

**INDIAN WELLS VALLEY  
GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY  
POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

**Indian Wells Valley Water District  
500 W. Ridgecrest Blvd.  
Ridgecrest, CA 93555  
Thursday March 7, 2019 6:00PM**

**Members Present:**

Ed Imsand, Patricia Quist, Tim Carroll, Nick Panzer, Renee Westa-Lusk, West Katzenstein, Lyle Fisher, Judie Decker, Raj Jonnalagadda, Don Zdeba, John Kersey, David Janiec, Josh Nugent,

**Members Absent:**

James Mower, Lorelei Oviatt, Ryan Klausch

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson David Janiec at 6:01 p.m. Chairperson David Janiec led the pledge of allegiance. A quorum of 11 voting members present was established after roll call was taken by Renee Westa-Lusk. A quorum is 7 out of 12 voting members when all appointments are filled.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1.The Chairperson David Janiec stated the requirement that Form 700 must be filled out by each Member of the PAC by April 2, 2019. Three PAC Members still need to turn in their Form 700. He reminded PAC Members that Ethics Training is required every 2 years.

2.David Janiece reminded PAC Members to turn their microphones on and speak into them so everyone can hear and that it gets recorded on the audio system. Turn microphone off when not speaking, green light on, green light off.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

The Chairperson David Janiec called for the public to address the Committee about matters NOT on the agenda. No action could be taken on non-agenda items unless authorized by law. Comments are limited to three minutes per person.

Lee Knudtson (Member of Public represents WellIntel Co.) announced he has 10 monitoring systems to be installed on shallow wells in the IWV. He expects to get results in 2 months. Most will be bringing forth new well registrations.

**3. REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES FOR JANUARY 3, 2019**

A motion made by Nick Panzer and seconded by Judie Decker to approve the January 3, 2019 minutes passed..

Passed 11 ayes: Imsand, Quist, Carroll, Panzer, Westa-Lusk, Katzenstein, Fisher, Decker, Jonnalagadda, Janiec, Nugent  
0 nays 0 abstentions

Chairperson David Janiec stated the minutes for February 7, 2019 are not available yet..

#### **4. REVIEW AND APPROVE PAC AD-HOC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR DOMESTIC/DEMINIMIS WELL OWNER OUTREACH BY THE IWVGA (please refer to audio recording of March 7, 2019 PAC meeting at [iwvga.org](http://iwvga.org)) 6:20 Part 1 audio**

West Katzenstein explained this is a revised document, given several recommendations proposed by Attorney Hoffman, meant to be “soft document” not to sound too lawyerly, recommendations from PAC to the GA only, emphasis was on voluntary registration not on a mandate. Added a closing comment. Did not put a list of specific suggestions because thought those are best put in the minutes and in the reports of the PAC to the GA.

#### **PAC MEMBER COMMENTS**

Chairperson David Janiec applauded the Ad-Hoc Committee on drafting this outreach document to explain to the GA how they need to approach domestic/deminimis well owners in order to get the well owners cooperation to voluntarily register their wells. He said he had 2 changes to recommend. The first change involves the benefit that shallow well info will be used for sustainability criteria in the modeling to develop the GSP because the GSP includes the shallow well mitigation plan. There are 2 benefits the shallow well data will provide: 1) it will lead to the development of a more accurate model and determining key criteria on which shallow wells are affected and 2) provide data for potential mitigation grants to well owners. He proposed to insert language that will include the well owner data to be part of the criteria used to determine sustainability. Sustainability is part of the model.

West Katzenstein asked “we should expect minimum thresholds to be developed as part of the GSP plan?”

Chairperson David Janiec yes, that is what the TAC has said is in the plan. This would motivate me if I ever drilled a well in Kern on my land to register my well.

West Katzenstein we tried to emphasize funding to help solve your well problems and your second point is this would be key to data in establishing minimum thresholds.

The Chairperson then made the recommendation to: 1) insert an additional point on page 2 under the list of benefits for deminimis well registration between items 3 and 4 that states “key data from shallow wells is needed in order to develop the model and criteria for establishing minimum thresholds”. This data will then be used to determine sustainability. He then also recommended: **2) to add “outreach effort” after “well registration” at end of the last sentence of first paragraph on page 1 under OBJECTIVES.**

Judie Decker you specifically said you want criteria for minimum thresholds, yet Mr. Markman has stated that under adjudications the issue “minimum thresholds” have not been considered or were considered and have been dismissed.

