

# Water Use Advisory Council (WUAC) Meeting

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

**Tuesday, June 11, 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, 237 992 9#](#) United States, Pontiac

**Phone Conference ID: 237 992 9#**

## MINUTES

### 1. Welcome

Laura Campbell, Co-Chair, welcomed members and guests. The meeting began at 1:04 p.m. with Laura Campbell to cover items 1-7 and Bryan Burroughs to cover items 8-11.

### 2. Roll Call

#### **WUAC Members/Alternates Present In-Person**

Laura Campbell, Michigan Farm Bureau (MFB)

Christine Alexander, EGLE

Kelly Turner, Michigan Potato Industry Commission (MPIC)

Katy A. Lindstrom, Barr Engineering

Tom Frazier, Michigan Townships Association (MTA) (Retired)

Dave Maturen, Michigan Lakes and Streams Association Inc. (MLSA)

Rachel Proctor, Consumers Energy

Megan Napier, AKT Peerless

Megan Tinsley, Michigan Environmental Council

Bryan Burroughs, Michigan Trout Unlimited

Doug Needham, Michigan Aggregates Association

#### **WUAC Members/Alternates Present via Teams**

David Hamilton, The Nature Conservancy

Margaret Bettenhausen, Michigan Attorney General (AG)

Elizabeth Morrisseau, Michigan Attorney General Alternative

James Clift, EGLE

Buddy Sebastian, Michigan Ground Water Association

John A. Yellich, Michigan Geological Survey (MGS)

#### **WUAC Members/Alternates Absent**

Pat Staskiewicz, Michigan American Water Works Association

Rex Vaughn, MLSA; serving as Dave Maturen's alternate

Jason Walther, MPIC

Frank Ettawageshik, United Tribes of Michigan

Michael Ellis, Barr Engineering, Inc  
Steve Kohler, Kalamazoo River Watershed Council

**WUAC Non-Members Present or Attending via Teams**

Hannah Arnett, EGLE  
Jeremiah Asher, Michigan State University (MSU) Institute for Water Research  
Megan Cameron, EGLE  
Dwayne Loper  
Evangelia M. Murgia, MGS  
Grant Poole  
Brian Gunderman, Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR)  
Ross Helmer, EGLE  
Sarah Horger, EGLE  
Andrew LeBaron, EGLE  
Marian Maier, EGLE  
Katie Mika, EGLE  
James Milne, EGLE  
Briana Hammontree, JetCo  
Howard Reeves, United States Geological Survey (USGS)  
Steve Kohler  
Todd Feenstra, Tritium Inc.  
Austen York, EGLE  
David Lusch, MSU (Retired)  
Jill Van Dyke, EGLE  
Ben Tirell, MFB  
Mike Frederick, Michigan Ground Water Association  
Joel Henry, Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc. (ECT)  
Abby Eaton, MDARD alternate  
Emily Finnell, EGLE

**3. Approval of Agenda-Roll Call Vote**

No noted changes for June 2024 proposed agenda. Frederick asked if EGLE Audit would be discussed.

**4. Approval of Minutes-Roll Call Vote Discussion**

Noted changes for WCEC narrative from April 2024 meeting minutes.

MSU Water User Committee Study; The MSU Water User Committee Project is co-funded by EGLE Office of the Great Lakes (OGL) and the University of Michigan (U-M) Michigan Sea Grant (MISG). EGLE provided funding to U-M and U-M administered their competitive grant program through their Integrated Assessment research program. MISG awarded the grant to Michigan State University. EGLE is not the grantor directly to MSU. The overall project cost is approximately \$400,000 with combined funding from EGLE, MISG, and required match funding from MSU.

The project purpose is to help EGLE, water users, and the WUAC understand how to successfully form water use committees and use the tools and strategies within the guidance document to help the parties involved. To inform the development of the guidance documents and get feedback, the project included

forming pilot Water User Committees (WUC). The MSU research team is currently working on obtaining and incorporating feedback on the draft WUC guidance document. The pilot WUCs were intended to be mock exercises, not to resolve any existing issues or water use issues in those given areas and to review and provide feedback on the draft guidance documents for WUCs. The project team spent significant time and resources to attempt to successfully convene pilot water user committees and address questions and concerns by participants. Farmers were invited to participate in the project, attend the informational meetings of the WUC project and pilot WUCs and had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss concerns.

