

**PORTAGE COUNTY GROUNDWATER CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CONFERENCE ROOMS 1 & 2, COUNTY ANNEX  
THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 2015 - 7:00 P.M.**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**GROUNDWATER CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GCAC) MEMBERS LISTING:**

<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>MEMBERS NAME</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>MEMBERS NAME</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
<b>TOWNS:</b>		<b>01/22/15</b>	<b>TOWNS:</b>		<b>01/22/15</b>
Alban	<b>VACANT</b>		Plover	Joe Firkus	Present
Almond	Edward Burns	Present	Plover	Roger Bentley	Present
Amherst	Mike Burress	Absent	Sharon	<b>VACANT</b>	
Belmont	Mike Warzynski	Present	Stockton	Richard Filtz	Excused
Belmont Alternate	Rita Walkowicz	Present	<b>VILLAGES:</b>		
Buena Vista	John Ruzicka	Present	Almond	Richard Burns	Present
Buena Vista Alt	Roger Turzinski	Present	Amherst	Mike Hinrichs	Present
Buena Vista Alt	Lynn Isherwood	-----	Amherst Junction	<b>VACANT</b>	
Carson	Fred Copes	Present	Junction City	Peter Mallek	Excused
Dewey	Dennis Meis	Present	Nelsonville	James Walker	Present
Dewey Alt	Kathy Girolamo	-----	Park Ridge	Dan McFarlane	Present
Eau Pleine	David Hansen	Absent	Park Ridge Alt	Christine Neidlein	-----
Grant	Mary Kiedrowski	Present	Plover	Matt Saloun	Absent
Grant Alt	Scott Provost	-----	Rosholt	<b>VACANT</b>	
Hull	Tim Zimmerman	Present	Whiting	Casey Jakubek	Present
Lanark	Bill McKee	Present			
Linwood	Garth Frost	Present	<b>CITY:</b>		
New Hope	George Guyant	Absent	Stevens Point	Joel Lemke	Present
New Hope Alt	Cathy Derezinski	Absent			
Pine Grove	<b>VACANT</b>				

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steve Kunst, and Amy Goffin, Planning and Zoning Department.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Reed Rocheleau, Jerry Walters – Portage County District 17, Barry Jacowski – Portage County District 23, Matt Jacowski – Portage County District 22, Dale O'Brien – Portage County District 19, Nathan Sandwick – UW Extension, Patty Dreier – Portage County Executive

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by E. Burns, Chair.

**2. INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBER:** None

**3. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM November 25, 2014:** Motion by McKee, second by Lemke to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried by voice vote.

**4. CORRESPONDENCE:** No correspondence presented.

**5. PUBLIC NOTICE:** *Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on specific agenda items must register their requests at this time with such comments subject to the reasonable control of the Committee Chair as set forth in Robert's Rules of Order.*

Rocheleau asked if the County has any control over high capacity wells, or if it is strictly a State matter. E. Burns replied it was his understanding all waters of the State are governed by the State. Rocheleau asked what the County is trying to accomplish by having groundwater meetings when no government officials are in attendance, and if the County is gathering information to take to the State. E. Burns replied this Committee reports to the Planning & Zoning Department as an advisory committee with the information we have collected. Rocheleau stated we should be inviting State officials to these meetings so the State gets involved. B. Jacowski replied State officials are invited, and have been in attendance. There are a lot of good minds that attend these meetings, and we all want to find answers; it is not a process that will happen overnight. Rocheleau stated he appreciates what the Committee is doing, but if this is a State issue it needs to be taken to the State. E. Burns replied he understands Rocheleau's concern; not sure of the next step, but have been in contact with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Dreier stated these are provocative questions, but how she sees it is

we are all building a capacity here in Portage County. This Committee started in the 1980's, and what this Committee has been doing is learning, asking questions, and researching together. Yes the State of Wisconsin has the responsibility, but so do we. We are all water users, and ultimately we decide our future.

**CONVERSATION CONTINUED ON TO AGENDA ITEM 7.**

**7. OVERVIEW: COUNTY EXECUTIVE ONGOING GROUNDWATER LISTENING SESSIONS:**

Dreier stated we have a lot of people having conversations and learning together. Dreier believes the listening sessions ended in a much different place than where it started; at the end people were much more open with one another. There were many sessions attended by approximately 200 different individuals, all with different opinions/answers to the questions asked. Dreier stated she wants to keep that momentum going. Rocheleau asked Dreier if she was implying self-compliance. Dreier replied yes, that is part of it. Rocheleau asked Dreier if she agreed with Dr. George Kraft when he stated high capacity wells are lowering the groundwater, and more wells will drop it even further. Dreier replied she believes there is a direct relationship.

**6. PRESENTATION: POTENTIAL FUTURE IMPACTS OF GROUNDWATER PUMPING ON NEW HOPE, AMHERST, AND LANARK LAKES AND STREAMS BY DR. GEORGE KRAFT:**

Complete PowerPoint presentation on file.

Zimmerman asked if the numbers shown on the drawdown graph comes from wells or lakes. Kraft replied it is one and the same since groundwater and lakes connect. Lemke asked if 1993 was the control, and since 2007 there was the amount of drawdown shown on the graph. Kraft replied no, the control was between the 60's and 90's; 1993-2007 was record water levels. O'Brien referenced map shown, and discussed water flow with Kraft. Bentley asked if Kraft's study shows or includes the deforestation of land as the removal of trees cuts down on the amount of water absorbed into the ground. Kraft replied in terms of lowland he does not believe there is an effect there. If the water table is within a few feet of the surface, it is probably an effect from tiling. Kraft stated irrigated crops use the most precipitation, non-irrigated and prairies are lower, and trees are in-between; trees do make for good recharge though. Lemke asked how many irrigation wells were near the Tomorrow River. Kraft replied 113 irrigation wells. Walters stated he believes the DNR limited the amount of high cap wells to 10 a year. Kraft replied 60 high cap wells a year have been going into the Central Sands area. E. Burns asked if Kraft attributes the loss of water by an acre bases, or cone of depression and expanding out. Kraft replied 1 well is equal to 103 acres, and every year he takes 2 inches multiplied by 100 acres, and taking it out of that well. E. Burns asked if that was 2 inches of drawdown a year. Kraft replied no, not drawdown; 2 inches consumed. Average irrigation numbers are 6-8 inches, and we take it as only 2 inches net consumption. R. Burns asked if that meant a well that was put in 50 years ago should be down 100 inches. Kraft replied no, assuming the land consumes 2 additional inches of water a year. R. Burns asked why Kraft assumes his model will reduce the 2 inches a year. Kraft replied the statistics support 2 inches gives the best match to drawdown. Kraft believes that is for a system that is not at equilibrium yet, and thinks 2 inches is too low. The groundwater does not go down 2 inches, the irrigation consumes 2 inches; irrigated land sends more water into the atmosphere. E. Burns asked if that is equivalent to 2 inches less recharge. Kraft replied yes, that is another way to look at it. Bentley asked if we are unable to recharge enough water to keep up with all the pumping, would at some point we run out of water. Kraft replied no; it may dry up all the lakes and streams, but we would not run out of water. Kraft stated there are a lot of places that high capacity wells can be put in without hurting the resource. Walters stated we do have areas where we can draw more water without detriment to any streams or lakes, correct? Kraft replied you are intercepting water and diverting it from the stream; there are no freebies. B. Jacowski asked if we take water from the mouth of the Little Plover River instead of the Headwaters, we are most likely to see the effects, correct? Kraft replied yes. E. Burns asked how wide the area is between the divide and the Tomorrow River. Kraft replied roughly 9 miles.

Lemke stated by looking at the drawdown graph, once you get near the divide the total saturated thickness goes way down to a fraction of what it is elsewhere, correct? Kraft replied is it the opposite, it is the thickest there. Kraft stated the rock there is not high there; the saturated thickness is the highest there. Walters stated he was previously told that is where the rock is the highest, and it caused the water to go in different directions. Kraft replied no, that does not have to do with the rock being higher.

E. Burns asked if the groundwater projections shown on the graph were lower than what they are currently. Kraft replied yes. Hinrichs referenced the graph showing the drawdown of the 38% irrigated area, and asked how that compares to the Little Plover Basin. Kraft replied it would be substantially lower. Zimmerman asked how the amount of wells in proximity to streams or lakes affects the number of wells that can be installed. Kraft replied it

is not how much we lower the water level, but how much water we take from the stream (diverting). Example: a high capacity well on the groundwater divide between the Little Plover River and Tomorrow Waupaca River would be taking about ½ of its discharge from each system. The closer you are to a stream; there will be more water diverted. The further away you are; you share the burden. Kraft stated in water management you have to manage for highs and lows, and take into account that you are managing for the dry times.

Lemke asked if Kraft had any comments on tunnel channels in relation to Long Lake. Kraft replied originally there was a clay bowl theory that stated clay stopped letting water into the Lake. Kraft stated he spoke with Bradbury and his student, and asked if it was groundwater connected, and they stated yes, but he has never seen a written report.

Walters asked if wells on the east side of the groundwater divide affect the wells on the west. Kraft replied yes; the divide is not a physical thing like a mountain basin, it is where the water table is the highest. B. Jacowski stated it is not impenetrable, gravity does the rest. Kraft replied correct. B. Jacowski stated he does not own a high capacity well, but often hears people saying we should not let any more high capacity wells be installed; what people need to realize is limiting or not allowing high capacity wells may make the problem worse. Kraft stated B. Jacowski makes a good point; the number of high capacity wells is a surrogate for irrigated acres and amount of water pumped. In the end we do not care about the number of high capacity wells, you care about how much comes out of them.

