

WELL DRILLER CERTIFICATION PROGRAM
MEETING MINUTES
February 24, 2010
Town of Concord
Department of Planning and Land Management Building
1st Floor Meeting Room
141 Keyes Road
Concord, MA 01742

Attendees : Paul Blain, David Bragg, Richard Bonetti, Elizabeth Callahan, Glen Cote, Steve Hallem, Steve Mabee, Kevin Maher, Ted Morine, Ron Peterson, Brent Reagor.

Minutes by Hallem

I. Introduction: Committee was updated on transfer of program to MassDEP.

1. Regulatory changes will be pursued on two tracks. Those regulations that will not require legislative approval will be pursued via this committee.
 - a. Looking at changes which can be made without approval of the Legislature.
 - i. Definition of a well:
 - ii. Method to determine well yield:
 - b. Legislative approval required for:
 - i. Frequency of renewals: currently annual. Looking at increasing the renewal interval to every 2 or 3 years with a change in the fees to reflect the increase in number of years.
 - ii. Pump installers: investigate the feasibility to register pump installers. Determine the criteria and minimum requirements. Protection of public health by requiring that certain minimum standards are maintained.
 - c. Public hearing was held on November 11, 2009 to solicit comments on proposed regulatory changes. Minor changes were made to get the program functioning at MassDEP. Mostly minor word changes; Director to Commissioner, DCR to DEP and so forth. Some comments were received by mail.
2. Certification vs. Licensing
 - a. Has been discussed with the Office of the Attorney General, Certified is the term used in the enabling legislation; may stand; Registered implies listing (Bragg).
 - b. Licensing would involve the Board of Licensure
3. What does the program do?
 - a. Certify Drillers (approx. 350)
 - b. Register rigs (450)
 - c. Process the backlog of well completion reports
 - d. Respond to requests for information
4. Fee Schedule: Changes proposed for the new Regulations
 - a. New Certification will increase to \$200/Renewals will be \$100
 - b. Rigs will remain at \$25 annually per rig
 - c. Waivers (applying for certification from another state) will increase to \$400
 - d. A reference was made to the increase in rig fees by RMV. Cost have increased dramatically due to regulatory changes. Cost now based on weight of vehicle.
 - e. Compliance and enforcement-fines to be increased.
5. Certification/Renewal
 - a. This June all will be processed through the mail
 - b. June 2011 - electronic registration will be available and will allow online fee processing.
6. Forms

- a. Well completion forms
 - i. Map with location can be adjusted to "fit" on the screen to improve accuracy.
 - ii. Section 11 of the General Form should contain the pick options of (TR-Tremie, GR-Gravity, OT-Other)
 - iii. GSHP: Some installations will be going to a presumptive approval process. If they comply with current guidelines and file well completion report. We will get well location and other data relating to the well(s).
 - iv. A suggestion to obtain elevations from GIS-DEMs and add to database to allow better correlation of the data (Steve Mabee)
7. Current data is composed of:
 - a. Old cards w/o lat/long (some go back to the 1960's). So far we have not been able to locate 15% of these, just because we lack the necessary data.
 - b. A suggestion to locate a "remarkable" well (one with special attributes, high yield or in a location which may not have any lithologic data). It may be worth the added effort to spend additional time in the field to locate such a well (Mabee).
8. SearchWell: Discussed the application with BOH agents, towns and other filters. The TAC was shown static examples of screens such as the filters, tables generated and a GIS screen with wells plotted. The group showed enthusiasm for the application. There was a question regarding security-should the application and location data be made available for Public Water Supplies?
9. The availability of certain published maps was discussed, such as surficial geology and bedrock lithology. Mabee provided some input regarding his work. These overlays would be potential base maps for SearchWell.
10. Additional Staffing: Mentioned the Program will be using temporally reassigned staff to assist in entering and verifying the backlog well data. This will be done for 4 months starting March 1st. Staff will be going to the Boards of Health to obtain better locational information to aid in locating the wells. Additional wells that are found in the BOH files will be added to the database.
11. Briefly mentioned the possibility of having a multi-tier well driller registration but were not prepared to discuss today.

II. Regulatory Discussion

1. Well Definitions: Some stated that the NH and CT definitions were good. Protection of the public health and natural resources were stated as priorities.
 - a. Piezometer if removed within 30 days of last recovery measurement would not require a well completion report.
 - b. Construction Holes/Wells: Do caisson wells, temporary wells (less than 24 hrs.), post holes, pile driving need to be included?
 - c. Observe, sample and drill. Many were interested in included the term "observe" as a criteria in the definition of a well.
 - d. Question by committee member - What to do about the abandonment of a 1000' dry potential domestic water supply? Grout 1000'? We don't want to put a depth limit for a temporary well.
 - e. We could place the definition of a well in the definition section of the regulations and then list exceptions in the regulation (Callahan)
 - f. The posting of a RTN (Ste Number) on a well completion form should not be a required field. Some sites are in the discovery phase (Bureau of Waste Site Cleanup) and do not have an RTN yet. The field is not a required field as many well will be installed that are not associated with a BWSC site.
2. Well Yield
 - a. We have Drinking Water Program criteria for testing a well which yields 5000 gpd or grater.
 - b. WMA has criteria for non-potable well yield
 - c. For smaller, private wells will airlift be adequate? This generated discussion relative to the lack of accuracy of this method. It may only be good enough for an order of magnitude estimate.
 - d. It was suggested the old FHA criteria of 5gpm/4hrs may be the criteria many follow for well yield. (Ted, Brent)
 - e. Pump installers may have a comment relative to this topic.
 - f. The well driller may be the best person to determine if the airlift method is the best method for a well (Ron).

- g. When a pump is set (by a pump installer) then a pumping test is conducted. The pumping test would result in a more accurate yield number. This would not be entered at the time of well drilling, but at some time after the pump is installed. The number may come from someone other than the person signing the well completion report.

III. Next meeting at the same place, April or May.