

**MINUTES OF THE TOWN OF HULL BOARD MEETING
PORTAGE COUNTY, WISCONSIN
HELD ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2012
4550 WOJCIK MEMORIAL DRIVE, STEVENS POINT, WI 54482**

1) CALL TO ORDER: The **Town of Hull Board Meeting** was called to order on Thursday, October 18, 2012 at 5:30 p.m. by Hull Chairperson John Holdridge at Hull Municipal Building, 4550 Wojcik Memorial Drive, Stevens Point, WI 54482.

Present: Chairperson John Holdridge, Supervisor Mel Bembenek, Supervisor Dave Wilz, Supervisor Dave Pederson

Excused: Supervisor LaVerne Syens

Hull Water Study Task Force Committee Members:

Tim Zimmerman, Russ Prusak, Gladys Laug

Water Study Advisors:

Bill DeVita, WEAL, Paul McGinley of UWSP College of Natural Resources, Ray Schmidt Water Quality Specialist for Portage County, Amy Nitka, UWSP Graduate Student, Recording Secretary: Patty Amman.

Hull Plan Commission Members:

Al Stemen, Shelley Binder

Others Present: Clerk Janet Wolle

2) ANNOUNCEMENTS OF CHAIRPERSON AND SUPERVISORS.

Holdridge The next Plan Commission meeting is November 29th at 5:30. We'll be looking at our Comprehensive Plan and several other things. The Hull Town Board meets on November 13th at 5:30. Then we have our budget hearing on October 29th at 5:30 p.m. In December, the Town Board meets on December 3rd.

There is an article in USA Today from last week that talks about municipal water systems and how the cost has skyrocketed and keeps going up. It deals largely with major cities. They looked at Milwaukee and Green Bay. Municipal water is a costly function. Much more than it was in the past.

The other announcement I have is the Department of Administration has rejected or at least has said that the Stevens Point annexation is contrary to public interest. They sent a letter out. It basically has to do with that island that is created in the Town of Plover with the industrial land around it. That will probably get worked out.

**3) CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE BOARD ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS.
AGENDA ITEMS ARE FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION. *None.***

4) PUBLIC HEARING TOWN OF HULL WATER STUDY REPORT.

Holdridge What I'll do is quickly go through this. You all got a copy. It's in draft form. The first part is the Executive Summary and there's a big contrast between incorporated municipalities like villages and cities as opposed to towns and that has to do with the water supply. If it's a municipal water supply, it's pretty heavily regulated and has to be regularly tested. The private wells like we have in Hull and the other 16 towns in Portage County, have to rely on citizens taking their own test and monitoring their own water supply. So that's a big difference. It's sort of a liberty issue. People have the freedom to test or not test their water so it's up to the individual to decide what they want to do. Quantity started out as being the major issue but we eventually resolved to get into quality because as we went through this, we discovered that the quality was the issue, not the quantity.

Then we go to the background on the study. The study was started by citizen inquiry into the quantity of our water. If you have a period where there's not much rain, then people start thinking about their water supply and there were at least two people that came in and said that clearly, their water was down. So we started on quantity then Well #11 went in and people in that area, within about a 1,400 foot radius from the well how many were tested?

Amman Within the 1,400 foot radius there were 44 homes that they actually ended up testing.

Holdridge So that became an issue. What if that, with the huge effort that makes, would draw down the water? The city to some extent covered themselves by having the testing done. We tried to get the names of the people who had their water tested but the city has a confidentiality agreement so probably our approach would be to write letters to those people within the 1,400 foot radius and invite them to share information. What will happen if they have well problems is they're going to come to the town government for some resolution. The notion of water just being incidental is gone. As in one of the articles I read, water is the new oil. It's becoming that valuable. In Wisconsin and the other Great Lake States, they realized pretty early that not only western states and other states that didn't have the water would go after Great Lakes water, but they also became concerned about those municipalities outside the Great Lakes Basin. One of the big ones is Waukesha. I don't know how that's been resolved yet. They had contaminated water. They were negotiating with Milwaukee and Oak Creek, all to get Lake Michigan water because they had contaminated deep wells.

Over on the next page, on the top there is the acknowledgement of the people that participated and did the work in developing this study. The advisors were crucial. I think anybody who participated in this who didn't know much about water had a lot of opportunity to learn about water.

The other thing I want to talk about is on page 2 is the study limitations. This is not a scientific study, an academic study. It really is an effort to collect what data we know and try to make some sense out of it, to organize it. The question of uniqueness, I don't know of another town that's trying to do this. The city has eight wells, we have 2,020 households. So how do you come to some kind of conclusion on town water when you have all those wells? So that's what's unique about it.

Again, the homeowner is responsible for their own water supply and water testing and the quality of their own water. You wouldn't have to participate and go along and know what your water is like but if you try to sell your house, you're going to get an offer to purchase that will require a water test. Then if you go for financing, they're going to ask for a water test. There's a good chance that the buyer will ask for a water test. So water is such a key issue and there has been discussion about it so that's important to understand that you have to take responsibility for your own water and it's certainly going to come up if there is a transfer of ownership.

On the next page we're talking about future trends. On the bottom of the page it says: "We have 32 inches of precipitation, 10 inches of which go into the groundwater." That's where I got the 10 inches. Amy, you must have written this.

Nitka I talked with Paul about it.

Wilz It's about a third, Paul.

Holdridge Now the quantity question is best looked at on Figure 5 which is on page 6. There are some lines across there that look at quantity. That's probably the best data we have right now on quantity that I know of. It goes over time and looks at it. Those were from four wells in the city.

On page 8, there is the identification, Table 1, of the contaminants and what the drinking water standard is.

These pages here are really educational for people that don't get into this.

On Figure 10 right at the bottom of the page it lists the amount of well testing that was done. Clearly the mid-1980's was the ascendancy of well testing. That coincided with the concern about the agricultural products. But it's pretty clear that's the highlight and it gradually slacked off but it will probably be picking up again.

On the next page there is a brief discussion about small public water systems and those that might have 25 users that use it at least 60 days. There are a number of those in Hull and all of that is public information. So if we want to get information, some of this is simply public and we can tap into that.

