

Water Use Advisory Council (WUAC) Meeting

Hosted by the Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE)

Tuesday, November 12, 2024

1:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m.

**Lee Walker Conference Room, North Atrium, Constitution Hall
525 West Allegan, Lansing, MI 48933**

Remote Option Available Via Teams

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 248-509-0316, 979460526#](#) United States, Pontiac

Phone Conference ID: 979 460 526#

AGENDA

1. Welcome

Laura Campbell welcomed via remote to the group at 1:03 p.m. Bryan Burroughs noted quorum could be held, with at least 13 voting members/alternates present.

2. Roll Call

WUAC Members In-Person

Bryan Burroughs, Michigan Trout Unlimited
Ben Tirrell, MFB (Laura Campbell alt.)
Katy Lindstrom, Barr Engineering
Dave Hamilton, TNC
Megan Napier, AKT Peerless
Megan Tinsley, Michigan Environmental Council
Dave Maturen, Michigan Lakes and Streams Association (MLSA)
Rachel Proctor, Consumers Energy
Doug Needham, Michigan Aggregates Association
Frank Ettawageshik, United Tribes of Michigan
Kelly Turner, Michigan Potato Industry Commission (MPIC)
Tom Frazier, Michigan Township Association (MTA) (Retired)
Adam Wygant, EGLE
Michael Frederick, Michigan Ground Water Association
Pat Staskiewicz, Michigan American Water Works Association
Doug Needham, Michigan Aggregates Association
James Clift, EGLE

WUAC Members Virtual

Laura Campbell, Michigan Farm Bureau (MFB)
Elizabeth Morrisseau, Michigan Attorney General (AG)
Abigail Eaton, MDARD
Steve Kohler, Kalamazoo River Watershed Council
Buddy Sebastian

WUAC Members Not in Attendance

Rex Vaughn, MLSA; serving as Dave Maturen's alternate
Michael Ellis, Barr Engineering, Inc
John A. Yellich, Michigan Geological Survey (MGS)

WUAC Non-Members

Ross Helmer, EGLE
Sydney Ruhala, EGLE
Tariku Negassa, EGLE
Joel Henry, Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc. (ECT)
Damen Kursev, MI Seed Potato Association
Jim Milne, EGLE
Marian Maier, EGLE
Bri Hammontree, JetCo
Melissa Grasman, JetCo
Katie Mika, EGLE
Trisha Hagerman, EGLE
Megan Cameron, EGLE
Lena Pappas, EGLE
Travis Bauer, EGLE
Danielle Mayo
David Lusch, MSU (retired)
Michael Fienen
Chanse Ford
Grant Poole
Anthony Kendall
Andrew LeBaron, EGLE
Paul Sachs
Sara Pearson
Jeffrey Snyder, DTMB
Todd Feenstra
Jill Van Dyke, EGLE
Jay Wesley, DNR
Younsuk Dong, MSU
Brock Howell, EGLE

3. Approval of Minutes-Roll Call Vote Discussion

Laura Campbell noted minutes from October to be approved during the December meeting. Dave Hamilton noted having changes to minutes from October.

4. Approval of Agenda-Roll Call Vote Discussion

Laura Campbell noted the November Agenda approved for discussion.

5. Public Comment (Three Minute Limit)

Laura Campbell noted no public comment.

6. Committee Chairs Report

Bryan Burroughs noted a change in format of the usual report, given that Data and Conservation Efficiency committees not having extensive updates or recommendations to the legislative report. Noted starting with Models and Implementation.

a. Models Committee

• Presentation of Three (3) Recommendations

Bryan Burroughs noted Dave Hamilton will discuss recommendations.

