conducted. I'm glad Greg added the policy about how we conduct our business as a discussion item. Towards the end we got three parts, thought that was the most important we do today. I envision we'd have more discussion about it because, again, everyone is going to be contemplating the changes that we propose based on the feedback that we got. That was in no way meaning that we were starting from the same point because we don't want to do what is requested. But if we're simply just taking the recommendations ad hoc, if we're just simply taking a 100 percent of the recommendations and making the changes to the rules and then having a debate in August we can do that cause that will relieve them of a whole lot of time right now. And that means we'll spend the entire month of July and August trying to get this right. Again, I appreciate your comments, but maybe I should make a motion to accelerate the policy to right now before we dive too further into one and two. So with that...

ROBERT BROU: Second that.

J.T. LANE: So with that, any objections? So I guess to respond in part to what Pat said I guess I just want to open it up to the floor and we're flexible. We want to get the work done just like y'all. I guess Greg since it was your item I'll let you start.

GREG GORDON: Thank you. On the one hand though I think as we go through these policies

and procedures just kind of since Pat brought it up is in that report, and when we look at those drafts it should be really more like a committee report. That all the things, all the public comments that were made, all the things that were provided by subject matter experts in the webinars and that were presented should somehow be reflected in the document draft that we get back.

J.T. LANE: A committee report of all of the recommendations.

GREG GORDON: Exactly. Cause that would be instead of, for example, when you're trying to go through what was provided and what was discussed at the webinars and was provided you're kind of having to go back and forth. How it would look on a piece of paper between this is what we DHH recommended in blue and this is what was given in red with the cross outs with DHH comments at the bottom if you agree or disagree. I think that's something that should be reflected in the committee report. Because the other thing too is all the hard work that we're putting into the webinars and making those comments they are read and they are put out there, but they are not reflected in any official document that the committee itself is putting out for digestion and for potential rulemaking in the long term. One thing that in terms of the policies and procedures and how this committee is working some of the things that, a number of items that I have that I think we need to discuss in terms of policies and procedures is first of all is the agenda of this actual committee meeting in getting that approval by all the committee members of the agenda prior to being posted and prior to the meeting so if there are items that committee members want to be put on the agenda that they're put on the agenda. Plus that there are items that seem nebulous, like Rusty brought up with putting on (inaudible) vote. Those kinds of things can be put on the agenda first. In terms of I think also things that I have seen is that potentially considering the amount of work that we're doing is there might be the need for subcommittees and some subcommittees concerning all the parts so that subcommittee can

work through all those parts and present so called a subcommittee report to the larger committee so the larger committee doesn't have to get bogged down on all that work. And maybe think about a make-up of those subcommittees and where the subcommittees can meet so we're not constricted by having to be in the Bienville building or are there other places in the Bienville building that subcommittees can use? How we can go about putting those subcommittees together and who is going to participate, who would be on it, who would be a chair of that subcommittee, the number of committee members that we may need to have on each one of those and getting public input for those issues that they discussed. I think another thing in terms of policies and procedures that I find, and I think that Pat and others have mentioned before, like the extension of emergency rule is that act 292 is out there. We're not saying we don't want DHH to do its job relative to emergency rule and relative to the amoeba and everything else, but there is a, I hate to say respect, but if we don't follow what act 292 says it kind of starts to disengage everything else. Act 292 says that DHH is not going to promulgate a rule without the committee's approval. Just bring it up to us. We all see the need for the emergency rule. I think it was a good thing. But the thing is that subverting that process makes the rest of the process tough to deal with so we need to kind of do that. And I think in terms of policies and procedures and how we move forward those are the kind of things that I see happening, I don't know if anybody else has any comments relative to policies and procedure.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: Just to add to what Greg said, I think there needs to be a step by step process. I don't think a step by step process, as far as I know, has been established yet as far as what happens immediately following the webinar. When we do a webinar we all kind of fell behind Keith and them because they went first and everybody supposedly is kind of keeping in that same process, but I don't think there's a written step by step process of what's suppose to happen as far as we receive the comments, we make a recommendation

to the committee of delete this add this, that sort of thing, and this document is submitted, but I don't know that it's submitted out to the committee for everybody to look at and review. And then once that's reviewed and everybody approved that yes that needs to be deleted or this needs to be added and everybody agrees to that from a committee standpoint. Then it needs to go to DHH to be brought into and the markups made. Once that's done then we need to see what that version looks like and then I think there needs to be another version after that that has DHH comments, changes, whatever you want to do it. Like Greg was saying one in blue, one in red of why you don't think we need to delete this or why did you want to add some other additional verbiage to it. But I think there needs to be a standardized process, because right now I think everybody's kind of doing it, similarly, but I don't think it's being done unanimously.

J.T. LANE: Okay. Definitely we can make some changes. I'll say this, the original idea we had was doing subcommittees and we decided to go with webinars and put everyone in charge of that. That was at the committee's request. If anything it seems to me that the emerging theme is that maybe more needs to be written down and how we do that and also formalizing the format for the committee report. Those are the two things that I see that are new. I just wanted to point out that we wanted to go the subcommittee route in the beginning. That was the department's suggestion.

PATRICK KERR: Open meetings.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: The subcommittees though we thought that we were going to have to have it as a public forum as well so that's why we kind of negated it.

J.T. LANE: That would be the advice of our legal department, balance both keeping everybody happy and keeping the law happy too.

ROBERT BROU: I'm definitely one who advocated going to the webinar verses the subcommittees. I find it is helpful in gathering information, but we're not getting

anywhere. We're just taking verbatim anybody's comments even if they are contradictory. You know if Greg has a different comment than Rusty they are both getting included. I really feel we're going to have to go to some kind of subcommittee. If we do have public meetings laws do it immediately following or immediately before our regular scheduled meetings. Still can advertise them. I think we'll get a lot more accomplished. We need to decide the makeup of it. One suggestion would be we already have assigned the experts in each section and let them chair each of those subcommittees and have other members of the committee, an example Keith could chair section one and move on from there. You're not getting anywhere the way we're doing now. There's not any real input or debate about what should be included and what shouldn't.

J.T. LANE: Sure. And that's definitely what I want is the debate. So is there a way I think to not totally reinvent the wheel to where we continue with the webinars the way the committee approved them, but that we get all of the recommendations from the webinars to the committee more quickly so that we have the debate and...

GREG GORDON: Well, one way of doing it is you would have the webinar to collect information, that subcommittee would meet, the subcommittee would formalize all of the collection of that stuff and present that this is what was discussed and this is what it would look like and then that committee would vote and pass it on to the full committee. Later that day the full committee could then take up action on that level.

ROBERT BROU: I don't think the subcommittees replace the webinars. I think they are the next step in the process.

PATRICK KERR: I've given a lot of thought to the subcommittee and I think this is a good process we've gone through. One of the mechanical problems we have, and J.T. expressed this, there are just not enough rooms in this building to have ten subcommittee meetings an hour before this meeting. My suggestion, and I wrote down some notes while you were

talking, would be that the subject matter expert solicit other members of this committee who would like to be members of that committee, we keep the membership in the committee to the members of the full committee, have say a minimum of two or three people, anybody can attend any of those meetings, the public, any other member. It could be a member, it could be the committee as a whole, it doesn't matter. But if we could get an agenda from the chairmen to Sheree 48 hours, 72 hours before, whatever we need so she has 24 hours to get it posted, still subject to open meetings laws. We got to meet in this building whether it's the lobby or the lounge. But the chairman can call that meeting and what I would suggest we do a meeting today. I think the law says any nine members of this committee can ask for a special meeting. So we could give the chairman authority to call that special meeting at the date and time of his choosing and if nine of us say yes at our next meeting it's done and then we just get those 12 or however many subject matter experts there are to coordinate so we do them one at a time, may be two or three a week. Whoever comes comes. We don't need this room, but we just need a room that the public has access to. And we do take exactly what you said Robert, we take everything we've got already instead of asking one person to distill all this down that subcommittee makes a recommendation of the full committee and then we have something to talk about and vote on.

CHRIS RICHARD: I agree with everything you said just add another thing. Instead of meeting prior to the meeting be more beneficial to meet and get the recommendations out to the committee prior to full committee so that you're not sitting here trying to read and digest it at the meeting. Take action at that meeting. The subcommittee get it out in advance of the full meeting so we walk in here prepared to vote and take action.

