

# Minutes from the Mahomet Aquifer Task Force Meeting

November 19, 2018

Place: Champaign County Board Lyle Shields Meeting Room Brookens Administrative Center  
1776 East Washington Street Urbana, Illinois 61802

Time Started: 10:00am

Time Adjourned: 12:55 PM

## Members Present:

Charles Hostettler, PDC Technical Services  
Alec Davis, Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group  
Jim Risley, Mahomet-Seymour School District  
Donovan Griffith, Illinois Manufacturers Association  
Sen. Chapin Rose, 51st District  
Mayor Diane Marlin, City of Urbana  
Mayor Deb Feinen, City of Champaign  
Steve Turner, Illinois Farm Bureau  
Claudia Lenhoff, Champaign County Health Care Consumers  
Teresa Barnett, Dewitt County Emergency Management Agency  
George Roadcap, Prairie Research Institute, Illinois State Water Survey  
Mayor Larry Stoner, City of Monticello  
Andrew Rehn, Prairie Rivers Network  
Mayor Todd Zalucha, City of Heyworth  
Eric Ballinger, Republic Services  
Mayor Julie Moore Wolfe, City of Decatur  
Mayor Charles Smith, Village of Rantoul  
Keith Gleason, President Teamsters Local 627  
Representative Carol Ammons 103<sup>rd</sup> District  
Senator Scott Bennett, 52<sup>nd</sup> District  
Barb Lieberoff, Illinois EPA  
Rick Cobb, Illinois EPA

## **TOPICS DISCUSSED:**

### **Approval of the Minutes from October 15, 2018**

Chairwomen Mayor Deb Feinen calls the meeting to order. Asks for the members of the public to have everyone go around the table and introduce themselves. Chairwomen Deb Feinen states that first item on the Agenda is approval of minutes from October 15, 2018 Task Force meeting. Chairwomen Deb Feinen asks if there any discussion or comments? There were no comments or discussion. There is a motion to approve. Mayor Larry Stoner to approve. Second by Representative Carol Ammons. Chairwomen Deb Feinen asks for any other corrections or comments? All those in favor signify by saying "I" The motion to approve the minutes passes. Before the discussion of the Draft Report the members go around and introduce themselves.

### **Public Comments**

Prior to discussing the beginning the item on the Agenda "Presentation and Discussion of the Draft Report" Mayor Feinen mentions that she had got with Barb a little late and wanted to bump Public Comments to the beginning of the Agenda and asks the Task Force their opinion on opening that up first? The nods seem to okay with that. We can still have that at the end as well.

Randy Locke PRI/State Geological Survey: Commends Task Force with their report thus far. Was able to get the report to a number of groups and would like to share those comments now. A gap would be calling for aquifer wide monitoring network. Very detailed characterized such as HTEM is needed but monitoring is needed. In regard to Appendix H a detailed cost water quality analysis we ask that be removed. In regard to a Top 2 Top 5 or Top 10 we recommend that the recommendations that you have provided is enough that whatever the legislature recommends is enough. The ranking is the important part not necessarily a categorization of what can get done b/c we don't know what resources could be available for that. Lastly b/c the report is very complex we certainly offer our support to prepare the final draft if it's useful to the Task Force and ask to be involved in that process. Thank you.

Mayor Deb Feinen comments that we have some questions for you Randy. Jim Risley comments, the monitoring system you are talking about the long range, can you be a little more specific. Randy Lock comments, I think George has got a lot of existing activity that is happening. During our discussion at PRI we thought it would be important to have a comprehensive aquifer monitoring strategy, now there is individual monitoring networks that a very important coalition of groups that are funding that but for it to comprehensive and protective of the aquifer as a whole recognizing that as an activity throughout the aquifer and be supported by the state we thought was an important recommendation. Jim Risley comments so this would include core