E. Burns asked if Kraft has or knows of anyone who has done back-casting to see if their models were calibrated correctly. Kraft replied no, not the models, but there has been statistical analysis' to show this without looking at the physical pumping. Kraft stated the predictions from the 70's were very close. Hinrichs asked as the water table goes down how that relates to recharge. Kraft replied the top few feet of soil is highly variable with the moisture content; you have to rewet that upper few feet at the end of the growing season before you get groundwater recharge. E. Burns asked if one inch of recharge is equal to one foot of raising groundwater. Kraft replied one inch of recharge is equal to about 5 inches of raising the water level and aquifer. B. Jacowski asked if there was a variation in recharge the further away from streams. Kraft replied recharge depends on run-off, and the moisture holding capacity of soil; Wyocena soil holds more water. B. Jacowski asked why the Wisconsin River raises so much when there is a rain event. Kraft replied the Wisconsin River is very large; it has miles and miles of run-off.

Sandwick stated to clarify, 2 inches is Kraft's assumption of the sustained usage in a year, correct? Kraft replied over the course of a year the net effect of a piece of irrigated land, you have 2-4 inches additional evapotranspiration, and 2-4 inches less net recharge. Sandwick stated that affects the shape of the groundwater table, and drawdown is the result of that; different shape if you were not pumping. Kraft replied that is correct.

Kraft stated he would look into the bedrock high to be sure, but the bedrock does not play a big roll where the groundwater divide is.

**8. GCAC MEMBER REPORTS:** None

**9. NEXT MEETING DATE:**

The next meeting date is tentatively set for Thursday March 12, 2015 at 7:00 p.m., Conference Rooms 1 & 2, County Annex.

**10. ADJOURNMENT:**

Meis moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Copes. Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Amy Goffin  
Amy Goffin, Recording Secretary

Ed Burns  
Ed Burns, Chair

03/19/2015  
Date

**PORTAGE COUNTY GROUNDWATER CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, LINCOLN CENTER  
THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 2015 - 7:00 P.M.**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**GROUNDWATER CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GCAC) MEMBERS LISTING:**

<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>MEMBERS NAME</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>MEMBERS NAME</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
<b>TOWNS:</b>		<b>03/19/15</b>	<b>TOWNS:</b>		<b>03/19/15</b>
Alban	<b>VACANT</b>		Plover	Joe Firkus	-----
Almond	Edward Burns	Present	Plover	Roger Bentley	Present
Amherst	Mike Burress	Present	Sharon	<b>VACANT</b>	
Belmont	Mike Warzynski	Absent	Stockton	Richard Filtz	Excused
Belmont Alternate	Rita Walkowicz	Absent	<b>VILLAGES:</b>		
Buena Vista	John Ruzicka	Excused	Almond	Richard Burns	Present
Buena Vista Alt	Roger Turzinski	Present	Amherst	Mike Hinrichs	Absent
Buena Vista Alt	Lynn Isherwood	Present	Amherst Junction	<b>VACANT</b>	
Carson	Fred Copes	Absent	Junction City	Peter Mallek	Present
Dewey	Dennis Meis	Present	Nelsonville	James Walker	Present
Dewey Alt	Kathy Girolamo	-----	Park Ridge	Dan McFarlane	-----
Eau Pleine	David Hansen	Absent	Park Ridge Alt	Christine Neidlein	Present
Grant	Mary Kiedrowski	Present	Plover	David Fritsch	Present
Grant Alt	Scott Provost	-----	Rosholt	<b>VACANT</b>	
Hull	Tim Zimmerman	Present	Whiting	Casey Jakubek	Present
Lanark	Bill McKee	Present			
Linwood	Garth Frost	Present	<b>CITY:</b>		
New Hope	George Guyant	Present	Stevens Point	Joel Lemke	Excused
New Hope Alt	Cathy Derezinski	-----			
Pine Grove	<b>VACANT</b>				

**STAFF PRESENT:** Jeff Schuler, and Amy Goffin, Planning and Zoning Department.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Reid Rocheleau, and Barry Jacowski – Portage County District 23

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by E. Burns, Chair.

**2. INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBER:** None

**3. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 22, 2015:** Motion by McKee, second by Zimmerman to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried by voice vote.

**4. CORRESPONDENCE:** No correspondence presented.

**5. PUBLIC NOTICE:** *Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on specific agenda items must register their requests at this time with such comments subject to the reasonable control of the Committee Chair as set forth in Robert's Rules of Order.*

Rocheleau stated he was at the last meeting where Kraft gave a presentation, but is uncertain what GCAC is trying to accomplish with this information. Rocheleau stated he stopped at Planning & Zoning (P&Z) Department to obtain information on the update to the Groundwater Management Plan, and was referred to the County Executive's office. Rocheleau suggested the County Executive's office provide copies of the update to GCAC and the public. He said people have moved into the County, and are now complaining about water quality. Wells levels are dropping, and poisoning is happening because of high nitrates. Rocheleau stated there is no law that requires people to grow potatoes, but there are laws against poisoning people; and asked the Committee if the high capacity wells are dropping the water table. Rocheleau asked if the Committee believes the farmers are responsible for high nitrate levels. McKee replied we all are responsible for high nitrates in the groundwater. Rocheleau asked if the Committee is planning on doing something about it, and stated we need to have the State involved, and invited to the GCAC meetings. Something needs to be done sooner than later, and he believes Katrina Shankland can help make that happen. Rocheleau stated there are a lot of smart people on the Committee, and he is interested in knowing what everyone thinks about these issues. Schuler apologized to

Rocheleau for the confusion he incurred when stopping at the P&Z Department. Schuler stated this agenda item is not to go over the specific text updates of the Groundwater Management Plan, but to give an update on where the planning process is currently at. The process to update the 2004 plan started a few years ago, and it has been on hold for the last year. We did not have a particular document to give Rocheleau when he stopped in; staff did not realize he was looking for a copy of the 2004 plan. The most recent document that came out was the County Executive's summary of the listening sessions. The Committee is not in a position to draw any conclusions to answer Rocheleau's questions, but they can provide their opinions. Part of the planning process is how we look at the science, and how we understand impacts to the resource. Then we can come to a common ground and have policies that affect the quality, quantity, and any other issues related to the resource. Schuler stated he handed out some documents prior to the start of the meeting that will cover how GCAC was established, what their function is, who they report to, and how they do it. One of the things we will talk about during agenda item #7 is how GCAC has approached their duties in the past, and how they can redefine what this group means. Rocheleau asked what the GCAC mission statement is, and what the group intends to accomplish. Schuler replied the recommendation of the implementation of the Groundwater Management Plan, and GCAC is the body that officially drafts the updates. GCAC considers all the issues related to groundwater in the County, and the Groundwater Management Plan. Rocheleau asked what the consensus of the Committee was; what does the Committee think about putting some sort of control on high capacity wells. Does the Committee have any authority to do anything? Schuler replied you are asking for conclusions that cannot be made overall by the Committee, because they have not talked about it. Everyone has an opinion, but it does not represent the amount of hours they will be spending learning about all of the different things related to the science of the issue. This Committee does not have any power to create rules; they can only make recommendations for policies that have to be discussed, and recommended by the P&Z Committee to the County Board. County Board members are the only people that can make the rules. Rocheleau stated he would like to see this acted on sooner than later; and if Kraft's theory is correct, something needs to be done soon. E. Burns replied Kraft gave the same speech five years ago; he has been presenting at GCAC meetings for many years. R. Burns stated he believes Rocheleau has unrealistic expectations of the Committee; we cannot make or enforce laws. R. Burns stated Rocheleau's concerns are more directed at the State level, and that is not us, we cannot do that. B. Jacowski stated the County Executive did spend a lot of time and money to give people around the County a different platform than this Committee has to voice their concerns on groundwater. It is not the County Executive's responsibility or obligation to write a Groundwater Management Plan; that falls to this Committee who has been working hard on it. They will make a recommendation to the P&Z Committee, and then it will be forwarded to the County Board. The County Executive was only trying to raise concern and awareness through her listening sessions about the groundwater situation. Her summary is in no way to be construed as a groundwater plan. Rocheleau replied he does not take it as a groundwater plan, and stated the County Executive raised a lot of concerns. R. Burns stated the plan is not a law; the County plan will not stop anyone from putting a well in. Rocheleau stated if you have a plan, then it can be taken up with the State; he would like to get Katrina Shankland involved. E. Burns replied Katrina Shankland has attended GCAC meetings in the past. Meis explained to Rocheleau that the County Executive sent her summary report to all GCAC members by email; they have all seen it. We have also had representatives from the State at GCAC meetings; Rocheleau has only attended the last few meetings. Rocheleau stated he appreciates what the Committee is doing, but feels it should move along quicker. Turzinski stated anything the Committee does is not the ultimate decision anyways; the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) trumps anything the County does, correct? Schuler replied the DNR is in charge of permitting the high capacity wells. B. Jacowski stated we are looking to build goals for the direction of groundwater. Schuler stated based on the best understanding we can get on what the status of the resource is. Fritsch stated it is important to remember a lot is being done at the State level. Bradbury has attended many meetings, and is currently working with the State on a project for groundwater modeling in this area that will then be used throughout the State. Turzinski stated there has been a lot done in farming as well; growing potatoes that use less water, using more efficient irrigation systems and the University is currently doing work with irrigation scheduling. Walker stated he understands Rocheleau's frustration in regards to community expectation based on what this Committee does. We have been meeting for a long time, and he believes people have expectations that positive results will come out, but it is not always easily identified. Walker stated there have been 7 high capacity wells installed within a mile radius of his home. He knows all of these went in because the State is looking at putting restrictions on high capacity wells. The agricultural industry is taking advantage of the period before those restrictions go into effect. Over the years there have been improvements made by the agricultural industry in terms of types of irrigation used, and they are using the technology that is available to them to try to minimize the water usage on their crops. In regards to the pollution issue; there has been a big improvement on that based on the measurements provided by Kraft and the Water Quality Specialist. The types of chemicals being applied to soils are under restriction, and years ago there were chemicals applied that are still

working their way through the system. Walker stated he recognizes there are efforts being made, we know what the problems are; we know weather contributes to it, but the fact that we are pumping so much water does not help. GCAC provides advice to the P&Z Committee, who has decision making abilities; the P&Z Committee then develops specific plans that get forwarded on to County Board for implementation. A few years ago our information went to the State after this process that then made Portage County a model in terms of how you manage groundwater. The State has the ultimate responsibility, and he does not feel the State necessarily has an interest in making the same impact as the average citizen. There is a lot of concern about the economic impact of certain restrictions upon the industries that rely on the availability of water. Walker stated this is a very complex issue, and he appreciates Rocheleau sharing his concerns. Bentley asked Rocheleau where he is from. Rocheleau replied Whiting. Bentley replied Rocheleau has great enthusiasm and interest in GCAC, and suggests he gets on the Committee if he could. Rocheleau thanked Bentley, and stated he has upset a few people and would not be good on the Committee, and is better speaking from the public's standpoint. Rocheleau stated he appreciates the people on the Committee that can work together, and for some members sharing their concerns. B. Jacowski stated everyone here is concerned, or they would not be sitting here. Rocheleau stated he is disappointed Patty Dreier, County Executive was not in attendance.