Several participants ultimately chose not to participate in the WUCs due to questions and concerns raised regarding the pilot WUCs. In addition, two groups of farmers also submitted letters to the WUAC Chairs for those interested in reviewing them expressing their concerns. The MSU project team was not able to successfully convene these groups due to insufficient participation and concerns raised by participants.

Work with the project team will continue to ensure that results, final reports, and deliverables can still be completed to help inform EGLE in next steps to work with WUCs in the future and serve as a learning process. Many lessons were learned through the project that will be incorporated into the final report and WUC guidance document that will be shared with the agencies and WUAC. The project is anticipated to be completed by the end of the year.

A question was posed regarding the possibility of extending the time frame and allowing individuals to gather more information and address the issues brought forward. The time frame issue lies with time constraints with the grant period and the growing season. There is a hard stop for MISG in January 2025 and extension is not possible due to their federal grant award supporting part of the funding for the project. There are growers who are a part of the project's Advisory Committee which will be convened to provide further review of the guidebooks, which still provides an opportunity for some input.

Question posed: If there is an opportunity to discuss after action learning about the project or review materials that can be provided as an update to the WUAC?

Suggested once a final report is developed to reconvene a WUAC group interested in the topic, discuss recommendations, and perform an individual tabletop exercise for discussion. Discussed the impact on agriculture and the importance of inviting them to the table in any next steps. Noted both groups are still interested in participating, however, if the growing season is a concern, they feel it should not be rushed due to the importance of the project.

Noted updates will continue to be provided regarding the status of the project. A list of those on the project's Advisory Committee can be provided for those interested. Also noted the project's Advisory Committee and the growers were also invited to participate in other tabletop discussions as well.

Motioned by Doug Needham, seconded by Tom Frazier to discuss revisions and approve changes.

Voting members of the council voted to approve the meeting minutes, as amended. 14 approved. 0 disapproved.

Margaret Bettenhausen, AG, made an announcement that Elizabeth Morrisseau, AG, will attend the meetings in her place moving forward.

**5. Public Comment (Three Minute Limit)**

Note made to members/non-members to update contact information, alternates, and committee status for WUAC. Note made to send a follow-up email for the information.

No other public comments were noted.

**6. Committee Chairs Report**

**a. Data Collection Committee**

Burroughs noted the committee was unable to schedule a meeting. It is unclear whether the committee will present any new recommendations to be included in the 2024 report. Noted without funding from 2022, it makes it difficult to move current projects to completion and be able to propose new recommendations.

**b. Models Committee**

Hamilton began with a discussion of the Site-Specific Review (SSR) Work Group and the 10-day review deadline.

The Water Use Assessment Unit provided data SSR review timeframes based on categories. The review timeframe was broken into three categories: administrative reviews, geology reviews, and technical reviews and based on a timeline of between 0 – 60 days to perform and finalize the review. MCL 324.32706c (4) has a 10-business day deadline for processing conventional SSRs [as opposed to the alternative analysis in MCL 324.32706c (1) and (2)], with no provisions for tolling that deadline. The report noted that some reviews can take extensive periods due to delays of additional information needed or the type of review performed. The point of the data was to represent how long it takes to perform the tasks. A total of 235 SSRs between January 2023 and April 2024 were evaluated in the review, consisting of 49 administrative, 56 geological, and 130 technical reviews. It noted of these three categories, technical reviews often take the most time to perform the work required.

Hamilton shared that an applicant has no idea how long an SSR will take to perform until EGLE begins the review. The data serves as evidence to show that the simplest reviews can be completed in the 10-day timeframe; however, more complex reviews, such as geological and technical, need more time.