On Well #11, there is discussion on that on page 15 up at the top. That's something we clearly want to look into. Patty has checked out with the city and found there's a confidentiality agreement between the city and those homeowners in that 1,400 foot radius the city can't give that information out, but I suspect that if we contact them, they may be interested in providing information to us.

Then we get into the four various areas to be looked at. That was a question of trying to manage data and organizing it in some fashion. Those are photographed and in nice color here.

We settled on the Southeast sector. There's a couple of pages following the Southeast sector with different sorts of contaminants.

Then the blue maps showing the lot sizes.

We get over to the Findings on page 29. I suppose to anybody who knows about water, they may think that these are really naïve findings but to some extent, it's what I learned in going through the data and looking at it. Patty, could you read those, one by one and we'll discuss.

Amman Page 29, Findings, also known as Summary / Conclusions, #1: *From the data in this report, there is no evidence that Hull has a water quantity shortage. Though the water level may fluctuate over time, it has remained remarkably consistent.*

Holdridge Any question about that? When we get these periods of drought or seemingly drought, it starts raising questions in peoples' minds.

Amman #2: *From the data, it is also clear that in general, water quality in the Town of Hull has been consistently safe. However, in the Southeast sector of Hull, nitrate levels in some household wells are higher than the recommended levels for health standards. That area should be monitored and evaluated periodically.*

#3: *Groundwater is always moving, and the direction of groundwater flow influences the type of contamination found in a well and may be a source of nitrate contamination.*

Holdridge Groundwater moves about one to three feet a day. I was thinking about this in terms of if you have a subdivision and maybe not a large subdivision, is it one mass of groundwater that is moving? Or is it broken up? If you measure the east end of the subdivision and then the west end of the subdivision, would you get similar data? I suppose you may or may not.

McGinley I'll take a quick stab at that. It would be as if you tilted the table and put water on it and it's flowing downhill. Every piece of water is different. They're all moving in response to gravity. The same thing here. You're putting that 10 inches a year going in.

Holdridge So that subdivision may have different results.

McGinley Every drop of water takes a different path and depending upon what it intersects along the way, it makes a difference.

Amman #4: *Septic systems return most of the water to the aquifer.*

Holdridge To me, that's the sustainability. The problem is that the water return may have nitrate and other things in it. David and I were over at Sentry a couple of years ago and they were talking about municipal water. Plover was there and the city was there and they take those urban systems, filter it and send it to the Wisconsin River then it goes down to New Orleans. There's no sustainability there, right? The best system, if you could get rid of the contaminants, is a septic system because it keeps water in the system.

McGinley It is going into the ground and does flow towards the Plover River and eventually goes into the Wisconsin River and into the Mississippi. But you're right. There's plenty of time and opportunity for treatment along the way. You could get the nitrate out with a different type of septic system. There are more advanced technologies that allow you to remove nitrogen.

Amman #5: *Understanding water quality requires an understanding of both what is in the water and the health effects of any contaminants. Water appearance may not necessarily reflect water quality.*

Holdridge Is that an example of what we have out here with the rust? That's an example that it looks atrocious but it may not be harmful to drink.

Amman #6: *Primary drinking water standards are health based. Secondary drinking water standards are public welfare standards established as a guideline to water users.*

Holdridge What does that mean? Public welfare standards? I understand the public health of the primary standards. It's public health because they damage your health in some fashion.

DeVita It's more of an esthetics thing.

McGinley Right. We would say esthetics, taste, odor, that's what the secondary standards are. That's why I don't know why it's public welfare language.

Holdridge That sounds like somebody was getting something free or something. So it is esthetics. It looks, it smells, but it may not harm you.

McGinley Or it might taste salty. I think the chloride standards are based on taste.

Amman #8: *Public water systems are required to meet the primary drinking water standards.* #9: *Private wells do not have mandatory standards. Drinking water standards serve as guidelines for private wells.* #10: *Treatment of groundwater is specific to the type of contaminant.*

Holdridge Anything else anybody would like to add to that?

Wolle We would just need to correct the numbering; this goes from #6 to #8.

Holdridge We'll note that and correct that. Then we get into the recommendations.

McGinley On #2, I recall the discussion on the language on #2. It's just a suggestion as an advisor, but the statement that says, "The Town of Hull has been consistently safe." Remember we said...

Bembenek Not really, right. I think Bill had mentioned that too when we said that.

Pederson We've had some atrazine problems in the past.

DeVita The nitrate problem is what we're talking about here. It's over the health standard in many areas of the town. Households have a problem and many have consistently had a problem.

Holdridge Let me read that, it says, "From the data, it is also clear that in general, water quality in the Town of Hull has been consistently safe. However, in the Southeast sector..." I

don't want to say that the drinking water in Hull is unsafe. Right? Because that would be a real over-statement.

McGinley You could say, "most of the wells have...."

DeVita Or, "general water quality is....the majority in the township have safe water." Something like that. "Consistently safe", just the verbiage there...

Holdridge How would you phrase it?

DeVita "Consistently – kinda sorta...."

Bembenek Or take it right out, like Dave says.

Amman Or just "safe"? Make it more generic.

DeVita That would be fine.

McGinley Say: "In general, most of the water..."

Amman Say: "General water quality in Hull has been safe."

Schmidt I don't think of the water quality and safety and risk as going together. It's the drinking water that's tested and safe in the majority of the wells. I think you could safely say that.

Holdridge Drinking water, be specific. We'll revise that.

Schmidt In the majority of the wells.

Holdridge Now on the top of the page, I rewrote that one under Recommendations. What's written there is kind of awkward. I said, "In the future, Hull should undertake an intergovernmental approach to data to determine Hull's water quality and quantity. As much as possible, share water data including from monitoring wells from and with Stevens Point and Portage County." What I'm trying to show is that we would rely on other wells that have been drilled; test wells. We're not always sure where all those are, that's the first goal. Then seek cooperation from the city. Ray, I don't know if the County has any wells, per se, out here, monitoring wells.

Schmidt No, we don't.