sampling the HTEM water sampling? Randy Locke comments No this would be completely separate. Think of it as characterization. What's the physical resource? And then monitoring resource. So then you would have an ongoing understanding of the condition water quality levels are. Deb Feinen comments what are you willing to help Rick Cobb? Randy Locke comments we are willing to offer any help and all help that the Task Force would like. We have a strategic communications group headed by Tricia Barker. We have full editorial capabilities, we can provide graphics work, whatever is helpful to the Task Force. Sen. Chapin Rose comments questions on substitute aquifer characterization paragraph. (copies are being passed out). Your identifying zones/area 2 are you referring to appendix E or F -Rick Cobb comments we haven't added any maps yet. Sen Rose comments it would be helpful if you would tell us what the \$ amount is for each of those areas instead of telling us instead of two of the areas. George Roadcap comments that yes it will be in the final document. I'd like to point out that those two areas 3 and 5 are examples and through discussion not to prioritize individualize. Sen Rose comments I realize there was discussion about individualize areas to prioritize or not prioritize and the fact is the this is going to get phased if the money ever shows up. It would be nice to know what the \$ amounts area. Rick Cobb comments that Area 2 covers the Natural Gas (Peoples Gas area). Rep Carol Ammons comments classification/clarification on characterization of aquifer, does it take into consideration especially closed landfills or is it just the two areas? George Roadcap comments it does include the whole aquifer (the HTEM studies) for the monitoring...there is a lot that we are currently doing within the aquifer, local sources, water authorities etc. but there are gaps. So, what we want to do is plug those gaps and that is what we are wanting to do here. This will include some of that in here. Does that answer your question? Rep Ammons comments yes it does. I guess I was looking for something that gives you high level threats, a visual that shows you that. We can't really see that till we start a monitoring process? George Roadcap comments you're asking how a monitoring component addressing high level threats? Rep Ammons comments, Yes. George Roadcap comments we could add that language in there and it would have to be approved by everyone. Rick Cobb comments that he has a question for Randy Locke. We have recommendation 3 in Appendix G relating to improving understanding water quality on budget appendix G...you say there's a gap.. are you adding to? I'm just confused. It's on page 24 (very end of report) Appendix H I'm sorry. Randy Locke comments we ask that budget be removed. H covers historical water quality review data that is available now, samples that have been collected. That's the scope of the budget for Appendix H. This should be part of a larger comprehensive data not only historical data but also a monitoring program that continues to monitor the health of the overall aquifer. Rick Cobb comments so that task/tab that you're looking at in Appendix H, is new monitoring wells? Randy Locke comments No. Rick Cobb is that task 3.1? Randy Locke comments 3.1 is collection of new samples, monitoring wells and the total for that is \$58,000 for the aquifer that covers a 15-county area and \$ 58,000 is not sufficient. Rick Cobb comments So you're scrapping that? Randy Locke comments We can come back with better language and a comprehensive scope for that. Rick Cobb comments so that in relation to the comprehensive groundwater quality and how this