#### **6. DISCUSSION/UPDATE ON THE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN:**

Schuler stated the discussion so far was a good start. The decision was made to update the 2004 Groundwater Management Plan; it was decided to form a Technical Committee to work through the science portion of it. The plan will contain background and science of what groundwater is, it will identify different issues related to the resource, and it will lead to conclusions, and recommendations for goals, objectives, and policies; that is how the plan is structured. The Technical Committee was part of how the science is looked at, the formatting, and actual chapter text. E. Burns asked if we will be using what was already in the works of being updated. Schuler replied it would all be relevant, but there has been a lot of discussion over the last year, and a lot of different information has been brought out, along with a lot of people's opinions. What we have to do when we get staff back in place is to pick it back up again, and find out where we were. At a Committee meeting we will need to discuss exactly what progress was made, and what happened in the last year in particular to see if there is any different direction we need to go with it. E. Burns asked what the last revision was, and if the Committee should read through it before we start over or change directions.

Schuler asked if we can talk about agenda item 6 and 7 together. E. Burns replied yes. **CONVERSATION CONTINUED ON TO AGENDA ITEM 7.**

#### **7. JEFF SCHULER, PLANNING AND ZONING DIRECTOR TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING THE VACANT WATER QUALITY SPECIALIST POSITION:**

Schuler stated Ray Schmidt was a wonderful asset as the Water Quality Specialist; he put in a lot of years, and had a lot of knowledge. We have a situation now where we will have a new person come into this position, and with that comes a new opportunity for redefining what that position does, and how it approaches the Groundwater Management Plan. We will have a different type of expertise come onto staff, and hopefully bring with them experience, and direction on how to make this the most effective plan we can have. To get to the point where we were last time with the draft, it is going to be a different document; it will be part of the Portage County Comprehensive Plan. It is a much different environment from when it was last updated in 2004 It will be a combination of how it fits into the Comprehensive Plan, and what the ongoing discussions have been. Water quantity has become a much larger concern, and that issue needs to be discussed and resolved. We will need to figure out what the County Board feels is an appropriate role for the County in terms of water quality and water quantity. GCAC will need to bring forward all the facts possible to explain what the benefits are, the negative effects, what sustains the resource, and the type of use that is not sustainable. This Committee needs to look at all sides of the issue, and bring forward some ideas on that. McKee stated he is curious if the search has begun for a new Water Quality Specialist. Schuler replied it has not. McKee asked if there was a timeframe for the search, and a timeframe for the Groundwater Management Plan to be incorporated into the County Comprehensive Plan. Schuler replied we are down 2 Planners, and a Water Quality Specialist. With these vacancies comes an opportunity to fine tune what we do internally in our Department. Part of our pause before we advertise for the Water Quality Specialist position is to figure out how it works in the 2015 P&Z Department. McKee asked if the position title will be limited to just water quality. Schuler replied he believes the position title will be Water Resource Specialist, or something similar.

E. Burns asked for more information for coming up with ideas for the County Board to approve for the Comprehensive Plan. Schuler replied E. Burns' job as chairman is to come up with the preliminary draft of the plan. Take all the ideas the Committee comes up with, and create conclusions on what that means about the resource. We will need to look at the last revisions and reshape it with what we know now to make it even more useful. Schuler stated there is a lot more going on now than when we first started talking about updates such as: groundwater listening sessions, studies by Wisconsin Potato and Vegetable Growers Association, Bradbury's studies, and Kraft's studies. When you think about it in broad terms, the two main things of concern are water has to last forever, and it cannot be poisoned. We need to come up with conclusions based on the patterns of use such as pumping, and trends in irrigation. The Farmland Preservation Plan is being drafted now, and they are looking at irrigation; it is a component of operation, and you try to minimize your cost of operations. They are looking at what approach the agricultural industry is taking to be very responsible, and minimize their use of water over time. These sorts of discussions gives us a balanced view of what the needs are, what the threats are, what are different sources of things that have an adverse impact, what things impact the resource now, and whether or not there is anything that can be done to approach the situation. These are all things the Committee will talk about over time. We have the County Executive's groundwater listening sessions that resulted in a report, and the report will go through a Groundwater Summit sometime in April. The basic themes that came out of the listening sessions will go through the summit; the County Executive will invite different people from around the County to work through these, and this will hopefully help create action statements. All of this becomes input for GCAC to consider as you work on the updates for the Groundwater Management Plan. All of the County Executive's work is an independent approach to gauging the public's feelings about groundwater. It has been so long that you have lost track of what is going to be in the plan, what steps it takes to bring it together, and what steps it takes to be discussed. One of the things we need to talk about is what GCAC's expectations are as a group; both with this planning process and long term. Neidlein stated GCAC has done a decent job over the last few years at educating us by having specialist come in to present, and getting us out into the Community. B. Jacowski stated it is important to remember the listening sessions, groundwater summit, near completion/summary of the Little Plover River study, and the models that are coming out. We are much better off taking our time to do it right, than rushing and having to do it over. R. Burns asked if there is a timetable for the County Executive to submit her final findings to GCAC. Schuler replied no; it will be completed when it gets completed, and the only place it has the greatest purpose is coming as input to this Committee. There may be other things done with it, but realistically the only group that can put together this plan is GCAC. R. Burns stated the public will know we received this input, and get frustrated with GCAC, because we cannot make the changes/updates happen quickly. Schuler replied at the listening session roundup he shared this is not to create new rules.

Schuler stated last year he put together a report for the P&Z Committee that describes what every section in the P&Z Department does. Schuler provided the Committee a copy of the duties for the Groundwater Section which includes descriptions of the Water Quality Specialist and the supporting Administrative Secretary. Kiedrowski asked if the Water Quality Specialists duties will change for the new hire. Schuler replied we are looking at ways to make that position better. We believe the duties that were part of the previous job description are great, but if there is a way to have a connection with other Department tasks we will try to do that as well. Kiedrowski stated she liked that GCAC's priorities were listed in the Groundwater Section report. Burress stated the idea of reevaluating the position sounds a lot like diluting the responsibilities to the groundwater section; and asked if this position will then have other duties not related to groundwater. Schuler replied that is incorrect, and we will not be diluting the position's responsibilities. Burress asked if the position would still continue to work with septic tanks, and other groundwater related items. Schuler replied only the effects of septic systems to groundwater; the installation/inspection of septic systems are handled by the Onsite Waste Specialist whom works with State requirements for permitting of sanitary.

Zimmerman stated he is concerned about the outcome of the Groundwater Summit. Schuler replied everyone has a different opinion, and that is why it is important to do it. Zimmerman stated he has no details as to what to expect, or how the Summit will be conducted. Schuler replied the purpose is to have several tables of people with various perspectives discuss the different themes that came out of the Groundwater Listening Sessions to try to come to a consensus. Zimmerman asked if there is a political table. Schuler replied no; it is nonpartisan. Schuler stated it is local information that informs politicians. There may be politicians there, but it will only be to observe the conversation, not to participate. Having it local allows us to find out what people of Portage County think about it. It is a Portage County Plan with Portage County's ideas, and when it is completed it goes to the Legislators. The whole point is to ascertain what the public is thinking, and what they think are good ideas. Schuler believes the County Executive wanted to generate discussion, and get some ideas on what action could

be. McKee stated he did not understand the roundtable discussion; it sounds like a one day session to obtain more information, but where does that information go afterwards. Schuler replied to the best of his knowledge there will be one more round of discussion that will create a conclusion for GCAC. McKee stated he was not aware of the Groundwater Management Planning and Implementation Committee. Schuler stated there is a disconnect between the Water Quality Specialist, GCAC, P&Z Committee, and the County Board, and we need to fix that. One important thing is to come up with a public information program on groundwater. The County needs to decide what type of issues it looks at, how it looks at them, what data it tracks, how it publishes the data, what the data is supporting, and what policies it is implementing. That type of connection from GCAC to the County Board has not been done for many years. We need to decide what we want to track and understand. Out of all the possible ways to look at groundwater, we need to find a way to be concise and comprehensive as we can. Through that we will create a program that shows who we are as a Committee, what we are charged with, and how we are looking at it. This will show the P&Z Committee and the County Board what GCAC is doing; it will help them understand. We need to keep the County Board Supervisors updated. B. Jacowski disagreed about there being a disconnect between GCAC and the County Board. This topic comes up a lot; we have to remember there is no legislation that can implement any restrictions, rules or regulations on groundwater. Schuler replied it is not a disconnect on the topic, but a disconnect with everyone being on the same page of the most productive way to discuss it is, and make recommendations on it. Policies at the County level will be based on what the County Board Supervisors feel is prudent to have an effect on the resource. It is all about sustainability; everyone wants good quality water long-term. E. Burns stated it would be nice if GCAC had a couple of indexes such as at every meeting we could get what the flow-rate is at the Little Plover River, or pick a well for groundwater depth. If we tracked these things over time it would allow us to know if groundwater is being contaminated, or is it actually falling; how can the Committee say "we are seeing drastic declines" if it is not being tracked. Schuler replied everyone has to agree with what that means; what would be the highest value to use, and as you look at those trends over time what do they tell you so that you can inform others the impact of the resource. Schuler stated the Committee will have to come up with a list of what they would like the Water Quality Specialist to be tracking and bringing to GCAC.