Holdridge But you probably know where some are.

Schmidt Oh sure.

Holdridge That would eliminate some of our cost and our effort if we can piggy-back on what others have done. The intergovernmental part seems remote at this time but times always seem to change. Any questions on that one? Patty, you want to go to the second one.

Amman B: *Contact selected long-term residents in Hull's southeast sector, soliciting interest in testing of their private well every 15 months.*

Holdridge What I said there was, "testing of private well, consistently, perhaps every 15 months." I want to say, as we develop some kind of design, instead of testing every 15 months, maybe there is a better testing period. Now I think it's recommended for every 15 months to have your water tested. That may not be what you want to do if you establish some sort of systematic approach. Any question about that?

Wilz Didn't Ray speak to that? That every 15 months gets you rotating through the various times of the year and seasons? So maybe if you didn't want to use the word "15 months", just say "per the recommendations of Portage County".

Holdridge What I'm thinking about is, we take the Southeast sector and we develop some sort of design for that and in that design, we might survey 20% or 25% on a consistent basis. There you might want to have something different in terms of the standard. This is a separate area; we're talking about the Southeast sector. I talked with Bob Enright yesterday and he has another sociologist that has a new testing methodology. Hopefully we can get together and figure out some kind of system that does that.

Zimmerman I have a question on collection of storage data. If you do that program, who collects and stores the data?

Holdridge I think it would be here, the municipal building.

Zimmerman If you collect the data, subsidize it in some form, how does that data get back to you?

Holdridge What does the data mean in the aggregate as you go through this?

Zimmerman So many different times that it comes out. Who does what, where, when?

Holdridge That's the challenge because I don't know of anywhere in Wisconsin where they have tried this with all these wells. We estimated that we had what, Patty, 600...

Amman There are 639 wells in the Southeast sector.

Holdridge So if you look at that area, this map shows it. It's all around the white area which is the city. As you look at this, you don't want 50% of the testing done in this sector. So you need to make a decision on how you are going to allocate the testing, then develop a letter to send to householders explaining what you're trying to do. Those would probably go to the householders that you think would be part of the 20% or 25% asking them to participate. You'd

need to have some sort of agreement, probably not unlike what the city has with those Well #11 people. The subsidy might be, if you decide just to take nitrate data, different than taking Bill's household package, which is more expensive. So that's a decision that has to be made. Hull would pay some sort of subsidy for the homeowner but the homeowner would also have to pay.

Zimmerman You would subsidize it to some extent and you test the water. Do I take it over to the University, or do I take it to the state for a more expensive test? Then I only want you to get the nitrate type of data, I don't want if I've got a gold mine there....that type of thing. What I'm trying to get at is specific data. If you subsidize it, are you going to a specific place like the University?

Holdridge The town would determine what data we want, do we want nitrate, do we want the homeowner package, uranium, etc. If we're going to subsidize it, then the homeowner will have to provide the data to us. I was looking at the end of this, it has a list of the testing organizations in Wisconsin, it would almost surely be the University. Appleton has one, Madison has one, people aren't going to take it to Appleton. So it's probably going to be the University; they are the closest. We've got to figure out the parking over there. That's a little bit of a challenge. That would be the agency that would do it. Now would the homeowner be responsible for taking it there? That's something we'd have to work out. But people go over there now to get their water tested.

DeVita In the interest of fair disclosure, you could probably deal with other labs through the mail if you really wanted to. The state lab would send you a bottle and you'd send it back through the mail. Most places would do that.

Amman Isn't there shipping both ways?

DeVita Sure.

Amman So there's a cost with that.

Holdridge I understand your sensitivity to that issue but it seems to me that the University is where you'd want to go from this area unless you've got uranium, like the one we sent to Madison. That was sent to the Public Health Lab.

McGinley And we compared that with the results we had. You could do either.

Holdridge I think in a practical sense, it's probably the University Lab.

Schmidt Part of Tim's question, he asked where would the data be stored.....

Holdridge It would be stored here.

Schmidt I would like to maintain the data, in addition to here, at the County GIS because of two things: it gives us the ability to look at water quality changes in the area but it also gives us the ability to look at what's coming from upgradient. If the water does indeed move one to

three feet a day, and we think it does, if somebody is putting in a new well and we know we have a 45 ppm nitrate here and they're going to be two years down-gradient, we would help them with the depth of that new well. We wouldn't want to target that same depth, elevation in the aquifer. We'd want to help them avoid that. I do that routinely with people and also with well-drillers who want to know: "Where can I have a chance of finding low nitrate water?"

DeVita Would the County have any money to help subsidize the testing program?

Schmidt You're asking the wrong guy.

Holdridge I did get a note from Patty Drier supporting us.

DeVita There you go.

Wilz The answer is yes. Patty's not here though.

Holdridge I know what you're saying and I think that's what we need to work out.

Schmidt You said you wanted to have some sort of agreement with the property owners similar to the property owners around Well #11 and I think you mean a confidentiality agreement.

Holdridge I don't want to be subsidizing the property owner and then not have them share the data with us.

Schmidt That's exactly right.

Holdridge It's got to be pretty clear that if we're going to pay \$10 or whatever it is, \$20, then we need you to give us the data. You being the householder.

Pederson I would say any data that we're asking for is public data because it is the town that is asking for it.

Holdridge I want to make sure we work that out; that they understand because there's some skittishness here. I suspect there are some people that don't want others to know what their well is like. The reason I put in there that paragraph about when you sell your house, people are going to know and if you have water problems, you need to deal with it. It would be a real inhibitor to selling your property unless it's cleaned up and that's what usually happens. That's a legal questions to some extent but I want people to know up front that if we select them, say they're one of the 25%, that here are our expectations of you and we'll discuss the confidentiality and have that resolved because we want to use it. It needs to be useable data.

Schmidt So it ends up that there is no confidentiality because it becomes public data.

Holdridge But public maybe in the aggregate. From the individual, it may not be public in that sense.

Schmidt That's something the town has to figure out what they want.