ROBERT BROU: The only reason I was suggesting doing it the same day is for people traveling. You don't have to bring up what was discussed at that subcommittee meeting that morning

in the afternoon meeting. We can wait till the next scheduled meeting. It just makes it a lot easier for people who are traveling from all over the state to come at one time. Hold off that discussion for a month. That subcommittee has time to get a document together that can get disseminated to everybody and then a month later talk about it.

CHRIS RICHARD: Right. You can still meet before, but that afternoon meeting would be not to discuss things we discussed in the morning. And we had talked earlier I remember in the first meetings about integrating the existing chapter 12. I think the staff was going to do that and I think these committees can look at the corresponding parts to their job, treatment what parts of chapter 12 are relative to treatment and disinfection, part one, whatever. When we finish we have a single document and don't try to integrate the two documents together.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: I think ideally you'd end up having the webinar like on the 15th, the middle of the month. You gather all the comments that you have and then within a day or two of that you should be having a subcommittee meeting to go through all those comments, get them talked about, figured out so that on the 30th whenever you have the next regularly scheduled full committee meeting you would have had time to get that information out to everybody so they can see ahead of time that recommendation from the subcommittee. The problem gets back as to reasoning why we weren't doing subcommittees is for travel. You have to have everybody on that subcommittee present. It can't be a conference call from what I'm understanding. You need to have everybody here present. And then having people who are having to travel in twice within a month. Now granted we're not going to be doing these subcommittees not meeting every month because you're not going to do that until, I mean some people won't meet until March, April, May.

PATRICK KERR: I think we could do the subcommittee of volunteers and anyone else who's on

the committee who wants to participate maybe we could do a webinar format. Let them come in through the web. They are not a member of the committee so they don't have to be here, of the subcommittee. If you, for example, couldn't travel to Baton Rouge you may not want to be on the committee that Keith calls to meet next Tuesday at 7:00. But you can absolutely participate, as anyone in the public could, through the telephone, through the webinar just like we did the webinar for public comment. The mechanics of it are such and the timing. I know we think it's early, but August is here pretty quick. We've been going at this since June or July, August. There's a lot to be done. It'd be nice if we could figure out a way to do the subcommittee. The law's clear we got to meet in this building. I'm sorry. I mean we all kind of signed up for that when we volunteered. If you can't get here or you could send comments like any of the public can to Sheree who's going to post them on the web and the web could be reviewed by the subcommittee. It could be like a discussion of web comments received to date or something. Each of us could be represented like anybody else. We just aren't going to be a part of the quorum on the subcommittee if we can't make it to the meeting.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: But you're still going to need to have a quorum of subcommittee members that are dedicated to be here.

PATRICK KERR: I know, but some of the subcommittees may have one person, some may have three and that's something we'd have to discuss. Do we want to say there's a minimum of three for a quorum and then as many as come come?

J.T. LANE: I don't know, David, I hope you are listening. I don't think that the subcommittees since they weren't contemplated fully in the law. I think it's more of a workgroup that assimilates the recommendations and provides a draft to the committee. That's the voting. The subcommittees don't necessarily vote on recommendations they would make to the committee. And then there are subcommittee members that would disagree on certain

points. Certainly we could make that discussion in this group. I guess just for the purposes of making it easier just get together assimilate the information and then make a presentation and any points of disagreement amongst the subcommittee members will most likely be a point of debate amongst all of us anyway. I think that will eliminate that.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: I'm just worried about we're going to set three and it's going to be everybody that's in Baton Rouge going to have to be on the committees. I'm just saying there are going to be people, you know, is Jim going to want to drive down here twice a month?

PATRICK KERR: But there's no reason we couldn't meet at 9:00 in the morning for one, and 10:00 for another, and 11:00 for another, but the subcommittee can come up with its own schedule if you got people from out of town coming for the meeting. He or she has complete flexibility when they set it up.

J.T. LANE: There are probably close to 500 programs that use these two conference rooms in DHH. We have another one on the other side of the building so we certainly would need to nail down an approach and structure and meeting dates to stick to so that we can explore dates that actually rooms would be available. So it might be a little bit of both where we poll everybody to see what's the best meeting time. This time around it may be more about when are most people available and then when are the dates the rooms would be available for scheduling.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: Correct me if I'm wrong, the subcommittee is only going to meet one time?

PATRICK KERR: As many times as the chair wants.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: Have the webinar, you go over the comments from the webinar to prepare this package to get approved by the full committee?

PATRICK KERR: No, I don't think so. I think I just put a little twist on that to say that this

committee did, in fact, pick people they considered to be subject matter experts in each of these areas and so that committee chair would have latitude to take the language that's given by comments, but also make his own and the committee would make their own recommendations and is presented to the public when we vote on it.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: I agree with that, but I'm saying that meeting happens one time.

PATRICK KERR: Not necessarily. If you've got a big section and you need to meet five or six times it's up to the chairman of the committee. Let's give them flexibility instead of saying one. We still have to make public notice. It's got to be 24 hours in advance posted on the front door. If J.T. can find us rooms. We want it to get done and if you need to meet four or five times to do it meet four or five times to do it.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: But is that supposed to happen between the webinar and the next committee?

PATRICK KERR: The webinars have all happened except for two of them. So there's only two left, chemical and treatment. They're done. So it's going to be up to the chair of these committees to gather all of this information.

CHRIS RICHARD: Some will be longer just because, I mean chapter four is large and going to take longer than some. So we might have four hour meetings just to address it all. I agree public comments are comments that need to be listened to and weighed, but not necessarily have to be agreed to. Somebody says we don't want any treatment, we don't like chlorine, just because they say it doesn't mean you take it. You take all the comments and you weigh them and the committee comes back with a recommendation on what that section incorporating chapter 12 that would be its own chapter in the code to bring to a full committee for discussion one last time.

JIMMY GUIDRY: I've done this a lot of years and we're struggling with it because we're trying to figure out what makes sense to protect the public's health. Getting webinars and

getting input let's you know what the public thinks. They are not subject matter experts. Some are, but they are not totally subject matter experts. They don't understand everything they do. It's a job and some of them don't understand why they are doing it or how they are protecting the public's health. So our job as subject matter experts is to get together and hash out what makes sense and what protects people. And so we were going to do subcommittees initially, but we talked ourselves out of having it mainly because having public meetings and trying to figure out how we're going to coordinate that. I've served on a lot of subcommittees as subject matter expert and usually it's a very small group of people that look at all sides. They look at the input, the law, and the policy, and they come together with recommendations on what makes sense. And usually involves people from the industry and some of our experts as well sitting at the table saying this is where we are. Obviously there's a gap between what our experts think and what the experts around the table think. That's pretty obvious to everyone. What we're trying to do is now that we have the input we looked at that and came back with recommendations. What we can live with there's still a huge gap. How do you narrow that gap? For instance, let's say somebody doesn't want to do something and it's the right thing to do, but they just don't want to go through the process. Chlorination. And they don't want to have to pay for it. So they put in the comments let's do away with chlorination. Let's delete that section. Okay. It goes into the minutes; it goes into what we look at. That's not acceptable, doesn't protect the public therefore does it make sense that we're going to put that as part of the rule when it doesn't make sense to the experts. The experts have got to come back with what makes sense so we can make sure we get the people protection. We were going to try to do it and it was getting real difficult to come back with our version and have a discussion and argument with the whole group on each section, but I'm sitting here telling you I'm not an expert in every section. I'll listen and take your input, but I'm not going to