Chairperson David Janiec responded that may be, there is a section in the GSP that addresses this specifically. It is being used in the modeling and in the stated criteria the TAC is using to recommend as a criteria for consideration in establishing “minimum thresholds” There is a recognition in the mitigation plan for shallow wells that are going dry or losing quality.

West Katzenstein (Member of Ad-Hoc Committee) said he will put together a sentence to address minimum thresholds adding another item between 3 and 4 on page 2 which will become the new No. 4. Quickly he came up with the statement “Registration will provide critical data on your well to update the model and establish minimum threshold criteria”.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Derek Hoffman (Member of Public Attorney for Meadowbrook Dairy) thanked the Ad hoc committee for their work. He then offered rewording of the statement West Katzenstein had proposed as follows: “Registering your well will provide information necessary to inform or develop sustainable management criteria for the plan”.

### **PAC MEMBERS RESPOND**

West Katzenstein, John Kersey, Lyle Fisher, Judy Decker commented.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Peggy Breeden (Member of Public) suggested rewording to item No.3 page 2 “to provide grants **as available** to well owners whose wells are damaged by lowering of water levels and declining water quality.”

### **PAC MEMBERS RESPOND**

West Katzenstein, Judie Decker, David Janiec

Josh Nugent asked that a word be changed in No. 3 on page 2 to change from “provide grants” to “**pursue grants**” .

Josh Nugent proposed the following wording of the new No. 4 on page 2: “**Registration will provide data vitally important for developing sustainable management criteria.**”

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Elaine Mead (Member of Public) has a problem with the “Domestic Well Background” paragraph on page 1. She wanted clarification on causes of “failures of deminimis wells” as there are many other reasons other than water level that can contribute to a well failure. In addition she requested that the last sentence of the paragraph starting with “Ongoing failures” to be unbolded. The statement was too speculative in predicting the consequences of deminimis well failures. She thinks the statement makes the consequences of independent wells failing is much worse than it actually is.

### **PAC MEMBERS RESPONSE**

David Janiec, Lyle Fisher, Raj Jonnalagadda, Judie Decker, West Katzenstein Raj Jonnalagadda all agreed the paragraph needed to stay in. Some offered to change a word or two in the paragraph of the last sentence “would” to “could”. Judie Decker stated the domestic/shallow wells are the canary in the coal mine if all the shallow wells go dry this valley is in big trouble. Renee Westa-Lusk asked that the last sentence in the paragraph remain bolded in light of the fact that at the TAC meeting earlier in the day it was stated this valley has 872 shallow wells (out of 960 known total wells (shallow and deep) ). Renee stated that if a huge number of these shallow wells go dry then this valley is in trouble. West Katzenstein stated the shallow wells are the canary if we protect the shallow domestic wells the whole valley is protected to a point, it should remain bolded.

### **Amendments and acceptance of Ad hoc Committee recommendation for and Benefits of Voluntary Registration of De Minimis Wells**

A motion by West Katzenstein and seconded by Lyle Fisher to accept the following amendments to the Recommendations for and Benefits of Voluntary Registration of De Minimis Wells document:

1) Add to end of last sentence page 1 first paragraph entitled “OBJECTIVES” as follows: **“and outreach efforts”** after “well registration”.

2) refer to page 1 paragraph on Domestic Well Background 2nd sentence change to read as follows: “The Domestic Well Owners Association is aware of **ongoing** failures of de minimis wells that have occurred due to the constant decline in groundwater levels or brackish water intrusion.”

3 )refer to page 1 paragraph on Domestic Well Background: 3 rd sentence change to read as follows: **Failures of de minimis wells would likely have a significant negative effect on the local economy, including but not limited to the value of real property, quality of life, economic growth, and the continued presence of the Navy.**

4) Add new No. 4 on page 2 (insert between no. 3 and current no. 4) the following: **“Registration will provide data vitally important to developing sustainable management criteria.”**

Passed 11 ayes: Imsand, Quist, Carroll, Panzer, Westa-Lusk, Katzenstein, Fisher, Decker, Jonnalagadda, Janiec, Nugent

0 naves

0 abstentions

## **5.ALLOCATION STATUS REVIEW AND UPDATE**

(please refer to audio recording of March 7, 2019 PAC meeting at [iwvga.org](http://iwvga.org))