E. Burns stated the well he always measures is down 1 foot since the January GCAC meeting, but over 5 years he has noticed it fluctuates 4 feet, and has done that 3 or 4 times. It is currently 2 feet higher than it was when he started measuring it in 2005. Fritsch stated he monitors his wells, and over the past 10 years he has noticed the water is going up. R. Burns stated scientific data like this that is updated frequently would go a long way towards informing the County Board versus statements from representatives from the community. E. Burns replied you have to justify your recommendations. Fritsch stated it is important that the new individual hired for the Water Quality Specialist position can assist with this information, and can bring together GCAC with the P&Z Committee, and the County Board. B. Jacowski stated other County Supervisors throughout the State are amazed at the hard work and dedication our County has put in and continues to put in on groundwater. Isherwood asked how many wells Ray Schmidt was monitoring. Schuler replied 3-5 wells. E. Burns stated there was going to be a streamflow monitoring program and training, but it must have fallen through. B. Jacowski stated the Mill Creek Watershed was talking about starting a monitoring program as well. Schuler stated it is great knowing how many people are involved, but from his perspective the most important thing about any planning is to have people feel like they are working towards something. There is a lot of energy expended on the topic, but not all of it productively in a way to where it makes sense, and contributes to something. From the planning side, we will work hard to take all this energy towards getting something done, and that starts with the Groundwater Management Plan, followed by the implementation of the Plan. Bentley asked about a timeframe for the start or completion of the Groundwater Management Plan. Schuler replied at May's meeting we will discuss the planning process/work meeting, and in July we will have a definite direction.

McKee stated there is an assumption of a GCAC structure per the last Groundwater Management Plan. Schuler replied GCAC does not have bylaws; do you feel like having subcommittees. We should look at what they have done in the past, what do they do, and do you want to break up into smaller groups to get things done. Neidlein stated we need to make sure Legislators stay informed. Schuler replied that is part of the plan; need to discuss if we want it as a standing agenda item or not. E. Burns asked if GCAC can create any type of subcommittee they believe is beneficial; we do not have to stick to the previous subcommittees. Schuler replied if you can convince everyone that it makes sense, yes. The previous subcommittees made sense at one time, but may not be relevant today. B. Jacowski suggested to be hesitant on creating a small legislative committee, because you would not want individuals pushing their own personal views; a subcommittee should include some County Board Supervisors. Schuler replied correct, those duties would have to be defined, because when people represent the County, they represent the County Board. E. Burns replied he was thinking more along the lines of

tracking legislative activities as opposed to lobbying. Meis suggested handling the updates the way the Associate Planner handled Comprehensive Plan updates. The Planner listened to our needs, drafted what they felt was appropriate, and brought it back for more tweaks and discussion. Schuler replied he believes that is where the Technical Committee came from, because meeting every other month makes it hard to accomplish anything. Meis stated therefore there was not a Planner for the updates; it was the Water Quality Specialist. Schuler replied that is correct. McKee asked if everyone should be reviewing the 2004 Groundwater Management Plan. E. Burns suggested reviewing the updates that the Committee had already accomplished. Schuler stated we should send out the final draft where it left off. We need to talk about what the Committee needs to do to organize itself to be more effective. McKee stated the lack of product has been a great frustration to him, and he looks forward to a product and results. Schuler stated we will look at procedures to make that more straightforward in the future.

**8. GCAC MEMBER REPORTS:** Zimmerman asked if there should be a timeline when someone brings up an issue. Zimmerman stated he does not see any budgeting in place by the County for water issues, no contingency funds. Schuler stated for the budgeting process you go through the planning process, look at the background, draw your conclusions, and create goals, objectives, and policies. Some of the objectives and policies will be toward specific issues, and once the County Board establishes what issues they are concerned with, there is implementation that is also part of the plan. Once the County Board adopts a plan with issues they find important and choose to pursue, that automatically becomes an implementation. It is plans like this that create a staff work program; staff helps the County Board deal with these issues. In terms of budgeting you will find if there is something the County feels strongly about addressing, the County will find a way to make it part of some department's work program to pursue that. Zimmerman stated he suggested to the Town of Hull a dollar per household up to a maximum of \$10,000 be held as a contingency fund. Schuler that would be based on the County Board adopting a plan based on the discussion and conclusion of it being an issue, and how you can best approach it. Zimmerman stated there are many issues he would like to see discussed such as: the Little Plover River quantity, Junction City quality, the Town of Hull water issues, the high capacity well issues, individual well issues, regulations on CAFO's, and investigating the metro water systems. Schuler replied GCAC's function is to think outside the box (free thinkers in terms of groundwater), provide any information you can think up, and refer through the P&Z Committee. Schuler stated Zimmerman came up with some good topics that deserve discussion at some point through the Groundwater Management Planning process. They are all indicative issues that are resource related, and it creates discussion points for both this group and the P&Z Committee. Zimmerman stated unless something changes at the staff level, the ideas will go nowhere. Schuler replied your ideas come to this Committee and if GCAC comes to the consensus it is a great idea, that recommendation gets made, and maybe something can be done with it. Zimmerman stated that is the process that needs to be improved; if you make a study of something what is the best practice.

Zimmerman asked Mallek how the Village of Junction City is doing. Mallek replied they are currently working with a Water Resource Specialist at Rural Water Association, because they have a well that is down due to high nitrates, and they believe they have identified the source. The Village uses a high capacity well which pumps 50-70 gallons a minute; therefore they are producing enough water. They are in the process of putting in a test well around the parks somewhere, and may be lucky enough to find a water source. They will then blend the new well with the old well in proper proportions that will give them additional water; this will bring the well back online and useable as blended until the nitrate levels go back down. The Village is still in the process of doing this, and is working at completing applications for funding from various agencies; they rank extremely high, because of health and safety issues of the water. They are looking at around 1 million dollars' worth of costs. McKee asked if that was a single source. Mallek replied possibly, they are uncertain. It is very difficult to know, because the groundwater travels in different directions; there is a possibility of two sources. They cannot prove either one at this point, but they have been addressed. One may be agricultural, and the farmer has agreed to limit what he does with the land, and the other might be an issue with the Department of Transportation (DOT) on the ponds/borrow pits they created when they put the 4 lane highway in. E. Burns asked the level of nitrates in the contaminated well. Mallek replied 13.2 was the most recent reading, and you have to be fewer than 10 for municipal wells. In the spring with high runoff Mallek anticipates the nitrate level will increase temporarily. E. Burns asked what the ratio would be to blend the wells. Mallek replied it will depend on what the nitrate levels are in the new well. Assuming the new well nitrate levels are at 0, and it pumps 50 gallons a minute, 25/25 would bring the nitrate levels down to around 6.5. B. Jacowski asked Mallek if they were actively pumping the contaminated well. Mallek replied yes. Zimmerman asked about the dollar amount. Mallek replied the amount will vary. One option is to pipe the well from the east side to the treatment reservoir on the west side; that is 2 miles of going through a lot of rock, and could cost 1.5 million dollars. Mallek is hoping they will get lucky enough to

find a water source, and keep the cost down to a half million dollars. Zimmerman asked if a political appeal to the State and Federal levels would help; giving an example of Milladore. Mallek replied that is part of the funding process. There is funding through the DNR, the Department of Administration State Block Grant Program, Rural Development, and the State Trust Fund. The State Trust Fund has just changed their standards, and interest rates. Once the Village identifies exactly what they are going to do, and knows what it will cost, then they will get the four funding agencies together to see what they can do for them. Theoretically, the Village can get up to 80% funding, but 80% of 1 million still leaves the Village with a \$200,000 bill. Meis stated, to him, borrow pits next to farm fields act as big open wells; there is nothing covering them from contamination. Mallek stated they have tested the water in the borrow pits to try to establish a link. The issue with the Village of Junction City area is they have high iron, and the University explained to them in open air iron will essentially dissipate nitrates causing them to never establish a link. The contaminated well is 400 feet deep, water comes in at about 100-110 feet, and the rest is reservoir. The best they can get is 70 gallons a minute; they were pumping at 50 gallons a minute when the well became contaminated. The borrow pit went down into the fractured bedrock, and there is only a couple hundred feet of distance between the borrow pit and the source of water in the well, but cannot establish a link at this time.

**9. NEXT MEETING DATE:**

The next meeting date is tentatively set for Thursday, May 21, 2015 at 7:00 p.m., location to be determined.