be able to make an argument with every section. That will take long. It's much easier doing a subcommittee where you have the experts working on it diligently. And it may take two meetings and it may take 20. Depends on how complex it is. Can't put it in a box. Some of them are very complex, some of them take a lot of time. Let's say you do a lot of the work and you come back and there's still disagreement. Our experts haven't had the conversation with you. You come back and say I think we should delete all of this, well we're at a disagreement. Well, guess what? That doesn't go anywhere. By the law DHH doesn't agree and you don't agree it doesn't exist. It's not official. We literally could do away with having what protects our water in Louisiana if we're not careful. We have got to bridge this gap. I do think that subcommittees of experts that do their homework, get the information, just because somebody's out there saying I don't want to deal with it, just delete it. That is not how you write policy. You write policy with what makes sense, not with what you don't want to do it. Make it based on science. So it's a charge that I take very seriously. I've told you that before. It takes all of us weighting in. It's going to take some more work. It definitely involves our experts and the experts in that committee having conversations so we can see where the bridges are going to be made. If we don't have that conversation at the end of the day there will be a report from this committee the department will be way over here, there will be no movement, nothing. All this work will be for nothing and we can not afford that. We can not afford to go into August without a way to protect our water system. A lot of our systems are old. They have a lot of boil water notices. It's no secret that yes we have good water in Louisiana and we take it seriously, but we can't throw out the baby with the bath water. We have got to make sense of this. So I do think we're going on the right track. We've had input, we're almost done with the input. Today was going to be a discussion on one and two to see where the gaps are, but I don't disagree with you. It should be a side by side thing. It should be

what you recommended. Again, the recommendations are just delete this and delete that. That's not a discussion in my opinion. That's just something I'm taking out. I don't know why you're taking it out. That discussion has to happen. I do think what we're talking about today is going to take a little more time, but it's got to be strategized. We've had all the public input except for two sections. Now it's like get some serious subcommittee work done and depending on the complexity of it, it might take several weeks or months to get some of these sections. Some of these sections might take a couple of days, a few days. According to David and our legal it was that if you do have these meetings and they're official and you're going to come back and report it's a public meeting. You got to put a notice and let people know you are attending. So if somebody say is coming from North Louisiana it's easier for them to come on the day of meeting and have that subcommittee meeting that day, try to accommodate. If other people on the subcommittee are local and they can do it any day of the week that again is just a public meeting where it's occurring, who's the chair, who's having it, and people are invited to attend. It's as simple as that. I go to subcommittee meetings all throughout the city, but it's official. There's an agenda put up, there's a notice and people come to the meeting and do work. Really rolling up your sleeves and coming prepared. Read it, you look side by side and you come with your arguments. That's where I think we are now.

PATRICK KERR: Can I second that?

JIMMY GUIDRY: Sure.

PATRICK KERR: I think you've just said everything that we've been talking about Dr. Guidry. I don't know how you can make that in the form of a motion? It is what we're talking about, right?

ROBERT BROU: A lot of suggestions were made about forming this committee. I would like to formalize that. Who's going to head each subcommittee? And I think it was Pat who

said if nine of us authorize that person to call a meeting they call it the first available time.

PATRICK KERR: Well, we just put it on the agenda for the next meeting. Let them get with J.T. and the staff and figure out the times that's available. Just let the chairman do some work.

ROBERT BROU: I'll make a motion that we form subcommittees with the subject matter experts previously chosen to chair each of those subcommittees.

CHRIS RICHARD: Second.

PATRICK KERR: I hate to say this J.T., but David before we can vote on anything like that do we have to open it up for public comment?

DAVID MCCAY: Yeah, I think you do.

PATRICK KERR: I think we just need to ask for public comment before we vote.

DAVID MCCAY: It's just procedural matter, but I still think it's the safest way.

J.T. LANE: Well, I was going to first ask if anybody else on the committee had any other, I'm trying to take pretty copious notes, any other recommendations, feedback, desires?

PATRICK KERR: I have one other thing. I think we ought to add a subcommittee that ought to work pretty quick to development policies and procedures to bring to us at the next meeting. We don't have such a subject matter expert, but it might be helpful so we have something to look at.

J.T. LANE: Let me say this, based on what everyone said I think we have enough to make that and send it out ahead of time so that we have a brief discussion as possible for the next meeting. As far as that is there anything as far as policies and procedures and the approach we want to take on how we do our work? Is there anything that anybody else wants or wishes to express regarding how we conduct our business?

GREG GORDON: I know we brought it up at some previous meetings and I know we talked about potentially doing this as a part, I don't know if that's one subcommittee is the

grandfather clause. If that needs to be discussed as a subcommittee or if that needs to be a part that's discussed or not, I know that was something that some of the committee members brought up at the last meeting was that maybe that is something that needs to be discussed. I don't know if it does or not.

RANDY HOLLIS: One of the things we had discussed as a committee was the very last section was the forward of ten state standards which includes a lot of policy segments. I think maybe that's the appropriate place to discuss that. I'm not sure who the expert was on part eleven. Vern, hello.

J.T. LANE: And just so we're clear since you brought it up, it's not whether or not it would exist, but how and what should be the material content of it. So that would be part of the work of your committee as well, timelines, criteria. So based on these comments, specifically, we heard about the committee report format in terms of how we're going to get back both the recommendations, deliberations of subcommittees, and the revised text that would include the format with both DHH changes and recommendations based on public feedback. That's number one. Number two, Greg was saying the agenda approvable prior to meeting of the committee. Then regarding the subcommittees the establishment of them, the establishment of the schedule, logistics, meeting places, the format for which they report back, the debate format for our meetings which I think we have pretty much covered, and then the only other outstanding question if we move forward with this for me is as Rusty made the first motion to vote on the parts today do we or do you still want to go forward with a vote for each part going forward, or do you think that we do this revamp of the approach we're taking that one vote would be adequate at the end? Or do you want to vote for each part? And this is for everyone's question.

RUSTY REEVES: One reason I brought up what I brought up is after doing part nine Sheree worked with us we had three persons in public and eight on the webinar and I talked to

Patrick and I felt like if we're pushing a 12 foot wide bus and we got 8 foot tunnel coming to us in August that everything was just mounting up on us and we wasn't making no progress. To me if we vote on it we know then well we can tame that horse or we got to ride that horse again until we get it right. And I think Dr. Guidry, yourself, Jake, and his staff they want a horse that rides out of here that's a white horse that's right for what we need for the State of Louisiana. I think cost plays into it big time, but we need the safest drinking water we possibly can provide at the most affordable cost. And the main thing we need to look at is that everybody can benefit from that safe drinking water. Not just a select across this country. Now that's your question I would like to see if move by a vote forward that way we know well y'all voted to go forward with it. If we need to revisit it we got to have a motion to second to revisit it. That's just my opinion to move forward by vote. Well, that horse has been tamed. Let's move on to chapter two, or chapter three, whatever. Thank you for letting me make the comment.

ROBERT BROU: You talked about the format of the subcommittee report. Especially where there's going to be some contention on what actually gets (inaudible). I would like to see the majority of the subcommittee recommends this and maybe have a vote or comments so that everything gets brought back to us as a committee as a whole and see where the majority lies from that subcommittee, but at least hear the argument at least from one person who has a difference of opinion.

J.T. LANE: Any other comments on that?

SHEREE TAILLON: I am no subject matter expert, but on webinars I think I am the only person in the room who has attended every one to date. So I do not think the webinars are very helpful and I'm saying with the subcommittees I do not think that we need to do both. I think that we can still gather all the comments and give them to the subcommittees, but I don't think the webinars have been very helpful. It's been very low in attendance. We've

tried two different times; both of them have been less than ten to twelve people. I don't think that's helpful.

J.T. LANE: So you're defining helpful by the level of attendance, is that what you mean?

SHEREE TAILLON: Well, by the level of comments and attendance.

RUSTY REEVES: The first one there was 56 and the last one there was eight. Of the eight three work for Patsy besides me. Sheree works for the health department and Pat was in there with me and I think Randy. We can account for the eight that was on there that's connected in this room directly. We may get more comments just by sending out an email to water systems saying hey we're going to accept comments and who replies and who don't move on with life.

