

***MINUTES***  
***TECHNICAL COMMITTEE***  
***CAPITAL AREA GROUNDWATER***  
***CONSERVATION DISTRICT***

***April 29, 2021***

---

**I. Call to Order**

The Capital Area Groundwater Conservation District Technical Committee met for a regular meeting at 10:00 a.m. on April 29, 2021 at the Baton Rouge Marriott, Salon I, 5500 Hilton Ave, Baton Rouge, LA. The meeting was called to order by the Technical Committee Chairman, Scott Bergeron.

**II. Roll Call**

The following members were present: Ryan Scardina, Scott Bergeron, Rachel Lambert, Jesse Means III, Dennis McGehee, and William Daniel.

Others attending the meeting included: Gary Beard & Miah Moore, Capital Area Groundwater Conservation District; Alyssa Dausman, The Water Institute; Jason Hewitt, Sustainability Partners; Hunter Odom; Marionneaux Kantrow, LLC; and George Losonsky, Losonsky & Associates.

**III. Establishment of a Quorum**

6 out of 11 members were present. A quorum was established by Scott Bergeron.

**V. Invocation & Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Gary Beard led the invocation and pledge of Allegiance.

## **VI. Recognition of Guests**

Mr. Bergeron opened the floor for guests to come and introduce themselves. George Losonsky introduced himself as a recurring visitor. Dr. Tsai and Dr. Dausman, the Water Institute; also came forward to introduce themselves. James Hudson, Honeywell; Max Lindaman, USGS were also in attendance.

## **VII. Amendments to the Agenda**

Mr. Bergeron asked to amend the agenda to allow Dr. Tsai to speak earlier so that he would be able to leave by 11:30 a.m.

## **VIII. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The following amendments were requested to be made to the minutes of the previous meeting: date adjustment (July to November) and a spelling error (Gaspard to Bergeron). Mr. Jesse Means moved to approve the amendments, there was a second by Rachel Lambert. There were no objections and the motion was approved.

## **IX. Executive Director's Report**

### **Permit Application Reviews, USGS Model**

Mr. Beard presented the committee with the new well permits and asked Max Lindaman to come forward and explain the potential effects of the new wells. Max Lindaman, USGS, came forward to present simulations related to new permit applications. Mr. Lindaman came forward and gave a presentation of the simulation he created to project the effects of the new wells. He expressed concern of saltwater intrusion around the Baton Rouge fault line into the 2400 ft aquifer. Mr. Lindaman gave some geological context to his simulation and informed the committee of the risks (mainly chloride concentration) of each new well. As well, his presentation included a simulation with no additional wells for comparison. Ms. Lambert asked if both wells being proposed for Baton Rouge Water would be located at Foster Rd. Mr. McGehee responded that one is at Foster Rd and the other is at a speculative site on Rainwall St. Ms. Lambert moved to approve the new wells for Baton Rouge Water and the motion was seconded by Jesse Means III. There were no objections so the motion was approved. Mr. Losonsky came forward to ask USGS if we have any profiles showing several wells and their interactions and mutual drawdowns. Mr. Lindaman confirmed. Mr. Beard passed around the Honeywell application and Mr. James Hudson came forward to address the committee.

Mr. Hudson informed the committee that there was an error in the former discussion. He clarified that the well is not additional water supply, but will be an active in line spare for #5 well because they don't currently have the option to switch in between wells. Mr. Hudson further clarified Honeywell's need for this new well and confirmed that this well would be in the 1200 foot sand and will alternate pumpage through different wells. Ms. Lambert motions to approve the Honeywell application. Mr. Bergeron seconded the motion without objection so it was approved. Mr. Beard announced that the applications would be presented to the full board for approval in two weeks.

### **Metering Update**

Mr. Beard reminded the committee that the metering options had been thoroughly vetted and that the most economic and effective option had been decided on.

