PRIVATE WATER ADVISORY COUNCIL
DNR Service Center - Fitchburg
Meeting Notes – October 25, 2023

1. **Introductions**
Council Member Attendees: Bob Aune, Pete Chase, Tim Jenks, Dennis Crow, Terry Marshall, Rick Peterson, Steve Tesmer, Bruce Walker

Other Attendees: Stacy Steinke (DNR), Frank Fetter (DNR), Bob Gundrum (DNR)

2. **WGNHS Updates (Pete Chase)**
- New Director and State Geologist Doctor Sue Swanson – appointed about three months ago.
- 25 WGNHS staff members currently, 10 of which are support staff
- Field projects underway -
    i. Depth to bedrock mapping -
        1. Confidence levels designated for points on the maps based on well log data
        2. Important to depth to bedrock and manure spreading rate data.
    ii. Surficial deposit mapping – used with depth to bedrock data to establish groundwater susceptibility data.
    iii. Groundwater studies – state monitoring wells,
        1. Study on well construction and likelihood of bacteria and/or nitrate contamination
        2. Manure spreading – monthly monitoring in door county, virus study suspended temporarily due to funding
        3. Central Sands – sampling streams for pesticides and nitrates
        4. Bayfield Artesian well study has recently been completed. Taking inventory on wells to place restrictions on bottling and use for drinking water.
        5. PFAS project – French Island and homeowner treatment systems and seeking new source of water to provide to the area.
        6. Hydrogeology of the Nicolet Nat. Forest – Bend ore deposits and effect on background groundwater quality.
    iv. USGS standardizing color schemes for different geologic formations on maps. Scheme to be consistent from one county to the next and state-to-state.
    v. Groundwater-Level monitoring network measuring head at different aquifers around the state.
        1. Data used by DNR for high capacity well permitting and variety of other applications.
        2. History 1934-2016 – goals established 1937, precipitation and groundwater relationship, also extent of fluctuation in groundwater levels relative to stream flow and lake levels.
        3. Up to 250 wells at one point, now around 100 wells
        4. Funded primarily through USGS – new funding provided for new wells at various locations across the state.
        5. Future proposal for well evaluation, repair and replacement.
- Elevated nitrate levels in groundwater attributed more to use of commercial fertilizer than manure spreading.
- Effectiveness of digesters on reducing potential impacts of manure spreading on groundwater quality. Digesters effective at reducing bacteria load.

3. **DNR Updates**
    a. **Planned updates on approvals needed for properties with residual contamination or continuing obligation (Steinke)**
        i. **Well Driller Viewer updates**
            1. Viewer to be updated – moving to new platform that may provide more functionality to the viewer.
            2. Viewer will look and feel different, but functionality will be same
            3. Soliciting ideas on improvements that might be added with this move.
                a. Rollout anticipated for January – may be later.
                b. If green or blue dot exists, driller needs to submit application to DNR to drill on that property. Will allow DNR to assess potential issues with locating a well there.
                c. Off site properties (neighboring property) also to require application when know contamination exists.
                d. New icons on viewer to indicate continuing obligations on the property. Circle - Property owner has continuing obligations and impact to neighboring property groundwater quality is possible. Tan square indicates offsite properties are impacted. Contact DNR specialist if drilling near this location.
                e. New application and fact sheet being prepared. Fact sheet to provide clear explanation of icons and required process.
                f. Possible situations include blue dot/open sites (investigation ongoing) and green dot/closed sites (cleanup has occurred).
                g. Form no longer referred to as "GIS Registry" form. Now referred to as Groundwater Contamination and/or Continuing Obligations form.
                h. Will be a slow roll out to the industry with more to be provided at tradeshow in January. Still waiting for approval from Secretaries office. This will determine what will be shared at the tradeshow in January.
                i. Marshall commented that there are drillers who do not use the viewer. Steinke commented that the intention is to go to an internal notification system that will require the driller to drop a point on the map at the location of the proposed well. The process will alert the driller if further steps are required before drilling the well at that location. This will be available when the notification is purchased and will eliminate the need to refer to the well driller viewer.
                j. Marshall: How are you handling the current NONs? Are you contacting the driller first or does it go to the property owner? Steinke said the NONs go to both the driller and the property owner.
                k. Chase commented that offsite contamination letters are certified mail delivered but not connected to the deed of the property. They were just notification letters. Steinke: It is possible for property to transfer without full disclosure of the offsite contamination.
        ii. **Off-site contaminated properties**
                a. Rollout anticipated for January – may be later.
                b. If green or blue dot exists, driller needs to submit application to DNR to drill on that property. Will allow DNR to assess potential issues with locating a well there.
                c. Offsite properties (neighboring property) also to require application when know contamination exists.