PATRICK KERR: The reason I brought up the webinars is because we're trying to accommodate people who don't live here, but even if there's two people who have something to say, and this is my problem, I think in this format with the subcommittee maybe we ought to let them talk and we can respond to them. What turned a lot of people off is hey I can just write my comments if all they're going to do is read them. They won't answer me. It's not a public hearing for a new rule where the department never responds. They respond in writing after receiving the public comments. We were trying to use this as a working session so each of us could get smatter in his subject matter and basically what happened is we muted our phones and said, okay they're here to listen to you. Well, one way doesn't work. May be if we set it up like this, and it doesn't have to be a webinar. It could be a conference call. I don't know how many people would want to participate. What I don't think we can do, I got to ask David again, I know we cannot vote or have a meeting of a committee where some members of that committee are on the phone. But there's nothing wrong with having people able to see what's going on and maybe send us comments. They do it at the legislator all the time. You can watch what's going on and email or text your

legislator if he's given you his email address or call his office and say hey I need to talk to him. So there is input even at the legislator when there's a public meeting going on. So what I envisioned is if you wanted to be involved but couldn't drive down it's available to you. And like I said, maybe it's a conference call. I don't know if it works in this room, but that way if you want to come come. If you don't I don't know what it cost the department to set up a call if only two people participate in. And may be you set it up where you say hey email me by this date if we have enough activity we'll open up a conference channel or something.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: My understanding is there's two more parts that need to have the standard webinar. If we're going to go ahead and just maintain doing it. I know Sheree says they are not useful, but we've done them already. I think the last two go ahead and do for those two. The other webinars we're talking about doing are for the subcommittee because it's supposed to be an open meeting. And so you're hoping that if you have a chair and if you decide there's going to be a total of three so you have your two other subcommittee members present anybody else from the committee that wants to participate and can't be here can call in or join the webinar, but we're talking about having these webinars as part of the subcommittees only to comply with the public meeting requirements.

PATRICK KERR: I'm trying to kill two birds with one stone so if we're going to put it out there so people can participate we may as well open it to the public. But members that want to talk they can talk over it. It's just communication.

J.T. LANE: Since there are two left let's complete that process since we're heading towards a deadline. And then I think what we can do is get the subcommittee structure in place and actually have at least two meetings prior to the next meeting. We can set that up. We can look right now. Everybody just has to be flexible to be able to once we check out and

see what's open for this room or in 132 on the other side of the building we can get the subcommittee meetings scheduled pretty quickly. And again, as long as everyone is flexible to attend those we can get that knocked out. And I guess prioritize the ones that we have ready now. One, two, and three or six. Does that make sense? And then we can schedule the others, go ahead and get them going and get them done and processed and we may just be prepared to for the rest of the meetings that are scheduled one to four we should be prepared to stay here as long as it takes to get it done. That is what I would propose.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: And the subcommittees have to be open if we have three people from the committee it has to be an open meeting.

PATRICK KERR: Subcommittee meeting's got to be open.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Let me suggest this, usually when somebody chairs something he finds the experts, and he finds the information, and he puts that together. And you can have public input, that's what the webinar's about, but really that subcommittee's job is to come back with an official report of what makes sense. It needs to be not just stuff, not a wish list, not for everybody's input. It's for people that understand this, people that really understand this. So I'm not saying I'm against the public having input. I'm not saying I'm even against a conference call where people can call in so they don't have to travel. They're not an official voter. They can certainly have input. You can have somebody call in if you think they're an expert, but your job as a chairman is to get the expertise. If you don't have it totally we need to find the other experts that can help you with the expertise. I'm not sure any one of us can claim to be an expert on that one section. There are other people that we know have done this for years and are very good at it. You really got to get that information from people that know this stuff. That's really your job as a chair is to get back to the committee with what the experts say. Not what the public said because the public's

had their chance to come on the webinar. People are not going to get interested in this until it affects them directly. If they have to pay more, or if it's something they're going to have to weigh in on, but we're losing interest because they don't understand our process and they are not going to keep going to all these webinars because it's not going to be important to them until it hits home or their pocket book. We got to make sure we don't get them sick. That's our job.

J.T. LANE: This approach was our attempt at doing that. I think what is very clear and recurring theme for some of the recommendations is just a preference for a more constructive way to see what's being recommended and what we're recommending. Again, when we provided the text it was we reviewed all the recommendations and got with our experts and this was the language that Dr. Guidry, Jake, Caryn and I and others, other engineers sat down and went through everything. I think as far as the attendance level I think we're recognizing there's just not a whole lot of, you know this is a highly specialized thing and everybody plays a different part in it. Again, I don't know there's anyway to anticipate how much level of interest it would be until like you said it comes into effect. So I'm trying to think of what motions to make out of this. Let's just start with this, if y'all indulge me. Committee report format, can I get a motion to, does anybody out in the audience want to make any comments about policy function and process?

SPEAKER: I know you were hoping I wouldn't make.

J.T. LANE: I am really hoping that.

SPEAKER: Actually has to do with meeting space. I understand that you are limited here and I also understand that act 292 says it has to be done here but if there was consensus of the entire committee you have four government buildings that you could possibly use and even the library that you could have committee meetings all at the same day and get the information out. But it would take a consensus even if it's an act 292 can't that be...

DAVID MCCAY: Well, act 292 doesn't speak for subcommittees I don't believe at all. It just says the meetings of the committee shall be held at its headquarters in Baton Rouge. Subcommittees aren't mentioned at all. I think we can assume and I think that it's inherent that the committee has authority to create subcommittees. I guess the question is whether they have to be held here is a little bit open, but I think if the meetings have to be here subcommittees do as well although that's not spelled out.

J.T. LANE: I think the legislator would be satisfied that we got our work done. So I think I would just go out and explicitly say the meetings take place in Bienville. Though I'm not aware, probably think that as long as the bill supporters and authors felt that we got our work done in a constructive manner and we followed your recommendation Pat that I think it would be okay with that.

JIMMY GUIDRY: What's important is that there's requirement 24 hour notice to people that it's being held here at a certain time and that they have an opportunity to attend. A public meeting that's really the requirement. If the subcommittee decides we're going to meet at such and such office it's got to be open to the public. Can't be a place where people can't access. There's a notice, there's an agenda, and a public notice. That's really the requirement for any kind of public meeting. Correct me if I'm wrong.

J.T. LANE: Anyone else? Rusty you were making a motion, or who was it Robert?

ROBERT BROU: I had just made a motion that we form subcommittees with the subject matter expert previously chosen as the chair and tasked at bringing a subcommittee report back to the full committee as soon as possible with the make-up should be a minimum of three of this committee.

J.T. LANE: So as soon as possible we will work with y'all as we develop the written policy and establish a timeline on that too.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: In the interest of moving forward today since I headed up the first part

of this thing I'll agree to go ahead and work with Sheree. And first of all can I get a show of hands of who would like to sit on the subcommittee?

PATRICK KERR: Let's finish this. We got a motion and I'll second it. We need to vote and move on.

J.T. LANE: I think Keith's concern is that he's already done a lot of work and he wants to know how much more time he's got to spend on part one.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: I want to get this thing moving. I'm sorry, finish with the motion.

J.T. LANE: Robert, thank you. Somebody want to second that?

CHRIS RICHARD: Second.

J.T. LANE: Any opposed? Following that can we please discuss, we said we're going to follow the subcommittee structure for each part. Is that our understanding? The second one in terms of the written policy will establish a written policy and have the committee report format showing the comparison of both DHH changes and recommendations to the committee as well as the operations of the subcommittee which will pretty much be establishing a schedule and the logistics for rooms and report back and then are adding that to the agenda for debate in the upcoming meeting schedule for which we'll vote for on each section. So that to me is all wrapped up in the policy recommendation. Is there anyone that has any further comment on that as a package?

PATRICK KERR: We've seen a lot in this process that there are sections that overlap and I would just suggest that we could also have joint subcommittee meetings to address those issues. If the chairman of a subcommittee finds that you're delving into somebody else's place the two chairman get together and we can just as easily notify joint subcommittee meeting. So this doesn't limit those three people for the endurance. It could be nine if you have three committees.

J.T. LANE: I was going to make that as one package motion since it's all related to written

policy. Does anybody else have any comments from the audience? Can I get a motion for us to compile this and deliver it to you within two weeks from this date for your review?

GREG GORDON: I'll make a motion.

SPEAKER: I'll second.

RANDY HOLLIS: I have a question. Everything you've done has been for ten state standards. We've talked briefly about chapter 12. Is this subcommittee going to try and dovetail those together because if we don't include chapter 12 right now when are we going to?

JIMMY GUIDRY: I think what we've done is sat down and try to take that into consideration. So the department's looked at chapter 12. Sydney speak up, you've been working on recommendations and the department's viewpoint so Jake can come and review it. So literally we're trying to simplify as much as we can what parts of ten state standards we think's critical, what part of chapter 12 is critical. I'm not sure if you're not seeing it in what we've written and sent to you then we haven't arrived yet. I'm not sure we totally agree that we're going to write all of chapter 12. We're going to address parts of chapter 12 that are addressed by the issues that we had to this act. Which is specifically what this act addresses which is plans, review plans. It wasn't all chapter 12.