relates to Section 6 of groundwater protection act is that somehow tie into that? Randy Locke comments It does and can tie into that. Rick Cobb comments there is a monitoring well program ran by Dept of Ag and an additional network so will there be an analysis done to look for gaps? Randy Locke comments certainly that will be done. The existing monitoring networks would have to be part of that, that overall plan. To make sure that the overall aquifer had coordinated monitoring. Whoever is collecting data and then feed into that. It could be quality and/or quantity. Teresa Barnett comments you mentioned that you would be removing numbers and since we are on a very short time frame, how much time are we talking? Randy Locke commented that they are under preliminary review right now so hopefully end of November. Donovan Griffith comments in regard to aquifer characterization on last line of paragraph two when describing area five, threat nitrate we have decided that decided that nitrate as potential threat so if we could just change that to be consistent. Mayor Deb Feinen notes that there are some new people that have arrived but if any others from the public would like to come forward. Andrew did you have something you'd like to say? Andrew Rehn comments in the Draft Report we have potential route, potential threat and threat and nitrate is listed as threat. Steve Turner comments I hope Nitrate could be considered as potential threat b/c on western side we have de-nitrification process, so we have potential situation. Donovan Griffith in subcommittee A we decided as potential threat, so I recommend we leave it as such. Diane Marlin comments that we have Road Salt listed as a threat. Is road salt different than nitrate? George Roadcap comments there is an inconsistency in the report page 7 and 17 and how some of these are listed nitrate as a threat New Holland wells are contaminated by nitrate. Steve Turner comments I know you have that one situation but to have that situation and have that uniformly, but I think agriculturally is important. Wording is very important to us. Mayor Deb Feinen brings up minority and majority reports. If we can't agree this is where these types of situations would fall. However, before we get to that discussion I'd like to keep with the members of the public to come forward. Rep. Ammons did you have a comment? Yes, what is the legal definition or the regulated definition potential threat/threat? Rick Cobb comments we have certainly provided that throughout this process. Under Section 12A of the Environmental Protection Act there is the word threat that is a very broad proscriptive term. We typically would look at 2-3 mg/l of nitrate as being naturally occurring. Anything above that as being a threat under section 12a and under the boards 620 groundwater standards treatment or additional treatment. Numerical standard 10mg/l drinking water standard acute contaminate. Page 7 of the draft report workgroups had to identify potential and current contaminate threats. Little bit of disconnect between legislative mandate and the meaning in the act. Andrew Rehn comments and we never really wrote out a firm definition in the report and if we did it's not mention in here or I don't see it. In Subcommittee A we didn't say here is what a potential threat is or potential route etc. We talked it about it a little bit etc. If we voted on it perhaps I wasn't there. Rick Cobb comments we did vote on it and it is also on Page 7 of the report (he then reads that section) and describes the worksheets. Andrew Rehn comments that we do not have a definition for potential threat and potential route so anyone who reads this has no idea what that means, unless its buried in appendices B and C. I

think it needs to be up front here. We need to define that. Rick Cobb comments, that I will let the Subcommittee talk to that, I am not on the official Task Force. Chairperson Deb Feinen adds that she will add that to the list of items to talk about, I want to go back to public participation before we have our larger discussion. Are there any other comments from the public please step forward?

Joe Hooker, City of Champaign. Elaborate comments from earlier. Making sure that sufficient resources are identified. Concerning abandoned wells. Most pressing manner b/c we don't know if they are properly sealed. Recommendation in current draft is devote more resources to that. What do we mean by that? Applaud the Task Force for the work you have done thus far. My other suggestion is taking closer look at HTEM technology for specific applications/landfills. Reasonable to assume tough to get the funding for entire aquifer. Teresa Barnett comments utilizes HTEM on landfills is not objective to deal with local gov't permitting or standards to do that.

Chris Stohr comments and first commends the Task Force for their efforts for protecting the Mahomet Aquifer. First talks about the resolution from the Champaign Co Board that is being discussed coming through to protect the Mahomet Aquifer for citizens of Champaign. Rep Ammons comments on page 7 of draft report potential route, potential threat and threat as you have talked about on landfill, Mr. Stohr has served on my environmental panel doesn't highlight 218 landfills, can you speak to that? Chris Stohr comments Yes these legacy landfills taken from IL EPA files in 1980's subtitle D operating landfills. These are old town dumps, non-lined. Inspections of these landfills are done by walking around in fields may not be able to examine all of these with certain seasons and features not accessible. Some of these sites go back 100 years old. Unregulated materials serve as a threat to water resources. Deb Feinen comments that on page 2 of your resolution goes beyond the scope of what we were statutorily tasked to do. anyone have any other questions for Chris? Rick Cobb comments yes on the 218 landfills I think according there are 25 part 807 landfills does that subtract from 218 landfills that aren't inspected? Just to get my numbers right and help write this report? I wouldn't think so b/c some of these sites have numerous landfills that date back to over 100 years. Rick Cobb comments So, the answer is actually yes then b/c they would have been prior to nobody is doing inspections. Chris Stohr comments thank you for making that distinction that probably the landfill owners are probably the only ones looking at them. George Roadcap how aware are you or how would anyone do they know they exist that they are a problem? Chris Stohr comments. I've heard of them being abandoned and not paying taxes. I don't know who would have responsibility. Deb Feinen comments if anyone else from public?