Dave Hamilton noted that the first item to be covered is the Timeliness of Site-Specific Review recommendation. Noted previously discussed in prior WUAC meetings and noted some discourse and concern regarding it and had gathered a small group together to work through those suggestions. Dave Hamilton provided a summary of previously discussed SSR recommendation, readdressing the concern of the timeliness to perform SSRs given constraints regarding capacity, lack of information, or complexity of the application. Noted a general audit had been performed on EGLE and noted that 54% of the SSRs were not completed within a 10-day period, thus resulting in the department needs to respond to this report. Noted these SSRs were broken into three categories: Administrative Review, Desktop Geology Review, and a Technical Review. Noted reviewed data from 2023 into the first quarter of 2024 and found that 82% of administrative reviews were completed in 10 days versus 95% of desktop reviews completed within 30 days. Also noted 96% of technical reviews were completed within 30 days as well. Noted had a conversation regarding whether this would require a statute change. Noted it was a unanimous decision that this does not warrant a statute change.

Dave Hamilton noted recommendation from SSR findings is to have the department continue to work as quickly as possible and complete the SSR in 10 days where they can. Noted in the areas where they cannot due to technical requirements or more work needing to be completed, that there should be a notice to the applicant within the 10 days that it will be completed within a 30-day period. Noted if it was complex document or required more data, then they would negotiate with the applicant to determine a schedule of when they will receive that information. Noted they believe it would be important for the department to release a public statement regarding needing more time. Noted the department cannot make a statutory change, but this information is important for applicants to know. Noted the committee discussed posting something on a website with status updates or on the Water Withdrawal Assessment Tool's user site so applicants know why an SSR is taking time. Noted they believe it is important the report provides data on these categories, so everyone knows what the department is doing.

Dave Hamilton asked for questions on recommendation 1. Jim Milne noted that Marian had updated the statistics from Jan 1, 2023, to November 7, 2024, and that this information is available, but not shown on the slides. Laura Campbell noted Mike Frederick's emailed concern regarding making a public announcement about what the procedure will be and the department essentially saying they will not follow in the statute as result to these public statements for the SSRs. Given this feedback, Laura Campbell posed to the group a question regarding a good way for the department to share the information that this is an internal procedure while remaining transparent about the process and concern regarding timeliness. Laura Campbell noted the understandable concern about opening the statute simply to change the number of days to respond.

Adam Wygant noted the department would be nervous to make a public statement saying they are not following the statute. Noted there are some moving parts regarding the audit ongoing. Noted entering a Lean Process Improvement (LPI), specifically looking at SSR process. The LPI will document the existing processes, issues with the current processes, and design improved future processes to address those issues.

Noted the SSR timeliness issue was discussed and determined it wouldn't warrant a statute change. Recommend the department continues to work as quickly as possible on areas where they can, but if they need more information or details, they will then work to get the information from the applicant and/or agent(s). Though it would be important for the department to commit to this, however, note that the department has the option of doing something else. Noted this would be beneficial for water users. Noted would be good for the department to report in these categories. Noted it doesn't eliminate the concern of liability of why they are not following the statute but believes that by reporting on the metrics on these three buckets and establishing three new trend lines, that the LPI will serve to help in informing whether the department is heading in the correct direction. Noted there is still a risk that someone could come to the department and tell them they are not completing an SSR in the 10-day statute.

Dave Hamilton noted that's true, and it is happening now. Noted the point of letting people know it isn't happening in 10 days allows for transparency.

Adam Wygant noted we can make it 10 days, but that EGLE would have to deny SSRs having insufficient information to process the request.

Doug Needham noted that the unknown is the most frustrating thing for water users. If you know it's going to be 30 days, then so be it and plan for it. Noted what are the ramifications of EGLE not meeting the 10 days right now?

Jim Milne noted for the conventional 10-day SSR deadline, there is no consequence for going past that other than reporting on our timeliness, and that became an audit issue and the LPI was identified as part of the EGLE corrective action plan to address the audit findings. Noted it is his understanding that the auditors will return to do a follow up on it to see if their concerns were addressed. Noted no other consequences. Noted an exception related to the alternative analysis introduced in the 2018 amendments. The amendments specify that the department has 20 or 25 business days to complete its review. If the review

exceeds this timeframe, the decision is issued by operation of law. To date, there have been only four attempts to utilize the alternative analysis. Of these, the first two were ineligible because the proposed large quantity withdrawals were over 1,000,000 gallons per day. The third attempt was administratively incomplete, resulting in it being closed and returned. The fourth attempt was a resubmission of the third and was deemed administratively complete.