PATRICK KERR: Construction, operation, and maintenance.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Okay. Well again, this is where I'm trying to figure out when Keith gets the information which would be what was suggested and where DHH's view is. Now we haven't done that for every part because that takes a lot of time. At that point in time I don't know if you're going to be looking at chapter 12 where it fits, or how it fits, or if it's integrated. Again, to me that's a meeting of folks that work on this stuff that know this stuff. Again, I don't know how you do that. It's really not a simple matter. So I'm trying to figure out how to make that happen.

RANDY HOLLIS: That's the purpose for my question. Are we going to get through in

September with August sitting here and we haven't even looked at chapter 12 and we've done all the ten state standards? When are we going to try to put them together?

SYDNEY BECNEL: Well, my idea if you notice in chapter 12, any chapter, any part of the code there's 28 parts of the sanitary code dealing with part 12 and it has right now I think 19 chapters, but it's reserved, the register makes you reserve a chapter. So you have chapter one, three, five. Chapter one has definitions then it goes into permit requirements. You know you have to get a permit. So my idea is to snug this thing into chapter two right after permit requirements. Leave all the other chapters alone then when there's something in part two that's covered in chapter two, covered in chapter 11 for example we're going to make a reference to that in part two. It will all be in part 12. It will all be in part 12, but we won't necessarily have to amend what's already in the code. You don't have to necessarily repeat it twice if it says it somewhere else. It's the same thing on Mr. Gordon's comments on part three. A lot of the stuff is in part 12, but some of the stuff is over at DNR. Well I'm not going to, in my opinion, copy what's over there in DNR. I'm just going to put see LAC56:1325A or whatever and you go there and look it up. It's all on the internet. Title 56, title 48 it's all available on the internet. Now you may have to have a class. Some of y'all to know how to move about and get that information, but pretty much one website, office of the state registrar website you can get all the titles online. But anyway, I thought it was the design of water systems and to keep it in one chapter.

PATRICK KERR: But we're not limited to design.

SYDNEY BECNEL: Okay, then to me y'all can forget August I can tell you. You can almost forget August right now. It's going to take four or five years. I've worked on enough and they are four or five years before we promulgate. Some other code doesn't even come to mind. It takes a lot of time to get all this nailed down. It's not an overnight thing. I can tell you that.

PATRICK KERR: That's what we're worried about cause the legislature said August 1st and we all said okay.

SYDNEY BECNEL: I can't see it happening to be honest with you. That's my opinion.

J.T. LANE: I think there are other stakeholders groups that are not represented on the committee that are impacted by all of this, especially DNR. How are we going to define where we're going to...

SYDNEY BECNEL: Nobody, as far as I know, on this committee is with DNR, representing DNR. They'll have input when we go to publish a notice of intent and then they can comment at that time. Unless y'all want to do something otherwise, but pretty much our rule there might be a few little differences, but pretty much in line with DNR. Not going to be anything big.

J.T. LANE: May be the solution is to let us finish our work on this and then contemplate life after this work is done so maybe that's when we get together a larger group and analyze that and start that process.

RANDY HOLLIS: Would it be appropriate for the subject matter expert verses the chairmen for each section when they present it back to overall committee is to look at chapter 12 and maybe point out major areas of conflict so the committee is aware. We're going to put this in chapter two or part two, a whole new part, but yet there are conflicts here.

J.T. LANE: If there's places where there's conflicts we want to while we're doing this, it's not just about the content, but also the conflict may be out there so that we can make it easier for the future. Definitely in any of the work we're doing we can look at those opportunities and talk about them in the meeting. I think that would be best. Any comments? So I was trying to make a motion on the format. Get it to everyone in two weeks. But if there's no other public comment can I get a motion for that please? I don't think I asked if there were any nos.

GREG GORDON: I'll make a motion.

RUSTY REEVES: I'll second.

J.T. LANE: Any opposition? Thank you. Is there anything else on this that we need to address that's not been stated? With that what's the pleasure of the committee with regard to our new business today? I would hate for us to lose time.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: We just as soon table this so we can have our subcommittees.

KEITH SHACKELFORD: Certainly discussion on one and two if we're going to revisit them after subcommittee.

J.T. LANE: I mean I think it would be good if we at least discussed one and two so that would help your subcommittee deliberations. I think we should definitely do that. I'm going to open it up. Everybody's received marked up copies and we had a discussion last with the recommendations for webinars. Open it up. Right at this point I'm assuming everyone's had a chance to review the text and marked it up or made a list of things they wanted to share. And I think this would be a good time to get all that out so when Keith convenes his subcommittee they can definitely make sure that the committee's concerns are heard ahead of time and then we can have a much quicker discussion next time we get together to cover one and two. With that I'm going to open it up.

RANDY HOLLIS: Part one? One of the things that I know there was a comment on was to, one of the main comments on part one was the engineer's report because on very small projects the full engineer's report is not required. And so one of the comments made was to delete that entire section of part one because if this is a technical specification why do we have to submit all the things about geographic boundaries? Let's just say if we're just adding in a small chlorinator. Why do we need to do know all that information? If you do an SIT, or anything for DHH, or for the utility service you're going to do a full blown engineering report. But for small projects some of the comments were to delete major

sections of part one, one, two, three, four, four and half pages completely deleted under some of the comments. When I looked at what was presented back to us none of that was deleted. Every bit of that was left in there and my point is is that required for every single project DHH, even if it's a minor improvement?

JAKE CAUSEY: So looking at the engineer's report small projects I guess is a general term seeing it's already required for home projects that's only specific to home projects. A very small number of projects that we permit every year that are large or small in size than the home projects. I don't know that that is really relevant to whether an engineer's report should be required or not. I think that for small projects the engineer's report is relatively small. You're only providing an engineer's report based on the actual project that you're doing, not the entire water system. If you're installing a chlorinator you're not writing a report on the entire water system. Probably for a chlorinator other than why you are putting a chlorinator would be the content that's needed. So I guess from my perspective your engineer's report is going to scale based on the project that you're working on. And I think the information contained is extremely helpful for our reviews and I find that probably a lot of the comments that we issue would not be needed, frankly, if we had that information.

RANDY HOLLIS: Now go back to Dr. Guidry's comment. Many months ago be careful what you ask for because you might get it. If you read this verbatim about submission of plans and everything it doesn't give you an option. If you're going to read this verbatim it says you must submit this, the area extent to be served. So these are some of the issues I think that the subcommittee we need to talk about. What do we have to submit and come together and agree. I can hear what you're saying and I know how good it is to work with y'all right now, but five years ago what's going to happen, ten years from now. So if we're going to write something in code, as Dr. Guidry has said, be careful what you ask for.

J.T. LANE: So you mean like being more specific to what he just said, whatever it is to be appropriate to the scale of the project?

RANDY HOLLIS: Yes, and I think that would be good.

CHRIS RICHARD: I mean that's what we're here as public safety of the water system, right. So some of these things that are in there don't further that then they don't need to be included just to provide information to an agency. All those things, and I know Dr. Guidry don't like me cause I'm spending money, these water systems have finite amount of money to spend on improvements. Can they have redundant pumps and fix old chlorinators to fix things? No, we're going to spend money on engineers to write these reports which don't make the water system any better. And that's an extreme, but that's what we're looking at through all these things is the best spending of the funds, limited funds to protect the public. Because there's not unlimited amount of funds with these systems. I think that's a lot of information that's in chapter one and that's why we deleted it. Not necessary for the protection of the public, it's just more paperwork to be done. You're extending a waterline and putting a hydrant you got to submit to DHH, you got to do whole engineering report. Right now we submit the design summary package and a set of plans. What's wrong with that? This would change that.

JAKE CAUSEY: I'm certainly good with discussing these in detail in a subcommittee about what makes sense for certain projects so that I understand Randy's concern as far as these are broad projects, not all projects include all elements. From my prospective the project doesn't include an element then there's not information to provide on that therefore it's not included. I think sometimes people just go a little speculative about what somebody might require ten years from now if it's a different person that thinks differently. I think it's hard to make decisions based on what someone thinks might happen later on, but I think distribution system projects vary significantly. A lot of projects we receive this information is

very important for a lot of things that should be revised such as monitoring plans and other things, maintaining residuals, how are you going to accomplish that with these extensions. There's a lot of pieces of information that I think some people, including water systems, expect are being reviewed currently and some of that. Anyway, certainly uncovering a lot of older systems too that have issues. So I think that having conversations for a specific project what specific information to include in that engineering report I think is a perfectly reasonable approach on that topic.