**5A.Review of Individual submitted comments from allocation discussion during February 7, 2019 PAC meeting.**

(please refer to audio recording of February 7, 2019 PAC meeting at [iwvga.org](http://iwvga.org))

**PLEASE REFER TO THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ( 9 PAGES):**

**1 PAGE MEMO ADDRESSED TO PAC MEMBERS FROM NICK PANZER SUBJECT: 7 March 2019 PAC Meeting Agenda Item 5. a. February Allocation Discussion. THIS MEMO DESCRIBES NICK'S RECAP OF MR. MARKMAN'S RESPONSE TO HIS JAN 15 QUESTION ON REASONABLE USE AND HEALTH AND SAFETY**

**2 PAGES FROM NICK PANZER JAN 15, 2019 QUESTION TO MR. MARKMAN**

**1 PAGE LETTER (no date) RESPONSE FROM MR. MARKMAN RESPONDING TO NICK PANZER'S 2 PAGE LETTER OF NICK'S JAN 15 QUESTION**

**3 PAGE LETTER (Dated 2-25-19) FROM NICK PANZER TO MR. MARKMAN DISCUSSING AND POSING QUESTIONS ON MR. MARKMAN'S FEB. 4, 2019 REPORT FROM THE JANUARY 11, 2019 ATTORNEYS' MEETING**

**2 PAGE MEMORANDUM TO IWVGA (Dated 2-13-2019) FROM NICK PANZER DISCUSSING THE NON-FEASIBILITY OF WATER IMPORTATION TO IWV**

Mr. Panzer was the only PAC Member to submit comment at this time on the allocation discussion from the February PAC meeting.

**5.B. Update Report and any assignment from Mr. Markman resulting from the 15 February Attorney meeting.**

**(please refer to audio recording of March 7, 2019 PAC meeting at iwvga.org)**

**PLEASE REFER TO THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ( 4 PAGES)**

**1 PAGE MEMO ADDRESSED TO PAC MEMBERS FROM NICK PANZER SUBJECT: 7 March 2019 PAC Meeting Agenda Item 5. b. Comments on Mr. Markman's February 28, 2019 Report on the February 15, 2019 Attorney Allocation Plan Meeting. THIS MEMO LISTS QUESTIONS NICK HAD ON THE DISCUSSION WHICH INCLUDED THE FOLLOWING: 1) Who claims to speak exclusively for underlying residential rate payers?, 2) What transfer price was used in the model run, and how was that price determined?, 3) What would project development include? Just planning, or full build-out cost?, and 4) Who are the negotiating parties and who among them claims to exclusively represent 31,000 plus residential rate payers (as opposed to the three pumpers that sell water to those rate payers)?**

**3 PAGE SUMMARY FROM MR. MARKMAN DESCRIBING THE DISCUSSION AT THE FEBRUARY 15, 2019 ATTORNEY ALLOCATION PLAN MEETING.**

**A Stetson Engineering presentation of three model run was shown followed by a discussion and presentations by 3 negotiating parties. Some assumptions made by the negotiating parties: 1) beginning assumed total production at 31,00 AF per year, 2) a 5 to 10 year period before commencing rampdown, and 3) a variable required annual rampdown percentages depending on the party ramping down.**

There were no assignments given to the PAC by Mr. Markman.

Chairperson David Janiec stated there is now a tie between what is happening at the TAC and the attorneys' meetings and what is happening at the PAC. There are framework options for 2 more future model runs. Attempt to do this without litigation it may or may not be possible.

**PAC MEMBER COMMENTS**

West Katzenstein Mr. Markman is proceeding as if the only rights that apply are the historic pre-existing water rights before SGMA was signed. He asked if SGMA provides any additional powers or authorities to the GA beyond pre-existing water rights? It would make sense to have Mr. Markman or someone give a briefing to us or the GA on exactly what he sees as the legal framework that exists now in place after SGMA for deciding for allocating water. Is it strictly pre-existing water rights? Are there other considerations that have equal legal bearing? What is the legal deck of cards now or is there anything else beyond or just the pre-existing water rights?

Chairperson David Janiec stated there are options including reasonable use one as Lorelei alluded to that may or may not be put on the table in other places. The question is that begs litigation would there in effect be litigation? He is exploring the bounds of this group in exploring the limits of SGMA.