Zimmerman Are some of the requirements for that..... it would be not out of the ordinary but above limits like say, somebody wants to test for the short chloramines and they're out of limits, like say it's 9 and they're coming in at 12 or 20, anything above the safe drinking water limits would automatically be...what I'm saying is, they go to Bill and say they want a test on water and it's going to cost whatever with the triachloramine and it comes in above testing standards and instead of just testing for nitrates. Now all we want is the nitrate information. Anything above testing limits for safe drinking water would be passed on? What I'm saying is, if you've got 25% of whatever, say 100 tests, why not have the agreement stating that instead of the homeowner getting back to you with the data, that's always a realbut anything that's subsidized comes directly from the tester. Instead of saying Bill DeVita's well, say well # 10 has a nitrate level of 6 and a trichloramine level of say 22, way above the standard limit, something like that. So instead of a report just requesting hardness, you know the 4 standard items.....

Holdridge I think we're in agreement that our problem is with nitrates. One of the first decisions would be, do you want to test with the homeowner package which is \$49 or do you want to work out something where you just test for nitrates?

Zimmerman Again, we have no control over what package they want.

Holdridge No but we do, if we're going to subsidize them, we're going to have some control.

Zimmerman If you just take the 4 things, it might be \$30 but you get a more extensive....

Holdridge If the homeowner wants to test for more, we want the nitrate and we would pay for the nitrate.

Zimmerman But if you were testing here and you're subsidizing the Town of Hull and all of a sudden you're uranium level is above the drinking water standard, that's something you want flagged from the test.

Holdridge We know that; then we know we have a problem.

Zimmerman Anything that's outside the testing limits, if you could get just the nitrates, or the homeowner package or if you get an extensive package...

Holdridge No, I think we've got to be focused because we have limited resources and I think the general agreement is that it's the nitrate issue. If some homeowner wants to expand it, that's up to them. But if we subsidize it, they've got to give us, let's say it's nitrate, that one chemical, that's what we want.

Zimmerman If you've got the test and we want to be alerted...if I'm a homeowner and I found out my uranium was 100 when it's supposed to be 20, something like that, I sure as heck wouldn't tell you and you're subsidizing people for just the nitrates...

Holdridge I know, but you have to limit it somehow. It's still going to be in the homeowner's ballpark. If they get a test back that shows all these other contaminants, that's an issue for them.

Zimmerman But what I'm saying is, do it at the testing level, not at the homeowner level.

Holdridge I don't understand what that means.

Wilz The reporting.

Zimmerman If Bill DeVita would say, well #10 has got a test for a substance above the state drinking water limit, he doesn't say so and so on such and such a street. All he's saying is this test well, that is subsidized by the town is safe within the 4 parameters – nitrates, hardness, everything like that is safe, but the uranium is way...

Holdridge Again, I don't think we want to get into those other things. Now if that test comes out like that, that needs to be provided and the homeowner is going to get that but we've got to limit our inquiry. It's true that there may be areas that have high uranium or whatever, high bacteria and that's something the homeowner needs to know, if they pay for the test and we subsidize it for one chemical. That's free information.

Zimmerman I see your point but I'm just saying any kind of unsafe drinking water level should be alerted.

Holdridge Fine but this is a unique operation we're trying to do here. There's nothing that says if the homeowner wants the homeowner package and they discover there are other areas that are contaminated, then that certainly is their responsibility to try to do something about it. But what we're trying to do is figure out the nitrate which will probably be a big enough issue. Particularly if you try to run it over time.

Pederson I think what Tim is suggesting is that we might be alerted to something that's coming and could be another contaminate in the area if this was reported to us and then it might alert us to tell other homeowners to check for this particular thing.

Holdridge My assumption is that would probably come out in the testing process.

Binder Here's my question: for the state lab or the University, for the private well being tested, do you have any responsibility for sharing that information with anybody other than the homeowner, the person that is being tested? No? What if you went to the State Lab of Hygiene? It still just goes back to the homeowner, okay. I didn't know if the state authority had anything where they had to notify municipalities that there was a problem.

Holdridge If there's high bacteria for example.

DeVita You just notify the homeowner.

Holdridge I think to get through this, we've got to be pretty focused. This might turn out to be a much bigger project than what we anticipate. As far as I can determine, the key chemical in this area is nitrate. You might discover other things as you go around. That goes back to the homeowner.

Binder In the lab, is there a general report to the municipalities saying of the 400 wells that were tested, we note that there were 3 or 4 that came up with...they don't identify who it was, they just say that in their testing, they had these blips, to you the municipality?

Holdridge I assume they can.

DeVita No.

Holdridge You can't?

Binder You'd have to be doing a study, right?

DeVita Right. What you're talking about sounds like doing a study. But if we have 400 samples come into our lab from the Town of Hull over a period of 5 years and we have to compile that data, it gets a little cumbersome.

Binder Well, in the first year, if there were a number of them done, but I was just throwing it out there.

Pederson Maybe it could take the form of, we'll subsidize the test for nitrate and we would request or urge you to share any other data that might be of concern to you and your neighbors that would indicate something that is beyond what is safe because that would help alert us to a potential problem in the neighborhood.

Holdridge Yes, that's a suggestion.

Binder You could through that suggestion out to them, right?

Holdridge But the reality is, all this data we collected has looked at these other chemicals, a lot of it.

Binder But how recent is it? 2010?

DeVita They were pretty select households.

Holdridge But the data does generate that, right?

DeVita No, we're not routinely testing for that. We're talking about the other household chemicals.

Holdridge As you look at some of these graphs in here, somebody pulled that out, it was part of some test.

DeVita You mean the homeowner's package?

Holdridge I don't know if it was called the homeowner's package, but I'm talking about over time. When we looked at this data that was collected over time, 30 years or so, there's clear evidence that some of these tests show these various chemicals.

DeVita Okay, so Paul, you pulled that together, right?

McGinley Yes. It was part of the study we pulled together, like you're suggesting, the historical data. Then some of it is from the city's monitoring wells, those four wells.

Wilz I think, to kind of close this, how we study, how we collect or how we pay for it, none of that has been decided yet. So I think what we need to do is get through this, then as a Board, decide whether or not we want to move forward. Then that becomes a piece that has to done. What are we going to start collecting? How do we do that? That's when all these other questions can be answered. That's not what we are here for tonight.