### **Presentation and Discussion of the Draft Report**

Next item on Agenda is draft discussion of presentation and discussion draft report. Rick did you want to get going? Rick Cobb comments there are two things. There is the report and then the comments from the deadline that we received that were added to discuss. I can go over both. Deb says lets go over the comments and go over new stuff. Rick Cobb comments assume you

have all had a chance to look at report. Didn't do executive summary/figures/maps. Deb Feinen comments if anyone has question lets interrupt if you have question let's do that. Rick Cobb once a full draft is completed we can develop executive summary. Takes comments from Oct meeting and rearrange report and address. Introduction intended to address comment explaining and describing the Mahomet Aquifer. Diane Marlin comments and hates to start with first paragraph have strong statement one of IL's natural resources X number people quality/quantity and what it's charge is should go right up in front for both Intro and Executive Summary. Diane will send language. Rick continues to describe Introduction. Rick Cobb comments would it be appropriate to open up the comments at this time? Deb Feinen anyone has questions/comments just speak up. Rick Cobb comments on Sen Rose's comment on citing issues. Rick mentions that he brought IL EPA's Chief BOL Todd Rettig today and he comes forward to answer any questions from the Task Force on that issues. Sen Rose comments what are the opportunity for the public to have the input on citing? Todd Rettig comment that citing is a total local issue. Application made to local jurisdiction and they do the analysis on whether the grant it or don't grant it. Pre-condition they have to show the Illinois EPA in order to get the permit. The Illinois EPA doesn't have any substantial process in the citing role. Sen Rose comments what is the role of the local governments go through that process? Todd Rettig comments I would have to get my notes but there is a section in the Environmental Protection Act that spells out that process could easily be referenced in a report. Sen Rose comments can you change categories of substance that is being taken in from an original permit from a permit modification from an 2<sup>nd</sup> citing hearing at a local level? Todd Rettig comments generally enough right now the answer is I'm not sure. There is a recent decision out of the 5<sup>th</sup> appellate court and we call it the "brick yard" decision, very recent, where the court seemed to focus on local citing approval looking at the location of the facility some more of the specifics like types of materials. Before of the "brick yard" we would at looked very carefully at the citing that was given by local authority by prior permitting to determine if additional citing was needed. After this decision there was a split between two appellate districts in IL. The IL EPA is discussing with AG's office to determine if we would need an appeal. Sen Rose comments what's the split? Todd Rettig comments the other districts were focused on specifics, local citing's, dimensions etc. The brick yard court did not focus was not focused on what was being accepted. Sen Rose comments is the entire aquifer in the 4<sup>th</sup> district? Todd Rettig comments I do not know the boundaries off the top of my head. Sen Rose comments who is the appropriate local jurisdictional authority? Todd Rettig comments It might depend municipality or county. Sen Rose comments if you have a permit to for X and there was a citing to receive X modification to receive X and Y it's an open question for X and Y? Todd Rettig comments some of it may be exactly what X and Y are. In the sense that under the subtitle D go into municipal waste so it could fall on that. But part of it to we are trying to understand the impact of this decision. We are still under the timeline of the appeal. So, it's still an open question for us right now. Chairperson Deb Feinen comments Todd are you staying for a little bit if we have more questions? Todd Rettig comments yes I am.