Noted that the SSR Technical Issues Work Group reviewed the SSR process and made a unanimous decision that the current 10- day deadline in Part 327 is not working. It does not allow appropriate customer service to applicants who need an SSR performed. The SSR workgroup believe this should be changed, which would require a statutory update.

The Model's Committee has proposed a rough concept about extending the number of working days to complete an SSR. The SSR workgroup will prepare material and share it with the Models Committee to provide a formal recommendation to the council. The rough concept suggests a change in the review deadline from 10 days to 20 days. This would likely allow the Department to meet the timeline required for administrative and geological reviews. This rough concept also proposed tolling the clock (i.e., stopping the clock). This means that if the Department requests more information, they would stop the clock until the Department receives all the information. When the information was received, the clock would start over, and the Department would resume working on the SSR. This case would be typical of more complicated projects that often require additional information. The example given notes it would comprise of two new clocks after the tool: (1) that would allow the Department 10-days to determine if work can be done to move forward and (2) one that would allow the Department 20 days to begin work again once the additional information is determined to be complete. Ultimately, this concept seeks to increase the requirement of days the Department has to meet the SSR. This would improve customer service for applicants by providing a more realistic estimate of how long the work will take. It will also give the Department the ability to stop the clock if more information is required, without it being held against them as a result of that wait, but also hold them accountable to move forward on projects as well. Noted that if the committee decides this is important, they include this with the committee's recommendations for 2024.

Concern expressed that EGLE seems to be requesting more information on many SSRs. Suggested that the tolling of the clock should occur for the first-round review and then once additional information is collected, the clock should resume.

Campbell shared a similar sentiment from growers that they are frustrated with deadlines for a response to an SSR. Additionally, farmers prioritize timely responses to SSR and water withdrawal requests. Noted it may be helpful to either to change the period of performance for a longer period (such as 20 days) or update the statute language to reflect what occurs and is necessary for SSR to help provide users an understanding if their request is more simple or complex.

A question was posed regarding this feedback and if a commitment would be required from the Department to hold them accountable to timeframes and if this could assist in meeting this concern.

Noted that it is fair and reasonable to place the burden on EGLE to identify all missing information in a administrative completeness review, but the clock should remain tolled (e.g., stopped) until a complete response is provided. If a partial response is provided the toll would stay in place (regarding the second clock).

Note they want to ensure that all missing information is requested up front and as soon as possible to develop an accountability measure. The second clock would allow for additional information to be identified, if needed.

Turner noted since this is customer service and could take more time, why don't we explain why some SSRs are late. What is the point of opening the statute if it opens the risk to make the statute more vulnerable if there is no real punishment for going over the current 10-day timeline? Noted that the Department, workgroup, and consultants determined the current timing for SSRs is not working. The recent audit also showed that if SSRs are consistently over the timeline, then the 10-day period does not serve as a realistic number to have out there to perform the task.

Question posed on how long a category takes to review. Answered, the review can vary based on the category, that it isn't just a one size-fits-all situation.

It was noted that the report stated that 129 SSRs were completed within 10 business days and 106 SSRs were completed over 10 business days or more (10-50). Clarification was made that SSRs completed in 10 days or under are the simplest ones performed. Reviews that take 10 days or more are complex and require additional information.

It noted that the document "Topics for the Models Committee" document detailing current projects within the Models Committee, was sent. Individuals may request it from Dave Hamilton if you'd like a copy.

It was noted the main things being worked on include the Michigan Hydrologic Framework and the Michigan Integrated Water Management Database that is under way. The first work group has met and are meeting with contractors, MSU, the USGS. Currently the projects are in the stage of gathering feedback from users to ensure they meet their needs and wants.

The second update is that funding is acquired, but work has not been performed yet, for the Key Aquifer properties for use in the tool and the 3D Glacial Aquifer mapping in two counties (Cass and Calhoun). One has been awarded a contract and the other still needs the request for proposal to be completed. A workgroup has been assigned to each; however, they have not met yet.

The third update is talking about determining this year's recommendation to have a study to look at streamflow depletion (measurement and modeling) and understanding it. It would be consistently modeled and measured to collect relevant information. Currently at the early stages of the concept with a plan to provide updates to the council for the report.