d. New icons on viewer to indicate continuing obligations on the property. Circle - Property owner has continuing obligations and impact to neighboring property groundwater quality is possible. Tan square indicates offsite properties are impacted. Contact DNR specialist if drilling near this location.
e. New application and fact sheet being prepared. Fact sheet to provide clear explanation of icons and required process.
f. Possible situations include blue dot/open sites (investigation ongoing) and green dot/closed sites (cleanup has occurred).
g. Form no longer referred to as "GIS Registry" form. Now referred to as Groundwater Contamination and/or Continuing Obligations form.
h. Will be a slow roll out to the industry with more to be provided at tradeshow in January. Still waiting for approval from Secretaries office. This will determine what will be shared at the tradeshow in January.
i. Marshall commented that there are drillers who do not use the viewer. Steinke commented that the intention is to go to an internal notification system that will require the driller to drop a point on the map at the location of the proposed well. The process will alert the driller if further steps are required before drilling the well at that location. This will be available when the notification is purchased and will eliminate the need to refer to the well driller viewer.
j. Marshall: How are you handling the current NONs? Are you contacting the driller first or does it go to the property owner? Steinke said the NONs go to both the driller and the property owner.
k. Chase commented that offsite contamination letters are certified mail delivered but not connected to the deed of the property. They were just notification letters. Steinke: It is possible for property to transfer without full disclosure of the offsite contamination.

b. Warden access to notification data – more contacts, specifically evening and weekend (Steinke)

i. Wardens are requesting access to well notifications.
ii. Wardens might cover times when field specialist is not available in the field such as evening and weekends. When they see a drilling rig onsite, they can confirm whether notification is on file and contact Private Water if not.

c. Staffing Updates (Nessman/Steinke)

i. Nessman not attending due to COVID. Fetter provided staffing update.
1. Backlog of WCRs and WARs has been processed with assistance of LTEs
a. Kelsie Fuhrman has taken a new position with RR. There are no plans to replace her.
b. Sophia Ziehr has moved to half time
c. Sara Fry is now assisting Aaron Kent with landfill variances

d. Compliance and Enforcement activities (Steinke/Fetter)

i. We should be on track in 2023 to match 2022 notifications. We are on track to match inspections from last year.
ii. Landfill variance numbers remain high for 2023.
iii. ARPA Well Compensation Grants – Steinke
1. All awards must be allocated by the end of 2024 and must be spent by the end of 2026.

2. There has been an increase in the number of applicants over the past 2 months. All those who are potential candidates should get applications in as soon as possible.
3. Award money will likely run out next summer.
4. October of next year is 2-year anniversary of the program which was set to run for two years. Once the award money runs out, we revert back to the permanent well compensation with program with income requirement <$65,000.
5. Marshall commented that he was not aware that a new well that comes back with high nitrate levels was eligible for replacement under this program. ARPA does allow for new construction.