Rick Cobb continues his discussion of the Draft Report. II --Potential and Current Contamination Threats to the Quality of the Mahomet Aquifer -Subcommittee A. Rick discusses the definition of Threat, Potential Threat and Potential Route and then Worksheets as well as the comments from Claudia Lenhoff and then asks how to proceed? Diane Marlin comments we need to define the terms. Which items contaminate the aquifer today? Rick Cobb comments Threat-arsenic is in the aquifer. Road Salt is a contaminant. Source waters that are susceptible to contamination like the western side like what Steve was talking about. On the eastern side has very little nitrates. On the western side we have nitrates. We do have a de-nitrification process happening. So it's a little bit of both so it's a known source of contamination. Charles Hostetler comments HHW under threats is not consistent and should be under potential threat. George Roadcap comments that under Appendix C a discussion of potential sources definitions and maybe that needs to be moved up. Subcommittee A focus of items that aren't being addressed...the gaps. Deb Feinen comments we need to make sure the document explains that. Rick Cobb if you recall I did have that up front but you wanted me to move them. George Roadcap comments move appendix C to the body of the report. Andrew Rehn comments the definitions in Appendix C really don't shed light on this. There needs to be accepted definition. Potential Route is not our directed. Rick Cobb is abandoned well. Andrew Rehn we just need to be clear on it. Rick Cobb comments let me elaborate on that. I understand the well doesn't show that but its direct pathway to contaminates. Andrew Rehn yeah it sounds like a threat. Rick Cobb comments is it a known source of contamination? Claudia Lenhoff comments Andrew I think what you were saying threat vs. route needs to be explained a little better and I agree with you there. Confusing, frustrating and what I try to wrap my head around and that's is it a known threat? I think many of us are concerned the future. Taking an action in a precautionary way. I think that's where some of the squishiness comes in. I just wanted to express from a lay person's perspective it can be hard to track. I do appreciate what you are trying to say though. The distinction between threat and potential threat and we may have a lot of discussion on that...and from an industry standpoint can perhaps you speak to what that mean to you? Charles Hostetler comments I'm going back to very beginning to subcommittee A our journey of frustration and confusion. We talked about this paragraphs one and two numerous times. They've been changed, and we had people volunteer to change sometimes we got those changes and other times we didn't, and this is what we came up with. Now I'm sorta like Rick we've through several variations and we tried to get as much consensus as we could into this process. My views are pretty simple, if you have known contaminates in the aquifer and you can put a predomintor or well there and measure them you have people on bottle water b/c they can't use them that is a known threat in my view. If you have a situation more like paragraph two that implies some source protection of material, there never been a regulatory requirement and never groundwater monitoring and it's over the Mahomet aquifer and it's over an area that susceptible to infiltration that potential threat. I also think that's one area that's confusion not very reflection without regulatory requirements. Actual contamination, potential contamination. Claudia Lenhoff comments I appreciate your response in terms of nitrates potential vs threat on page 12 nitrates and concentrates is this in the aquifer

