

MEETING DATE: Wednesday, February 10, 2021

MEETING SUBJECT: Wastewater Omnibus Proposed Rulemaking, Public Stakeholder Meeting

MEETING BACKGROUND: (sent in email on 2/10/2021 with online registration information)

The Iowa Department of Natural Resources has rescheduled the stakeholder meeting to discuss several proposed changes to the Iowa Administrative Code regarding separation distances, wastewater, general permits, sludge, private sewage disposal systems, and operator certification. The rescheduled Zoom meeting will be held on Wednesday, February 10, 2021 from 1:00 to 3:00 PM Central Time.

MEETING TRANSCRIPT (including Chat):

Meeting started at 1:05 pm.

Courtney Cswercko, DNR, began the power point presentation and discussed the agenda and how to submit comments during the meeting. Additional comments should be submitted by February 17, 2021. Difficulty with the online recording process was noted. The meeting recording started at 1:24pm.

- **Cory Frank, DNR (from Chat):** Wendy there may be some people on the old zoom date according to Noah Poppelreiter (DNR). I told him to send them the rescheduled link so they can reregister and get in.
- **Wendy Hieb, DNR (from Chat):** Thank you.
- **Christina Gruenhagen, IFBF (from Chat):** Will non-permittees or NPS be allowed to register in the NRE? Or is it only PS? If the project is cost-shared who gets credit within the NRE?
- **Brian Graettinger, Eurofins TestAmerica (from Chat):** Will this power point be available for review after the call?
- **Wendy Hieb, DNR (From Chat):** Yes, we will make the PowerPoint available.
- **Adam Schnieders, DNR (from Chat):** Hi Chris, yes it's possible for nonpermittees to register practices in the NRE. Specifics are still being worked out on that and what happens when there is shared investment.
- **Christina Gruenhagen, IFBF (from Chat):** Thanks Adam.

After the presentation, Courtney went through the list of participants who had indicated that they wished to comment.

- **Trenton Pohl:** No response.
- **James Hodina: Linn Co. Public Health:** Thank you for opportunity to comment; I would like to comment on proposed changes to Chapter 69, section 5, paragraph 2. Proposed change of term; manufacturer's certified technician changed to trained individual familiar with the operation and maintenance of the system. Concerned with ambiguity of the phrase "trained individual". Unsure how as a local public health agency we would enforce this. The DNR's wastewater and drinking water rules commonly define the required training and certification for individuals who perform critical duties that protect drinking water and the waters of the state. While a revision to the terminology for maintenance of onsite wastewater systems may be appropriate, we suggest that the DNR apply the same standard of a certified individual used elsewhere in the rules to this provision of the rule as well. Thank you.
- **Katie Resor, R&R Septic Systems:** We do maintenance on alternative septic systems as well as do installations of alternative and conventional systems. Thank you for giving me time to address the proposed changes to chapter 69 today on this call. There is not enough time to address all of my concerns to the changes in chapter 69 so rest assured I will be submitting those in written form. There are three items I would want to mention today. Item 73 567-69.5(2), regarding a trained individual. Who defines trained individual? If we are no longer going to have systems inspected and maintained by a manufacturer's certified technician, please tell me what the definition of trained is. Who provides that training; who keeps track of the training that trained individual receives for continuing education? Does trained refer to anyone who watches a YouTube video to become familiar with the system? Trained is vague. What if a homeowner says he or she is trained? If that is the verbiage you want, I'm fine with that but it needs to be specifically defined. Number two item 74 amending 69.1 regarding changing the maintenance of a peat file to be performed once every two years instead of annually. If water quality is the ultimate end goal, why would you decrease the maintenance? Frequent routine maintenance provides the opportunity to catch