iv. Primary & Secondary Enforcement

1. Fetter: Secondary enforcement has been high while primary enforcement has been lower for 2023.
2. Steinke: There has been less primary enforcement due to more emphasis on outreach. Phone calls and emails are being used rather than issuing an NON.
3. Marshall asked for more details on the sampling and grouting violations. These issues might be mitigated in the future through continuing education. Fetter mentioned that grouting was related to mud management and choice of grout.
4. With sampling, the issues are all over the map. Crow mentioned concerns regarding the length of time required to obtain the second sample due to delays in pump install. Jenks mentioned that there is no one drinking unsafe water, so concern is less. One of the final steps before the well is used for potable water is to sample after the pump install. Fetter: The greatest concern has been from a few drillers who have not issued samples for a number of years. At the same time, we know that they have been doing work. There is also an instance of a lab that is no longer certified for bacteria that continues to submit sample results for both nitrate and bacteria. Because pump installers do not need to provide notification to the DNR, it is difficult to be on site when they are doing the install. Steinke mentioned that pump installer notifications are intended to develop relationship and trust between pump installers and DNR staff so they will be more open to contacting the DNR when they have questions. DNR internal reports are generated on sample reporting and sent to DNR field staff. Where reporting issues are rampant, field staff can elevate enforcement on reporting issues.
5. Jenks asked if extending the 30-day sample submittal requirement to 45 days would resolve some of the late sample submittal issues. Fetter mentioned that this might be addressed with the next code revision and would likely reduce the occurrence of late sample submittals.
6. Marshall had a question regarding noncomplying feature form 3300-305. Fetter suggested bringing the question up under new business.

e. Rule Revisions (Fetter/ Gundrum)

i. Board Order DG-07-22(E) and DG-08-22 update (Type IL Cement)

1. Gap in rule requirement from 10/8/2023 to 11/1/2023 which is when the permanent rule goes into effect. Enforcement will not be active on this requirement during this window.

ii. Board Order DG-03-23 (NR 812 Subchapter III, etc.) &

1. **Scope Statement DG-04-23 (NR 146 – Licensing)**
    a. Streamline driller license regulatory requirements – rig operator training requirements under review for revision as well as separate license requirement for heat exchange and water well drillers. Revisions may be needed to address new approaches to heat exchange applications such as Darcy Systems. A variance was granted by DNR in 2022 for this type of system. Fetter mentioned that the system has provision for also operating as a water supply well (which the DNR did not approve). Temperature and bacteria were concerns expressed by the group. DNR did not allow system to be used as a water source. It was thought that sampling was not required for that reason. Marshall expressed concern that the system might negatively impact the aquifer with susceptibility to bacteria. Steinke suggested putting this subject on the agenda for the January meeting. Walker asked if the Geothermal Association was consulted on this application and whether the components of the system were compatible for use in a potable water system. Fetter commented that he recalls a thorough review being done on materials used and potable water compatibility. Fetter did have concerns about the potential for the system to develop a leak and the impact that might have on the aquifer.
    b. Marshall supported the assignment and documentation of responsibility in drilling and pump installing contractual agreements.
    c. Peterson agreed that there may be a need to create credential specific to Property Transfer Well Inspections. Knowing the code is still an important aspect doing property transfer well inspections. Regarding a separate credential for pump installer employees, Marshall commented that this had been discussed in the past and that the consensus was that the department did not have the staff or resources to oversee it.
    d. Aune commented that there are a lot of limestone wells in his area with 4” casing. When these wells are inspected for the purpose of property transfer, a visual inspection notes that the well is good, and they are not noted as being out of compliance. Another pump installer may come later to work on the system, and they may inform the homeowner that the well is not in compliance. Peterson commented that the requirements for this type of well were in place back in the 50s. This should have been addressed in the report done by the well inspector. The question to answer is how the well got constructed that way in the first place? If the water sample is good and it is a good producing well, what really needs to be done about it? Fetter commented that this topic is covered in the scope statement for NR 812 revision, and it will be addressed. Marshall added that it should not be necessary to replace the 4” well if it is sampled and producing safe water. Fetter commented that the code does not require that a new well be drilled. It is the lender for the property that is requiring that the well be replaced in order for the loan to go through (because it is a noncompliant well). It is up to the buyer and seller of the house to negotiate and decide what to do about it. The department is not involved. Peterson commented that with the housing market now, inspections are not always required.