An extension was granted to allow up to 25 days for review, but the application was ultimately denied on two grounds: (1) Insufficient stream flow to authorize the proposed action and (2) Identified issues with the modeling methodology used in the analysis.

Adam Wygant noted that while his perspective doesn't have the force of law, tracking key metrics is a valuable step toward greater transparency and alignment with stakeholders. By tracking these metrics, we can better understand the efficiency of processing simpler administrative approvals within the 10-day timeframe and assess the feasibility of moving slightly more complex cases through in a timely manner. Additionally, the tracking will help identify how many sites fall into the 30+ day category, which typically involves more complex, site-specific reviews. This process will also ensure that proper documentation is in place for cases requiring extended review periods, offering clarity on the nuanced nature of these decisions.

Dave Hamilton noted he believes adding some form of notification would go beyond and be useful to the application and building transparency to address these problems.

Bryan Burroughs noted this is a good interim step but is not a total solution. Noted the way to get it done may be changing the statute from 10 days or you have to say funding is insufficient to meet the 10 days but noted then you need to have discussions regarding general fund or permit application fee increases.

Dave Hamilton noted sometimes staffing isn't the issue, sometimes it's just the flexibility of the site.

Bryan Burroughs noted that administrative reviews should ideally be completed within the 10-day timeframe, and efforts are actively being made to ensure this happens. From past experience, it's clear that most stakeholders prefer not to receive a denial within 10 days due to insufficient information. Instead, there is appreciation for the department's efforts to facilitate the review process and work toward a final decision. Tracking these reviews aligns with the department's commitment to responsiveness and continuous improvement, demonstrating the intent to meet expectations while considering reasonable measures for each case.

Dave Hamilton suggested making a sentence that talks about publicly making this commitment, given the concern of what Mike Frederick posed in his email.

Bryan Burroughs noted he believes what is being proposed is better. Noted he understands the worry of communicating you are not following the statute, but in practice noted that's what the statute and funding level says and it's still happening. Noted he believes there is a good way EGLE could post this on their website to indicate the process of initial policy and will be notifying applicants within 10 days of whether the SSR is

complete or needs more time. Noted he doesn't believe EGLE is not honoring the law, but rather just speaking to the fact EGLE will be communicating with the community on the status of an SSR. Noted it doesn't say it changes the 10-day timeline but allows the applicant to understand the process.

Laura Campbell noted she believed Bryan hit on what she was hoping to note. Noted Mike raised concerns not about the principle of creating three classifications for site-specific review timelines, but rather about how to communicate this process to users without making a public statement that could be perceived as an admission that EGLE is not following the statute. Instead of recommending a public statement, it was suggested that EGLE should inform registrants about the process—either by posting on the website or notifying registrants directly—without making a dramatic announcement. This would address the issue and ensure transparency while avoiding the implication that EGLE is using an administrative procedure to bypass statutory requirements. Additionally, it was acknowledged that if the 10-day timeline is not met, there is no statutory penalty for this.

Dave Hamilton noted he believes the wording works then. He asked if there were any objections to removing forward with recommendation as is.

James Clift noted we may just want to update the sentence to say like we strive to keep the applicant informed on progress under their application, as staff often talks to individuals on the phone.

Dave Hamilton and Bryan Burroughs noted no further objections.

Dave Hamilton moved onto next recommendation was which investigating the streamflow depletion in the area with significant large quantity withdrawals using detailed data collection and monitoring. Noted questions have been raised regarding effectiveness of models and data support. Noted the availability of data as well to support them. It was acknowledged that the variation in climate, weather, and irrigation practices makes it difficult to directly link impacts on stream flow to specific causes, such as irrigation. The proposal aims to combine observation and modeling to better understand how irrigation wells affect streams. The screening tool process is recognized as a conservative protective measure to safeguard stream flow. While the screening tool itself is not being altered, the components used within it will be reviewed to determine if any adjustments are needed. The goal is to balance protecting stream flow without overly restricting irrigation water use or causing environmental problems. The system is designed to strike a middle ground, and ongoing collaboration will ensure that the approach is effective and appropriate.