performance problems. I do maintenance twice a year, spring and fall. I know the problems that can crop up in that short time span. I can only imagine poor conditions and disrepair of those systems if they aren't touched more frequently. Water quality is adversely affected when routine maintenance is not performed. I for one do not want to be responsible for those systems and this lack of maintenance is not even addressing the financial impact to the homeowners. But, that's a great segue to my third comment; the fiscal impact statement dated January 20, 2021 states, and I quote, it is not anticipated that the proposed changes regarding maintenance contracts in chapter 69 will result in significant costs to regulated entities, as these systems are not new and existing technicians and trained individuals are able to inspect and maintain the systems. This fiscal impact statement does not talk about the work that maintenance providers will be losing by doing regular maintenance every other year verses annual for peat systems. It doesn't address the trickle-down effect that has for the business, employees, household income, mortgages, car payments, kid's activities, groceries, and ultimately the money they will not be spending in our local economies. And, what about the potential financial impact to the homeowners of those systems? This fiscal impact statement forgets to point out the typical larger cost associated with neglect and lack of maintenance. When you hold off on regular maintenance and repairs of your vehicle, those needed repairs don't disappear, they get worse and ultimately become more costly. Same with your septic system. At the end of two years, there is greater potential for costly repairs. Who pays for those? Yes, the homeowner and what if they can't afford them? Either no repairs are made and poor water quality is being discharged, or they rob peter to pay paul and the above scenario of the economic trickle-down effect ensues on the homeowner front ultimately limiting what they can pump back into the economy. And, don't get me wrong, those homeowner is ultimately responsible for the performance of and the costs associated with their septic upkeep but the vast majority will only do the bare minimum that is required of them and by the laws. So if those lowans don't count in the potential financial impacts, then who does? Please take my verbal points, my submitted written statement, and those of my fellow septic installers, maintenance providers, regulators, manufacturers, seriously. We are a passionate, informed and educated group and we know our stuff. Thank you.

- **Tom Rankin, TG Rankin Company:** Katie covered a lot of my questions there, so thank you. I did want to ask a few questions, wanting to know, regarding chapter 69 and the proposal for item # 74 and changing the annual maintenance to biannual. What are we attempting to fix by this rule change? What data do we have in the field that supports this rule change? And, how does this work with the current NSF standard with Iowa, currently now, each homeowner in order to stay compliant with NSF, you've got to have maintenance for at least two years. I believe the NSF requires one every six months for two years, so that's four maintenances in two years to be NSF complaint. So, those are my three questions.
- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** I don't have answers right now: I wrote those down and we will get back to you with the answers on those.
- **Jon Cornish, West Central Service:** I think the previous people, especially Kate, hit all the nails on the head there. You're going to hear these same comments from all of use maintenance contractors. You've trained us, you've beat it into our head that we're trying to clean up the water, we've jumped through tremendous hoops to be licensed, CEU's Fees, manufacturer training. What exactly are we trying to accomplish here? We're trying to get the water cleaned up and you want to reduce the amount of testing on these systems; I just don't get that. We may as well go back to throwing this wastewater right in the ditch like we attempted to fix the first time. If you leave these peat systems or other discharging systems without maintenance, potentially you could throw raw wastewater into the ditch for a period of two years. Are we ok with that? I want an answer from the DNR on that. I thought we were real strict on what we were doing and we all cared. I can't even imagine where this is coming from. It's actually ridiculous. The second question I had for you; this new grade W for onsite systems; so you'll have a new license through the DNR if I'm understanding this correctly that will have a W on the back of it so will that be another license we have to pay for in addition to all the rest of them we keep?
- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** Laurie Sharp is on here.
- **Eric Wiklund, DNR:** can we do questions at the end, this is the opportunity to provide comments orally, and when everyone has provided their comments we will have an opportunity to take questions through the chat and hopefully orally as well but let's try to keep questions and answers to the end. This is the oral comment period. Thanks.
- **Freedom Malik, Clean Air Muscatine:** My original questions were answered in the PowerPoint presentation. Thank you for the thorough presentation and answering the questions already. I have nothing more to comment.

- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** great; if you have any additional questions or comments after you think it over, please submit them in writing.
- **Michael Stidham:** not present; did not respond.
- **Travis Scott, Regional Manager for Waterloo Biofilter:** I have been an installer and maintenance provider for 20 some years. I am shocked, as many of my counterparts are, that the DNR is going to put themselves in the position that they have essentially labeled a certain system better than the rest because of a gap in the maintenance requirement. To homeowners that would look like the DNR is saying that's a better system. When most of my counterparts would tell you that that system, without maintenance, will cause more problems. I'm just kind of shocked; those of us in the industry have been talking; that DNR would allow themselves to be put in that position to make that statement when they've always been very clear about not recommending a particular system.
- **Ryan Budke, Shawver Well Company and Iowa Water Well Association:** One of my concerns is the setback distance in chapter 49, and changing ditches and allowing 15 feet for ditches for a well to be from a ditch. A lot of the time we get into these animal confinement buildings where we are already crunched for space. By allowing that to 15 feet, what you are going to do is put contractors in danger of overhead lines. A lot of times contractors don't get there until the building has started and we just don't have any say in it so if we don't do it someone else will come and do it; ultimately, it's getting to be a safety factor. Even the utilities, I've talked to them, and they usually want and OSHA wanted a 25 foot setback from utility lines. Those are usually bare lines. Most of our derricks go 30 to 40 feet up in the air and the sun would come off that derrick and go into those power lines, creating a huge safety issue. I don't see where there's any reason; there's some spots that yeah, if there's no power lines there, but I don't know how you can put one blanket on everything. I think it's causing a bigger problem by changing that 15 feet versus just leaving the 25 feet the way it is now. Is there any real reason for changing it to 15 feet?
- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** Russ Tell was the staff member that made most of the changes to the table in Chapter 49 and he retired in January, so I'll have to get back to you on why that change was suggested and we will definitely take a look at that.
- **Jim Kelso, Linn Co. Public Health:** A lot of my stuff has also been covered. As a past installed of septic, when a lot of this stuff was just starting to become an issue the biggest thing was the discharges and the cleanliness. We have found out with the discharges that we don't necessarily always meet, we might meet our TSS's and BOD's, which, if you use the same language that you currently use for sand filters, somebody familiar with the system, which could be the homeowner, I would venture to say most homeowners do not understand what any of the stipulations are or what a good functioning system looks like or does. We've left a trained individual or a homeowner responsible for their sand filters. If it's okayed and they have proven that they do not typically keep up with their maintenance or with sampling their discharging systems, and so with the notion that we have a system that's discharging to the surface that it could potentially contaminate surface waters and make it to drainage ways or whatever that could impact larger areas that I think somebody not necessarily certified that has their name on it and a possibility of a legal ramification against them on a yearly basis that they're not trustworthy to do the proper maintenance on their systems and I disagree with getting away from a certified technician. As a sanitarian, changing this will cause some difficult because currently we have a system set up with our maintenance providers where we track these systems and they send in all of their information from their maintenance contacts and their yearly maintenance with the NPDES's and the sampling and all that that they do and we're not going to require that of the trained individual which will make it a tracking nightmare not to mention whose going to follow up and make sure these people are doing it correctly. I don't have enough time in my day to track and track and follow all of these people that could potentially become new maintenance providers for themselves or their neighbors or something like that and try to keep things going in a straight line and protect the environment, these discharging systems are finicky and should be left to people that have been trained both in their local environment and with their maintenance providers and manufacturers. The definition of somebody familiar with a system and a trained individual needs to be specific and it should be easily handled if you have a county such as ours which is tracking these maintenance contracts and making sure they are updated and held on a yearly basis. Thank you.
- **Daniel Miller, Jefferson Co. Environmental Health:** no comment at this time. Thank you.
- **David Kohlhaase, Dickinson Co. Environmental Health:** no comment at this time.
- **Christopher Logue, Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc.:** no comment at this time.
- **Evan Gardinier:** no response.