Another concern is for the pump installer who replaces the pump in one of these wells. Is he in violation for installing a pump in a noncomplying well? This is addressed with the form completed by the pump installer. Peterson commented that when he checks box 3 of the inspection form, he does not have issues with the lender. He checks to the box and adds a comment regarding casing diameter. Chase asked if there are variances associated with the well construction report. Fetter stated that with technology, the department will in the future link variances to well construction reports, but we are not there yet. It is possible to link variances to the report, but the older the well, the less likely that it is possible to do so.

e. Steinke mentioned that technology improvements that would allow the department to do more with existing well data cannot be developed currently due to the lack of funding available in the budget to pay developers. Every year budget proposals are submitted for improvements that would allow the DNR to work more efficiently in providing services of this type to the regulated community. A lot of ideas are on the list that will be addressed when the budget allows for development. Fetter mentioned that the program recently lost an excellent developer (Jen Filbert) who took another job within the department. She was responsible for many of the improvements that have been implemented for the well driller viewer. Her position is funded through high-capacity water use application fees. Steinke commented that these improvements were possible only because her time was taken from the high-capacity use program to develop these improvements for our program.
f. Walker requested that the scope statements be made available for viewing by members of the council. Fetter will provide copies to PWAC. Walker also commented that items earmarked in the budget for certain projects should not be pulled from one area to address a need in another area. There should be measures in place to make sure money in the budget is used for what was intended.

2. Scope Statement DG-03-23 (NR 812 Subchapter III, etc.)

a. There will be emphasis on addressing redundancies and omissions.
b. Marshall asked why yard hydrants are on the list of objectives for the NR 812 revisions. Fetter commented that attempts will be made to address issues that were not resolved with earlier revisions.
c. There is a list of suggested revisions that will be used somewhat as a guide in the revision process. It includes 250 items.

3. Next Step – Advisory Committee

a. Fetter sent email to Peterson requesting names of WWWA members willing to serve on an advisory committee for the revisions. The initial kick-off meeting with members will be held before the end of the year. Peterson provided the names of Jeff Beiriger and Matt Kouba to serve on the NR 146 advisory committee Terry Marshall and Rick Peterson would serve on the NR 812 advisory committee.
b. Marshall suggested that those serving on one committee should also be included on the other. Fetter was open to the suggestion but mentioned that at times, there will be NR 812 discussions that have very little to do with NR 146 and vice versa. Marshall commented

that meetings could be held at different times, but the same people could serve on both. Fetter mentioned that it will not just be industry and drinking water program people serving as members. There may be people from DATCAP and DHS serving on the NR 812 committee as well as people from the department's public water supply program. We want to have a representative committee and still keep the size somewhat manageable. It would also be preferable to have members on the committee that hold both well driller and pump installer licenses. Peterson added that it is beneficial to have members who are familiar with the current code language and who have used it on a regular basis. Some view their role in the water industry not so much as a job, but as a profession and they are stakeholders in what happens with the upcoming revisions. Fetter mentioned that the approach to committee members would not be decided at the meeting. Marshall provided more detail on his vision for the committee. You would have the same members on both, but not all members participating in every meeting. Agenda topics would include items for one or both code revision. Members would attend when the agenda includes relevant to their position on the advisory committee. The question that needs to be answered is whether we would have two separate committees running parallel or one advisory committee with members that participate in meetings as needed when topics discussed are relevant to their position. Steinke thought the better approach would be to have on advisory committee, with the understanding that it would likely take longer to achieve what needs to be done if that approach is taken. This will be brought to Marty for his input before direction is set. Target date for kick-off meeting would be by mid-December.