isn't that a threat? Charles Hostetler comments it is and this is part of the confusion we have b/c the aquifer is not the same everywhere. The levels of concern are different. Steve Turner comments your map visual identifies that, but we have a test well showing differently. That is where we argue the potential threat side of things. Todd Zalucha comments why can't nitrates show up in both potential and threat? Deb Feinen comments I'm also wondering depending on the area of the aquifer looking at page 12 that it does depend on the area of the aquifer. That maybe mention the area of the aquifer. Sen Rose comments did the subcommittee put it as potential or threat? Charles Hostetler comments that we left it where it is now. Sen Rose comments that pharmaceutical should stay where it is, and I agree with Todd's comment and splitting it. Steve Turner comments that he agrees with that, but we are working with showing the potential side. I'd have to say to see how we worded. Rep Ammons comments I could see at best in both locations. I would support potential but greater potential in other areas based off of this map. There is a lot of research out there. It goes back to clear definitions of potential threat vs threat. Charles Hostetler comments there are some other items arsenic is present in other areas like nitrates, but we felt putting naturally occurring in parentheses, so I sort of hear where Steve is coming from. So, we could put modifier like spatially variable for nitrates and lessen the tendencies. Sen Bennett comments I've been listening here as to what is the role of this Task Force? To minimize something or to ring an alarm bell? I don't know if I think to put in two categories b/c its confusing. I think if it's a threat it's a threat. Steve you can speak to that maybe. If the only concern, we don't want the legislature to overreact we can certainly hear the farm bureau out first. We overemphasize b/c the western side is already in danger. The proper place is the greater side b/c we can work on the legislative side on how to fix it. That is just my 2 cents there. Mayor Diane Marlin comments if comparing nitrates to People's Gas situation isn't a comparison. Jim Risley comments People's Gas isn't a threat it's a reality. How we deal with that as a task force is let's vote and we will see. Steve Turner comments I don't want to get dissected into two parts. Deb Feinen comments I think Claudia's comments on potential ramification of one classification or another? George Roadcap comments if you look at the maps nitrate/roadsalt etc. The people who live out here don't know their wells or if they are at risk. Don't want to give false risk and if they are in Mahomet Aquifer. Sen Bennett we are on page 7 of long report and this is good are planning on going through all of this today? Deb Feinen comments our next scheduled meeting is Dec 17. And our report is due end of year so we may need couple meetings. We may need another draft from Rick and PRI. I'm keeping list of outstanding issues and we need to vote on end or out and we have 40 days to do that. Rep Ammons its difficult to schedule more than two hours and I've submitted my from our panel all of our comments how we are going to put in our out how we are going to do this? Deb Feinen concern is if we don't go through all those comments and as a comment and vote up or down and we decides if those get in. Rep Ammons comments we've submitted ours in writing. Procedurally I'd love to go through those. We don't agree with the entire report. Deb Feinen comments we got stopped at Sen Rose's comment. Jim Risley comments would it be feasible to go over only the comments before we leave? Deb Feinen comments that what we have been



trying to do. Andrew Rehn comments we are going over a different version of the report. I submitted line by line comments on the previous report, so we are sorta going over new report. Rick Cobb comments I got this out to you two weeks ago. Andrew Rehn comments did you want me to submit comments on this and then you submit them in here? Was that the idea? Again? Rep Ammons does this report submitted recommendations? Rick Cobb yes we are on your next comments/recommendations yours and Claudia's. Deb Feinen comments Rick to Andrew's comments did you include them into this draft from the Oct meeting/draft report? Rick Cobb I absolutely did and some of them went away comments b/c of the reorganization based by the full task force. Andrew Rehn comments That's the point I'm making...nevermind. Deb Feinen comments are Andrew's comments preserved somewhere? Rick Cobb comments absolutely. Most of his comments are in regards to the executive summary which is not part of the report. Andrew Rehn comments my concern is this document we are looking at it was rewritten and lot of it we are looking at is different so we are discussing this draft so there was no time frame on this draft we are looking at there a draft on last draft we submitted you put this draft together so to say we can only get time frames on the other draft. This is a completely new document we are looking at. I made the comments I wanted to so that's okay. Rick Cobb commented I reorganized based on what the Task Force told me to do. Deb Feinen commented, and I realize this is more work, the goal is not to prevent you from commenting this is NOT the last and final draft. I am assuming get a 3<sup>rd</sup> draft with PRI help and hopefully executive summary. Rick Cobb sure if everyone gets in timely fashion I will do my best. Deb Feinen comments Rick what is the plan with respect to the bubbles? Rick Cobb yes those have not been vetted by the full task force. Deb Feinen comments do you know how many there are? Rick Cobb no but we can walk through them? Deb Feinen we are what the first one? Rick Cobb those are just Sen Rose's comments not really decisions. **Sen Rose's mic is in audible** Deb Feinen comments in order for Rick to have direction in drafting do you want to make a motion in local citing? **Sen Rose's mic is inaudible** Deb Feinen comments Rick can't include things in the report that we don't have a majority here to incorporate. **Sen Rose's mic is in audible** Deb Feinen comments before you ask a question do we have a second? Second by Rep Ammons Donovan Griffith comments isn't there already an existing body called the Mahomet Aquifer Consortium? Has a role in this outside of this Task Force? Deb Feinen comments loosely affiliated group no process for that suggest Chapin that if your wanting to put a group together that there be funds available as well. Rick Cobb comments that the Consortium is mostly concerned with water quantity not quality. **Sen Rose mic is inaudible** Charles Hostetler comments we have had a motion and a second is that correct indulgence of the task force to put down a blank workspace exactly what the wording of this is? Teresa Barnett comments separate group outside of us correct? Sen Rose comments yes. George Roadcap comments that Consortium has received money before mostly donations and we do have recommendation on page 24 #4. Sen Rose comments all I'm suggesting there is going to be a lot of things that didn't get considered that are going to show up in these notes that would be far better put with that body going forward then leaving them untouched. George Roadcap comments I think it's worthwhile to have a discussion on what that committee should look like