Dave Hamilton noted the study aims to field-test stream depletion by pumping a nearby well and modeling the sources of water entering post-pumping wells, with a focus on evaluating the watershed budget, which has not been fully explored in previous studies. The goal is to determine whether water extraction is negatively impacting stream flow in a way that violates statutory limits. The study will combine field experiments, empirical data collection, and the development of a regional groundwater model to better understand the impacts of pumping. It will also assess various analytical approaches to model the water

flow. Collaboration with farmers and other stakeholders is key to the success of the study, with their involvement essential for data collection and ensuring transparency. Regular meetings will be held to keep the community informed and involved. The study will also include a component to educate the public and other interest groups about its findings, which will be published openly. Data will be collected over multiple seasons, with tests conducted near streams to measure depletion. Additionally, there will be an evaluation of how different systems, including irrigation, impact stream flow. A budget of \$1.2 million is proposed, including the potential installation of high-capacity wells to conduct necessary pump tests. The study is designed to provide valuable insights and will rely on collaboration without financial exchanges between states, though there will be shared learnings from a similar study in Wisconsin.

Dave Hamilton asked for questions on the recommendation.

James Clift posed a question on the actual withdrawal measure. Dave Hamilton noted most wells are already metered. Noted it is not usually information shared but would be necessary.

Frank Ettawageshik asked a question regarding picking a test site. Dave Hamilton noted a test site will never be demonstrative of the whole state. Noted going to pick something they believe would best demonstrate what we're looking for and lessons that can be learned and determine how it can be applied elsewhere.

Bryan Burroughs noted he had a similar question and explained to Frank a lot of the work would be the modeling components of this being paired in one location with enhanced data and empirical pumping results. Noted they are going to likely pump hard in a spot to get a stream flow depletion and then come in and put together models to explain and match that data and use a larger spatial scale model to build off that. Noted the insights may be like a sensitivity analysis and determine important variables.

Dave Hamilton noted that modeling is key to variability that was being discussed. Noted from site to site that there will be different geologic features.

Doug Needham noted that Todd Feenstra had good comments on having an individual or private entity agree to this and that might need to install a test model to monitor and do it. Noted if this was the case the pumped water being discharged on the land surface in the test area (e.g., through a center pivot irrigation system) or discharged off site away from the test area could affect what is being seen in this study.

Dave Hamilton noted this is correct. Noted there is a 1960 video in Wisconsin for USS Fitz study exploring this. Noted they piped the water away so it would not impact the study area.

Doug Needham asked if this was an existing farm field, how the water would come back?

Dave Hamilton noted one of the proposals is to perform a two-part test. One is to pipe the water away from the test area as a theoretical model. Noted the second part is to come back in and use it through irrigation, which many farmers are currently doing. Noted the department has real concerns about this, which this can help address.

Doug Needham noted if we must do that, it would be good to match what people are currently doing, noting many individuals are likely keeping the water on site and being utilized in different capacities.

Frank Ettawageshik noted this is a good recommendation to propose as it would help in answering some of the questions and concerns posed to him several years ago when they toured a site and the farmers had indicated what they were doing wasn't affecting the stream flow, despite the model showing it did. Noted it is timely and a good thing to do and he is looking forward to the results.

Dave Hamilton noted there has been a lot of support for this, including questions.

Laura Campbell noted a procedural concern was raised regarding the timing of the vote on the proposed field project for site-specific reviews. While there is full support for conducting a field project, it was noted that this is the first detailed presentation of the proposal, including the budget and project design, for many members outside the Models Committee. To ensure transparency and thorough understanding, it was suggested that the group be given more time to review, digest, and raise any questions or concerns before voting. The aim is to ensure that the final report, due in December, is accurate and reflective of collective input.

Bryan Burroughs noted the council could have everyone review the document to ensure they like the idea and don't have any remaining critical questions. Noted the council could then get consensus. Noted could also get language-based updates and get support at or before the December council meeting.

Dave Hamilton noted he is just looking for any serious objections currently but is comfortable with this.

Bryan Burroughs asked if there are any strong objections and if not, can the council address any slight improvements?

Todd Feenstra noted no objection, just wants the rest of the Models Committee to have a chance to review it as the document has seen some changes.

