

WUAC – Implementation Strategies Committee
MAA Conference Room
February 21, 2020
9:00 am to 11:00 am

Doug Needham – Michigan Aggregates Association
Bryan Burroughs – Michigan Trout Unlimited (phone)
Taylor Ridderbush – Michigan Trout Unlimited
Jim Milne – EGLE
Nathaniel Shuff – EGLE

Hannah Arnett - EGLE
Dave Hamilton – The Nature Conservancy (phone)
Pat Staskiewicz – Ottawa County Road Commission
(phone)

- As a follow-up to our 1/24/20 committee meeting, members provided comments as to the ranking and grouping of the 35 items in the HLH and HHH categories in the Impact/Effort/Urgency column (H = high, L = low).
- Members of committee were asked to identify items (out of the 35) that they believe are high prior and should be addressed in the near future. The following is a summary of the voting:
 - 5 votes – TU2.2, TU7.1, EM2.1
 - 4 votes – TU.3.1, EM2.4
 - 3 votes – TU1.1, TU1.2, TU1.3, TU1.3a, TU1.3b, EM2.2, EM2.3
 - 2 votes – TU6.1, EM1.6
 - 1 vote – EM1.2, EM1.1, TU4.1, EM1.3, TU4.2
- The items that received the highest ranking by the committee were reviewed and discussed. A summary of the discussion regarding each item is as follows:
- TU 2.2
 - Recommendation per 12/12/14 Final Report, “Make the WWAT registration number a required field in Wellogic (and on paper well logs) for high-capacity wells.”
 - EGLE informed the committee that there is an optional field in Wellogic for this registration number but it is not mandatory.
 - The benefits of making this a required field would speed up the process of registrations and compliance reviews.
 - Currently the requirement to provide a WWAT registration number is on the owner of the well and not the drillers. It was discussed that if the requirement was shifted to the drillers this may add an administrative burden to the drillers. However, this information is not submitted to EGLE in a timely basis.
 - It is believed that this change could be handled via administratively vs. legislatively.
 - **Action: Develop a workgroup with well drillers/EGLE Drinking Water and Environmental Health Division (DWEHD)/WRD/DTMB to discuss this suggested change/modification.**
 - **Cost: No legislative funding request**
- TU 7.1
 - Recommendation per 12/12/14 Final Report, “Work with stakeholders to develop criteria describing the required features of groundwater-flow models to

be used in the water-withdrawal assessment process focusing on streamflow depletion.”

- This has been discussed as part of the Michigan Hydrologic Framework and is being addressed in the Models Committee.
- There needs to be a process developed by EGLE, with input from the Models Committee, on how to incorporate information into models.
- **Action: EGLE will develop baseline criteria as to what is required if new ideas/methods are proposed. EGLE will reference approved test methods and set minimum requirements. Once drafted, the criteria will be presented to the WUAC for review.**
- **Cost: No legislative funding request**
- EM 2.1
 - Recommendation per 12/12/14 Final Report, “We recommend a database be created to gather and collate data on glacial geology, static water levels and aquifer characteristics collected by state and federal agencies as well as by universities and private industry. It should utilize a common set of accepted geologic and hydrogeologic terms and fields. Organizations or agencies collecting this data should have the ability to submit information to be entered into the database, and the data submitted shall conform to State program requirements. This database should be publicly viewable.”
 - EGLE informed the committee that \$100,000 has been allocated from the remaining Clean Michigan Initiative water use funding that could be used by the WUAC to leverage additional financial support from other sources for the Michigan Hydrologic Framework. This funding must be committed prior to September 30, 2020.
 - The Michigan Hydrologic Framework was discussed and it was noted that a framework needs to be designed so that it is compatible with the various sources of geologic, groundwater, water quality, hydrologic, climatological, and other data, whether those various data sources are uploaded all at once or in a phased implementation. It was suggested to ensure this database be able to capture both water quantity and quality information.
 - **Action: Bring this item to the full WUAC and request the \$100,000 be used to work with various stakeholders to develop a conceptual framework on how to store and utilize both water quantity and quality information. Once the conceptual framework is developed then work with WUAC on how to move forward with funding and resources.**
 - **Cost: \$100,000**
- TU3.1
 - Recommendation per 12/12/14 Final Report, “The process for checking the compliance of “as built” well construction details with WWAT and/or SSR registrations of groundwater LQWs should be automated. Discrepancies between these should be flagged for follow up by staff.”
 - EGLE mentioned that there is need for Welllogic to communicate with the WWAT tool and MDARD reporting data.

- It would be beneficial to have a flagging process that identifies discrepancies between as approved and “as built” wells.
- This improvement will speed up the time it takes EGLE staff to ensure that the installation details match the authorized details. This will benefit the authorization time on future wells. It will also reduce the workload of EGLE compliance staff, expediting efforts to bring more serious violations of Part 327 back into compliance. It will also result in fewer compliance communications being sent to property owners (with copies to consultants, well drillers, and other agents) to address these violations.
- It was mentioned that a new system would be required to address this recommendation.
- **Action: Form a workgroup with well driller, DTMB, DWEHD, and WRD to discuss the design of a new system that would address how this could be accomplished.**
- **Cost: Unknown at this time. Will be determined by the workgroup.**
- EM 2.4
 - Recommendation per 12/12/14 Final Report, “The DEQ should use high quality data it receives, acquires, or collates from the data submitted to the groundwater database and integrate that data into the SSRs, develop numerical models to better understand the hydrogeology of certain areas, and develop better tools to predict streamflow depletion in those areas. Collection of this data and using updated models can ultimately inform and upgrade the screening tool once sufficient data is collected for the associated Watershed Management Areas.”
 - The WWAT’s groundwater model currently uses median aquifer transmissivity values for a given water management area and a statewide default aquifer storage coefficient value that is appropriate for a leaky confined aquifer. EGLE uses site-specific aquifer properties and other information, when available and appropriate to the hydrogeologic setting, in the SSR, alternative analysis, and permit review processes.
 - If any data is changed in the WWAT, it applies to all of the areas of the water management area.
 - However, many areas of the state have water management areas with varying geology so a generic number for the entire area is not truly representative.
 - Also, the current system only takes into account the surface area (X,Y) and not depth (Z).
 - Benefit - If the WWAT was updated with more realistic information, then the need for SSR’s could be reduced.
 - There is a need to determine how the WWAT can be modified to accept this additional information.
 - **Action: The Models committee is currently discussing this recommendation and is planning on bringing to the full WUAC with a plan and cost.**
 - **Cost: TBD**

- Future WUAC Implementation Strategies Committee Meetings are scheduled for the following dates. All meetings are scheduled from 9-11 am and will be held at the Michigan Farm Bureau, 7373 W. Saginaw Hwy, Lansing, MI 48917.
 - March 20, 2020
 - April 17, 2020
 - May 15, 2020
 - June 19, 2020
 - July 24, 2020
 - August 21, 2020
 - September 18, 2020
 - October 16, 2020
 - November 20, 2020
 - December 18, 2020