
From: Benzie, Richard (DEQ)
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2012 3:28 PM
To: 'Janet Kuefler'
Subject: RE: \$106 grant gw work
Attachments: Request for WQ Monitoring 10-31-12 wb-swas-reqform_247026_7 (1).doc

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