Holdridge The intent would be, in a paragraph, and the big paragraph is on the Southeast sector and doing some sort of comprehensive, systematic study of that because that's never been done elsewhere. Maybe outside Wisconsin, but that's the main focus here. Going back to the issue, it's been pretty consistently nitrate. The data collected and the homeowner has other issues, bacteria and anything else you've got, that's going to be put out to the homeowner. Dave's suggestion, we could suggest that in a letter, if there are other things that come out, that's fine. I think we've got to limit it. I would say there would be a small group that will sort of design this study and raise the important questions. Depth to groundwater is a good one. If you've got your well down beyond 29 feet, we already know some areas that have got deeper wells and have more nitrate than more shallow wells, but there are a whole host of questions that I think have to be answered. Those would have to be tied in with homeowners selected to participate so we have data on that well and that situation. Where the septic system is and some of those other questions that are relatively new sort of questions, and to study it over time like that. Those are issues yet to be resolved.

Amman C: *In the other three sectors (Northwest, Central and Northeast), solicit volunteers for longer term testing of private wells, perhaps every two or three years, with results to be shared with Hull. Confidentiality will be clarified.*

Holdridge Any questions? I'm not sure what would encompass that sort of testing dealing with those areas. That's to be worked out.

Amman D: *Share information through our newsletter, website, etc. with Hull residents about the possibility of nitrates and other contaminants in certain areas of Hull. Also share information on the health effects of contaminants, including safety levels and recommended corrective measures.*

McGinley Just a quick grammatical suggestion: most of the places in the report it was nitrate, not nitrates.

Amman So no 's'.

Holdridge There is that one in the appendix that deals with several reports from the University of Nebraska. One is on nitrates. That information, we need to get that out.

Amman E: Recommend authoritative sources or experts that residents can go to for advice on dealing with specific water contamination issues. F: Advise residents of the possible dangers of lawn chemicals/pesticides and their effect on drinking water. Explain possible limiting of future subdivision lots to a minimum of two (or more?) acres per family to accommodate proper septic system dispersion.

McGinley Can I make quick suggestions there? What about instead of 'proper', just 'to provide more'.

Holdridge Say that again.

McGinley My suggestion would be instead of 'to accommodate proper septic system dispersion' it would say something like 'to provide more septic system dispersion'. My thought there is that two acres is not going to guarantee that you're going to have proper dispersion. I think when there are pretty narrow plumes of contamination, it reduces the likelihood that someone is going to stick a well in there.....

DeVita You mean maybe to accommodate proper septic system dispersion placement?

McGinley I was responding to the dispersion, that if maybe they had bigger lots, then ...I thought this was giving the impression that if you have big lots, the plume would be very wide and diluted. Right? It wouldn't be dispersed and it would be less of a problem. Technically that's probably not going to be the case and bigger lots are better because you'll have more water and less likelihood of intersecting, but I don't think it means it guarantees that the plume would be spread out.

DeVita I guess I'm thinking about it in two ways. Not only septic system placement but well system placement. You can place a septic system 400 feet from a well, in sand, you're going to have a fairly narrow plume because the flow rate is so high. I think we talked about this at a meeting, that it might be a possibility for a subdivision, what the groundwater flow direction is, in platting out the subdivision, if you understood that, you wouldn't put septic systems upgradient of wells or conversely wells downgradient of septic systems.

Holdridge Ray, do you take that all into account now?

Schmidt No, we don't take any of that into account. We're not really allowed to under state code. But I think it's the next logical step.

Wilz But this is giving information for people in the future. Things you should know if you're building your new house. You might want to put your well over here instead of over there.

Holdridge That's one of the data collection questions. Where is your septic system? How far is it from your well? Is it upgradient?

DeVita From you neighbors well.

Holdridge That would be important questions to answer.

Schmidt That would be a very important question to answer. And we could help them answer that, in many cases, right now. But you're dealing now not only with a plain but with the depth of wells, the pitch of the gradient and the groundwater, trying to determine when it's going to intersect which well. So it's not something simple in all cases.

Holdridge You may not be able to answer some of those.

Schmidt I can always give them an answer but it might not be a helpful answer.

McGinley And that's my comment, I was just advising that maybe the word 'proper' in there may suggest that going to a two acre minimum, you won't have any problem. I don't think that is the case.

Wilz It also suggests that if you are currently less than two acres, you are improper. All of our subdivisions are less than two acres.

Prusak You're assuming that bigger lots would improve the....

Wilz They could, yes.

Prusak That's what you're trying to say, but ultimately you could have 40 acres out there, it would be much better than having a half acre.

McGinley My concern is dispersion may not be the solution that we get, it's just less likely....maybe you just end it at family, put a period there. It says 'minimum of two or more with a question mark' so it's suggesting that

Wilz Unless you put 'Two or more acres per family to accommodate proper water strategies' or use some general term, 'incorporate strategies for proper well placement'.

McGinley Well and septic.

Wilz In other words, don't try to be specific because as Ray just pointed out, there are four or five things to consider.

Holdridge A lot of variables.

Schmidt It also looks to me like we start that with a sentence about lawn chemicals and pesticides and then we switch to subdivision septic systems. I think we might want to split those into two separate things. I see them as two separate topics.

Prusak If you are looking at two acre lots, you might want to discourage them from putting two acres into lawn that they fertilize every three months. If you go to two acre lots, you might want to encourage them to retain, maybe 50% natural conditions instead of fertilizing every couple of months.

Holdridge I think some of those things have to come out of a study. If we start telling people we don't do that now.....that they need to have so much unfertilized or....

Prusak At my lot, when we built the house over there when we got my lot, zoning encouraged in that subdivision to try and maintain as much natural as possible. If you look at that subdivision, there are lots of trees and most of the owners have followed that and kept their grass to a minimum. In that subdivision, they are not grass to grass to grass. There are a lot of trees in between. That was specifically when Steve Brazalle was there, the subdivisions were encouraged to keep 50% if possible in the natural state without going to grass.