West Katzenstein want to be sure what is happening with Markman does not become the plan.

What are the powers the GA has? If there are additional legal options available as a result of SGMA, it would be nice to know what are they? What points can we make if we are part of the dialogue? What kinds of legal foundations we might have to lean on if we are part of the dialogue?

Don Zdeba responded he does know the meetings are not going in one direction.

West Katzenstein said you can find all kinds of language in SGMA and the constitution about other water rights and authorities other than pre-existing groundwater law. Mr. Markman is basing his whole dialogue on who has pre-existing water rights and trying to make an agreement on what they might be so they can divide up the safe yield. My question is I would like a briefing on the overall legal spectrum that exists now since SGMA.

Don Zdeba Mr. Markman's approach is to avoid litigation. Obviously there are other approaches that could or would end up in litigation.

Chairperson David Janiec Mr. Markman is trying to find boundaries of it. It not just pre-existing water rights it is all the case law. Trying to find out how far can push to avoid litigation is going to be balanced against options which might result in litigation. Any public group when they are having legal negotiation discussions that's part of the three areas even under the Brown Act are allowed to be confidential discussions. We are free to bring in alternatives to those meetings. Mr. Markman is representing the GA and so he is not going to give away what the GA's negotiating position is.

West Katzenstein asked are there more legal strengths or weaknesses that an argument might have? If someone could we give us a briefing on full legal basis for litigation or no litigation since SGMA, is anything changed or is it strictly just pre-existing water law or pre-existing cases? Are there additional legal options as a result of SGMA we would like to know what they are?

Chairperson David Janiec replied we can certainly ask him that question and I would put it in the Board's comments to ask is that available or are the referred briefings he has had for us twice has that been discovered as one of components to talk about? I suggest we ask that question if we are all in agreement. I will capture that as a question in writing and I will forward to him.

Renee Westa-Lusk asked at the TAC meeting today there was talk of doing additional alternative model scenarios are those going to be considered by Mr. Markman, any of the future scenarios?

Chairperson David Janiec said lawyers proposed other scenarios run by TAC will be considered by Mr. Markman. Yes, there is a recognition that there is a tight loop canal between the data available and analyzed, the model runs the scenarios the policy side and the TAC, the GA, the attorneys, the Chair of TAC Adam Bingham, myself, General Manager Don Zdeba, the WRM Steve Johnson have all agreed there is a iteration of coordination required here.

**PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE**

## **6. REVIEW POAM ITEM No. 35 (HYDROGEOLOGIC CONCEPTUAL MODEL (HCM)) AND No. 49 (BASELINE AND MANAGEMENT ACTION RESULTS) AS TASKED IN POAM**

**a) please refer to 14 page hand out: Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Model March 7, 2019 PAC Meeting**

**b) please refer to audio recording of March 7, 2019 PAC meeting at [iwvga.org](http://iwvga.org)**  
**POAM ITEM NO. 35 and NO. 49**

Jean Moran of Stetson Engineering presented the following:

Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model (HCM)

Historical Calibration Water Budget

2020-2070 Baseline (No Action) Model Run (for 50 years out)

TDS (Total Dissolved Solids) Baseline (No Action) Model Run (no change in pumping)

Predictive Management Scenarios

Next Steps

**(Please refer to end of part 2 and the the first half of part 3 audio recording of meeting)**

### **Conceptual Model and Water Budget Components**

**Baseline is purposely a no action and the worst scenario because there is no management action.**

**Average recharge is 7,650 AFY (over many years)**

### **PAC MEMBER QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

Raj Jonnalagadda asked if he could receive a copy of all assumptions made in developing the initial model. Assumptions around geological, mathematical, sample size, air bays, number of monitoring wells, calculations on monitoring wells, hydraulic level drops per year etc. I would like a full list of assumptions of the scenarios. Who is helping coming up with the assumptions and what is it based on? I would also need operational definitions from a technical standpoint. Hydraulic levels assuming it is the level of the surface of the water to the base of the aquifer? Is that correct? He was referring to the drop in hydraulic levels of 68 to 70 feet over 95 years which translates to .032% drop in hydraulic levels per year. The reason for asking for this data of assumptions is that it is the backbone of the model and sometimes you can make a model do what you want it to do. He said he would like to sit down with Adam Bingham (Chair of the TAC) because he works with his group and he could go over the data with him.