**10. ADJOURNMENT:**

Burress moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Kiedrowski. Meeting adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

Amy Goffin, Recording Secretary

Ed Burns, Chair

10/15/2015

**PORTAGE COUNTY GROUNDWATER CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, LINCOLN CENTER  
THURSDAY, October 15, 2015 - 7:00 P.M.**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**GROUNDWATER CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GCAC) MEMBERS LISTING:**

<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>MEMBERS NAME</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>MEMBERS NAME</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
<b>TOWNS:</b>		<b>10/15/15</b>	<b>TOWNS:</b>		<b>10/15/15</b>
Alban	<b>VACANT</b>		Plover	Joe Firkus	Absent
Almond	Edward Burns	Present	Plover	Roger Bentley	Absent
Amherst	Mike Burress	Excused	Sharon	<b>VACANT</b>	
Belmont	Mike Warzynski	Absent	Stockton	Richard Filtz	Excused
Belmont Alternate	Rita Walkowicz	Absent	<b>VILLAGES:</b>		
Buena Vista	John Ruzicka	Present	Almond	Richard Burns	Present
Buena Vista Alt	Roger Turzinski	Present	Amherst	Mike Hinrichs	Present
Buena Vista Alt	Lynn Isherwood	Present	Amherst Junction	<b>VACANT</b>	
Carson	Fred Copes	Absent	Junction City	Peter Mallek	Excused
Dewey	Dennis Meis	Absent	Nelsonville	James Walker	Present
Dewey Alt	Kathy Girolamo	Absent	Park Ridge	Dan McFarlane	Present
Eau Pleine	David Hansen	Present	Park Ridge Alt	Christine Neidlein	-----
Grant	Mary Kiedrowski	Present	Plover	David Fritsch	Present
Grant Alt	Scott Provost	-----	Rosholt	<b>VACANT</b>	
Hull	Tim Zimmerman	Present	Whiting	Casey Jakubek	Present
Lanark	Bill McKee	Present			
Linwood	Garth Frost	Present	<b>CITY:</b>		
New Hope	George Guyant	Present	Stevens Point	Joel Lemke	Excused
New Hope Alt	Cathy Derezinski	-----			
Pine Grove	<b>VACANT</b>				

**STAFF PRESENT:** Jen McNelly, Kristin Johnson, Jeff Schuler, and Amy Goffin, Planning and Zoning Department.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Christine Mechenich – UWSP, James Gifford – Portage County District 14, Jerry Walters – Portage County District 17, Matt Jacowski – Portage County District 22 and Barry Jacowski – Portage County District 23

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by E. Burns, Chair.

**2. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 19, 2015 AND AUGUST 26, 2015:** Brief discussion on borrow pits for the benefit of Hinrichs.

Motion by McKee, second by Guyant to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried by voice vote.

**3. CORRESPONDENCE:** No correspondence presented.

**4. PUBLIC NOTICE:** *Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on specific agenda items must register their requests at this time with such comments subject to the reasonable control of the Committee Chair as set forth in Robert's Rules of Order.* No one registered to speak.

**5. PRESENTATION: OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN AN APPLIED RESEARCH PROJECT WITH UWSP BY CHRISTINE MECHEINICH FROM UWSP CENTER FROM WATERSHED SCIENCE AND EDUCATION:**

Mechenich stated when people have their water tested they receive a lot of different numbers back, and it can be a challenge to understand. UWSP is working on designing an online program that will allow for graphic personalized water test results that would explain to you what your numbers are at, what is standard for your area, and things to consider doing to improve your water. Mechenich stated they currently have a test system available, and in order to get grant money they would need volunteers to help test their program. The test would take approximately 45 minutes and consist of her giving an explanation about your hypothetical well water results, and then you would look at graphs and discuss what questions or suggestions you might have. This

process will help Mechenich understand what people do not understand about their water results, and how she can make this online program better. Mechenich passed around a sign-up sheet for anyone that would like to volunteer, along with a consent form for human subject research. Mechenich stated she will contact anyone who signed up to set up a time and location for testing and encouraged members to share with anyone that might be interested, because they need a wide variety of people to make these results accurate.

B. Jacowski asked what form of grant Mechenich can apply for and how much money she may need. Mechenich replied she is unsure, but she is working with Kevin Masarik who is the outreach specialist that has been working on this for some time.

#### **6. DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN – UPDATE PLANNING PROCESS AND REVIEW PROGRESS ON THE FIRST THREE SECTIONS OF THE PLAN:**

McNelly stated the first section we will be looking at is background information on groundwater in Portage County, and most of what you see came from the 2013 draft. There were updates to numbers and some format/grammatical edits made.

**Section A** – McKee questioned the maximum 5 year revision cycle for the Groundwater Management Plan, and asked if comprehensive plans are normally 10 years. Schuler replied the comprehensive plan statute recommends you review your plan once every 10 years; every section of the comprehensive plan can have its own revision date. McKee asked what the relation of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is to GCAC. McNelly stated TAC is made up of experts/technical people in the field of water; representation from the Department of Natural Resources, consulting firms, UW Extension, Ed Burns, Joel Lemke, County Health Department, and County staff. TAC met and went through this section prior to GCAC receiving it. Schuler stated the purpose of their work/review is to get the best representation of all the technical aspects. Zimmerman asked if there is representation from legislature or a lawyer to know what you can and cannot do. Schuler replied that will be important in a certain portion of the plan, but not in the section we are currently reviewing. Corporation Counsel will not come in to play until we decide what type of actions we want to take to address groundwater concerns.

Hinrichs asked if the Comprehensive Plan is used by the County. Schuler replied yes, zoning and regulations for enforcement of ordinances in the County based on the Comprehensive Plan. Since 2005 the County has had a Comprehensive Plan, and any time there is an application for rezoning in a town the consistency with the County Comprehensive Plan has been checked by P&Z staff. We have never come across a conflict, because staff works closely with the towns to make them aware of any issues that might cause a conflict. One thing we are looking at doing with the Comprehensive Plan moving forward is making the plan more relevant to the needs of the County. The State looks at the Comprehensive Plan as the official policy document for the County, and that is why we want the Groundwater Management Plan incorporated into it; it has the weight of the statutory expectation behind it.

Hinrichs asked if GCAC will see the final Groundwater Management Plan prior to County Board. Schuler replied GCAC completes the work to their satisfaction, and then it goes to the P&Z Committee, the Ag and Extension Education Committee, and the Land and Water Conservation Committee for recommendation to take it to County Board for final approval. If there happen to be issues or questions from the P&Z Committee the document will come back to GCAC, but otherwise once GCAC forwards it they are finished with it Schuler stated public input is very important so at some point we will have to open it up to public comment.

**Section B** – E. Burns asked if graphs will be updated. McNelly replied yes, as information becomes available the graphs will be updated. E. Burns stated there may be some confusion with the 5 year average from departure. McKee stated this is a document meant to be read by the public; standard departure is a term that is not universally understood. McNelly replied she will look into clarifying the term. E. Burns suggested putting it in the appendix. Hinrichs suggested adding a line through zero on the graphs on page 8 so you can clearly see what is above and below the line.

McNelly stated the “Landuse” section is under review; therefore that section is not available at the moment, but it will be available at the next meeting.

**Quality** – McNelly stated the nitrate (human influence groundwater quality issue) section is not complete; therefore we are only looking at the natural groundwater quality issues. Hinrichs asked if there should be ranges of existing data from the County for the radioactive section on page 11. McNelly replied she will look into it.

Schuler asked if it was a consensus of the Committee to move forward with the plan, and bring back new sections at the next meeting. GCAC agreed.

B. Jacowski asked if draft sections will be released to the public as they are completed. Schuler replied the packet is published to the website for every GCAC meeting so if there are updates/changes they will be posted through the website. Schuler stated meeting notices are published in the Gannett, and when we have an open house there will be an advertisement in the paper as well. B. Jacowski asked if P&Z staff will be letting townships know. McNelly replied the towns representatives are here as GCAC members, and should be responsible for bring this information back to their towns. B. Jacowski suggested the town clerks get copies of the GCAC packets. Schuler replied that was a good idea.

#### **7. GCAC BYLAWS HANDOUT FOR DISCUSSION AT NEXT MEETING:**

McNelly stated there were questions on what GCAC's role/direction was; therefore we found it best to provide bylaws for the Committee. Zimmerman asked what the purpose of having them is. McNelly stated the purpose is to provide direction, responsibility, and outline for GCAC members and Committee. E. Burns stated this is a good idea, especially for potential new members. McKee stated section 1.1 states GCAC provides technical expertise, but if they are not the experts, it is truly secondhand. Hinrichs suggested "gathering expertise" versus "providing expertise." GCAC agreed.

McKee asked how we came up with 28 municipalities as he only came up with 27. Schuler stated 27 plus the County. B. Jacowski asked who the County representative is. Schuler replied P&Z staff. B. Jacowski stated section 2.4 states there should be no financial compensation for GCAC members, and he suggested we should add "at the County level" as some members are paid by their towns. B. Jacowski asked if staff is a voting member. E. Burns replied no. Schuler stated therefore it should be 27 municipalities, not 28.

Hinrichs asked what the Land and Water Conservation Committee (LWCC) does as GCAC has never dealt with them before. Schuler replied recently LWCC has become more interested in the overall scope of resource management in the County. Schuler stated it was possibly an error of omission over the years that there was not a direct contact between the Water Resource Specialist, GCAC, and LWCC. Hinrichs asked what LWCC's responsibility is on water. Schuler replied LWCC provides information on farm impacts, runoff, and surface water. Schuler stated he appreciates LWCC's interest. B. Jacowski invited GCAC members to attend a LWCC meeting to see what they do. B. Jacowski stated 90% of the issues LWCC faces deal with water based on runoff and surface water situations. GCAC is LWCC's backbone, and they appreciate all the work GCAC does. Walters stated there was no connection/communication between LWCC and GCAC in the past and there should have been; LWCC attends Inland Lake Group, Little Plover River Group, and Drainage District meetings.

Walker asked if GCAC will start to meet more frequently than bimonthly. McNelly stated in the bylaws it references GCAC will meet a minimum of bimonthly, but we will discuss frequency under agenda item 10.

#### **8. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE:**

McNelly handed out a summary of Groundwater Law, and a list of pending legislation. McNelly stated SB72 or AB105 written by Mason and Miller has been around since February of 2015, and has been sitting in committee since March. Highlights – it is trying to establish a Technical Advisory Council at the State level, and a process for designating groundwater management areas in the State. Any person can petition the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) for a groundwater management area designation; that petition would then be forwarded to the Technical Advisory Council for consideration, and they would have to make the conclusion that it qualifies as a groundwater management area. It then goes to the Groundwater Coordinating Counsel for their approval, if approved; it goes back to the DNR who makes the official designation. If designated to a groundwater management area all high capacity well permits would have to undergo review. This bill would require all wells be examined for significant adverse impacts on water in the State.