Kelly Turner noted a procedural question as well regarding having a chance to review the document. Noted she just wants to make sure everyone has a chance to properly review the document and provide any comments back. Noted she will want to review the council meeting notice distribution lists to ensure concerns about interested parties not being notified can be avoided in the future.

Dave Hamilton noted the intent was to have council meeting notices sent out a week prior to the meeting and it unfortunately was not. Noted he does feel-good about the document though.

Bryan Burroughs noted not hearing any serious objections to the recommendation. Noted will put a deadline on the draft to provide feedback to Dave Hamilton for his review so he can coordinate with Laura Campbell for the report.

Dave Hamilton noted the Models Committee's final discussion topic is improving streamflow tool. Noted there is some unease within the committee regarding the

Streamflow Depletion Calculation in the WWAT, so it will not go into this year's report and there is no new funding requests associated with this topic at this time. Would like to advance for proposal next year and would like the department to be aware it is in the pipeline.

Bryan Burroughs noted the council's recommendations are provided to improve the Water Use Program and that anytime there is a consensus on a recommendation, the council would be to make work on including them in a subsequent report (not necessarily limited to the current biennial reporting schedule). Noted this recommendation has been noted as a great improvement of the program. Noted it's important the committee thinks about this component and reach consensus.

Dave Hamilton noted he thanks the Models Committee for their work and would like to have this be a future recommendation. Laura Campbell asked how do we move forward with replacing the half-max rule and how do we do it in a way with good certainty of what is happening in the real world? Noted that web squared model is representative and noted this is answering how does streamflow depletion impact water withdrawal. Noted extensive discussions about the uniqueness of the sub-surface geology, but she is not quite ready to agree with a field experiment. Noted getting to something with a model is great, but the data is important to build trust among the user community. Noted this could mean some significant change in watersheds and lead to large quantity withdrawal (LQW) approvals. Asked how we know if it's better by doing a similar model (such as Zipper)? Noted wants to raise the concern regarding what model calibration looks like for field experience, noted she would like it to be more than a desk-top exercise.

Dave Hamilton noted will schedule a Models Committee meeting to discuss. Buddy Sebastian asked what advantage would the grower have to have this work done? Noted need to consider how this would benefit a grower and not use the data against the grower. Noted heading in the right direction. Dave Hamilton noted that it's a great point. Noted the council would help in building relationships and could be a trust-building exercise. Noted in Wisconsin have seen a lot of success with their farmers (e.g., a farmer was able to use data to save money). Bryan Burroughs noted it would be easier than it seems. Noted many water users don't trust the current process and so this could be an easy sell in terms of highlighting changing to a new process.

Adam Wygant noted will not negate someone's participation in the program. Adam Wygant noted he assumes users could return the water they used before the study. Dave Hamilton noted it's modeling what is going on and pick up variations. Adam Wygant the department would then look at the threats in the back of water users' minds.

Frank Ettawageshik noted that while individuals want to use more water, this work might show how users might realize they have more water to use. Adam Wygant noted this is the next level of science to be proactive and work alongside individuals. Bryan Burroughs noted that he doesn't believe the WUAC hasn't "gone back" on individuals in the past or talked about how the accounting was done differently. Noted this could provide a test well

to find the depletion and determine the form of processes. Noted determining what is the process, what is the standards. Noted haven't done this yet.

Adam Wygant noted that additional data & modeling could result in "Geology Pass" SSRs where the underlying aquifer is not connected to surface water in Zone D Water Management Areas (WMAs).

Bryan Burroughs asked if there were any additional comments?

Todd Feenstra noted that in the Models Committee they discussed a lot of things regarding this. Noted how weather patterns impact what the data looks like and noted it would be important to find common ground. Noted it would be important to demonstrate and show how a user can understand the importance of the work. Noted would be important to look at his work in the proposal and how users could benefit in the work. Noted it's important we have open discussions and don't move quickly on the process. Noted should get growers' input and have a huge data set to look at. Noted the Wisconsin study established the importance of establishing trust at the start of the process. Noted question would be how prepared we are to move forward together on this?