and who it should include but at least there is something in there already. Alec Davis comments and agree with George #7 I thought that was doing on page 24 accomplished what we were doing. Jim Risley comments I think empower and management was a roadblock for others to vote on, so some rewording would make that move forward to make decisions as that come up. Rep Ammons I think the feeling we are in agreement with motion Sen Rose. I have to leave so any technical questions can go to Chris Stohr on our panel. Deb Feinen comments so a couple things I want to be respectful of everyone's time. We have 40 days. We need a consensus on how we are going to do this. The initial report is what the two subcommittees agreed to but everything else needs to be vetted. If you get this other entity going then other items can be discussed passed Dec 31 just my thought. Rep Ammons respond to comments via email? Deb Feinen comments I believe that goes against the open meetings act. Andrew Rehn comments can we get a summary list of substantial changes based on major discussion a week to compile those or whatever and that list goes out to the group and we all prepare our up/down votes and we come back to the next meeting. Deb Feinen comments that would be fine. Rep Ammons I think some discussion would be fine b/c Sen Rose is asking for similar consortium body into place. That the Task Force was not able to address this issue but this other body will do that. Deb Feinen comments I totally agree. Donovan Griffith comments what I notice is we do these drafts and we do these comments and there a lot of good comments when we come together but there are brand new ideas. We have spent 10 months putting together this draft. I don't think someone should be able to have brand-new ideas and have this idea voted and vetted as these ideas that be treated as the same ideas that we have spent 10 months working on. If there is a recommendation in next week and put for a vote that in not an example of what we should be voting on. Now the Senator's idea is in here and that is something we should be voting on but if we are going to go back and make changes I don't think we should make a new concept at this point. Charles Hostetler comments clarification compiling a list in favor of doing that comments. Deb Feinen comments prepared to vote on the Sen Rose do you want to speak to that? Sen Rose works with Rick to clean that up what the motion. Teresa Barnett comments that she is a little confused on what this groups role would be. Sen Rose comments that the legislature would in turn make this group a quasi governmental or governmental capacity. Teresa Barnett comments is it a brand new group or giving strength to an existing group? We can decide that now or legislature can. Sen Rose comments we already have a starting point with the Consortium and we have some good people here. Deb Feinen do we want to do a Roll Call. Barb can you do that. Mayor Charles Smith comments the Governor set this up do we authority to act in this capacity? Sen Rose comments we are asking the general assembly to pass a law to make this particular group but a group. Donovan Griffith comments so this group would be purely advisory and believe we brought up would just be annual basis and maybe reports? Sen Rose comments I'm hesitating b/c I would maybe like to see this also be a vehicle where grants are received. Write grants and have authority to hire people like PRI.