Wilz And the word as you said here is encouragement. I think that's what all of it should be. People want to know. What should I do if I choose to do it? That's what we're talking about putting together.

Holdridge Was that a requirement of the county?

Prusak When I built the house there and went to get the zoning permit, that was part of the discussion.

Holdridge That was the whole subdivision.

Prusak Right. When anybody came in for building permits, whoever came in, the county zoning was encouraging to hold as much natural area as possible without going to grass on top of grass. There was nothing to force me to do that but it was logical building in the middle of a woods when we started there. So on my lot, I picked the open area within my lot that had very few trees. But houses that came after that pretty much stuck to that. You can go from one lot to the next and there are buffers between pretty much every house and lot. So apparently it did work, they took it to heart and I think it's helpful out there.

Wilz It started with somebody providing some information.

Prusak Right.

Holdridge You might discover as you get into this, that is the way you would want it to be or it's required to be. It may not be just encouraged any more. New subdivisions going in might have to have these certain standards that old subdivisions didn't have to have based on the quality of the water.

Pederson It could also be written into covenants.

Holdridge When I was talking with these aldermen about the two gas stations that went in, the wellhead protection area, conditional uses, if they were in the city, if they were in the county, they couldn't even put them in, they kept telling me, "Well, we've got nitrate problems because of the agricultural land, that's the source." We've got septic, we've got lawn fertilizer and we've probably got agricultural lands. They were pretty focused on the agricultural. So that's one of the things, if we could sort that out and say where does it come from. It's probably the most important question anyway.

Schmidt Sounds like that would be a great study.

McGinley The study request I did last year, I'll submit that again this year and see if we can get funding.

Amman *G: Correct the level of uranium in the drinking water at the Hull Municipal Building. H: Create a central location for data obtained through monitoring efforts, and assign that responsibility to an individual staff member. I: Develop communications with individuals surrounding Stevens Point Municipal Well #11 to share information and invite feedback on the status of their private household wells. J: Develop a way to measure the quantity of water in Hull. K: Possibly develop a Wellhead Protection Ordinance for the Town of Hull.*

Holdridge I don't know if any town has such an ordinance but maybe that is something we really need to look at. Then you go to the references, I would suggest what we do is after the recommendations, we move the glossary there and then put the references at the end. There's a pretty extensive glossary of terms. Then there's an appendix. One of the appendix is talking about nitrates. On page 34, we list the water testing labs. I think in there, we should somehow have a map that helps people to the University and helps give them directions where to park.

DeVita I can get you that.

Holdridge I think that would be good. You look at all those and they're outside the area so I think what you'll end up with is the University will get a lot of activity. Then the one guide is on nitrate and we have those from the University of Nebraska.

My suggestion to the Board would be, particularly on these other recommendations outside of the one that looks at the Southeast area, those can be implemented as we go along, come up with a plan for them. But the one on the Southeast, I would suggest that at the Board meeting in December we try to come up with a method or design on how that particular Southeast area should be scrutinized and tested. Hopefully Paul, Ray, Bill, Bob Enright and some of us can sit down and come up with something. Any other thoughts?

Laug I was curious about the lab test that you did take with the study. Have any of the homeowners contacted you for results or concerns?

Wilz They got their results.

Laug Yes, but has anybody showed concern from the results that Amy did? Have you had any feedback?

Holdridge From all those past tests?

Laug Yes, that we just started out with, when we first started this whole study.

DeVita She's talking about Amy's class project I think, right?

Laug Right. When she started this whole project.

Bembenek You're talking about the 44 wells.

Nitka No. There was a small study I did with 9 wells.

Bembenek Oh, that's right, okay. The 44 were by Well #11.

Holdridge Where were the 9 wells?

Nitka They were throughout the township. That's where we were looking at the human waste markers and septic indicators and then the pesticides and the nitrate.

Laug That's how you found out the Southeast was more.....

Nitka We also did, through this study, then we looked at some more historical data.

Wilz Gladys, from historical data, we knew the Southeast was in rough shape. Just look at all the dots on these pages.

Holdridge What about the 9? What was the outcome of that?

Nitka There were two in the Southeast area that had high concentrations of pesticide metabolites and their nitrate levels were in the 30's. Then there was another one in that area that had a higher concentration of the septic indicators. Those nitrate levels were also above the drinking water standard.

Bembenek Did any of the 9 households question any of that after they got the results?

Wilz That's what Gladys is asking. Has anybody asked or been concerned about...

Bembenek You didn't get any calls from anybody? Okay.

Holdridge So they all got the data.

Nitka They all got their results from the study.

Wilz Did they draw the water, or did you help them draw the water?

Nitka I went and took the samples.

Holdridge So I guess the answer is, there hasn't been.

Pederson Were they provided with any remediation suggestions?

Nitka No.

Wilz You asked if there are any other thoughts here; I envision that out of the work that has been done and the work that will be continued to be done, that maybe we can get some information and maybe have an intergovernmental approach. Maybe with Portage County, we can participate in that to create a really good pamphlet on 'This is what you need to know about your drinking water. Here are some tips on how you should fertilize or not fertilize your lawn. Here's where you can get your water tested. This is where you can get a reverse osmosis system.' Kind of a...I've got this, now what do I do. Well, just keep reading the pamphlet. I think this would be great for all of Portage County, not just the residents of Hull.

DeVita We've got some literature at the Extension.

McGinley Right. So there would be specific pamphlets for some of this. Now what you're describing is something more distilled down even a little bit more.

Wilz A quick guide: "Hey, I got my water tested and I came in at 10.5, what do I do? What is reverse osmosis?" Well look in the...describe it and maybe even five places in town you can call and get more information.

McGinley We could assemble the literature we have now that we would normally give to somebody who called up with those questions.

Wilz Kind of a resource guide is what I'm thinking of.

Amman People are sometimes confused. I had someone ask me just yesterday; she has a gravity carbon filter water purifier and she thought that filtered out nitrates and I said, "No, it doesn't." And I explained to her what three types take out nitrates and that was news to her.