- **Lance Aldrich, P.E., Fox Engineering:** I don't have any comments; thanks.
- **Sheryl Ervin, Infiltrator Water Technologies:** I appreciate you giving us the time to provide comments on these proposed rule revisions. I'm going to start off by saying that I know that some of what I'm going to say has already been addressed, although this indicates that representatives from various aspects of our industry have very similar concerns. I'd like to start off by saying that, because peat moss biofilters, recirculating textile filters systems and aerobic treatment units include many different types of systems. Most are NFS-ANC certified and maintenance requirements should be applied consistently across all of these different technologies. They've been tested to NSF 40 standards, sometimes NFS 245 standards; they've received certifications, products will comply with these standards. So the requirements across this standard type of technologies should be uniform, and one technology shouldn't be favored over another. This applies to aerobic treatment, packed bed, textile, and even some tech drain field products. The three-year maintenance frequency falls outside of the maintenance frequency specified in the NSF 40 certification and if you don't maintain those maintenance requirements then the manufacturer risks losing their certification. Since senate bill 511 qualifies maintenance requirements as a minimum, the frequency in the rules should match the NSF 40 requirement for the first two years of service which is one every six months and then after that first year of service require at least annual maintenance for all of the reasons that have already been discussed. Manufacturers all have guidelines where they specify as to that. Additionally, one of the questions that I have is how will this apply to the cocoa filters that are currently being installed in the state. In reading through the rules, many of the different types of technologies are called out specifically in the rule while cocoa filters are not. That brings up my next point; rather than focusing on the type of system, we would suggest that effluent quality be used by the DNR for the evaluation of these advanced treatment units. By rule the DNR does require NSF 40 certification for these systems and while all types of these systems installed in Iowa are required to be certified, there really are differences in the effluent quality that's produced and that can be seen as you read through those NSF certifications. All types of advanced treatment units that are treating domestic wastewater to a specified level should have uniform approval and maintenance requirements that are harmonized with the standards for which they are certified. This has already been talked about, but I just would like to point out again that the amended language changing certified technician to trained individual familiar with operation and maintenance of the system; these private sewage disposal systems requiring a maintenance contract are extremely varied in design. Training and certification by the manufacturer is really important to ensure that these systems are functioning properly. Additionally, trained individual familiar with the system is vague and unenforceable. We have the potential to reduce system performance by allowing someone without proper knowledge and training to maintain these systems. I have other written comments that I'm going to provide but I do appreciate you giving me the time to provide oral comments. Thank you.

After comments had been received, questions were addressed.

- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** that looks like it for the comments. Now we will move to questions.
- **Wendy Hieb, DNR:** the first question came from Margaret Jaynes in the chat box.
- **Eric Wiklund, DNR:** I know Laurie Sharp had to step out, and I know she indicated that Tom Atkinson should be able to address the questions for grade W, so if you're available Tom, and would be willing to answer the questions.
- **Margaret Jaynes, Story Co. Environmental Health (from Chat):** What will the new grade W for onsite system operators be required for?
- **Tom Atkinson, DNR:** So Grade W would be for publicly owned treatment works that have a discharging system that utilizes an onsite wastewater treatment technology. So, the things that are mentioned in Chapter 69 as technologies, but not for private sewage disposal systems. So these would be, say a small community decides to utilize some of those technologies; that's what a Grade W would be assigned to.
- **Eric Wiklund, DNR:** so I believe there was a question by one of the installers if that was a certification they were going to be required to get, the answer would be no, unless you are going to be a certified operator for a POTW that is implementing that type of technology; but it's not required from an installer perspective.
- **Christina Gruenhagen, IFBF (from Chat):** What is the rationale for putting the LPG storage setback in the footnote 9 (p.17) rather than in the table?
- **Taroon Bidar, DNR:** I can go ahead and take that. I think one of the reasons was, the LPG tanks, even if it leaks, it won't get into the ground, so it's not really, a source of contamination, and the table is the source of contamination, so we did not actually put it in the table, but also Chapter 43 calls for or requires the drainage to be directed away

from the well in all directions for a minimum radius of 15 feet. So, taking that into consideration, if there is an LPG or a gas tank there, you should be at least 15 feet away from the well.

