
From: Crooks.Jennifer@epamail.epa.gov
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2012 5:31 PM
To: Benzie, Richard (DEQ)
Cc: Kuefler.Janet@epamail.epa.gov; Poy.Thomas@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Fw: §106 grant gw work--MDEQ proposal re: CECs, FFCs
Attachments: Request for WQ Monitoring 10-31-12 wb-swas-reqform_247026_7 (1).doc

Richard--this a terrific proposal! An excellent use of funding for monitoring. Is there something we can do to get Bill Creal's attention to fund your monitoring proposal? Write him a letter/send him an email in support--from Tom?

Jennifer

----- Forwarded by Jennifer Crooks/R5/USEPA/US on 11/05/2012 04:27 PM -----

From: Janet Kuefler/R5/USEPA/US
 To: Jennifer Crooks@EPA, Cary McElhinney/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, William Spaulding@EPA, Wendy Drake/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Rita Bair@EPA,
 Cc: Thomas Poy@EPA, Miguel Deltoral@EPA, Nicholas Damato@EPA
 Date: 11/05/2012 04:07 PM
 Subject: Fw: §106 grant gw work--MDEQ proposal re: CECs, FFCs

Jen--Rich B. had asked about other states §106 work after the states call in Sept (and maybe after you talked with the state!) No guarantee that this will be funded, but I think that it is a very nice proposal.

Rita--can you pls. share as an FYI with UCMR3 lead (was not sure if that was still Ron).

Kim--fyi re: PFCs, CECs.

Jen--do you think that it would be good to follow up with Rich (or a letter to the CWA program, or DW program) re: our support of this project, etc.--not sure if it might help get it funded.

thanks,

+++++

Janet Kuefler
 State Programs Team Leader
 Ground Water and Drinking Water Branch
 U.S. EPA Region 5
 77 W. Jackson Blvd, WG-15J
 Chicago, IL 60604

kuefler.janet@epa.gov

312/886-0123 fax: 312/582-5814

----- Forwarded by Janet Kuefler/R5/USEPA/US on 11/05/2012 04:00 PM -----

From: "Benzie, Richard (DEQ)" <BENZIER@michigan.gov>
 To: Janet Kuefler/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
 Date: 11/05/2012 02:27 PM
 Subject: RE: §106 grant gw work

Janet,

I was cleaning out my inbox and came across this message still highlighted. I thought I would let you know what I submitted in response to the annual request from the Surface Water Assessment Section for suggested monitoring in support of their programs. I don't know if it will go anywhere or just aggravate some program managers, but Liane suggested we put forth a request so I submitted this one. It's not Groundwater work, but it is related to UCMR3 and Source Water Programs at surface water systems.

Richard

From: Janet Kuefler [mailto:Kuefler_Janet@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2012 3:34 PM
To: Benzie, Richard (DEQ)
Subject: §106 grant gw work

Rich--this is something that Tom Poy had asked me to put together for internal purposes in May 2012; we looked at internal documents only (did not verify with states). I thought that you might find it helpful.

+++++

Janet Kuefler
 State Programs Team Leader
 Ground Water and Drinking Water Branch
 U.S. EPA Region 5
 77 W. Jackson Blvd, WG-15J
 Chicago, IL 60604

kuefler.janet@epa.gov

IDEM. According to the 2011-13 Indiana EnPPA, IDEM plans to spend \$4,965,604 (91.56%) over 2 years for surface water and \$457,966 (8.44%) over 2 years for groundwater. The total amount of 106 funds that will be spent for Groundwater and Surface Water programs is \$5,423,570. It appears that the percentage of funds that Indiana intends to spend on groundwater-related CWA Section 106 work is well below the recommended 15% level.

FY 2010 funding for ground water work was \$46,640, which went toward the salary for 2 summer interns and travel costs for network sampling; FY 2011 funding was \$57,091 for development of an unconsolidated aquifer sensitivity map for Indiana. IDEM uses §106 funds to supplement the implementation of the ground water component of Indiana's Water Quality Monitoring Strategy (Strategy). They utilize these funds for summer interns and sampling supplies and depending upon the year this actual funding amount fluctuates.

IEPA. IEPA funding targets, per the EnPPA documents, are at 15% for GW work. (the FY 2011 and 2012 funding targets for IL Section 106 for GW activities are \$819,500 and \$818,200 respectively, our of FY 2011 and FY 2012 are \$5,463,400 and \$5,454,700 respectively), however, specific activities were not included in the EnPPA with the exception of GWR related work, and the State does not have a separate workplan under Section 106.

In a 2007 survey of SWP work, the States reported that "Funding and staff levels are below what would be needed to effectively assist local communities in developing source water protection and management programs. Currently, the Groundwater Section is down two FTEs and has been for several years." and, "The Bureau of Water no longer has a budgeted line-item for the SWP Program.

Therefore, it is nearly impossible to estimate funding sources." and "The Groundwater Section has 14 staff, of which about ½ spend a portion of their time doing SWP." However, there were not responses to any of the funding sources questions, but there was a statement that minimal state funds are used for SWP work.

MDEQ We believe that very little or no §106 funds are going to ground water activities.

The 106 grant and the 319 grant are part of a PPG, so their activities are combined into one workplan. The FY 2012 workplan for 106 and 319 for MI shows only Management/Administration, NPDES/Stormwater permits program, and Surface Water Restoration and Protection program. There is nothing in the 25-page workplan related to groundwater except the last page of Attachment C, Michigan's FY 2012 Compliance Monitoring Strategy for the NPDES program, where it says Michigan has no plan to commit to any groundwater activity related to NPDES. There is a Monitoring and Assessment Section, but it is specifically related to surface waters. (In 2007, MDEQ had 4 FTE for the SWP program and used some very small amount of §106 funds for this work--they reported that 90% of their funding of the 4 FTEs was from DWSRF set-asides)

MN

MDH FY 11- \$66,593

Conduct Reconnaissance Sampling of Private and Public Water Supply Wells-

Various reconnaissance samples (1,112) were analyzed and performed with total costs of \$53,747.