Wilz It was interesting through this study, this group and all the work you've done, I tried to attend as many meetings as I could. I put a new well in about a year or year and a half ago and the nitrates were high. So I had it tested again and guess what, they didn't go down. So it was reverse osmosis. I went out trying to learn about it. I did what everybody would do, I

started at Lowe's and Menard's. Then luckily I needed some plumbing done in the house and a plumber came in and said, "I'll tell you what, we'll put one in, we'll take care of it." But if that hadn't happened, I might have been so frustrated trying to get information that I might have put in the wrong thing in or just left it alone.

Laug Also, my son works for Maher Water, and he tested my water and Amy tested it. So I am fortunate to have a water cooler in my house, but when I asked him about a reverse osmosis, you're talking bucko bucks compared to what you pay.

Wilz So a resource guide I guess. Homeowners will make the decision, they just don't know where to start.

Holdridge There is an appendix on reverse osmosis from the University of Nebraska. When you send back these test results, do you give them any information on it?

DeVita Yes. We send along an interpretation guide and if they are over the standard or there is bacteria or nitrate, whatever, there's a statement on the report saying that it's over the state health standard. From Amy's study, remember a lot of the septic system, human waste indicators, pesticides, nothing was over state standards in any of that stuff because there are... with the pesticide metabolites, the standards are so high. It's not like we were going to exceed those and there are no state standards for any of these human waste indicators so there would be no....

Holdridge But what I'm saying, though, when you send back the results of the test, do you provide any other information that gives them some direction?

DeVita You mean for treatment?

Holdridge Yes.

DeVita No.

Schmidt If it's got bacteriological contamination, they do send along a brochure that talks about bacteriological contamination and chlorination of the well, right?

DeVita Right.

Schmidt I've seen some of those.

Holdridge It seems to me, once they get it tested and get the results, if they identify some real contaminate problems, that's probably the time they should have information on potentially, how they can take it from there. That's a learning opportunity.

Schmidt It's a teachable moment.

Holdridge Maybe that's something in the long-term that we can look at. I think that's a good suggestion.

DeVita We have all sorts of information on our website regarding treatment options.

Holdridge Maybe that's the other one, the website.

DeVita It's listed on every report.

Holdridge You don't have to send the information, you send the website and they can take it from there.

Schmidt It helps many people but it doesn't help them all. One of the things as I went through this drinking water nitrate, nitrogen guide from Nebraska, I went through it kind of fast, but I don't see anything in here that talks about the Wisconsin Department of Health advice that nobody should use high nitrate water long-term. Not just infants and pregnant women. Now they recommend that nobody drink water above 10 ppm.

Amman Did you read page 47?

Schmidt No. Should I?

Amman Yes, the very last page. Page 47 explains the Preventative Action Limit levels.

Holdridge What about Ray's point? It used to be infants but now you're saying it's not just infants, its adults too.

Nitka I think on page 34 right at the top of the appendix.

Schmidt I was trying to read the fine print, but here it is. Thanks Amy.

Holdridge Other questions, comments, suggestions?

DeVita Maybe that comment shouldn't be just in the appendix. It's important enough to go into the text.

Holdridge You're probably right. You want to note that?

Pederson You mentioned uranium levels here at the Town of Hull but was there any data collected anywhere else in the town that indicated uranium levels....?

Holdridge I don't know. There might have been.

Schmidt Amy, did you find any other uranium?

Nitka Nothing that was close to the drinking water standard.

McGinley Of the 9 samples that she took, she tested 2 for uranium. Then there was a little historical information because of the mobile home park. Otherwise there hasn't been a lot of testing.

Holdridge This one got targeted, the water in there. I'm not sure why, but somehow it did and we got it tested by the lab in Madison.

McGinley I eventually started on that I guess.

Holdridge That clearly showed high uranium.

McGinley Right. We had the capability on campus to look for at least the most common form or most abundant form of uranium. We did the preliminary test and it came back high and we the sample to the Madison lab.

Prusak Have you done any testing on the deep wells over on the west side?

McGinley I think one of Amy's 9 wells.

Nitka We had one deep well from the northwest, 140'. It was actually lower than some of the other ones.

McGinley So it isn't really a pattern, a straight forward predictor.

Holdridge But that suggestion about nitrates and adults, we probably should pull that and put it more in the narrative someplace.

Schmidt There is a little bit of it on page 21 in the narrative but it's not real pointed.

Holdridge Do you have something official?

Schmidt Yes.

Holdridge Can you send that over to us? Then when we get questions about what is our source.....I think everybody understands about the infants, or should understand because that's pretty common knowledge. Other comments or questions?

Prusak One thing on page 7, Figure 6 and Figure 7 where you're talking about the estimated drawdown. I think we need to clarify that prior to any pumping that was done. Because when you look at those 2 figures, you're (*estimating*) pumping at 5 million gallons per day and the drawdown was less than when it was (*actually*) pumped at 13 million gallons after testing. The estimated drawdowns, prior to any testing, explain why, when the actual testing came it was less than anticipated. But when you look at it, you'd say: "Why would you pump more and have less drawdown?" So it's counter-intuitive unless you figure out that the "estimated" was different than the "actual" pumping.

Amman That was why I bolded the ‘estimated’ and then bolded the ‘actual results’ hoping that that might help a little bit. But what you’re saying is helpful too.

Prusak Estimated prior to any kind of pumping going on out there. Otherwise you’ve got a drawdown showing at one point then showing 1.2”. So you go from more pumping and have less drawdown. If someone doesn’t really understand what’s going on there, how can you pump more and get less (*drawdown*).

Schmidt I would say the last sentence just above those two pictures that says ‘water quantity in the Town of Hull should not become an issue.’ I would say, ‘water quality in this part of the Town of Hull’, or ‘in this area’.

Wilz ‘In this specific area.’ Because it’s all around that well.

Holdridge Patty, you want to note that, on page 7.

Schmidt The last sentence above Figure 6.

Wilz Because everything is related to that area.

Holdridge Anything else?