Jean Moran stated Desert Research Institute (DRI) did put together a model report. We will ask DRI to make a copy available to you. She commented to Raj “you should have been in the TAC”.

Raj Jonnalagadda stated the PAC should have a good understanding of the assumptions because I want us to be well informed as we go ahead. He then asked questions about the TDS variance from comparing the east and west sides of the basin.

Renee Westa-Lusk I have a question on the 2 kinds of imported water and can you expand on surface water spreading and what that involves?

Jeff Helsley of Stetson Engineering explained 2 possible sources of imported water. One source could be coming from LADWP through a water exchange and the water would be stored in a set of percolation ponds next to the airport. The second source of water could be to buy exchange treated water (ready to use) from AVEK (Antelope Valley East Kern Agency) the water would need to be piped up to the Indian Wells Valley from California City for IWVWD and SVM.

Raj Jonnalagadda thanked Jean Moran for all her work and that he appreciated it. He explained he needed to know the basic assumptions to make sure he passes on the correct information.

West Katzenstein stated you are looking for other scenarios to run the model on. The GSP may require 2 plans. The models you have chosen so far to run are based on having imported water. SGMA does say if you use imported water you must show DWR where the imported water is coming from and the viability. By the time the GSP is due you may not have imported water lined up yet. The GSP may end up being a two phased plan waiting to line up imported water. He suggested to run a worst case scenario of not assuming having imported water. We may get our GSP plan rejected because we do not have a viable source of imported water. He suggested running a model without imported water because it may be required for the GSP.

Jean Moran responded the Model Ad hoc TAC committee is discussing this.

Jeff Helsley said this thought has come up in a lot of different places not just the TAC. It is interesting and eye opening to look at those numbers.

Chairperson David Janiec stated it is the precise reason we had an Ad hoc subcommittee to GA that has selected a water marketer to address the urgency. They are rewriting the statement of work to include questions brought up at the last GA meeting.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Earl Wilson (Member of Public) pointed out errors on page 12 of the hand out for the presentation change Mutuals are 10%, Agriculture is 40%. This is the wettest year in ages, we will have wet water for sale, we need to encourage the GA to move forward on imported water.

Chairperson David Janiec stated he knows LADWP has already released water in Mono County like they did in 2017. When we have it too wet we won't have capacity to store it.

Derek Hoffman (Attorney for Meadowbrook Dairy, Member of Public) a question raised about referring to imported water in the GSP when do not have infrastructure for that yet. Comments made that the GSP will be rejected by DWR for that reason. GSP is a plan to be implemented for over 20 years of time. For the benefit of the PAC referring to the Code of Regulations 354.4 4 it is averting to what the plan includes. It says each plan shall include a description of projects and management actions that include the following: B.6. says an explanation of how the projects or management actions will be accomplished. If the project or management actions rely on water outside the jurisdiction of the GA then an explanation shall be included about the source and reliability of that water. We don't have to have everything solved on day 1, but we are talking about making a plan for projects and management actions to be implemented.

Chairperson David Janiec commented.

Tim Parker (Consultant for the IWVWD, Member of Public) about DWP releasing water, looking at recharging, it would be really useful to get some instrumentation out there and do some measurements before they release. Don't know where you would go or who you would talk to LADWP. A technical suggestion but it has to have leadership to do that.

Chairperson David Janiec commented.

## **7. SHALLOW WELL IMPACTS ANALYSIS**

- a) please refer to 3 page hand out entitled: Simulated Future Shallow Well Impact Analysis**
- b) please refer to audio recording of March 7, 2019 PAC meeting at [iwvga.org](http://iwvga.org)**

Jean Moran of Stetson Engineering explained simulated groundwater levels have been predicted at the end of 5 year increments. They look at change of groundwater levels dropping. Looking at change of groundwater level per year for each of the 5 year periods. GIS looks at average change per acre. What shallow well impacts have been based on is the estimated drill dates and construction of a shallow well and the simulated groundwater levels change over time. Updated analysis on 872 wells. She explained they are lacking data on most of the shallow wells. They have well permits data. They have identified 872 wells 377 of them are domestic wells, 455 of them are other private wells and 40 are mutuals. 455 wells we know nothing about. We assume a certain drill date. 40 mutuals they have data on. They know of 938 production wells(on map) total in the valley 66 are large production wells. Summarizing the 872 shallow wells there are 832 Domestic/Private wells and 40 Mutuals.