Bill SB239 – McNelly stated this bill was referred to committee on August 26, 2015, and went to the Committee of Agricultural, Small Business, and Tourism on October 7, 2015. This bill states if a well is replaced, repaired, or property gets transferred no permit review would be required by the DNR. Zimmerman asked if that removes the

protection from injection wells. McNelly replied she is unsure, but believes this is only referring to high capacity wells.

Bill SB291 – McNelly stated this bill was referred to committee on October 8, 2015, and went to the Natural Resources and Energy Committee with a public hearing on October 13, 2015. This is a hybrid bill of the first two bills we talked about; it creates a process to designate a sensitive resource area. Therefore, a professional would have to provide information to the DNR proving that pumping is impacting a specific water body. This bill does not include wetlands it is limited to lakes, rivers, and streams. The DNR has to make a request from the Joint Finance Committee to get approval to pursue these impacts. If approved, the DNR had to evaluate and model the areas hydrology; once completed the DNR would issue a decision on whether the area should be designated as a sensitive resource area, and what actions need to be taken. After the decision is made, there would be public hearings and could be contested in legal proceedings. The DNR's report would be forwarded to each house of the legislature, and then legislature would have to pass a bill to allow the designation. This repeals the Lake Beulah decision on considering accumulative impacts for wells, limits the DNR's authority to language specific in the bill, and also includes the Gudex bill where there would be no review of a well if it is replaced, repaired, or property transfers. McNelly stated a common question is "how long does designation take," and with this particular bill it could be up to 10 years.

Zimmerman stated they are trying to substitute Western Water Law for the Public Trust Doctrine, and he asked McNelly to explain to GCAC members. McNelly stated the Public Trust Doctrine currently states that water of the State are held at public trust (belong to everyone), and by taking away the ability of the DNR to review well permit, there is concern water will be tied to private property rights. When property is transferred it implies your pumping rights transfer too; this is a major concern.

#### **9. MEMBER REPORTS:**

E. Burns stated there was a pond in front of the Portage County Bank in the Portage County Business Park that has water flowing into the pond from the culvert opposed to out, and asked if there is a hole. Schuler replied there is a pump house that keeps the ponds at a certain level, but he will look into the matter. B. Jacowski asked if there was a high capacity well pumping into a pond that we aerate, and if the ponds are lined. Schuler stated the ponds did include piping to maintain a certain level of water in the ponds, and he is unsure if the ponds are lined; he would assume so. B. Jacowski stated all of the retention ponds in that area are not doing any good to reclaim any of the runoff water, because it is all being aerated and evaporating. Schuler replied B. Jacowski may be correct, but it is speculation on both their parts. B. Jacowski stated he did notice the ponds at Skyward are lined with plastic, and it is bewildering that a retention pond be lined with plastic. Schuler replied lined for esthetic features. E. Burns stated he thought they were lined to a certain height to allow for runoff. B. Jacowski stated Skywards ponds are lined to the top and surrounded with rock.

Zimmerman stated the Town of Hull issue has went into closed session, and they are waiting for discussion from Stevens Point for the water withdrawal on well 11. Zimmerman stated he was a speaker at the public service hearing about contamination from the old gas plant, and they are dredging out part of the river and small pond. Zimmerman stated they did not share the level of contamination found.

#### **10. NEXT MEETING DATE:**

McNelly recommended GCAC meet monthly to continue moving the Groundwater Management Plan along. R. Burns suggested limiting the agenda to allow for shorter meetings. Walker suggested people provide email feedback without being present in case they cannot attend the meeting. Hinrichs suggested one month agenda be strictly about the Groundwater Management Plan, and the bimonthly meeting be a standard meeting.

The next meeting date is tentatively set for Thursday, November 12, 2015 at 7:00 p.m., and December 17, 2015 at 7 p.m., location to be determined.

#### **11. ADJOURNMENT:**

McKee moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Walker. Meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Amy Goffin, Recording Secretary

Ed Burns, Chair

12/17/2015

**PORTAGE COUNTY GROUNDWATER CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CONFERENCE ROOMS 1 & 2, COUNTY ANNEX  
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2015 - 7:00 P.M.**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**GROUNDWATER CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GCAC) MEMBERS LISTING:**

<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>MEMBERS NAME</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>MEMBERS NAME</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
<b>TOWNS:</b>		<b>11/12/15</b>	<b>TOWNS:</b>		<b>11/12/15</b>
Alban	<b>VACANT</b>		Plover	Joe Firkus	Absent
Almond	Edward Burns	Present	Plover	Roger Bentley	Absent
Amherst	Mike Burress	Absent	Sharon	<b>VACANT</b>	
Belmont	Mike Warzynski	Present	Stockton	Curt Soik	Present
Belmont Alternate	Rita Walkowicz	Present	<b>VILLAGES:</b>		
Buena Vista	John Ruzicka	-----	Almond	Richard Burns	Absent
Buena Vista Alt	Roger Turzinski	-----	Amherst	Mike Hinrichs	Present
Buena Vista Alt	Lynn Isherwood	Present	Amherst Junction	<b>VACANT</b>	
Carson	Fred Copes	Absent	Junction City	Peter Mallek	Absent
Dewey	Dennis Meis	Absent	Nelsonville	James Walker	Excused
Dewey Alt	Kathy Girolamo	Absent	Park Ridge	Dan McFarlane	Absent
Eau Pleine	David Hansen	Present	Park Ridge Alt	Christine Neidlein	Absent
Grant	Mary Kiedrowski	Present	Plover	David Fritsch	Absent
Grant Alt	Scott Provost	-----	Rosholt	<b>VACANT</b>	
Hull	Tim Zimmerman	Present	Whiting	Casey Jakubek	Present
Lanark	Bill McKee	Present			
Linwood	Garth Frost	Present	<b>CITY:</b>		
New Hope	George Guyant	Present	Stevens Point	Joel Lemke	Present
New Hope Alt	Cathy Dereziński	-----			
Pine Grove	<b>VACANT</b>				

**STAFF PRESENT:** Jen McNelly, Jeff Schuler, and Amy Goffin, Planning and Zoning Department.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Barry Jacowski – Portage County District 23

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by Burns, Chair.

**2. INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBER: CURT SOIK – TOWN OF STOCKTON:**

Burns introduced Curt Soik as the new member for the Town of Stockton.

**3. CORRESPONDENCE:** No correspondence presented.

**4. PUBLIC NOTICE:** *Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on specific agenda items must register their requests at this time with such comments subject to the reasonable control of the Committee Chair as set forth in Robert's Rules of Order.* No one registered to speak.

**5. DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN:**

**Page 6** – Isherwood suggested removing “43” in the beginning of the second paragraph for the varying participation. McKee suggested removing “typically” instead. GCAC agreed.

**Page 12** – Hinrichs stated the table only shows 2005 data, and asked why there is not more years of data included to show the changes in land use. Schuler replied there is no annual update on existing land use; this data is from when the Comprehensive Plan was completed. This data simply shows us how land is used within Portage County. McNelly stated table 1 came directly from the Comprehensive Plan, and has not been updated; table 2 shows similar data that is updated. Isherwood asked why in table 2 that the Rural Town Acreage and the Total County Acreage was different. Schuler replied it changes all the time; it depends on how it is calculated. Schuler stated when you look at land use it does not focus on numbers. Hinrichs stated all land uses are titled differently in table 1 vs. table 2 so it is hard to compare. Schuler replied there are different titles, because table 1 is from P&Z and table 2 is from the State. Isherwood asked about adjusting the ordering on the tables to be consistent with one another. Schuler replied we could adjust table 1 as it is the County's table.

**Page 11** – Guyant referenced the last paragraph, and suggested removing “natural” as they are man-made lakes. GCAC agreed.

**Page 13** – Hinrichs suggested adding more data to the tables to be able to see trends. GCAC agreed. Warzynski asked why there was a difference between irrigated farm and irrigated acres. McNelly replied that is the way the census breaks it down; the land and farms that use irrigation and irrigated acres is the actual irrigated acres. B. Jacowski asked if there could be an explanation added. Schuler stated we can add a footnote below the table. GCAC agreed.

**Page 14** – Hinrichs stated throughout the plan it states “recorded by USGS,” and asked if there is specific information that should be added such as the date and who completed the work for USGS in case someone wanted to look up the information on the USGS website. McNelly stated she will add in the specific citation for reference. Hinrichs referenced “5 long-term groundwater wells,” and stated it should be 8. McNelly replied that needs to be corrected. McKee asked what hydrograph well meant. McNelly replied it means the USGS uses them to establish a hydrograph; it takes the groundwater level measurements, and all 8 are hydrograph wells. Some have longer histories than others, which is why when we look at long-term trends we do not use all 8, because 3 wells went in within the last 3 years. Isherwood asked if the graph can be enlarged. McKee suggested all maps be larger. GCAC agreed. Soik asked why 6 of the USGS wells located in the moraine. McNelly replied that surprised her as well, but that is where the USGS wanted to place them. McNelly believes some of the reasoning for placing them in the moraine was to try to provide an area with more intensive high capacity well density. Burns asked when the wells were put in. McNelly stated to look at the USGS groundwater watch website as it has all of their monitoring listed. B. Jacowski asked if McNelly received this map from the USGS as he has 2 USGS wells on his property. McNelly replied she took the map directly off the USGS website, but she will look into the wells located on B. Jacowski’s property.

**Page 15** – McNelly stated she will look into getting the graphs updated. Hinrichs stated it says there are 5 long-term monitoring wells, but the plan only shows graphs for 4 of them. Soik referenced the Plover monitoring well graph, and stated there was a weir taken out around 1994/1995 and water dropped 3 feet. The DNR states it should not make a difference, but he believes it does. McNelly stated she will look into the issue, the date, and possibly add a footnote.