Dave Hamilton noted we don't need a big elaborate study to help the program or make recommendations. Noted we should try to find a way to use the data regardless of other study. Todd Feenstra noted he agrees and trying to do it too. Noted that farmers and growers participating or looking at this may have some hard questions. Noted may be worth having a more open discussion on this and get users' input. Noted that a major takeaway from the Wisconsin study was cooperation and collaboration with farmers/growers to encourage trust. Noted trust should be established early on.

Dave Hamilton noted this is a great idea. Noted it is important to utilize existing data from farmers and historical sources to enhance understanding of water management areas, even before the proposed study is conducted. It was emphasized that while the field project is valuable, existing farmer-provided data could be analyzed immediately to support program determinations and provide insights into recovery trends and water management challenges. Leveraging this readily available data could aid in making informed decisions without waiting for the larger study's outcomes, offering immediate benefits to the program.

Todd Feenstra agrees. Noted he and Dave have been huge proponents of trying to do this.

Bryan Burroughs noted the importance of leveraging existing data collection efforts by water users who have previously collaborated with the program. It was noted that enhanced data collection often suggests the current tool may over-predict stream depletion. Therefore, engaging with water users who have already participated in data collection would likely yield more accurate insights with less uncertainty. In contrast, working with users without prior data collection poses a greater risk of ambiguous outcomes. The group agreed that focusing on areas with existing data and proven methodologies would maximize the study's effectiveness while reducing uncertainty.

Kelly Turner noted if there is a group of farmers who haven't collected data this would allow them access to data. Noted benefit for farmers who have collected data would also have access. Noted it would be important to understand that data and how it is used in model

statistics. Note that we don't get to see behind the curtain for the batch tool. Bryan Burroughs agreed, noted the models are very important but it's not always clear as individuals don't always trust the data.

Bryan Burroughs moved onto the Implementation Strategy Committee.

b. Implementation Strategy Committee

• Discussion of Draft Legislative Report

Laura Campbell thanked those sending recommendation updates for the report. Noted the plan for next step will be to wrap report items together. Noted to continue sending 2020-2022 recommendations to Laura. Noted will work on writing introduction of the report and laying out the timeline for the report. Noted would like to include the plug for Sara Pearson regarding funds being separated and promoting MGS. Laura noted will put the recommendations into the report and work with the committee and Dave to finalize any recommendations. Noted that would allow individuals to give final review and she would work with Bri to get a published draft.

Noted in the past will work on giving a report to appropriate legislative committee and department heads. Noted will plan on repeating this report in a late February timeline when new legislative committee chairs are established.

Doug Needham noted questions on the 2020 recommendations regarding well-drilling training. Noted MGS will conduct training. Noted in 2020 we asked for \$4,000 dollars but were they only asking for \$2,000 per year or was this in perpetuity? Jim Milne noted that the Michigan Ground Water Association (MGWA) paid for the MGS training. Noted this \$4,000 was rolled into the budget for the MGS' data gap analysis project. Doug Needham noted for the report would not be needing this task. Bryan Burroughs noted it was a 2-year financial request but doesn't recall if there was a discussion regarding this be a request for every year. Doug Needham noted the idea was to get individuals up to speed. Adam Wygant noted whether it is a recommendation, we see it as a value. Jim Milne noted the training and benefits will continue, but the need for continued funding is unknown.

Sara Pearson provided clarification on the need for programming and what programming looked like. Noted going forward there is still need and only identified the MGWA members. Buddy Sebastian noted MGWA paid for the program and that well drillers are not required to attend events or put accurate data in. Noted will be a slow process, as those currently in training will receive it. Noted those drillers now working we may not see coming into the driller trainings.

Doug Needham noted for clarification, we should state the funding would be a 2024 recommendation for funding to be allocated for continued support. Buddy Sebastian noted support, as MGWA can't always foot the bill. Adam Wygant noted for consideration for the council is that the three groups want to continue to educate individuals on the groundwater database and want to offer a tool that will allow for consistency and move with synergy with the department. Adam Wygant noted rolling out change management will be a part of the department's new process.