JIMMY GUIDRY: It's like any profession. I see it in the medical profession. You have some people that are going to give you a lot of stuff to look at and other people that are going to take a percentage of the project and give you as little information as possible. So a lot of times projects get delayed because we don't get enough information. We're basing our decisions on information that's not sufficient. I do think it is a problem, like you're saying if you're not clear it's scalable depending on the size of the project and impact, but the engineers should know what they're putting in is going to impact other things. You know like Jake's saying a chlorinator or something else that can impact something else. We might want to know what's their plan for implementing, what's their proposal. Cause our job is not to come up with what needs to be done. Our job is to review what's been proposed to be done and see if it makes sense. A lot of times I find people coming to us and saying you tell us what you want because we're not going to give you everything we're just going to give you what you ask for. In my mind review of plans is really a difficult one because people are always complaining about how long it takes because they want to move on with their project, but sometimes we don't get what we need. Almost like throwing a blanket to try to get as much as you can, but clarify the scalable size of the project, could even say certain criteria, price of the project, but I do know that in a project a lot of times that plan and that proposal is based on the cost of the project. And part of that the

complexity of the project drives how much of a plan you have to give. If it's a simple project it shouldn't cost, it shouldn't take very long. But again, we're looking for the experts to help us figure out what is palpable. Not submitting anything puts everything at risk because we don't know what's out there. Things that were submitted 20 years ago we're still living with today because we said we agreed 20 years ago. Engineering 20 years ago is very different than engineering today. The amount of people around to contaminate water systems is very different today. Things have changed, but I see both sides, but I'm trying to narrow the gap. I'm trying to get it to where we can agree with we can live with. I don't see us eliminating it, but I see us being clear what it is we look for. But again, I would think the engineering profession should know what we need, maybe I'm wrong. To me when you do a project you should know what's needed to make decisions. They should help us figure that out. Many times they just want us to draw it up for them and all we got to do is fill in the blanks. That doesn't happen and I know you know that. And there's some that are very good and give us more than we need. Trying to figure out what's the correct language to make sure we get what we need. Bottom line is we take it away, delete it we're going to spend most of our time delaying plans to get what we need if we can't stamp approval till we have what we need. At the end of the day that's what happens. That's what I'm trying to avoid to make sure we get what we need to make the decisions as fast as we can.

RANDY HOLLIS: One other comment that was made by a number of people and I think this one more people attended part one, 56 people and almost everybody commented on 1.6 and that wasn't touched in the revisions. And so I think this is something, a perfect example of a subcommittee that needs to be nailed down in language and that is it's 1.6 additional information required. As engineers we deal with this all the time. We say water treatment plant and appurtenances to a contractor and they're going to build

everything that's supposed to be there even if we didn't show it. He's responsible for giving us a working treatment plan. Says reviewing authorities may require additional information which is not part of the construction drawing such as head loss calculations, proprietary technical data, copies of deeds, copies of contracts, etc. In other words where does it stop? I think this is something the subcommittee can look at and say how can we do this, put the language in here that would be acceptable to both parties because this is an open book right now. I'm just the spokesman, but everybody commented on this. Come on guys.

JIMMY GUIDRY: I think it's part of the discussion. I agree with you.

J.T. LANE: Again, setting a stipulation rather than leaving it general. Again, just like with the report that is reflective of the scale of the project. Same thing there, something more qualified rather than very broad.

RANDY HOLLIS: Absolutely. In other words, if we're working in an existing water treatment plant that's been there for 75 years why do we have to give you a copy of the deed of the water plant? I'm not saying that's ever been asked of me and it hasn't. That's a perfect example that could have been asked.

JAKE CAUSEY: I can say this, I don't know that I'll start asking for deeds, but I can say on several systems I wish I had asked for deeds at the time because we're trying to sell the thing and we don't know who owns what frankly. I can tell you that deeds could be very helpful.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Keith left, I was going to ask the question as subcommittees how are we going to get this discussion, what the department thinks and what the expert in the subcommittee. If we don't have it and the subcommittee goes about its work and doesn't involve our experts at some point in time our experts have to weigh in and that discussion has to occur. I'm not seeing that they're going to be able to be on every subcommittee and every discussion, but at some point there's got to be what we're doing right now with part

one. Our viewpoint so that the subcommittee person can take that and try to figure out a win win I guess. I'm looking to y'all to try to figure out how do we deal with the fact we don't see things the same way.

CHRIS RICHARD: The committee comes up with this work and that might be the red and then DHH will review and have staff comments in blue and that's the document that comes back to the committee so you have both parts in front of the committee to vote and take action.

RANDY HOLLIS: What we all hope out of this process is that 90 to 95 percent of this is in agreement by both. It's only the small part that we need to really work out the differences. So I think as we get into these subcommittees or whatever we're going to come back to the main committee and go this section, this section, this section is fine, but of this part let's discuss just this one item.

CHRIS RICHARD: We talked about earlier on and there was some discussion about whether or not a code should or can have recommendations or needs to be rules. And I think before this committee gets started we need to establish that. If we're going to have you should do this or you should do that in the code I personally don't think it should be there. If it's to protect public health it should be black and white. You do it period or you don't do this. But there's a lot of things in ten state standards because it was developed as a design guide and recommendation it is not a code that are merely recommendations. And so I think I guess we need to decide as a committee are we going to have any recommendations or determine you can't have recommendations in the code it should be you shall. So moving forward some clear direction on that.

J.T. LANE: I think philosophically certainly Jake, and David, and Dr. Guidry can weight in. I think philosophically I think that's part of what's brought us here today and part of what's lead to either miscommunication historically or lack of not knowing what the expectations were. I would say we need to be as explicit and clear as possible. The shoulds and should

nots should be in favor if possible unless the situation warrants something more flexible. I think that's what we're all looking for is clarity on that.

DIRK BARRIOS: The question I have is I'm going to be the second one. Are we talking about construction, operation, and maintenance or are we talking about operation and maintenance? That's the big concern I have because ten state standards is basically a guide for the instruction on design of the plan. I'm looking at we're going to make major upgrades. I understand engineers got to take all that into consideration. What I'm looking at right now just as an operator that's what I'm here for and I'm wondering may be I'm misunderstanding, I'm not following this whole thing. I thought when we was here mainly for the operations and maintenance and that the construction and/or design would be something the engineers had to worry about. I mean that's why they have a stamp, that's why they have a PE, that's why they're licensed. Ten state standards, not all of it. There are some stuff that is about operation and maintenance, but a lot of it is design and construction. And I just don't understand we keep circling around mentioning. If we're going to make any kind of recommendations for this committee I'd like to know what kind of recommendations. Is it supposed to be design, construction, and operation, and maintenance, or just operation and maintenance? That's what I'm looking for. I'm hearing one thing and then they are saying something else and coming back and say wait a minute this is ten state standards and it's not supposed to be. May be I'm just being confused, making it too complicated. Tell me what am I supposed to come back and tell y'all what the committee or subcommittee recommend to the committee because a lot of what y'all have in here, and I'm not saying it's not right or wrong. A lot of it is design and I as a manager of a plant is not looking at the design as much as I'm looking at the operation and maintenance of that plant.

JIMMY GUIDRY: Are you saying you're not the subject matter expert?