The fourth update is the SSR Technical Work Group is making good progress in moving through topics and recommendations on their agenda to bring forward to the full committee and then the council.

Noted that a question is often heard from growers wondering how EGLE is reviewing and using models in the process for SSR and allow transparency of this work. Noted that is a part of the agenda of the work group to cover. Also noted, making sure there is good communication between consultants and the

Department is often key in this work. Noted that the EGLE update will provide additional updates on current models.

The fifth update discussed recommendations for the 2024 report that come from the 2022 recommendations that the Models Committee would like to see funded.

**c. New Topics Committee**

Discussion on Transitioning to an As-Needed Work Group. No updates.

Discussion on transitioning to an As-Needed work group tabled for August.

**d. Water Conservation and Efficiency Committee**

Noted that the Advancing Michigan's Water Conservation and Efficiency Efforts have begun. Noted that work has begun with those groups and are currently deciding how they are going to pull information together in stakeholder meetings.

Noted recommendation #2 for Increasing Water Conservation and Efficiency Practices in Agriculture has hired both educators through the MSU-Extension. The first has started and the second will start later this summer. It was noted MSU-Extension has not identified the advisory committee and this will be named after the second hire starts.

Noted the Water Conservation Efficiency Committee (WCEC) has been reviewing concepts for 2024 recommendations. Concepts included the revision of the 2022 Agricultural Irrigation Pilot Project to show farmers the financial savings, including water and energy savings, coming from the pilot program. The pilot program would support the two new additional hires from the MSU-Extension.

A lesson learned from the previous years' recommendations, is that it is important that there is a measure in place to review the language and specificity of the recommendations. As a result, there is a subcommittee to look at the recommendations to provide feedback on how to reshape the recommendations to create an application that makes more sense. This also means reviewing grants that could be applied for within the next fiscal year. Discussion is happening in tandem with this recommendation.

Noted there is discussion of creating a Water Conservation Coordinator position to manage overarching conservation goals and provide technical assistance. Noted there could be a grant program that would be available for people to try to implement some conservation practices. However, this is still in the infant stages of the project. Question posed if this would be OGL, EGLE, or MSU performing this task. Noted that this is still unknown/undetermined.

Noted continuing through end of the year, there has been discussion on partnering with the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Water Sense Program and continuing work with the EGLE Drinking Water & Environmental Health Division to identify opportunities to incorporate water conservation into energy programs. Noted WCEC is exploring other leak reduction projects and how they relate to increased energy savings. Noted last

meeting also held discussions with agencies, researchers, and stakeholders to identify current priorities, gaps, needs, etc., and seeing if there are current programs available to provide funding and pathways for these groups to those funding sources. Noted the MSU Water Research group will be attending the WCEC August 1 meeting to provide an overview of their program and what they are doing to see if there might be some synergies for discussion.

Noted Teresa Seidel is now with the EPA and has talked about creating a dashboard that would serve as a proving ground for the Western Lake Erie Basin to get a sense of what is going on for the Great Lakes. Noted the WCEC should try to reach out to her as she may provide insight into resources and what the EPA is working on.

Noted future committee work also includes research projects to determine trends in water use and water management and how it is changing over time and geography. Also noted the committee is working on inviting researchers from MSU-Institute for Water Research and USGS to gather information on impacts of climate migration on land and water use.

Noted clarification for the concept of creating a pilot grant funding program to support implementation of water conservation, Best Management Practices (BMPs), and areas of potential high-water demand/stress is currently in a concept phase and still needs to be further fleshed out with other recommendations that are focused on agriculture needs.

Clarification was noted on that the Water Conservation Coordinator would potentially serve as a grant administrator for a small pilot program and be within the state government, assisting in identifying opportunities for Michigan to advance water conservation efficiency programs and then provide technical assistance to other water sectors and BMPs. Verified this is in the conceptual phase. The timing of funding for the energy use projects and the legislation around these programs prevents including them in the 2024 report's recommendations.