- **Christina Gruenhagen, IFBF (from Chat):** What is the rationale for the size of the distances for transmission lines in table 49? The commentary said it is less restrictive than surrounding states.
- **Mark Moeller, DNR:** Taroon, do you know the answer?
- **Taroon Bidar, DNR:** no.
- **Mark Moeller, DNR:** So I think on that question, and Ryan, I jotted down your question about the ditch changing, I'm going to have to say the same thing as Courtney. Russ Tell isn't here and we can't pick his brain now, but we will go back and look at that.
- **Andy McKinlay, Waterloo Biofilter (from Chat):** Will the data that was provided to the DNR to justify peat filters extending frequency of service and maintenance? I cannot find anywhere in any other jurisdiction that references service and maintenance longer than one year in any of their documentation. I am not sure the two systems are similar, or are they?
- **Eric Wiklund, DNR:** So I'll address that one. This is a bit of a unique situation; there was a bill in the Iowa legislature that was going to remove the need for inspections, and the department was faced with maybe having that as a potential outcome, that there would be no maintenance contracts required, so we went forward with a suggested rule making that would not take them away but would reduce the frequency. We are very appreciative of the comments that have been provided and we are definitely hearing the concerns that you are bringing forward. We do not have any data that led to that decision.
- **Marie-Christine Belanger, Premier Tech (from Chat):** Question regarding setback distances and open portion and close portion of a sewage system – can you clarify what an open portion of a system includes and what a close portion includes. I understand that dispersal area falls under open portion of a septic system and that a septic tank is covered under the close portion of a system but what about treatment systems if in a close vessel? And what is not into a close vessel?
- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** It looks like this was a question directed to me, so I'm going to try and paste it out to everyone. It's not working. Mark or Taroon; what is a closed vessel and what is not in a closed vessel, that was the question.
- **Taroon Bidar, DNR:** A closed vessel is something that does not leak, which holds everything in itself. It is not open, it's contained; we consider that a closed vessel and closed portion of the system.
- **Rebecca Fox, Koch Fertilizer, Fort Dodge (from Chat):** In removing Table III from Chapter 63 will this also remove the sampling requirement referenced in Table IV, number 46 "Sampling Procedures for Monitoring Wells?"
- **Wendy Hieb, DNR:** I can take that. Yes, I believe it will remove it. I have to look closer at exactly what our markup does but I believe it would remove it. Those, I believe we are putting now in the permits that have monitoring wells, monitoring requirements for those monitoring wells in the permit, that the sampling procedures will go in the permit from now on, rather than having them buried in rule.
- **Rebecca Fox, Koch Fertilizer, Fort Dodge:** so if our current land app permit doesn't have the requirement for how we would need to sample then would we just follow the EPA guidance on monitoring well sampling?
- **Wendy Hieb, DNR:** this is always tough when you talk about putting things into permits, it takes time to get through renewal cycles. Maybe it belongs in a different Chapter; we'll have to look at it, but it kind of doesn't quite belong in Chapter 63 with wastewater. We will have to look at that to see if it belongs somewhere else or if we're just going to make sure it gets into permits more quickly.
- **Jon Cornish, West Central Service (from Chat):** Why would you ever maintenance a system less than the manufacturer recommends?
- **Eric Wiklund, DNR:** We wouldn't really want to do that. One of the concerns we have about making the maintenance less frequent is we know that a lot of counties, counties can be more restrictive than state rule and code and we wouldn't want counties then putting in their own more strict frequent maintenance contracts. We would like to have a good frequency in our rules that everyone is in agreement upon, and everybody just follows that. So, yes, we would not want to have a system required to be maintained in law less frequently than the manufacturer requires or that everybody agrees upon is the right timing.

