



Standards Oversight Council (SOC)

Developing effective technical standards that protect Wisconsin's natural resources

131 W. Wilson St., Suite #601, Madison, Wisconsin 53703
(608) 441-2677 || Fax (608) 441-2676 || socwisconsin.org

01 Verification of Depth to Bedrock Standard Team

MEETING NOTES

Monday, March 16, 2020 ▲ 9:30am – 10:30am ▲

Remote Meeting online via GoToMeeting

9:30 Welcome, Introduction

Goal: Welcome and introduction.

Attendance:

Kate, Rachel, Matt W, Amy, Francisco, Travis, Tony, Joe, Dave, Maureen

Absent: Jamie, Jason, Matt K, Nathen

Guests: None

Since most of us are unexpectedly working from home today and may have distractions of children and pets, we'll need to abbreviate our planned agenda. The team should jump in and participate, or you can email Rachel or I after the meeting with follow-up thoughts on these comments and responses.

Purpose of today's meeting had been to finalize the responses to comments, and prepare the text for Broad Review. In actuality, we'll be focusing on a couple of the more significant comments and use email to finalize the text for Broad Review.

For now, we won't identify who specifically made a comment, but if you think it helpful to understand their approach and interpretation, Kate can identify.

Key Comments

Goal: Discuss the Initial Review Comments on the Draft Technical Standard and associated documents with focus on qualifications, geophysics and examples.

Initial Review consisted of 137 comments by 13 expert reviewers. Some were minor, some more substantial. The technical standard text with the comments and the draft responses were emailed around to the team for review prior to this meeting.

The comment process isn't intended to change our sideboards, or revisit old conversations and decisions. Unless significant new information is provided, we shouldn't discuss again. However, multiple similar comments may indicate we'd want to provide clarifying or supporting language.

The team focuses the discussion on some of the comments which raised more substantial issues:

- Qualifications clarification is needed (qualifications to implement intrusive vs geophysics, qualifications for who is approving). Team previously agreed to qualifications and how process would work (and how it would be different for a CCA vs a land owner) but additional wording would make this clearer in the standard. **Rachel** will add language.
- Geophysics comments – look extensive but addressed rather simply by some team members before this meeting. Some of the additions would result in wordy text, especially for a summary table, and will be left out. Team previously agreed that the qualified personnel would have knowledge of equipment operation and would need some flexibility on how to apply to a specific field. There are some responses that still need some corresponding edits to the text. **Kate** will reach out to **Dave** and **Moe** after this meeting to have them help confirm the appropriate text edits for Table 2.
- Providing examples of verification? Team discusses and concludes some figures on how to position borings and geophysical survey will be prepared. The map will be zoomed in enough so there is less information that would identify the parcel. We also agree to not show the data collected, but just show where planned verification (sampling points) would occur. We will present three maps in the example:
 1. A current map showing depth to bedrock variability for one field (from SnapMaps);
 2. Same map as #1 with addition of proposed boring locations to dispute X depth to bedrock boundary (boundary will depend on depths show on sample field);
 3. Same map and boundary dispute as #2, but instead with proposed geophysical transect lines and reduced boring locations (required ground truthing).
- A good example would be the 2nd field that Dave and Nathen worked on for their field testing of geophysics equipment. Nathen was unable to be on call today, but **Kate** will reach out and see if **Nathen** can help prepare the example Maps #1 and #2 in bullet above. **Dave** will then add geophysics for Map #3. Both will make sure the sampling points match our required sampling densities. Travis also has probing information that could be useful in putting together these examples.

Discuss Other Response Adjustments from Team

Goal: Team discussion of draft responses to adjust. Finalize written responses to comments.

Rachel will make text adjustments based on conversation today, and some comments received via email from team members as well as some decisions made by DATCP internally.

Outreach Recommendations and Plan of Action

Goal: Discuss options for public outreach and training after standard publication.

Action Items:

- **Rachel** will add language related to qualifications and other minor edits discussed in this meeting and received via email from the team.

01 Verification of Depth to Bedrock Standard Team

MEETING NOTES

Monday, March 16, 2020

Page 3

- **Dave** and **Moe** will confirm the appropriate text edits for comments received on Table 2. **Moe** also had some general edits to be included and she'll email **Kate**.
- **Kate** will reach out and see if **Nathen** can prepare the example Maps #1 and #2. **Dave** will then add geophysics for Map #3.
- **Kate** will then email the text for the **Team** to review one more time before public Broad Review. We'll plan on getting the team revised text addressing Initial Review comments by next week, give the team a week to review, and strive to have this out for the Broad Review in mid-April.
- **Kate** will email team seeking input regarding outreach and training to prepare for after standard publication.

10:30 End