4. **Licensing & Continuing Education (Gundrum)**
    f. **New licenses and registrations thus far for the 2023 calendar year**
    g. **2023 data relative to historical trends (2023 data added to graphs of historical data)**
5. **Old Business**
    h. **Daycare wells discussion carryover from April 2023 meeting**
        i. Fetter requested tabling this item until the January meeting to allow time for the new business agenda. Discussion is regarding existing wells drilled for private use that later transition to daycare use. When the daycare is licensed, it triggers inspections that require the well to meet a certain threshold. When the well is found to be noncomplying, the question is how is this addressed? The word "nonconforming" was used rather than noncomplying. In the minutes from the meeting, it stated that timing on replacement of a nonconforming well would be decided through enforcement conference proceedings. Fetter believes that the approach taken would is to allow time for replacement if the well is providing safe water, but that replacement would be required short term if the nonconforming well was providing unsafe water. This item will remain on the agenda for old business at the next meeting and be reviewed more thoroughly before then. These are public water systems that need to meet requirements of NR 811.
6. **New Business**
    i. **My Skilled Trades, LLC., Reedsburg, WI. Opportunity for Spring of 2024 for training in the Well Drilling industry (Crow)**

i. Dennis Crow reported on behalf of WWWA and Matt Kouba. A general overview was provided at the meeting with more information to be available at the meeting in January.

ii. Matt Kouba has worked with the WWWA to start a non-profit 501(c)(3) drilling training academy under the title “My Skilled Trades”. Training is being planned to cover well drilling, welding, and possibly pump installing. Tentative launch set for spring semester of 2024. Matt has worked with Marty Nessman on experience requirements for licensure of drillers. Questions should be addressed to Matt Kouba at (608) 768-8508. A website has been created and is available for viewing at My Skilled Trades - Well Drilling Academy Continuing Education Classes. Fetter asked if this is associated with efforts to provide training at the Plumber’s Local 75 facility in Madison. Dennis said that this is an entirely different approach to providing the training need for rig operators to meet driller license application requirements. Jeff Beiriger has been involved with Matt Kouba in the development of the training academy. The aim is to bring more people into the well drilling industry in Wisconsin. Marshall commented that the increase active rig operators shown in earlier data indicates that there is interest out there to get into the industry. Peterson commented that people are becoming aware that there is a good living to made in these trades. Gundrum asked how this information will be made available to the public. Crow said that information will be released at the convention and there will be advertising within the industry. There may be an outreach to high schools as well. Everything is still in the early stages so some of these details are yet to be determined. Fetter will add this topic to the agenda for the January PWAC meeting.

j. Bacteria Sampling after well is drilled, but before pump installation; why? (Beiriger/All)

i. Jeff Beiriger raised this question for PWAC discussion but is traveling and could not attend the meeting.

ii. Jenks commented that sampling off the rig often results in a high percentage of unsafe samples. This was not the case in the past with a cable tool rig. So, taking a sample off the rig is now not a good idea. On the other side, being aware of high nitrate sample after drilling and before the pump install is important. Jenks thought this question may have been raised because the driller leaves it to the pump installer to obtain a safe sample from the well before in is used for drinking water. Fetter commented that by code, the driller is required to resolve an unsafe sample issue at the time the will is drilled. Marshall commented that is should revert back to the driller if there is an unsafe sample taken after the well is drilled. Peterson mentioned that a well cannot be drilled without introducing bacteria for materials and the process used. Samples pulled off the back of a rig are typically taken under unsanitary conditions. Prior to the pump being installed, no one is using the water for consumption, so why sample that water? Fetter added that if the pump installer can’t obtain a safe sample from the well, he will point to the driller as being the source of the problem. That is the issue that would have to be resolved to eliminate the sample taken at the well after it is drilled. Marshall commented that this needs to be resolved because time and money are being wasted when the driller is sent back to the well for no reason. He takes his samples from the test pump. Marshall added that getting a safe sample by the driller after the well is drilled is just good business practice. If he gets an unsafe sample that needs to be addressed, he may communicate to the pump installer that he needs to come back after the install to get a safe sample. When the pump is installed and the system sees full pressure, there may be different conditions than what was introduced by