Noted research projects are being generated surrounding climate migration and what it will look like for Michigan. A discussion was held within the WCEC meeting to see about having U-M Masters students pursue this as a project.

Noted another committee meeting isn't until August and so they are being strategic in determining what needs to be moved forward for the 2024 recommendations. Noted there may be one that is moved forward regarding the mobile lab recommendation from the 2022 recommendations that is currently under revision and consideration. Noted two irrigation specialists for the funded 2020 recommendations are looking at strategies for enhancing agricultural water conservation efficiency as well, but don't have recommendations from the overall project yet.



Noted student interns this summer will begin to do some work to understand what current research priorities are within the agencies and what is being done across the region in the area that would result in the Masters' project.

**e. Implementation Committee**

Have not met since the April meeting.

Noted the Implementation Committee is planning to collect rough drafts and determine the language and that it looks good. Reminder to provide an idea of recommendations for the 2024 report for August so work can begin in the Fall.

Noted when getting into the details of recommendations, that it will be important to identify the who is performing the tasks to the legislature.

No other updates.

**f. Nominations for Officers and Committee Chairs**

Campbell noted informing the full council who serves as the executive committee and the council. Verified if we want to confirm that status or wait until the August meeting.

Noted no issues with the tri-chair status as it works for the council, allowing for coverage if needed. Question was posed though regarding the purpose of the executive committee.

Noted that the executive committee was formed to identify agenda items for upcoming WUAC meetings, bring forward specific requests, and keep the meetings on track. Noted who is currently on the executive council.

Noted that many changes have occurred since the council's inception which are not necessarily within the statute (Part 328, Aquifer Protection, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, 1994 PA 451, as amended; NREPA). The statute's requirements are a lot. There is no specific reason for having a larger executive committee among the co-chairs other than keeping the council diverse and allowing different engagement, which is encouraged. Also noted that the executive committee has always integrated EGLE since they administer the program and provides support in the notes and logistics.

Noted individuals interested in serving on the executive committee would be required to meet two weeks before the WUAC meeting to prepare the agenda.

A note was made of tabling the vote to allow communications and review the list, including ensuring it stays updated.

Tom Frazier noted he is the local government representative that has been assigned to serve as a Co-Chair or serve on the Committee. Urged the co-chairs and Department to speak with Speaker Tate's office to get it updated. No noted successor. Noted will need recommendations from the MTA to identify as the

local government representative for Speaker Tate to consider. Noted coordination will occur to assist in updating this information and the representative.

Recommendation holds till August 2024, motioned by Laura Campbell.

Seconded by Dave Maturen.

## **7. EGLE Update**

Noted MiEnviro database used by EGLE Air Quality Division & WRD. Part 327 complaints and permit applications (for new or increased withdrawals > 2 MGD) went live as of June 10.

The 2020 recommendations for both projects (MI Hydrologic Framework and MI Integrated Water Management Database) are currently in progress with workgroups. Noted the draft work plan for Transition Probability Mapping, Cass & Calhoun is being drawn up for review.

EGLE Groundwater Data Management System have identified a contractor, Earthsoft, for their EQUIS system and a contract has been signed. A project kickoff still needs to be scheduled.

EGLE is drilling monitoring wells in the Michigan Aquifer within the predicted zone of impact of AquaBounty's well field between June 10 – 28.

Noted depleted water management areas (WMAs) are the same as April, with noted changes. Currently about 14 WMAs are depleted. Two new gauges have been installed in Dickinson Creek and Osborn Drain. No new Water Withdrawal Assessment Tool (WWAT) or SSR registrations are allowed in depleted WMAs. This does not impact the existing baseline or registered Large Quantity Withdrawal (LQW) capacity. Noted initial response actions include stream gauge installments and miscellaneous stream flow measurements for WMA.