Jean Moran pointed out differences in scenario no. 1 model draw down and scenario no. 2 model draw down. Scenario no. 1 ramp down would occur over the first 20 years, less pumping in the Northwest part of the basin and more pumping in the southeast part of the basin. Scenario no. 2 there would be direct use of imported water with no southeast draw down and with continued pumping in the northwest. She announced the Model Ad hoc committee of the TAC would be meeting next week.

#### **PAC MEMBER COMMENTS**

Raj Jonnalagadda pointed the years listed on the handout should read 2020-2070(not2020-2017)

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Don Decker (Member of Public) the red area from his perspective scenario no. 1 wipes out every shallow well in the basin.

#### **8. GSP REPORT UPDATE**

Jeff Helsley posted on a power point a schedule for all the chapters of the GSP.

Jeff Helsley stated chapter on robotics chapter 1 revisions done by next week and chapter 2 on plan area will be revised this week. All draft chapters are out for review by June 2019. The first draft of the GSP will be out in August. End of August the 90 day public review process will begin. He reported the imported water study will be out in the next 2 weeks. Stetson will be distributing chapters directly to the PAC and TAC members.

#### **PAC MEMBER COMMENTS**

John Kersey stated if one date of completing the GSP shift to the right we will be working on this through December 2019. How are you going to make your deadline?

Raj Jonnalagadda stated the most critical sections are 4,5, 6 which are a lot of work. A lot of work for those making comments. I think you have crammed a lot into the month of June.

Renee Westa-Lusk how will we get the chapters to the GSP?

#### **9. REVIEW AND DISCUSS INDIVIDUAL SUBMITTED COMMENTS ON GSP DRAFT CHAPTER AND NEXT UPDATE VERSION, IF AVAILABLE**

( please refer to audio recording of March 7, 2019 PAC meeting at [iwvga.org](http://iwvga.org))

**Comments submitted: NONE**

#### **10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (APRIL 4, 2019 PAC)**

Chairperson David Janiec named the following items to be on the next agenda: allocation status review and update, draft GSP chapter 2 review and update, review POAM item no. 49 progress as tasked in POAM and looking over Communication and Engagement Plan, imported water report update.

Judie Decker stated the GA Board needs direction on how: to communicate, plan an approach, to communicate in other ways without cost to the GA.

West Katzenstein said the GA should post a status report or newsletter

Chairperson David Janiec said he will put West Katzenstein's idea along with C&E Plan on agenda for next month.

Lyle Fisher stated some people find it too hard to keep up with the GA.

Renee Westa-Lusk asked that a policy on how to pay for imported water be put on the agenda. This task was given to the PAC by WRM Steve Johnson at the January 3, 2019 PAC meeting.

## **11. FUTURE PAC MEETING DATES: APRIL 4, 2019, May 2, 2019, June 6, 2019**

## **12. MEMBER COMMENTS**

**( please refer to audio recording of March 7, 2019 PAC meeting at [iwvga.org](http://iwvga.org))**

Ed Imsand is helping maintain the Sand Canyon stream gauges and just sent in data to Tom Hasselbacher.

Pat Quist said because of the snow melting soon we should invite LADWP to dump their excess water here. She said last time LADWP dumped water here one farmer claimed his well level increased by 2 feet in height. A study was done in the 1990's that did flood control monitors in gullies near here that monitored wells. Is it possible to dig up the old study? It would be helpful to know how much yield could be counted on in the aquifer when there is excess water run off from wet years.

Don Zdeba announced the results of the Danish study Skytem is set for Wednesday March 20 at 10AM.

Chairperson David Janiec reminded there are 2 Members that need to get their form 700 in. The Ethics Training is coming up and only good for 2 years, PAC Members will need to retake the training again this year. He thanked Jean Moran and Jeff Helsley of Stetson Engineering for coming to the PAC meeting and presenting to the PAC. David also announced that it might be very likely that the PAC would be asked to meet more often than once a month in the coming months in order to get the GSP completed on time.

## **13. ADJOURN TO APRIL 4, 2019 6PM MEETING**

Hearing no objection the meeting was adjourned at 8:45PM by Chairperson David Janiec

Submitted by

Renee Westa-Lusk appointed minute taker Member of the PAC