Evaluate natural water quality in community water supply wells –Monitor 125 community water wells on an annual basis to support assessing vulnerability, refining treatment, and updating assessments.

Characterize groundwater quality in wellhead protection areas – Provided technical support to public water suppliers for 1) preparing and implementing wellhead protection plans and 2) managing potential contamination sources that are inventoried during a sanitary survey. Chemistry data is used for characterizing the rates of groundwater recharge and potential impacts of well water quality attributed to land use. The results help refine the approach that will be used to conduct assessment source water monitoring under the federal Ground Water Rule and to assess overall water quality within wellhead protection areas.

I believe that MDH has also been very active in the past several years in setting GW standards (this is correlated with the emerging contaminants work, which is also highlighted in the EnPPA), but I believe this is funded through the tax revenue. MDH uses considerable DWSRF set-asides and state funding sources for SWP work.

MPCA. We do not have the exact funding amount used by MPCA for ground water activities.

MPCA's EnPPA does not include specific activities but does include narrative of management priorities, which include ambient gw monitoring and constructing new wells in vulnerable aquifers to add to the monitoring network. Priorities include working with sister agencies (Health and Ag), tracking trends for nitrates, VOCs, chlorides, pesticides and other parameters, focusing on vulnerable aquifers, recharge zones and areas where land use is changing. The EnPPA talks about specific issues, such as human-caused impacts to ground water quality are apparent in many areas of the state: Twin Cities metropolitan area, Rochester and St. Cloud--elevated concentrations of chloride and nitrate and detectable concentrations of VOCs are common; In rural and agricultural areas, nitrate concentrations are frequently elevated or exceed standards; and pesticides and pesticide

degradates are commonly detected, though at concentrations that are nearly always less than applicable drinking water standards. Nutrient issues are specifically mentioned: Areas of impacted ground water correlate well with land uses that are known to cause the observed quality impacts. The prevalence of elevated nitrate concentrations in ground water in regions dominated by agricultural land uses and in unsewered residential areas is particularly noteworthy.

For MPCA there is much more GW work going on now than years ago when there was a disinvestment in GW monitoring (even before the sales tax revenues came into play). The grant workplan calls for 100 wells to be monitored per year.

OEPA: FY 12 funding is at 15%--Total federal funding amount (surface and ground water):

\$5,355,800

Ground water amount: \$803,400 (15%)

FY 11 & FY12: Primary activities included in Ohio's FFY2012 CWA Section 106—Ground Water Section work plan:

- ground water quality monitoring and characterization
 - implementing Ohio's Ambient Ground Water Quality Monitoring Network
- source water protection
 - conducting special studies in cooperation with other Ohio EPA programs and Ohio agencies (e.g., Ohio Department of Health) to evaluate local ground water quality impacts
 - maintain and update the Ground Water Quality Impacts database
 - provide GIS support for the development of source water assessment reports for new PWSs and drinking water source protection plans for CWSs
 - continue development of GIS capabilities to support source water assessment and protection programs, water quality characterization, underground injection control, and public drinking water supervision
- integration of CWA and SDWA programs to protect sources of drinking water
 - complete the ground water section of the 2012 Integrated Water Quality Report
 - complete the public drinking water supply beneficial use assessments for all locations with sufficient data and include the findings in the 2012 Integrated Water Quality Report
 - provide technical assistance to CWA programs (e.g., water quality certifications, nonpoint source pollution, NPDES, TMDL) to ensure protection of ground water and sources of drinking water
- provide technical assistance for Ohio's public water supply program
 - develop GWR program, including implementation of the hydrogeological site assessment
- participate on boards, commissions, and organizations to promote a comprehensive and coordinated ground water protection and management program

WDNR: We do not have the exact funding amount used by WDNR for ground water activities.

FY 2011

- Coordination with the WI Groundwater Coordinating Council - State agencies with separate authority to take action to protect groundwater met to assess the condition of groundwater

statewide, and developed a report to the legislature, to help them prioritize resources to address the greatest threats.

- Setting Ground Water Quality Standards - Ground Water Standards for 15 substances that included six isomers of dinitrotoluene (DNT) and an enforceable standard for perchlorate were promulgated.
- Reducing N in groundwater in prioritized subwatersheds - A draft strategy to reduce nitrogen in groundwater in targeted subwatersheds has been developed and shared with USEPA Region 5.
- Maintaining and enhancing ground water related databases - State databases used to capture information used by agencies to protect groundwater were maintained.
- High nitrate PWSs in WI were mapped - A statewide map was developed of public water systems with high nitrates. This map and an associated strategy will be used by the state to reduce nutrients in Wisconsin waters.
- Source Water Protection Plans were developed and implemented - Risk to public health was minimized through source water protection for 13% of the population served by CWSs.
- Guidance was provided to those putting in monitoring wells - Monitoring wells were developed in a way that allowed the capture of accurate samples of ground water quality.
- Information and training about ground water was delivered to the public, including sand model demonstrations at elementary schools.
- 6,500 well construction reports were reviewed.
- 4 civil prosecutions were settled against well drillers and pump installers for total forfeitures of \$43,000.
- Plans and specifications for high capacity wells were reviewed, on average, in 26 days.

FY 2012

In addition to the above, a nitrate reduction strategy will be implemented to a degree in accordance with funds available.

(See attached file: Request for WQ Monitoring 10-31-12 wb-swas-reqform_247026_7 (1).doc)