**Page 16** – McKee asked why the Amherst Junction well differs from the others. McNelly replied the location is different, and it is not situated in an area that has as many high cap wells.

**Page 17** – McKee asked how the monitoring information will be shared with town boards. McNelly replied she would like to do a report monthly by email and mail, and stated there is currently not a lot of data so they will get it in one lump sum at first. Zimmerman asked what the towns will do with the information. McNelly replied it is good to keep the towns informed. Soik asked what the point is of having GCAC if the towns can make their own groundwater restrictions in the comprehensive plan. McNelly replied the towns cannot. Schuler stated it is not a comprehensive plan for regulating groundwater usage; it is a plan that describes what we know about groundwater resource, and give the County Board Supervisors information they need to work towards establishing groundwater resource sustainability. Soik stated if GCAC knows what is going on with the plan, and you give it to the town and no town members have attended GCAC meetings, how will they know what has been discussed in this plan. Kiedrowski stated she attends her towns meetings and provides them with updates, because they are concerned. Therefore, she feels it is very important to share this information with the towns, and possibly mail them a copy of the meeting minutes as well. B. Jacowski stated it is very important to share with the town boards, and suggested emailing the town clerks them to save on costs. Schuler stated the point of the plan is to not have the towns do extra things; the major point of the plan is to make the County knowledgeable of groundwater. A common question is “what good are hydrograph wells, and do they give us the information we need,” and it is this Committees job to make recommendations on different types of monitoring programs that may be more effective. The point of this group is to keep close track of the groundwater resource as possible, and put you in a position to understand it. We will share our information with the towns, but the data is mainly for the Water Resource Specialist for education purposes, and identifying trends. B. Jacowski stated out of 12 listening sessions, the popular topic that was always brought up was public education. Soik stated the problem with that is there is conflicting information at all the meetings he has attended; UW Madison and UW Stevens Point’s models do not even agree. Lemke stated facts go into a model; a model does not produce facts. When models do not agree is it because different variables are involved and you can play with those. For

example; a hydrograph well shows the levels in a monitoring well, there is not another set of data that differs from it; how you use it determines what you make out of it. Schuler stated GCAC's job is to take in information from all groups and figure out what makes the most sense, and provide good balanced information to the County Board. Burns stated this plan is a good starting point; if you have a problem you can view this document for information. B. Jacowski stated GCAC, Planning & Zoning, Land & Water Conservation, and Ag & Extension Education Committee's do not set laws or perimeters on groundwater; this is information only. Burns suggested removing "monthly," and leave it as "shared with the town boards." GCAC agreed.

McKee suggested removing "as does the ability for pumping groundwater" in the last sentence on the page as it is confusing. GCAC agreed.

**Page 18** - Soik asked for a breakdown of a 1000 gallon per minute wells compared to the rest of the high capacity wells. McNelly stated currently the data we have at the County level to separate this information out is municipal and high capacity which is anything over 70 gallons per minute. McNelly stated she would have to ask the DNR to see if they would hand over that data. McNelly stated when you have multiple wells on one property that when combined pump over 70 gallons per minute it is considered a high capacity well. Hansen stated the papers quotes 1400 high capacity wells, and stated the general public's perception is there are 1400 center pivot wells. Lemke stated we need to clearly identify the definition of a high capacity well. Schuler suggested putting the definition in the first paragraph under the "High Capacity Well Use" section. McNelly stated we will remove the current sidebar and make it its own paragraph. GCAC agreed. Lemke stated the code defines a high capacity well as one or more wells, drillholes, or mine shafts on a property that have a combined approved pump capacity of 70 or more gallons per minute. Lemke stated if you have 30 wells on one piece of property it will be considered 1 high capacity well. McKee questioned the number of inactive high capacity wells. Burns replied you can go on the DNR website to look up wells that are inactive.

Hinrichs stated there are 18 municipal wells, but the graph only shows 15. McNelly replied she will look into it, and stated they may be covering one another.

**Page 19** – Burns asked if we will have 2014's data by the time the plan is published. McNelly replied she has requested them from the DNR, but has not received them yet.

McKee stated 2012 was a dry year, and asked why cranberries and non-metallic mining went down in their water usage. McNelly replied there is a lag time from when they use water, and it would not be reflected until later. Hansen stated the reporting went from July to December so you do not have a full year. Burns asked what "All Other Uses" is, and why it has doubled in two years. Schuler suggested a footnote with a description of what is included in that category. GCAC agreed.

**Page 20** – Hansen asked if the rural water use was reflected in the pie graph. McNelly replied no, it is only for high capacity well pumping. Hansen stated that means there is a 3% use of groundwater that is not being represented anywhere. Schuler suggested adding what that impact could be to the "Rural Water Use" paragraph. GCAC agreed.

**Page 21** - Burns stated it is interesting to see that agriculture use of water has dropped from 2005-2010. McNelly stated those are 5 year estimates. Soik stated over the last 15 years they have become way more efficient. McNelly suggested adding a reference to the Farmland Preservation Plan in this section, because they talk about this more in depth. GCAC agreed.

Warzynski stated the number of high capacity wells on page 21 states 1,148 and on page 18 it states 724. Schuler stated 724 high capacity wells are only including agricultural, and there are 1,148 high capacity wells total which include everything else. Schuler suggested rewording the paragraph as it does make you think we are talking about agricultural. Burns suggested removing the word "historically" in the second paragraph, last sentence as well. GCAC agreed. B. Jacowski stated we should highlight that agricultural use of water has dropped over the last few years. McNelly replied that is why she wants to reference the Farmland Preservation Plan. Burns stated it will be included in a summary towards the end of the plan. Schuler stated at the end we will have a section for what GCAC has learned.

Hinrichs questioned the terms domestic, public, and municipal. McNelly replied there will be term clarification in a footnote.

**Page 22** – Guyant asked what the timeline is for the Little Plover River study. McNelly replied the DNR is supposed to get the final report from that study, but she is unaware if they have received it yet. Burns stated the last thing he heard was the DNR was having troubles with Bradbury's recharge numbers.

**Page 19 / 21** – Hinrichs referenced the groundwater withdrawal total, and the amount shown in the pie chart that agricultural uses, and asked if it should correspond to the numbers in table 6. McNelly replied no, because 2006 are 5 year estimates. Information on page 19 is specific year information; therefore, they will not work together. In order to get a long term record of a long term view of information, that is the record we have to use. The DNR will not give us any information earlier than 2011, because they do not feel their records are accurate enough to put out publicly.

**Page 22** – Schuler stated we will be adding citations for the different studies on these pages as well.

**Overview** – Schuler asked the members how they feel about the information so far. McKee replied he believes it is a good background piece; he has sat on this Committee for numerous years and feels this is well structured. Hinrichs suggested more data. Soik stated this plan will be very valuable.

**6. MEMBERS REPORT:**

None

**7. NEXT MEETING DATE:**

The next meeting date is tentatively set for Thursday, December 17, 2015 at 7 p.m., location to be determined.

**11. ADJOURNMENT:**

McKee moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Lemke. Meeting adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

Amy Goffin, Recording Secretary

Ed Burns, Chair

12/17/2015

**PORTAGE COUNTY GROUNDWATER CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CONFERENCE ROOM C, AGING & DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER  
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2015 - 7:00 P.M.**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**GROUNDWATER CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GCAC) MEMBERS LISTING:**

<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>MEMBERS NAME</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>MEMBERS NAME</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
<b>TOWNS:</b>		<b>12/17/15</b>	<b>TOWNS:</b>		<b>12/17/15</b>
Alban	<b>VACANT</b>		Pine Grove Alt	Jeanette Wilson	-----
Almond	Edward Burns	Present	Plover	Joe Firkus	Absent
Amherst	Mike Burress	Present	Plover	Roger Bentley	Absent
Belmont	Mike Warzynski	Present	Sharon	<b>VACANT</b>	
Belmont Alternate	Rita Walkowicz	Present	Stockton	Curt Soik	Present
Buena Vista	John Ruzicka	Present	<b>VILLAGES:</b>		
Buena Vista Alt	Roger Turzinski	Present	Almond	Richard Burns	Present
Buena Vista Alt	Lynn Isherwood	Present	Amherst	Mike Hinrichs	Present
Carson	Fred Copes	Present	Amherst Junction	<b>VACANT</b>	
Dewey	Dennis Meis	Present	Junction City	Peter Mallek	Absent
Dewey Alt	Kathy Girolamo	Absent	Nelsonville	James Walker	Present
Eau Pleine	David Hansen	Excused	Park Ridge	Dan McFarlane	Present
Grant	Mary Kiedrowski	Present	Park Ridge Alt	Christine Neidlein	-----
Grant Alt	Scott Provost	-----	Plover	David Fritsch	Present
Hull	Tim Zimmerman	Present	Plover	Matt Saloun	Present
Lanark	Bill McKee	Present	Rosholt	<b>VACANT</b>	
Linwood	Garth Frost	Present	Whiting	Casey Jakubek	Present
New Hope	George Guyant	Present	<b>CITY:</b>		
New Hope Alt	Cathy Derezinski	-----	Stevens Point	Joel Lemke	Present
Pine Grove	Ben Sawyer	Present			

**STAFF PRESENT:** Jen McNelly, Kristen Johnson, and Amy Goffin, Planning and Zoning Department.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Ken Schroeder – UW Extension, Barry Jacowski – Portage County District 23, & Matt Jacowski – Portage County District 22

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 6:57 p.m. by Burns, Chair.

**2. INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS: BEN SAWYER & JEANETTE WILSON – TOWN OF PINE GROVE:**  
Burns introduced Ben Sawyer and Jeanette Wilson as new members for the Town of Pine Grove.