the test pump. This can cause conditions that result in an unsafe. Installing the pump as well as downstream components introduces other possible sources of contamination. Jenks commented that he understands that the driller is required to get a safe sample. He had a well that needed to be chlorinated 6 times before he was able to get a safe sample. He was aware that the source of the problem was not coming from his portion of the well system. Walker commented that he has had safe samples after the pump install that when tested again later came back unsafe. One well was in operation for 11 years and then started producing unsafe samples. It took 3 chlorinations to bring it back to a safe sample. The problem was attributed to manure that had been spread on a nearby field one week prior to the unsafe sample being taken. Marshall added that he has seen where dead ends in the distribution system have caused unsafe samples. Marshall suggested that this be part of the discussion to be had by the advisory committee for the upcoming NR 812 revision. Fetter read the current code requirement for unsafe sample as it is written in current code language. The code states that the driller should "attempt" to obtain a safe sample when an unsafe is collected after the well is drilled. Fetter typically advises that the driller exercise due diligence and attempt to get a safe sample after the well is drilled.

iii. Fetter asked if the question that needs to be answered is whether the driller can come back after to the pump is installed to collect a safe sample. Or does the driller not have to come back after the pump installed if the pump installer collects a safe sample. Steinke mentioned that the concern is if there is no safe sample from the well driller after the well is drilled and the pump installer gets an unsafe, there is no way to diagnose what the source of contamination may be. This may be one of the technology updates that the DNR is struggling with. The unique well number and notification number are not always available to the pump installer when they draw their sample. They will then record the well address which may not always correlate to the well location data associated with the notification or WCR. If there is no sample taken at the time the well is drilled, there may be a lot of systems flagged as having no sample at all. It may be possible in the code revision to update where responsibility lies for obtaining a safe sample. Steinke added that this is something that will need more discussion as everyone is make valid points on both sides of the question. The DNR would need to have upgrades to their system as part of the final approach that is set based on these discussions. Marshall added that there could be new business practices set in place to educate the pump installer on how to report to the sample to the lab. Fetter added that the driller has 30 days to submit the WCR and the pump installer can't always wait for a unique well number to be available. Crow added the lab often times has no idea what well the samples submitted are associated with. Fetter proposed that the well driller communicate with the pump installer to ensure that the data gets into the system correctly. Crow commented that this would be an additional task added to getting the data entered into the system which is a huge workload to begin with. Marshall suggested that the driller be responsible to provide the notification number to the pump installer. Fetter suggested that this be added to the list of objectives for the code revision. The PWAC will not be able to resolve this because it is currently set in code. Tim Jenks said that he would entertain the idea of being on the code revision advisory committee. Steinke agreed that more discussion is required and what may need to be consider is that it may result in a greater work load when communication between the driller and pump installer is required.

iv. Peterson asked how the notification number is assigned to the well. Fetter stated that the notification number is assigned by the system. Steinke commented that

changes are being considered that would require either the notification number or unique well number be provided on the sample form. Peterson then asked how the unique well number is assigned and why it cannot be assigned immediately instead of a notification number? Steinke advised that multiple drillers take out notifications for the same property and the unused numbers will later be deleted. The well for which the notification has been purchased is not always constructed for some reason. Peterson suggested that the unique well number be affixed to the well casing earlier rather than waiting 3 months for the sticker to be placed by the builder or homeowner. If the unique well number could be affixed to the well casing before the pump install, it would ensure that the sample data is associated with that well. Steinke said that the driller does not have a unique well number until the submit the WCR. That is the issue. Fetter suggested that what might be considered is having the driller affix the notification number to the casing and that it be used by the pump installer for reference. Steinke asked if the notification number could be placed on the inside of the well cap for the pump installer to access? Walker added that the driller can designate an agent to take the sample. Why can't the driller designate the pump installer as their agent? Fetter added that the code requires a sample to be taken post-construction. There will be further discussion on this when the NR 812 code revision is underway.

v. Crow has received feedback from homeowners regarding the letters sent by the DNR for labeling the well with the unique well number. They thought it was a little "tacky" to cut the well number out of the paper and tape it to the well. Compared to the old stickers, this is a rather approach is perceived as tacky. It's just a piece of paper. The question that was raised was how many people will actually follow through and do it? Fetter commented that common sense would tell you to use clear packing tape and cover the entire label with tape.