Dave Hamilton noted it would be worthwhile to put the budget into another bucket that aligns with similar programming. Laura Campbell noted \$4,000 is a part of a noted ongoing expense. Bryan Burroughs noted it should for now live in that report section. Doug Needham noted in the report we ask for items under yearly asks. Noted want to make sure we can tie with the recommendation time frame. Noted we might want to specify it isn't annual.

Bryan Burroughs noted unsure what to currently do with this one from the original recommendation and noted we should think going forward if it needs to be an explicit recommendation. Noted could be captured in the 1 year follow up report.

Bryan Burroughs clarified timelines. Noted Laura will work on 2024 reports, will work with relevant committees for the report and noted there isn't a separate report for progress reports. Laura Campbell noted room to put these documents into the report. Noted if there is a progress/status report to send to Laura. Laura Campbell noted is aiming to get updated draft prior to Thanksgiving. Noted meeting in December can take care of final edits. Final appearance and formatting will then be taken care of between Laura and Bri prior to December 28th.

Dave Hamilton clarified to provide updates to November 19th by EOB for report. Bryan Burroughs noted would like final report by Monday, December 2nd. Laura noted that it should be a quick turnaround as Laura will be working ongoing on the report for the items that roll in. Bryan Burroughs reaffirmed the new due date, and that December 6th will be the final rough draft notes that are provided to Laura.

Laura Campbell noted it has been helpful to look at 2020 and 2022 recommendations and thanked those again for providing the information.

Dave Hamilton noted the report for Water Users group report would be good for that report. Frank Ettawageshik noted it would be worth having a placeholder for this. Laura Campbell noted unsure how to provide a narrative on that now. Bryan Burroughs noted to provide consensus when needed on it.

c. Data Collection Committee

Bryan Burroughs noted no reports for the committee.

d. Conservation and Efficiency Committee

Kelly Turner noted trying to put together a group of people that come up and talk about some of the barriers to the irrigation pump retrofits from diesel to electric. Noted EGLE had released a grant on this, but no one had applied for it. Noted heard some feedback from farmers about their roadblocks and so the committee is trying to get energy companies and farmers to come together and explore roadblocks and determine a way to remove them. Noted Water Conservation Best Practice project is hoping to meet in January/February 2025 to present their work to the Water Conservation and Efficiency Committee (WCEC). Noted irrigation specialists have been hired and will be attending the winter meeting. Noted winter meeting is when annual conferences and education happens. Noted would allow educators to get to the farm users and provide notes to them.

Noted may need to provide an updated status report to Laura for the legislative report.

Noted there are a lot of questions regarding Climate Migration and Water Use Research Project concept. Thanked Frank Ettawageshik who has been assisting in this conversation and Katie Mika has done a good job on synthesizing the questions posed on this. Noted hoping to build an RFP to look at climate trends/research/and other features to understand and predict future water needs. Noted want to look at how this would benefit WCEC and other committees. Noted Katie and Kelly put some narrative together that will be sent to Laura for the legislative report. Noted received approval from Frank Ettawageshik to send to Laura.

Katie Mika had nothing to add.

No questions noted online.

7. EGLE Update

Bryan Burroughs handed off to Jim Milne to cover the EGLE update.

Jim Milne noted outline of updates, including Geologic Resources Management Division (GRMD) hiring updates, 2020 recommendations, Michindoh Aquifer drilling update, large quantity withdrawal trends, part 327 metrics, and questions.

Noted GRMD GGSS manager has been filled by Lena Pappas and Groundwater Data Unit (GDU) GIS Support position has been filled by Tariku Negassa. Noted interviews for 2 SSR Geologist positions are scheduled for November.

Noted 2020 recommendations include a new Joint Funding Agreement (JFA) with USGS of \$4.3 million dollars. Noted this will be completed in 2026 and will include an aerial magnetic survey (AEM), installing additional stream gages, drilling new monitoring wells, and groundwater modeling. Noted grant agreement underway with MGS to examine existing data gaps and concerns and to make recommendations. Noted Stafford Grey the contractor to update the water withdrawal assessment tools aquifer properties. Noted this is the aquifer transmissivity and storage coefficient data. Lena Pappas clarified that the aquifer properties contract was awarded to Fishbeck and MSU. Jim Milne clarified Stafford Grey is working on the WWAT user interface update. Lena Pappas agreed.

