
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-swms-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 UCMRS 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.