Motion is to Develop a group with a mission similar to the Mahomet Aquifer Task Force and is a blend of other select individuals that serve in a quasi-government or government capacity to provide leadership administrative stature or process for regional water supply

Deb Feinen comments Barb can you call the Roll on the above Motion. Barb Lieberoff begins the Roll call

George Roadcap Yes

Teresa Barnett Yes

Mayor Larry Stoner Yes

Charles Hostetler yes

Jim Risley Yes

Donovan Griffith No

Alec Davis No

Andrew Rehn Yes

Claudia Lenhoff Yes

Mayor Deb Feinen Yes

Rep Carol Ammons Yes

Mayor Diane Marlin Yes

Mayor Charles Smith Yes

Keith Gleason Yes

Steve Turner No

Eric Ballenger Yes

Mayor Julie Moore-Wolfe Yes

Todd Zalucha Yes

Deb Feinen comments that is now a recommendation and will appear in our report. Our next step compile our comments list and vote on another meetings no new items. Andrew Rehn commented on I think it's worth commenting on issues we've discussing adding as well. Deb Feinen goes through her notes and the Task Force agrees with her issues on notes and those will be brought forth. Sen Rose comments is there any we can discuss today and are there any that can go onto with the future group? I withdraw my comment about permitting and put on future list. Deb Feinen comments we don't know if that group will exist? George Roadcap comments some of those are from public and I'm not sure how those can be adopted? Keith Gleason comments and his mic is inaudible. Teresa Barnett comments on Public Comments we can't vote on public comments coming vote on them, but we can discuss them and they do have bearing. I'm okay with more meetings as well. Mayor Diane Marlin's mic is inaudible Deb Feinen comments is include in final report don't include it or kick to Chapin's new committee. Donovan Griffith comments so now we are just voting on whether to include or not include comments in regard to these new worksheets/legacy landfills what if I agree to some or not? Rick Cobb comments I have Todd here if you want to ask some questions. Todd Rettig comments on the number of inspections the BOL has done in regard to the past year and the existing threats and

the existing contaminates. Sen Rose comments I appreciate your comment bubbles, but I would of appreciated here are the 12 things. So where are we going? Deb Feinen comments I get the sense we are all exhausted. The next step we will have a list of the comments and how to vote on them. What I'm concerned about in PRI/IEPA is working on this are comments we haven't approved on yet. They could be working on maps and tightening things up Would that make sense? Sen Rose comments would it make sense to have the comments have two people sort them have phone call? Deb Feinen we aren't allowed to. What is everyone's schedule like first week Dec? Claudia Lenhoff comments it would be helpful to have document with comments. Discussion on the legacy landfills worksheets on how to handle them takes place between Task Force members and how to review them for the report. Deb Feinen comments is it consensus we are done with additional comments? Andrew Rehn comments so where is discussion on nitrates or definition of threat? Deb Feinen comments stuff talked about today and is included as comments. Andrew Rehn how do we make an up or down vote on a not definition? Deb Feinen comments that hopefully IEPA/PRI come up with that. Rick Cobb comments I am not coming up with your definition you will have to do that. Deb Feinen comment we can do that at the meeting if we have to. Andrew Rehn comments I would happily come up with a definition or work with someone to do that. Deb Feinen if the need comes up we can. Donovan Griffith comments what if multiple definitions pass? Jim Risley comments I know everyone is ready to go... mic becomes in audible Rick Cobb comments those are in there.

### **Task Force Comments**

NO comments

### **Future Meeting locations**

Deb Feinen comments Do we want Barb to do a survey monkey and do when meeting in Nov meeting before Dec 19? I mean Dec 17. Meeting is in Springfield. Let's just do Survey Monkey for that. PRI had offered to work with IEPA everyone okay with that? consensus yes? Any public wish to address? NO

### **Adjourn**

12:55