DIRK BARRIOS: Well, I'm the subject matter to some degree because I used to do this kind of work. The whole premise I understand, again correct me if I'm wrong, ten state standards was not where we're supposed to be going. We just took ten state standards because we needed some place to start. Am I correct or misinterpreting everything that was said? We just needed something to start with and we keep coming back and we're boiling on the design, the design, the design. I can count the engineers in here. I can understand their concern. Me and him and a few of these other guys we're not the engineers. We're the operators of the plants. I need to know, I don't know about Rocky, but I'm pretty sure he's in the same boat I'm in, what are we writing? Are we writing strictly an operation and maintenance manual that when ya'll come and do a sanitary survey that we have to adhere to to protect public health, produce the best water we can, or do we worry about well I built a tank in 1959. The railing is only 2 1/2 foot high. Ten state standards says it has to be 3 1/2 foot high so I have to change that railing right now. I just don't understand what y'all want us to report to y'all on. I don't have a problem reporting, I just have a problem I need to know specifically what we're trying to tell y'all. So we're going to get into discussion with these subcommittees if it starts getting on design and design is not something we're really concerned with we can say that is something that we need to bring. More concerned that hey you got to have .5 chlorine residual in the system minimum or you can't exceed (inaudible) levels and all of this other stuff. That's where I'm at right now. I'm hearing a lot of information and a lot of smart people in this room, a lot smarter than I am. But I just don't get the guidance I'm looking for. What do you want me to tell you? If you can tell me what you want me to tell you at least not specific, but the operation and maintenance, or is it design, or is it a combination of both. Then I know what I can tell you.

GREG GORDON: I think everything. All of it. It's a design document that's also being utilized currently as a...

DIRK BARRIOS: I know what it's being utilized for, but that is not what it's supposed to be.

GREG GORDON: From my standpoint I would take it as the department interpretation and its enforcement bureaucratic culture is using this document currently in this way that it would probably, unless there is some kind of change internally it would be utilized that way in the future since historically the department has been doing that.

DIRK BARRIOS: Historically it's only been recently. Not been historically. I've been doing this 29 1/2 years, historically has not been 29 1/2 years. Not to argue what they were doing in the past was right and what they are doing right now is wrong. That's not the point. The point is a lot of this is strictly, the comments have been made throughout after the webinars and I think almost every time we've made the comment from our water system about what I just said. No one has ever come back and said yes that's right or it's wrong. Design is design. Operation and maintenance is not design.

J.T. LANE: So it's all of them. Design I would say the foundation though of everything that the system is. I would assume that a lot of it's going to focus on that. And that's just my, I think it's all of those things. I think everybody here has something to say about one or all parts of it and has something to contribute to it. What exactly it is we want is A everybody agreed from the beginning at the first or the second meeting that we would start with ten state standards as the basis for our code. And some things that we heard before even when we had the original work group when we had meetings that were concern or restricted to a certain set of the ten. I view this as the opportunity for you to A to either alter what is there since we're starting with ten state standards as a basis or make recommendations on what you think is missing based on your expertise. And that's the same thing for everyone. The one request we keep getting is having a Louisiana focused and based set of standards. Everyone also agreed in interest of workflow that we start from ten state standards and it does cover all three. So if there's something that I think

that you think is either missing from what you see or doesn't apply then I think that's also part of what you report out. Again, it's very expansive and to give you an explicit list of we want this, this, this, and this is going to be difficult because everything we could possibly give you would not apply to every part.

DIRK BARRIOS: I understand. Again, that's fine. You are giving me guidance and I understand that. My biggest thing is and I'm going to come back to when we did our sanitary survey. This is the 2012 version and we have a 1950 plan, or 1960 plan, or 1970 plan that met all the criteria and we're coming back. You're going to incorporate new design methods into your Louisiana code and when they come and do their sanitary survey they going to write you up for something you built 30 years ago because you are not up to code to date.

J.T. LANE: That's more a question of how we're going to do our job. And that was often a criticism that we got and we heard and that's something that again, if we can address that and use this forum to the max that we can to air all that. We want to correct that. So I hear what you're saying. And that was again, someone said at the beginning that I heard quite a bit that as we promulgate new changes or they weren't either adequately communicated or systems felt like they needed more time to come up to code. To me that's something really a reflection of how we do what we do. And again, we can add that since we're going to be sending the agenda out sooner we can add those types of topics as we get time. I don't know that that's so much either if we're going to come up with criteria, for instance, on how long it takes to promulgate a new requirement. Then it's maybe not so much something that's easily done immediately and so therefore it's not, you can't get anything for it if you just promulgate it and you're trying to update it a month later, two months later, whatever. It's going to be different. I think everybody's going to have a different part of that. I would say that as you see as you are informed by your 29 years of

experience and you see chances in someone else's presentation or your own subcommittee to bring that up as it's impacted you in the past is something that we should address and make a recommendation and let the committee discuss how we can address that so it doesn't happen again going forward.

DIRK BARRIOS: I realize what you are saying, but I was always under the impression that safe drinking water is what we were trying to accomplish and just because certain things that are relative to design is recommended because of the safety factor has nothing to do with the safety of drinking water and there's a lot of that in here. And that's all I'm trying to say.

J.T. LANE: And that may be true, but I think overall things do change over time. We learn new things. We learned about the amoeba. I think that's what...

DIRK BARRIOS: But that's not what I'm arguing. I'm arguing from a prospective of the actual work out there. How many of y'all here actually work in a water plant by raising their hands. There's not very many of us here. Now are they experts because they're engineers? And I respect that because you sat down and you went out there and you earned your degree and you passed the test and you know what's going on, but it's a different application when you sitting in a room with a textbook and you know all the material in the world, but I can assure you many, many times there's a lot of stuff that's gone down that textbook does not apply. It just doesn't work. One of it is nitrification. You're going to have a whole kind of problems with nitrification. Textbooks do not tell you that you can get free chlorine and free ammonia in your water at the same time, but it does happen and the experts say it does happen. But anyway, that's just another point. I'm just trying to say the only reason I got on this committee was because it's nothing but engineers on it and we needed some representation from people like myself and Robby. And Randy has a lot of affiliation with it and so does Pat. People like us on here we're the ones it's going to affect us. The engineers, hey they live with it. If it cost more to do it

they get paid a bigger percentage. That's what I see. They are going to fight for it because they are fighting for their constituents, but in the end result if it's a million dollar project that cost a million and a half they are going to make more money on it.

PATRICK KERR: Can I boil that all down to one sentence?

DIRK BARRIOS: Sure.

PATRICK KERR: You need to be on Vern's subcommittee and work on the grandfather clause and I mean that sincerely. That's how stuff is operated that was built 30 years ago. We need to figure out a good grandfather clause with language that says provided you're producing water that meets the drinking water standards so he can order you to change it if it's not. But that's probably the most important part of this discussion. I would argue that we're here because of the big disconnect between what had been built and operated not in accordance with ten state standards and DHH is insistent that they should have been going forward. We can argue about whether the rule was that way since 1973 or was enforced that way, but enough people in this state got aggravated and thought we were being asked to operate our system differently than were built, got the legislator to help us because we couldn't get y'all's attention. That's why we're here. The grandfather clause has to be strong. We got to have a break somewhere that says if it was built prior to this date and produce good water you keep doing it that way. You don't, you got to get it fixed. And maybe there's got to be some language in what we're doing that says you need an engineering report if you fail. Some trigger, you fail to do this, I don't know chlorine residual problems, you need an engineer's report that says how you're going to address it. You want to involve the experts then maybe we say, and under the new, the distribution rule basically that's actually what's going to happen. It's coming from the feds. If you have violations, repeated violations you have to put together a plan to address them. And I think that's going to fix itself. But the operators need a grandfather clause, the designers

need a going forward clause. And then we just really ought to be arguing about how we make the transition from old stuff to new stuff. Right?

DIRK BARRIOS: I agree.

PATRICK KERR: And that's why we're here. Dadgum chlorine buildings. I'm sorry, stuffs built in 1940 and we got to put it in a building all of a sudden. It was my reason for being here. And everybody else here has a reason. I hate to say it, but I wouldn't mind saying that ten state standards should be used for review of plans and don't put it in chapter 12. We use it and we use it smart.

ROBERT BROU: I would like to echo that sentiment. I think ten state standards is not going to go away. It's going to continue to get updated. It's a good document. It has all the recommendations that we're saying should not be in there. I think our focus really ought to be what in ten state standards needs to be a regulation for Louisiana and that becomes a very short list. That's not an extension. You still use ten state standards as your design criteria and you move forward. And some things in there absolutely need to be in regulation and need to be, no matter what day it was built it has to be there because it's there to protect public health. And I think then we could come to it pretty quickly if we all approach it from that way. There's not a lot in the ten state standards that needs to be. A lot of it is recommendations. You have to have heating for operator comfort. Why does DHH want to regulate that? There's no reason to ever have that as any regulation that we present for Louisiana standards.