## **X. Chairman's Report**

### **Flow Metering – Technical Approaches, Alternatives & Demonstration**

Mr. Bergeron asked Dr. Tsai to come forward for discussion on flow metering. Mr. Bergeron asked Dr. Tsai if he would need real time, monthly, daily, etc. data. Dr. Tsai expressed that he is involved in Phase II for the Water Institute and his hopes for the model to be used in future planning purposes. He explained that there are many uncertainties with groundwater, one of the biggest being geology. He went on to say that human pumping is the second largest uncertainty. He explained that our pumping rate will affect the parameters of the model. He expressed how important the metering program will be to decreasing uncertainty in the models. Dr. Tsai responded directly to Mr. Bergeron's inquiry by stating that currently we are using monthly data for the model, but that we need daily pumping data. He went on to say that we need real time observation because rates can change in minutes and that information would be very helpful in understanding impact. Mr. Normand asked how important real time data is for the model and Dr. Tsai clarified that every hour samples would be the best and that the data can be reported daily. Mr. Bergeron asked Dr. Tsai how quickly the data would be needed. Dr. Tsai responded that the data is not urgent. George Losonsky asked Dr. Tsai how the data is worked into the model. Dr. Tsai responded that monthly models are used to predict models within a year and that in the model all of the data is aggregated into a monthly number. Mr. Losonsky followed up asking if it can be useful if the model shows daily fluctuations and Dr. Tsai confirmed. Mr. McGehee asked Dr. Tsai if daily data is more ideal and if hourly is not necessary. Dr. Tsai responded no, and clarified that

monthly models don't mean you record data once a month, and that the discussion is about accuracy. Mr. Joey Normand asked Dr. Tsai to clarify on the process of finding the averages. Mr. Bergeron asked Dr. Tsai how often data is input into the model. Dr. Tsai informed Mr. Normand that the project is long term and they will not be able to produce the model for next year this year.

### **CAGCD Technical Permitting Application Process**

Mr. Bergeron opened discussion on the permitting process asking the committee if the permitting process should be more robust. He suggested incorporating Dr. Tsai's model and USGS data. He asked the committee if they wanted to change the code so that the applications must be submitted 30 days before the next meeting. Mr. Means asked if the board had the ability to deny a permit. Mr. Bergeron replied yes but it is a difficult process that must be based on science. Ms. Lambert said that it would be beneficial to include a description or rationale on the applications and maybe a commitment to abandoning old wells in a certain amount of time if that is the case. Mr. Beard pointed out that the more robust process will come with a cost and suggested an application fee. Ms. Lambert added that unless they're replacing a well, a permit application fee to cover modeling costs is warranted. Mr. McGehee asked how many application the board receives per year to which Mr. Beard responded "5 to 6". Mr. McGehee suggested that the permittee should be required to get with USGS and get modeling done as a part of the presentation/application. Mr. Beard requested that the model be run with USGS for new wells before the meeting in 2 weeks. Mr. Lindaman stated that the simulation is easy to run but that it takes a few days. He expressed that it takes months to go through peer-review, so the product wouldn't be finalized immediately, but they could eventually create a tool that allows a simulation of the impact of wells depending on coordinate location. Mr. Bergeron suggested that the companies go through the board to get their modeling done. Mr. Beard asked if the Capital Area Groundwater Conservation District had the status to charge a fee for an application. Mr. Normand responded that if the board decides the model is important the company would either reimburse the board or the board should require that they have it done themselves. He supported his suggestion with the fact that this is required for drainage, traffic studies, etc. Mr. Hunter Odom, Marionneaux Kantrow weighed in that the district does have the authority to charge the permit fee. The committee continued to discuss the permitting process and additional methods to make it more robust.

## **Interim Plan for Metering & Related**

Ms. Lambert came forward and made a presentation on a metering alternative. The meters were portable and could be used to verify flow rates being submitted by users. She suggested that this alternative was more effective than Sustainability Partners and Gulf States. Mr. Bergeron asked the company representatives to discuss the technology they use and Mr. McGehee explained the system used at Baton Rouge water and confirmed that they've used portable meters for canals or trying to find a leak. Mr. Daniel asked if Sustainability Partners would be able to provide a different technology since they had already done the RFQ. Mr. Beard clarified that Sustainability Partners proposed the same technology that Ms. Lambert brought in. Ms. Lambert suggested that the district needs a scaled down version of what Sustainability Partners was proposing. Mr. Beard clarified that the board received competitive quotes and are using flexim meters. Mr. Daniel asked Ms. Lambert if she had a cost analysis due to her statement that her alternative would be a quarter of the costs. Ms. Lambert stated that she did not have a cost analysis but that she did have some notes in her notebook. The committee continued to discuss the alternative presented by Ms. Lambert. Mr. Daniel clarified that the board has options to modify the proposal from Sustainability Partners. The committee decided to transition to the administrative meeting as the topic began to bleed into the agenda of the administrative committee.

## **XI. Commissioner Comments**

Mr. Bergeron did not have any comments.

## **XVII. Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

## **XVIII. Adjournment**

There was a motion to adjourn by Mr. Scardina, seconded by Ms. Lambert. There was no objection. The meeting adjourned.



---

GARY J. BEARD, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR