

MEETING MINUTES
GROUND WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GWAC)
March 5, 2008
TELECONFERENCE
North Mall Office Building, 725 Summer St. N.E., Ste. A
Salem, Oregon 97301

GWAC Members Present		Staff Present		Others
Terry Daugherty	Merilyn Reeves	Doug Woodcock	Jerry Rodgers	None
Jim Mack Sr	John Stadel	Donn Miller	Kris Byrd	
Tim Smith (at WRD in Salem)				

I. **Call to Order** – Tim Smith, Chair

II. **Approval of Minutes for the 1/11/08 Meeting-Deferred to next meeting**

III. **Advice on Proposed Rules for Eola Hills Ground Water Limited Area, Polk and Yamhill Counties and Pete’s Mountain Area, Clackamas County**

Doug Woodcock, Manager of the Ground Water Section, explained that these rule matters have come to GWAC several times before. They have been merged into one set of hearings. The public hearing on February 12th in Canby drew only supporting comments from the three people who spoke. The public hearing on March 4th in West Salem drew only supporting comments from the one person who spoke. The written comment period ends on March 10th. Today, the Department is seeking GWAC’s advice on the rules for the Commission. The staff report for the hearing record and recommendations will be available in mid-May for the Commission meeting at the end of May.

The proposed rules have a measuring tube requirement standard for both Petes Mountain and Eola Hills. Additional proposed rules for Eola Hills have a well construction standard, describing casing, sealing, and open-interval requirements in basalt wells. Both kinds of rules are proposed as special area well construction standards. Measuring tubes would allow water level access in the well at any time. Hard pipe (schedule 40 PVC) with a constant inside diameter of ¾” is proposed. The specifics were developed in coordination with the driller technical committee. The measuring tube standards are proposed as requirements at both Eola Hills and Pete’s Mountain when pumps are placed or replaced in wells. It would be the landowner’s responsibility to install the tubes. On a statewide basis, these standards could be offered as a method to achieve water level access.

The proposed well construction standards would apply only to Eola Hills. New and deepened wells that develop water from the Columbia River Basalt aquifers would need to be continuously cased and sealed to within 100 feet of the bottom of the well. This open zone can be expanded with evidence that satisfies the department. The standards are a special rule to prevent commingling.

MEETING MINUTES
GROUND WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
March 5, 2008

John and Jim had questions about the measuring tube specifications, diameter, and couplings. Kris Byrd, well construction specialist, explained the proposed rules. Terry pointed out that specifically requiring the desired ¾" inside diameter is critical for describing acceptable tubing. Doug said the cost of tube placement is estimated at about one dollar per foot.

Merilyn was concerned with the Department's ability to enforce the proposed rules. The Commission needs to support the proposed rules with resources in order to implement them.

Doug envisioned mailings to drillers and pump installers, informing them of the regulations. Further, direct mailing to affected landowners is likely. Merilyn suggested that the Department prepare a small brochure that pump installers and drillers could provide well owners to inform them of the regulations. John discouraged the use of counties as a notifier of the regulations.

Merilyn made the following motion to give committee advice on the proposed rules:

GWAC approves the rules as submitted. We have been briefed and although there are technical issues that will need education, that's another issue. We want to make certain that there is adequate education and information for landowners and that the department has adequate resources to implement this.

During discussion of the motion, John said that he thought that it was premature to approve the rules at this time.

The motion carried 3-2 with Jim and John voting no. The committee members were satisfied with a split vote as it would provide the Commission the sense of committee opinions. The vote appeared to be split over matters of rule clarity and implementation concerns.

IV. Public Comment – Items not on the Agenda

No public comment was offered on non-agenda items.

Audio-files of the meeting are available.