vi. Marshall requested discussion on compliance form 3300-305. Is the form being used and is it accomplishing what it was intended? Are they being used by everyone or just by certain contractors? Peterson said that he uses the form frequently for well permits when doing inspection for municipal wells. Marshall referred to the second page that requires the signature of the well owner. Is the well owner signature required? Fetter stated that the well owner signature is not required for a compliant well. Marshall said that if it is noncomplying, he will get the homeowner's signature. He leaves the form with well owner and instructs them to mail submit the form. Marshall asked whether the department is seeing these forms. Steinke mentioned that the forms go to Sara Fry. If a compliance issue is noted, Sara sends a letter or assigns a unique well number if needed. There is still a transition from the old noncomplying feature forms. A lot of times the driller leaves the form with the homeowner and that is OK. Many times, it the form is submitted by a driller or pump installer when they come across a system with obvious issues that need to be repaired. The DNR is seeing more of them, and it helps that everything can be done using one form. It has a lot of uses. If the well is noncomplying, the homeowner may not submit the form so as to avoid having to replace the well. If the well is providing good water and the noncomplying feature can be addressed at a later date, the DNR is not going to take action. Steinke added a lot of these are noted and addressed with property transfer well inspections. Marshall likes using the form for complying wells because it assigns the unique well number. The only time the form is needed in a complying situation is when the unique well number can not be found, and one needs to be assigned. Crow expressed concern that a duplicate well number may be assigned if a well number already existed for the well. Steinke commented that the departments QC

will prevent that from happening. The department will do a search on the address and coordinates to determine if a unique well number already exists. Peterson asked if there was a provision for making corrections to well construction reports? If corrections are needed, an email request would need to be sent to Sara Fry. In the future there may be the ability to notify the department electronically when a known error is found on a well log.

7. **April 2023 Meeting Notes**
   - Notes are available usually within a couple of weeks following the meeting. The PWAC would like to be notified by email when the notes are available. The slides and recording are posted at the same time.
8. **Future Meeting Dates**
   - **k. January 2024 – WWWA Convention, Wisconsin Dells**
   - **l. April 2024 – Location TBD**
     - **i.** Meeting at WGNHS in Mount Horeb may be delayed for a while by fire suppression work is being completed at the facility.
   - **m. Closing discussion**
     - **i.** Crow asked whether the funding from the infrastructure bill earmarked for municipalities is going towards treatment for PFAS. Steinke mentioned that the funding is coming through the EPA and there will be a new grant opportunity for smaller municipalities that will roll out in January. It will be similar to how well comp has been able to help people with PFAS in their systems. Up to $200,000 will be available for municipalities to treat for PFAS. These are federal dollars that will be distributed through the public water program. The funding can be used for drilling a new well if needed. The funding is aimed at mitigating PFAS issues in municipal water supplies. This is another item that can be added to the agenda for January if people are interested in learning more.
     - **ii.** The DNR Secretary has resigned. It was a surprise to all. He was in the position for 10 months. Payne was never confirmed. Steven Little is deputy secretary and will be filling in until a replacement is appointed.
     - **iii.** Marshall asked why yard hydrants was added to the scope statement for the NR 812 code revision. Fetter commented that the department gets a lot of questions on them. Marshall thought that the issues with yard hydrants had been resolved and that anything installed before 2014 would not need to be addressed. This was stressed in continuing education. Buried pressure tanks were one of the considerations mentioned. Location is not between the well and the tank when the tank is buried. Fetter added that the department gets pushback for requiring a reservoir rather than letting the hydrant drain to a sump or a gravel bed. The pushback come from DIYers asking why they need to purchase a hydrant that is hard to find. Menards only carries the sump style hydrant, and the question is aske why Menards is allowed to sell them if they are illegal. So, the topic will be addressed again in the next code revision. Walker pointed out that the DNR has a flow chart showing where the yard hydrant is legal. There is a fact sheet available as well.