Question posed on what the anticipated timeframe is to understand what an adverse resource impact (ARI) is. Work continues this topic. The initial approach is continued stream monitoring. When continuous stream gage measurements are not available, miscellaneous (one-time) stream flow measurements are collected. Most of the miscellaneous stream flow measurement locations are sampled three (3) times a year, during the growing season, while other locations are sampled five (5) times a year, before, during, and after the growing season. Measurements taken out of the period are still relevant. Noted regarding the question for timing, the process would aim for including both wet and dry years to capture the median flow. The WWAT's initial stream index flow measurements were developed using a regression model based on 147 gauges that had at least 10 years of continuous stream flow records. It was noted the question is very difficult and that James Milne came to the Models Committee to determine how to address this. Further discussions are needed in the Data Collection and Models Committees. Models Committee is happy to work with the Department. The Data Committee would be interested in this work as well, to determine at what point it would be important to change index flows based on data feedback regarding percentages and median.

Noted possible future response actions include groundwater data collection, groundwater/surface water modeling, and stat. analysis of stream flow, and joint public/private/university questions.

Noted Groundwater models update include Dickinson Creek (Calhoun County). It is currently under review and is one of the watersheds in the negative status. Previous model reviews of the Cass County Pilot Study model and the Fawn River model (St. Joseph County) by DEQ (now EGLE) and/or USGS identified issues with both models. Noted both have been reviewed by USGS. The Models Committee formed a work group to address issues with the Cass County model, which met once and has not met since. EGLE remains committed to being part of this work group, should it be reactivated.

Question posed on what the next step is or what is needed to move forward for this work. Noted some improvements include having additional review from more workgroups and having EGLE participate in those work groups.

Noted that Fawn River has had no update since the USGS review. Cass County is under review to update it and did not push the model forward as the Dickinson model is still under work. Noted would like to see resolution on the Dickinson model and then start work on the Cass model, with Fawn River serving as the third priority. All three are viable models and data has been continuously collected. All models have stream gages.

No SSRS have been submitted which proposed using either the Cass County or the Fawn River models in support of the proposed LQWs. Out of state experts performed a peer review (which has not been provided to EGLE). Models are regional models. The challenge is getting everyone in a room where everyone is comfortable with the review. The 3D flow modeling will be the best model to use for the models moving forward.

Noted that the purposes of the Cass County and Fawn River models were: (1) Data collection, (2) Test methodology of testing and methodologies that would create techniques and procedures for the state, (3) (for Cass) would create a working 3D flow model in SSR to cover five water sheds that were delineated.

Question posed on challenges of EGLE keeping on with the issues as they are changing faster than they can address, such as issues as abandoning many wells in the area because of a foreign plant and withdrawals. Noted EGLE did look at withdrawals and are aware (based on water use reporting data) which LQWs are currently inactive or active including a golf course that recently closed.

An update was provided on the Water Use Program Audit. Noted the Office of Auditor General performs oversight on all State programs. It is a routine scheduled audit, and the end goal is to identify improvements to be made.

Audit findings found:

1. SSR review exceeding 10 days
2. Insufficient enforcement of compliance violations such as delinquent fees
3. Insufficient internal security controls over the WWAT database, Water Use Reporting database, and Batch tools
4. Difference between WWAT and batch tool results

Noted EGLE's response for the following issues include: (1) Noted that the SSR 10-day deadline is difficult. Having the Models Committee discuss a new proposed deadline for potential implementation. (2) Noted EGLE is initiating lean process improvement exercise which could improve the efficiency and tracking of compliance efforts. New compliance and enforcement procedures will conform to EGLE's compliance and enforcement policy. (3) Noted this was not an IT security issue for outside users. It was an internal issue addressed by updating database privileges and strengthening passwords. Noted will begin onboarding and offboarding database access procedures. Also noted having restricted access of copies of Batch tools. (4) Noted short term-response would be to have all SSR and other EGLE work performed by staff using the batch tool for consistency. EGLE Information Management Division and the Department of Technology, Management, and Budget will continue to investigate and test to identify the cause of differences between the results of the WWAT's and the batch tool's versions of the Hunt 1999 analytical equation, given identical input parameters. Noted the long term-response would be to update and re-write the WWAT and batch tools so they can incorporate into one up to date format.