J.T. LANE: There are going to be things in there that do not apply to the state and we should take them out based on the debate in this committee. You just said a smaller amount. Randy said 90 percent. I realize it's everybody's ballpark. No one can agree because we don't know. No one's counted the words or counted the lines on what should really apply. That's why we're here. I don't want to spend more time debating that. I think we need to

figure out what exactly in our subcommittees we are going to recommend finally for each part and where we think it should be the case that we operate it will say should or shall. And if we so desire to make recommendations that's great. And again, assuming what should be there in that document and then also separate that from operational issues in the field. I've never stated that we do everything right. I often go on camera and talk about how we do something wrong and how we're going to fix it. We can have a very transparent conversation about that and talk about how we're going to improve. No one is against that and I'm very much in favor of making those changes. I think it is everyone really has a much more nuance and a different prospective to offer and that's why maybe Dirk we should have had more operators. It wasn't my bill. But that's good feedback. But we stand very committed to work with you and each and every one of you to make this right. Part one.

RUSTY REEVES: J.T., would it be feasible to take part one that we have as we have here and like we talked earlier have it marked up with the comments that was suggested and put in comparison to what's here and send this committee? We can sit here all afternoon and argue back and forth about it. I don't think we're getting nowhere with it. And we did talk about having it marked up both ways with the comments by this committee as well as what DHH is recommending. May be we see it side by side some things, okay I understand that and maybe we could move forward. I'm having to look back and forth between papers and look at different things. I'm getting more confused as this goes on.

J.T. LANE: Well, at least we're going to talk about part one, but yeah we can definitely do that. And I acknowledged that we would do that already. I just thought since Keith was here we would have that discussion so that when he has the subcommittee meetings he might benefit from that so he would be better informed going into it.

RUSTY REEVES: I understand that.

J.T. LANE: Is there anything else on the agenda you guys want to cover or discuss while we're here?

RANDY HOLLIS: Future dates of meetings.

J.T. LANE: We're going to work on that and send that out to y'all.

RUSTY REEVES: On that future date can Sheree send us one of them surveys to fill out?

J.T. LANE: Sure. Once we, again, get the availability of the rooms in several surrounding buildings we'll let you know and send out. We're going to have to figure out first the makeup of the subcommittees unless y'all want to talk about that now? Because that's the people we're going to have to survey for their availability on whatever times we can find available.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: Isn't that going to be whoever's the chair and then we need to give over the next week if you want to volunteer for one of the other ones contact that chair and let them know that you want to be a volunteer. And at the end of the week, or whatever, if you're a chair and you don't have anybody time to start reaching out and asking I guess.

J.T. LANE: We'll send out those instructions.

VERN BRELAND: Go ahead and try to nail down who wants to help me with this. I'm not an expert; I'm just a guy who gets the angry phone calls in the mayor's office. Anybody who would like to serve on that subcommittee I would appreciate it very much so.

PATRICK KERR: Grandfather clause Dirk.

GREG GORDON: I'll volunteer.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: Dirk and Greg, that's your three.

VERN BRELAND: Dirk, I can assure you I will work on the grandfather clause.

DIRK BARRIOS: And we probably have a more younger system. Our system is 58 years old. Considering us and Jefferson Parish and Orleans, we're relatively young. We don't have the old, old stuff like these other guys have. And I can assure you we're going to run into

problems, I know they are going to run into major problems.

JEFFREY DUPLANTIS: I don't know if it's going to benefit you, but could you send out an email that has the committee's names and what part they have?

SPEAKER: It's on the website.

SHEREE TAILLON: I'll resend it.

J.T. LANE: I wonder for the sake of time and the time that we have left in this process to get our report done if I can get a commitment from everyone that they are satisfied with the way we are going to go based on this discussion today?

COMMITTEE: Yes.

J.T. LANE: I have tried to remain as opened-minded as possible and I value the work we do and the time that y'all spend doing it. We all put a lot of time into this. We have a lot of work to get done by August and I don't want to have this conversation again, prefer not to at least, in two or three months. This is going to be lock down time. We will work to get all the rooms in order of policy and get that out to you as soon as possible so that and may be even so that we can again, finalize that discussion and move forward. The only remaining agenda item we had was a makeup day and as we're going about scheduling subcommittee meetings I thought it might be prudent that we schedule at least one extra meeting to make up for the lost one in January and so we'll look at does anyone have any opposition to that? And may be even based on, obviously based on our progress in the next few months, may be even want to look at adding another. We'll go ahead and start looking at some dates and may be even go ahead and find two or three extra dates to lock down in case we need them in June, July, and August. May, June July. Find one more day in each of those months and then we'll poll everybody for that.

JIMMY GUIDRY: For those subcommittee chairs looking side by side there's our folks part three. Again, for us to come up with what we would like to see is not a simple matter in

addition to everything else we're doing. There's work in expertise that can be done by looking at what all the recommendations are, what your thoughts are, but I don't see coming from DHH's side we're going to have all these parts ready when you might be ready to go. So be thinking about how you might do some of your work without our rendition cause that's going to take some time to pull off. And then I just didn't want you to get where you got your subcommittee going and you're waiting for DHH's proposal, what we would like to see because I think that's got to take quite some time to get to.

JAKE CAUSEY: Some parts are going to go faster. It will, but we're working on it. Some parts are going to go faster than others.

JIMMY GUIDRY: I would like to put this in people's minds. There's some things that we really want to fix and other things it doesn't really matter. It doesn't make a whole lot of difference. So again, we need to put the things that really matter. As I've saw this going on just parts one and two which I thought no big deal as I read it, not a lot of heartburn we can get that done, it's a big deal. Everything's a big deal. It's not getting to what we're here for which is the things that really matter. Let's spend our time on those things that make a difference in people's lives. I certainly think there are things that we really have a lot of heartburn with. Whether somebody's got to submit something or delete it totally. It would have to be a lot of heartburn for me to say hey let's just do away with it. We were pretty much doing all this before and referencing ten state standards when citations occurred. All we changed was putted it more towards ten state standards so people paid attention and it got a lot of attention. I don't think it was ten state standards as much as we want to blame ten state standards. We all know the recommendations in there that are really good. I think it's years and years of older systems we're going to have to do things that come up to par. They are not cheap and we have it in waste water and we have it in drinking water and nobody wants to pay for it. How do we go forward and make sure

we're protecting the public at the same time not occurring unnecessary cost. And I hear it over and over again from the group, really a long list of heartburn. Let's spend our time on the heartburn and not on all that other stuff. Important maybe, important not. Right now I can't answer the question. If I'm Keith and he left, but whether the disagreement about what should be proposed for the engineer. What Jake's thought is, what's yours and how are we going to bring these two together. May be a big deal, I don't know. Is it worth fighting over, I don't know. At the end of the day if either one disagrees to it it doesn't exist. And so again, let's make sure we don't destroy what we have because people are not getting sick. We have something good in place. We got to make sure going forward they don't start to get sick. So I'm hoping that we can come to some agreement. I'm trying to make sense how we are going to get there. We're not the first state to do this by the way. Colorado's been working on their drinking water requirements. It's not like we're the first ones to think up how we're going to go forward. I agree with you, not everything's in the science books. There's a lot of experience that goes into decision making, but again how do we bridge that gap? If Keith comes back to this committee and y'all say hey we like it and DHH says we can't live with it what happens? How are we going to get there? Think about it. When I look at stuff that I try to bring people together in agreement I try to look at what is something I can't live with. Otherwise I let a lot of it slide, but there's some things I cannot let slide. And that's where I think the code comes in. You shall do this, you shall do this, and everything else is a recommendation. And so again, I'm with you. It's confusing, it's difficult. I'm not there yet, but I do think side by side look at what we like, what you like and then having a discussion why we think the way we do would help us get there. I'm getting there slowly.

J.T. LANE: All right. Any other comments, questions?

RANDY HOLLIS: If Chris could get with me and let's get Sheree and work out the date for the

next webinar and let's knock that out. I'd pick Mardi Gras and she said no.

SHEREE TAILLON: My only other comment is the next three meeting days are March, April, and May right now are on Fridays at 9 a.m. due to legislative session. I just wanted to remind y'all.

J.T. LANE: Any other comments from the audience? Do we have a motion to adjourn?

ROBERT BROU: (motioned)

J.T. LANE: Do we have any opposition?