**3. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 15, 2015 AND NOVEMBER 12, 2015:**  
Motion by McKee, second by Zimmerman to approve the October 15, 2015 minutes as presented. Motion carried by voice vote.

Kiedrowski stated on the November 12, 2015 minutes she did not agree with the rest of the GCAC members on removing “historically” from page 21 of the Groundwater Management Plan.

McKee motioned to approve the November 12, 2015 minutes as amended; seconded by Walker. Motion carried by voice vote.

**4. CORRESPONDENCE:** E. Burns handed out a document that was received from Soik.

McNelly handed out a drafted scenario from Ken Bradbury’s model on what would happen to the Little Plover River if the dam was never removed and/or put back in.

**5. PUBLIC NOTICE:** *Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on specific agenda items must register their requests at this time with such comments subject to the reasonable control of the Committee Chair as set forth in Robert’s Rules of Order.* No one registered to speak.

## **6. DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN:**

**Page 9** - McNelly stated the biggest changes made are in the Aquifer section. There was additional detail added to provide a better picture of the bedrock geology of the area. Hinrichs stated the last paragraph containing information on crystalline rock and sandstone needs more detail; such as adding the thickness of sandstone.

**Page 21** – McNelly stated 2014's numbers have been added to the Groundwater Withdrawals, and Groundwater Sources charts. McKee asked if the figures come from USGS. McNelly replied the DNR records this information.

**Page 23** – McNelly stated the total metered water sales have been added. McKee asked if the metered numbers are from well or from individual meters from around town. McNelly replied that is a question for Lemke. Mallek suggested Junction City be added. McNelly agreed.

**Page 14** – Hinrichs asked why potatoes are not included in the list of crops. McNelly replied potatoes are included in vegetable crops. Zimmerman questioned irrigated acres. Soik explained only a certain percentage of the farm will have irrigated acreage, the rest of the farm is not irrigated. McNelly stated 18% is actually irrigated. Zimmerman asked if there could be an extra box that lists the amount of water used. McNelly replied it depends on the crop type, and that information is not available. Turzinski stated it depends on the weather, the time of the year you plant, and when it is matured. R. Burns stated there is no such thing as an average inch on every acre of irrigated farm, every field is different. Zimmerman replied the chart is sort of useless then. McNelly stated it is important to know how land is being used in the County and have some idea of what percent are agricultural acres, and what percent is actually being irrigated.

**Page 24** – Guyant asked why the 2010 figure for "Total Agricultural Irrigation (million gallons/day)" is so different from the trend that appears from 1985-2005. McNelly replied it has a lot to do with the weather, and it is also a 5 year average. McKee asked if the 2015 data will be published. McNelly replied if new data comes out prior to the plan being finished it will be updated. Soik stated the DNR has not sent out the worksheets yet. McNelly replied this is USGS data and it is estimated; the DNR is actual numbers.

**Page 23** – M. Jacowski suggested adding a table that shows the total water discharged down the river by municipalities. McNelly replied that is a good idea. Hinrichs suggested looking into the percentages listed and whether they are municipalities or not, needs clarification. McNelly stated she will look into it.

**Page 26** – M. Jacowski stated Wolf Lake is in the Town of Almond, not Belmont.

**Page 35** – M. Jacowski questioned the title of Table 8. McNelly replied "groundwater" needs to be removed from the title.

**Page 27** – McKee stated arsenic is listed as a minor concern, and asked if there is any evidence of arsenic in Portage County water. Hinrichs suggested stating "arsenic is a minor concern compared to other aquifers in the State." McNelly stated we do not have an issue with arsenic in Portage County, but it is on our watch list, and stated she will reword it.

Hinrichs asked if there is a PH number that could be listed to identify corrosive and soft water. McNelly stated yes, and she will add them.

**Page 28** – McKee suggested using "adhere" to soil instead of "absorb." McNelly agreed.

**Page 31** – R. Burns asked how current the numbers were for open cases for investigations and clean-ups of contaminated soil and/or groundwater, spills, and superfund sites. McNelly replied those numbers are updated frequently. McKee asked the difference between closed case and historic site. McNelly replied she will look into and add it in.

**Page 32** – Hinrichs asked if we could add examples or a table for toxicity levels of pesticides. McNelly suggested the table will be referenced in the appendix.

**Page 33** – M. Jacowski stated atrazine is listed as the most common pesticide in Portage County, and stated that is old data. McKee suggested using "historically." McNelly agreed. McNelly stated it is still being detected in

wells; therefore it is not gone. Turzinski suggested saying the current use is declining, but we are still dealing with the historical problems.

Zimmerman asked if there are any pesticides that are not listed on the table. McNelly replied the table shown is only the 10 most common pesticide active ingredients that were sold in Portage County in 2009. There is a much larger table that includes a lot more pesticides, and that entire table will be appended to the document that way people can reference it if they want. Hinrichs asked if there are records of pesticides used. McNelly replied not that we have access to; it is private information.

**Page 35** – M. Jacowski stated the term “sludge” is no longer used, and it should be “biosolids.” Turzinski stated biosolids are treated; it is cleaner and more environmentally safe.

McNelly stated she would like to post this working document on our website for the public to see and to do that she would need Committee approval.

McKee moved to approve the drafted Groundwater Management Plan, Section 5.2 pages 1 through 36; seconded by Guyant. Motion carried by voice vote, with Kiedrowski voting nay.

### **7. DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE GCAC BYLAWS:**

McNelly stated with the addition of Pine Grove’s two members, which maxes out the number of elected officials allowed on the Committee. B. Jacowski suggested allowing for a case-by-case situation in case a town/village cannot find someone other than an elected official. Zimmerman stated there must be a reason why only 20% of the Committee can be elected officials. B. Jacowski replied one reason was so elected officials do not get 2 votes; one at the town/village level, and one at GCAC. McNelly stated GCAC is supposed to be reflected as a “citizen” committee to have a wider representation outside of elected officials. R. Burns stated if this becomes a problem the Committee can go to the 6 communities that have elected officials and see if they can find someone else. McKee stated it used to be 15%, and we were not filling open positions so it was changed. E. Burns stated it can be readdressed if it becomes a problem.

E. Burns asked if we need to add an allotted time for a member of the public to speak. M. Jacowski stated any public comment is under the rule of the chair per Robert’s Rules of Order.

R. Burns motioned to approve the GCAC Bylaws as presented; seconded by McKee. Motion carried by voice vote.

### **8. DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE RESOLUTION FOR WASTEFUL USE OF GROUNDWATER BY PORTAGE COUNTY ENTITIES:**

McNelly stated the resolution went to County Board and it was referred back to the Ag/Extension Committee. M. Jacowski stated the County Executive lists groundwater as a top priority, but the County itself is wasting water by water medians, flowerbeds, lawns, etc. The stormwater retention ponds are lined with impervious liners which do not allow water to filtrate through them. That water is then pumped into the air so water evaporates instead of going back to the recharge area, and if it is a dry period we take groundwater and pump it back into the pond for esthetic purposes. If we are concerned with groundwater we need to take action and the County needs to lead by example. M. Jacowski asked GCAC members to share their input on this situation. McNelly stated there are more details about the retention pond that should be discussed with someone that designs them. They are not completely lined to the top with a liner, and there are reasons they are aerated beyond aesthetic reasons; it is to reduce algae growth and blooms. M. Jacowski stated there are alternative options to aerating. E. Burns agreed that we need more information on retention ponds. McNelly asked about putting this into the plan versus a resolution. M. Jacowski stated we can add it to the plan, but feels it needs to be in a resolution as well; too many plans sit, and are not used. Fritsch stated Crossroad Commons retention ponds are lined to a certain point, because the depth to groundwater is not very deep so when stormwater runs in, it is percolating through the soil to clean itself before it enters the groundwater. Fritsch stated the Town of Plovers standpoint has always been to keep stormwater on site and not to pump it elsewhere. Hinrichs asked how it is regulated; is there written direction for new businesses. Fritsch replied yes, there are certain calculations that have to be maintained on site. B. Jacowski asked why they are lined 1 foot from the top. Fritsch stated if the groundwater was 10 feet below the surface and you dig a hole 9 feet deep and allow stormwater to run into your pond you only have 1 foot of filtration before it enters the groundwater. Soik stated the liner catches impurities. Fritsch stated the area is designed near the discharge pipe which allows you to clean them when needed.

Walker asked M. Jacowski about the retention ponds being replenished by pumping groundwater into them. M. Jacowski stated the retention ponds in the Portage County Business Park are being refilled with groundwater for aesthetic purposes. B. Jacowski stated we as a County cannot control anything by State Statute, but the groundwater we use as a County can be. E. Burns stated it is a good idea for the County to lead by example. McKee suggested GCAC not make a motion on this particular resolution in case there are changes as it was brought back to the Ag/Ext. Committee for further discussion. M. Jacowski asked if any members would like to make any comments to please contact him. E. Burn asked how the Committee should express their support. McNelly replied we can express it through a memo, and asked GCAC members what they would like it to say. Mallek suggested using the last sentence of the resolution. Warzynski stated we need to add that the County needs to lead by example. E. Burns suggested rewording and stating as "taking conservative actions" to eliminate confusion. Mallek suggested the memo stated "Conservation of groundwater in Portage County is essential for viability and economic growth. As a Committee we promote any area in Portage County and other local units of governments can eliminate wasteful use of groundwater. Portage County should take immediate action to curtail all unnecessary use of groundwater by all entities under Portage County control." GCAC agreed.

**9. MEMBERS REPORT:**

None

**10. NEXT MEETING DATE:**

The next meeting date is tentatively set for Thursday, January 21, 2016 at 7 p.m., location to be determined.

**11. ADJOURNMENT:**

McKee moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by R. Burns. Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Amy Goffin, Recording Secretary

Ed Burns, Chair

2/25/2016