Question posed on what are the next steps that EGLE could take. Noted the auditor doesn't necessarily follow-up, the Department will start beginning work on ongoing issues and follow up on them and address on a continued basis until resolved.

Question posed about groundwater data management system regarding whether it strictly used for EGLE or will the public have access, as well as the type of data on it. Noted it is going to be a multi-phased implementation/process for the initial phases with electronic data already available to upload into the system. Hardcopy format data this is siloed in multiple EGLE divisions (and within multiple programs within some of the divisions) will be scanned and uploaded. Noted the long-term goal of the system is to receive data that has been generated by both EGLE and by external customers. As a result, regulated parties and consultants should be able to submit into the system.

Noted that the items identified in the audit report could potentially also be raised to the WUAC to help in support for finding solutions, while understanding that EGLE must follow process. Noted August could potentially have recommendations and fixes regarding the auditing report.

Question posted on when previous audit has been done? No previous audit has been noted as performed due to the program being relatively new. Auditing would usually occur more than once if serious problems in the Department(s).

Noted there is a perception that growers don't understand the Batch tool and how EGLE makes decisions and noted it may help to provide clarity to growers on the tools so they may understand what the Department is doing to address the issue. EGLE provided a quick update on what the Batch tool is. Explained what the tool is: run multiple withdrawal scenarios and allows different aquifer property values than what's fixed in WWAT.

Rounding error and unit conversion errors within calculations account for some, but not all, of the differences between the WWAT's and the Hunt 1999 batch tool's results. EGLE then must review these closer to fix the information. Note that the other causes are unknown currently. Believe that the WWAT diverges from the Batch tool. Verified that it's just a math issue – rather than inputting new data.

Noted tying it into the Models Committee and their work and how it could make the batch solution more robust.

No additional updates to report.

## **8. Future**

- a. 2024 Meeting Dates (at Con Hall unless others offer to host) (\*Quorum critical meetings)
  - August 13, 2024 – Anticipated Committee Topics List for Final Report Due
  - September 10, 2024\*
  - October 8, 2024\*
  - November 12, 2024\*
  - December 10, 2024
- b. Formats
- c. Quorum

## **9. Open Comments (Three Minute Limit)**

Howard Reeves confirmed drilling in the Michindoh Aquifer near the Michigan/Ohio state line started the other day (June 10) and the Michigan Geological Survey is logging those boreholes. Provided a link for a meeting announcement for the MidWest Climate Adaptation Science Center, held in East Lansing. While it focuses on projects under their umbrella, noted it does open the door for potential partners and discussion of climate effects (<https://mwcas.umn.edu/gathering>). Also noted that USGS might have resources to help with the batch tools, as he has written some pure Python functions and could be used in the future online for public and private sector.

Noted update for attendance sheet for meeting minutes.

Noted building awareness of the need for funding for the 2022 recommendations. Noted Dave Maturen reached out to the local senator to see if there are specific budget items set aside in the appropriation committee(s) or subcommittees.

Noted a couple \$100 million in excess not accounted for in the budget. Asked if he could include a placeholder in the Senate Appropriations Committee for \$215,000.00. Noted has been discussing with Senator Sam Singh to see about getting the funding appropriated towards WUAC. Noted if you know anyone

(senator, house, committees) to reach out to let them know placeholder is in place that may assist in receiving funding. Also noted that WUAC should be influential in the budget discussions.

Noted John Yellich retirement and Sara Pearson replacing. Congratulations on retirement of 11 years of work.

Reminder the council that growers are interested in managing water resources and monitoring it well.

Noted Presidents Council for Advisors on Science and Technology is requesting input for ways government agencies should enhance water data collection model changes in inventory, flow, and recharge, scale groundwater recharge, protect groundwater quality, ensure sustainable supply, and limit over use (<https://www.whitehouse.gov/pcast/briefing-room/2024/04/25/pcast-welcomes-public-input-on-americas-groundwater-challenges/>).

#### **10. Motion to Adjourn**

Motion to adjourn by Bryan Burroughs, seconded by Dave Maturen.