Wilz I have a comment. On page 2 you wrote a narrative here on thanking everybody and that was very well done. I think when I came to these meetings and saw everybody interacting and saw the importance of this, thank you’s are in order. But I would also like to thank you, John, for thinking about things other people don’t think about sometimes. And Mel, for co-chairing too and your background in water. I don’t know what we’ve learned but we know more than when we started and we’ve got a direction now and that is what we were trying to do. We’ve got to build information and this is a great, great start. So I’d like to thank all the citizens, all the Portage County and University people and especially you, John, for kicking it off.

Holdridge I think we’re sort of riding the back of the tiger on this because it’s never been done in a township. I sent something to one of our leaders suggesting that they ought to offer towns in Portage County an opportunity to test their water; town boards making that decision and asking their citizens who would want their water tested, subsidized by the County. If the town boards take that up in this area, that’s a risky venture because we have so much farm/ag land and there’s been a history of great concern about controlling pesticides. But on the other hand, I think it’s probably time to start looking at our water and taking it very, very seriously because it’s become not only a Wisconsin issue but all over. So I appreciate your comments. We really just started. We need to have a system in place and start collecting data and dealing with the issues.

Wilz Right. What Paul said, in your funding that you got cut short on your study, it’s like we need to quit talking about what we think. We need to start finding out about what we know and what we don’t know. We need information and data. This is a start in that direction.

Holdridge One of the aldermen said to me in my discussion with him, he tends to be an environmentalist, he said, "Well what happens if you discover the source is this or the source is that?" Well, we're not going to sit on it. We have a responsibility. If the source is a huge interest group, that's the way it falls. But I think you've got to go for public health. Take those issues on. We don't know that yet but from his perspective, these things always get strangled by big interest groups that don't want you getting into their territory and probably affecting to some extent even their economic survival. In the interest of 2,020 households, I think we have to be concerned in Hull about what impacts our households. The other thing I was thinking about doing, Paul, was finding out whoever in the DNR is the water quality person right at the top level and writing or communicating with him. Maybe sending this study along, sending it to Rick Stadelman of the Wisconsin Town's Association because those people typically have contacts, you have contacts.

McGinley That's a good idea. Let them know people care about this.

Holdridge Yes, get the word out.

Wilz I think it's also noteworthy too that we're not through the budget process yet. It's going to be approved but the Town Board did approve up to this point the budget for 2013 where we allocated for water testing in this coming year, \$5,000. So we've already put some money behind this in anticipation that the citizens will approve.

Holdridge It might be at some point that we will need some more expertise. We have to take it very seriously. We want this study to be the very best we can come up with and if we have to hire some additional expertise, I think we ought to be prepared to do it. Clean air and clean water are probably our number one goals in public health.

Pederson Is part of the educational process now going to take the form of a press release on what we've found?

Holdridge Yes, we'll work on that and I think it would be good to have a comment from my friend, Ray, here, in that release as a water quality person.

Schmidt Absolutely.

Holdridge And if Paul would come up with something. I think this is a unique effort and we had some real bad results as far as I'm concerned with the city putting in gas stations. We fought that. That was not a move towards protecting the water supply as far as I'm concerned, and others, I think feel that way.

Zimmerman At our last meeting of the Portage County Groundwater Committee, I made a suggestion to Joel Lemke from the city that if and when the Town of Hull water should become polluted, until it's corrected, the city would supply water temporarily to the Town of Hull and he said he had to think about that. He's in a tight spot. Politically, if you want water, they want you to connect to Stevens Point.

Wilz By annexing.

Zimmerman Annexing to Stevens Point. But again, it would be on a temporary basis. It would be on the basis of those gas stations. It's not anything else like farmers or anything like that, it's just strictly gasoline products.

Bembenek That doesn't mean if our water is contaminated in that area. The city might have the same problem because that's the same water.

Zimmerman Again, mine was only for the individual homeowner because he wouldn't be able to drink his own water.

Bembenek Oh, okay, I see.

Zimmerman On a temporary basis, at cost. You're not going to get it for free but at least you'd have water. That's what I was getting at.

Holdridge There was, in the Town of Plover, a discussion with the city. I noticed Tim Karcheski wants the city to provide water to that subdivision that's sitting in the middle of that whole annexation area in the Town of Plover. That if those private wells become contaminated from any industrial facilities that go there, plants or whatever, that the city needs to guarantee they will provide sewer and water or at least water to those houses. I think there are only five or six in that area, without any annexation. I don't know where that discussion went but I read that in the Gazette last week.

Zimmerman That's generally the same kind of discussion, on a temporary basis.

Holdridge As I read the municipal water tests and water results, I think the municipalities have got problems of their own. Obviously the private wells have got some. But these city municipal wells have real serious contamination problems. Waukesha is an example, Ledgeview over in the suburb of Green Bay has arsenic and radon in their water, uranium in their water so just because you have a municipal well doesn't mean that you're out of the woods on this stuff. Melvin probably knows far better than I do about this stuff so the idea that the city can annex you and all of a sudden you would have great water, that may or may not be the case at all.

Bembenek When I started, there wasn't anything put in, not even chlorine. Then when they did they started with the chlorine, then just the minimum with the chlorine and the stuff for teeth and dental. That was it.

Holdridge I think it would be useful if the Board would take action on this and we'll come back probably that first meeting in December and look at this area and figure out a design.

Wilz Kind of the next step.

Holdridge The next step and it's a big one. The rest of these, some of these others are publicity and volunteers.

5) ACTION BY THE HULL BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON WATER STUDY REPORT.

A motion was made by Dave Wilz that we accept the Town of Hull Water Study Report as we reviewed it and with the changes and recommendations that were made to approve it. Motion seconded by Mel Bembenek. Motion carried unanimously.

Holdridge Any other discussion? I want to thank all the people, Paul, Amy, Bill, Ray Schmidt, we couldn't have done this without them. We needed a citizen group. The other thing I was thinking about is maybe we need to have a small citizen group to call in and keep them updated on our progress here. That might be something we need to look at because I think it's useful to have citizens as we go along.

6) ADJOURNMENT. Meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Janet Wolle, Town of Hull Clerk

Patty Amman, Water Study Recording Secretary