Jim Milne noted Michindoh Aquifer Drilling update. Noted GRMD has received the report from the Remediation and Redevelopment Division (RRD), Geological Services Section for their drilling, which includes maps, field notes, well construction, and soil boring and gamma ray logs for the wells. Noted they drilled 5 wells. Noted two wells at Amboy Township Hall with total depths of 62' and 188' deep. Noted remaining wells were near Michigan/Ohio border with 70', 123', and 164' well depths. Noted the GRMD and RRD will be working over the winter offseason to schedule additional water drilling at a third well site in 2025.

Noted issues with viewing the map on the slides (corrected slides will be posted on web site). Continued discussion and will include this in the meeting minutes to be released.

Jim Milne noted the first well, 62' well at Amboy Township Hall, noted USGS calls this MAW 01 South. Noted there is a link to this as well as a link for the 188' well to show real time groundwater elevation data. Noted Laura Campbell was able to get the data.

Jim Milne noted pre-screening review metrics statistics from January to November 7th. Noted 21 total completed, with 6 in zone A, 2 in Zone A/Geological Pass (meaning that

the pumped aquifer is not connected to surface water), 9 in zone B, 2 in zone C, and in 0 in zone D. Noted there was 2 baseline capacity replacements.

Noted 1 327 permit was issued, with 7 underway. Andrew LeBaron noted numbers have changed since November 1st.

Jim Milne noted compliance metrics, with a total of 93 compliance communications.

Noted breaking down this data showed 4 after the fact (ATF) registrations, where the withdrawal was authorized despite not being initially registered through the tool or SSR, as sufficient stream flow was available. A missing pump information compliance communication is sent when the pump capacity is not identified on the well log.

Additionally, 62 revised registration communications were issued where the "as-built, as-operated" configuration differed from the registered data, but sufficient stream flow was available to register the revised configuration. Furthermore, 26 communications were sent to property owners to verify whether withdrawals had been installed, along with 15 first violation notices issued.

Kelly Turner asked is there a trend in this evidence that could allow for an education opportunity? Noted this could be beneficial tool. It was noted this communication is part of what is being changed by EGLE to address audit findings.

Frank Ettawageshik asked what are the capacities and what are the uses being approved in other areas and is curious to understand how these numbers represent volume of water? Bryan Burroughs noted they did this years ago and this data is kept on the EGLE website. Andrew LeBaron noted looking at the water use trends can be dangerous due to differences, noted it can be done but there are lots of caveats to the work. Dave Hamilton noted they do a report on Water Use reporting for irrigation. Frank Ettawageshik noted he asked the question as he has been trying to steer individuals to understand the process as many tribal leaders are concerned over these items and would like to be able to talk about the water use. Noted believes this will be an ongoing discussion for the next few months. Bryan Burroughs noted he may be able to help coordinate with EGLE on it.

Adam Wygant noted Tariku will be able to work on these types of projects and provide clarification for tribes. Pat Staskiewicz noted interest in water use by data centers.

Bryan Burroughs noted it may be worth asking for presentations on what the demand will look like for different sectors. Frank Ettawageshik noted what happens with water from these data plants and the expenses associated with this water. Jim Milne noted it may be worth having someone come to talk about permitting. Adam Wygant noted how solar farms and registered water withdrawals and how they sell to data plants as well using this information. Kelly Turner noted interesting wording in these contracts and that they don't address who owns these contracts. Frank Ettawageshik noted discussion of how solar panel farms have mixed land use.

No other questions.

8. Future

a. 2024 Meeting Dates (at Con Hall unless others offer to host) (*Quorum critical meetings)

- December 10, 2024

Noted proposed dates for 2024 meeting dates. These will need to be confirmed based on locations and Bri meeting with EGLE to solidify these dates/locations.

b. Formats

c. Quorum

9. Open Comments (Three Minute Limit)

Kelly Turner noted to update processes for mailing list.

10. Motion to Adjourn

Bryan Burroughs motioned to adjourn 3:20.