- **Freedom Malik, Clean Air Muscatine (from Chat):** Could you share the bill that recommended no maintenance moving forward or the legislator who proposed it?
- **Eric Wiklund, DNR:** I believe that the bill was Senate File 511.
- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** yes, and it would have been last year's. SF 511.
- **Eric Wiklund, DNR:** yes, it is still out there.
- **Jim Kelso, Linn Co. Public Health:** Does anybody know the sponsor of that bill?
- **Eric Wiklund, DNR:** I don't know off the top of my head, no.
- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** I have a copy of it but I don't see anything about who was the sponsor but I'm sure that it's on the legislative website.
- **John Cornish, West Central Service (from Chat):** so will all currently licensed on-site contractors automatically get the W?
- **Tom Atkinson, DNR:** I'm not sure there's an answer to that one yet John. There has been discussion on what the class is or what that requirement is for obtaining Grade W certification. I'm not sure there's been much discussion yet on whether that would be retroactively applied if we use an existing course; if we would retroactively apply it instead of retaking it or not. I'll put that in the notes to talk to Laurie about.
- **Jim Kelso, Linn Co. Public Health (from Chat):** Would not 511 be junk as there are laws that govern how these systems are to be approved and maintained according to NSF and manufacturing specifications? I feel this change is only to grease the squeaky wheel because someone didn't want to pay for a certified individual to inspect their system and had the right connections to have someone bring up a change. The change from a certified individual to a trained and familiar system could allow environmentally damaging waste to be discharged for an extended period of time? Is this change going to be environmentally beneficial? If anything, should we not get softer but more stringent and require yearly sampling for all systems that discharge not just sand filters and NPDES systems?
- **Eric Wiklund, DNR:** Jim I hear you loud and clear and I don't really have a response to that because unfortunately, you can read between the line on that one. There's concerns there, absolutely.
- **Jim Kelso, Linn Co. Public Health (from Chat):** thank you.
- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** does anyone else have any comments or questions? I know his is a lot to digest, so please submit any questions or comments you might have later on today or within the next week.
- **Wendy Hieb, DNR:** We had a request in the chat earlier to provide the power point slides for today. Would you like to put them on the NPDES website?
- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** Yes, I was already planning on doing that. The NPDES Rules webpage has all the rule documents that I had emailed out when I sent out the meeting notification and I will put this power point up on the NPDES webpage. Thank you Wendy for putting up the link.
- **Wendy Hieb (from chat):** <https://www.iowadnr.gov/Environmental-Protection/Water-Quality/NPDES-Wastewater-Permitting/NPDES-Rules>
- **Andy McKinlay, Waterloo Biofilter (from Chat):** can I make a quick comment or would you like to move on? I can submit it in writing.
- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** Andy, make a quick comment if you would like.
- **Andy McKinlay, Waterloo Biofilter (from Chat):** Just a quick reference back to the NSF. I understand what someone was saying about the NSF requiring two visits per year; it's mostly because NSF only lists treatment systems for six months. So that's why there is a requirement for you to do maintenance every six months, that's all they know it would operate for. I think you would need data to prove that it would last longer than six months without any maintenance. Just wanted to make that comment.
- **Travis Scott, Waterloo Biofilter (from Chat):** Sounds like the changes to Chapter 69 need to be removed from the omnibus then.
- **Katie Resor, R&R Septic Systems (from Chat):** Will that be the power point only being posted, or this recorded meeting that will include all comments?
- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** Katie, I did set this to record the meeting.
- **Eric Wiklund, DNR:** it was not recording; I stated it recording at 1:24. So, we've got all of the comments.
- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** I will post that on the website as well.
- **Cory Frank, DNR:** I think there's a question from Forrest Aldrich that came in as well on Chapter 43 item number 3.

- **Forrest Aldrich, Veenstra & Kimm (from Chat):** Chapter 43 Item No. 3. The way that the revised rule reads for a water main crossing a storm sewer as long as there is 18" clearance between the water main and the storm sewer, regardless if the water main is over or under the storm sewer, no additional changes are needed. Is that the intent?
- **Mark Moeller, DNR:** Gabe Lee is on this to help cover water mains.
- **Gabe Lee, DNR:** If the separation is greater than 18" and water main is located above, you need not do anything. If it's less than 6 inches but greater than 18 inches, and the water main is located above, then there are four options. You can construct the water main as a ductile pipe as gasket, or construct the water main with water-type casing, or construct the sewer of water main materials, and the last one, reinforced concrete pipe with gasket is acceptable. If the separation is greater or within a quarter inch of the water main located below, you can use those four options too. However, if the separation is less than six inches with the water main above the sewer, it's not allowed, or if the separation is greater than 18 inches with water main below, it's not allowed. We have a fact sheet, I can give it to Courtney, it can be posted. It has the different scenarios, if that would be clearer.
- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** I would be happy to post that.
- **Forrest Aldrich, Veenstra & Kimm:** That section of the code does not cover the case of the water main more than 18 inches below a storm sewer; that's my comment. Those four bullet points do not address the way it's written in the code. It is for the sanitary, but it's not for the storm. Please take a hard look at it, when water is under the storm, greater than 18 inches deep.
- **Gabe Lee, DNR:** Ok, we will take a look at it. Thank you.
- **Evan Gardiner, Homegard Inspection Services (from Chat):** Senator Jake Chapman originally proposed the changes in peat bio filter maintenance SF 385.
- **Jim Kelso, Linn Co. Public Health (from Chat):** look up his county and see. There are plenty of certified individuals. His opening argument for the bill holds no water.
- **Courtney Cswercko, DNR:** I think we've got all of the comments and questions. It looks like Evan found more on the senate file; it was originally SF 385; that is correct. If there are no more questions or comments, we can wrap this up. As I mentioned previously, if anyone has any further thoughts on anything, please submit them by February 17th. Thank you all for participating in this. I'm glad we had a lot of interest and it's good to hear your comments.

Meeting closed at 2:25 pm.