

Great Lakes Collaboration April 28th Notes
Coastal Health Strategy
Grand Traverse

Participants:

Dale Bryson, Lake Michigan Federation
Joyce Coffee, CH Team Staff; Natural Resources & Water Quality, Dept. of Environment
Richard Draper, Bureau of Water Permits, NY State Dept. of Env't. Cons. (NYSDEC)
Chris Glanz, US Army Corps of Engineers
Marcia Jimenez, CH Team Co-Chair; Commissioner, Chicago Dept. of Environment
Julie Kinzelman, Department of Health, City of Racine (tentative)
David Rockwell, GLNPO-MIRB, USEPA Region V
Mike Shriberg, Public Interest Research Group
Elizabeth Toot – Levy, Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District
Don Zelazny, CH Team Co-Chair; Great Lakes Programs Coordinator, NYSDEC
Tom Hoogerhyde, Jones and Henry Engineering Ltd.
Norman Grannemann, USGS
Phone:
Janet Vail, MI water resources
Janet?, MI DEQ
Shannon Briggs: Michigan

Issues and New Directions from Morning Executive Committee Meeting

(Notes from Andy Schwartz, consultant:)

Don Galazy and Marcia Jimenez chaired the meeting. Ms. first Jimenez reviewed the revised format for the draft reports that the Executive Committee had endorsed in the morning session. The summary reports from each Team should include:

- The desired state
- A statement of the problem; of the issues and stresses that currently affected the condition and impeded reaching the desired state and
- 5 recommended actions that should be prioritized for consideration by the Executive Committee, noting where there is consensus in the group for a recommendation. Where possible, the descriptions should include the costs of the recommended actions as well as intended benefits and they should identify which agency or group would be primarily responsible for completing the task. The recommendations should include a discussion of how long it might take to see results.

Regarding the structure of the whole strategy, Ms. Jimenez noted that the current plan is to proceed with the eight sections; one for each strategy team. Once it receives the individual pieces, the executive committee will look to see at the issues from an ecosystem-wide perspective and will identify 10 top recommendations. Both Marcia and Don noted that the draft report already prepared by the Coastal Health team included most of the information required in the new format.

(All notes that follow are from Joyce Coffee)

Guidelines and Expectations:

- Realistic goals
- Be as specific as possible
- Demonstrate on the ground actions
- Recommendations should be concrete, specific and few in number
- Document short, medium and long-term priorities.
- Strategy Team chapters should include:
 - Desired State – Define endpoints/outcomes. Quantify if possible and be specific
 - Problem statement – link to desired state and then link to recommended actions.
 - 5 top recommended actions – Prioritize for consideration of Executive Committee. Develop consensus if possible. Include in costs if available and brief statements of results/benefits.

Appendices:

- Assessment of on-going actions,
- alternative approaches,
- other recommendations
- reference material,
- supporting info for costs.

Indicators and outreach team cover public education and outreach

Discussion

Do we have any priorities that do not require a funding request?

Are we recommending that certain legislation be past?

Do we have any local community actions?

Funding in the Beach Act

Information needs: What is causing the closures of beaches?

In recommended actions, include small achievable goals/some items we do not need money for:

- Alter maintenance and operations – low and no-cost
- Discover tools to target your efforts
- What are the goals that are going to have the biggest impact?
- What are the steps to reach the ultimate goals?

Endpoint – How to reach the goal depends on the year end (3-5 years) (5-10 years).

Bryson: Concern – cannot be platitudes. If make the goals too big – no one has to do them. No one will take responsibility for them. Goals need to be real

Bryson: Rockwell's point to focus on Beach Closings

Action All: B/Griggs: Be specific about who should implement recommended action to reach endpoint.

Reorganization of Chapter –to make it more strategic, less jargon and more finely prioritized

Primary: Novel Approaches to Pollution Source Contamination I.D. and Remediation

1. Eliminating Adverse Impacts of CSO/SSO/Stormwater Discharge
2. Improving Beach Management to Incorporate Source Identification into Beach Management Plans
3. Protecting Drinking Water Quality

Discussion

Action: Think out to the 7th generation.

“Feasible” isn't a strong word

Total elimination is impossible

Goal of elimination is important

Eliminate adverse impacts of wet weather events (CSO/SSO and Stormwater)

“Adverse impact” is not a strong statement

Bryson: Beach Management – means eliminating beach closures.

Action All: Let's speak in specific: CSO, SSO (not wet weather/dry weather),

Action All: To encourage specificity and detailed recommendations for communities to select from the remediate or prevent degradation of coastal health, define recommendations by source (not by wet/dry/management categories) including stormwater in the Wet weather.

Action Rockwell post on internet: Chart distributed: 2002 Great Lakes Coastal Beaches Sources that Resulted in Beach Advisories/Closures

Comments on Rockwell chart:

- Data include all beach managers that reported (108 agencies could potentially have reported in).
- Data are open to independent interpretation
- Wet Weather Sources are a sum of stormwater, SSO and CSO events.
- Other and unknown are wind driven, cladophera,
- (Closures due to exceedance of EPA standards)

Kinzelman: Tool for guiding standardized sanitary inspection form.

Action: in document; change cladophera to blue and green algae”

Determine cause of beach closures. Standardization in monitoring and how we test for it.

Page 3 of 4/21/05 draft: “Summary of Recommended action: Standardize, Trial and Implement a risk-based approach to manage recreational water. The approach should build.....”

Dry Weather (DW) Action: Change the language to **standardize sanitary survey** so that when a beach closes, they discover what it was that caused the closure.

Rockwell: keep the recommended simple.

Jimenez/Rockwell: How frequently you **monitor:** e.g. MI monitors 1X per week. Other place 2-7 days per week.(e.g. Chicago 7 days per week)

Wet Weather (WW) and DW Action: Consider where monitoring language fits in document

Toot-Levy/Kinzelman: Focus attention on problem areas: if rarely have exceedance, or if a beach is rarely used, don’t monitor as frequently – leave **leeway for professional judgment.**

Jimenez: Address multiple beach closures on one day – If 22 beaches, 19 close on one day, bulks up numbers. How do we address prioritization? When do more testing (e.g. 7 days per week) result in additional closures. Therefore need to standardize protocols.

Ohio – Look at % time beach closed vs. open.

? require an annual survey of each beach. If beach has been closed in previous year, require a survey.

Fact: 70% of beaches never have a closure.

Shriberg: Boat Discharge – in the document, page 3 recommended actions: “improper discharge of onboard boater waste.” Page 3 measurable objectives “availability and importance of proper boater waste disposal.”

DW Action Zelazny: Implement standardized sanitary survey and reporting to manage recreational waters.

For public beaches – implement through beach management. For private beaches, individual stakeholders need the same priority – through ordinance or public education.

Schwarz: Want goal statement to reflect in recommended actions. What does dry weather mean?

Possible ways to categorize that are not jargon:

- Direct and indirect sources?
- Point and non-point?
- Wet weather and non-weather impacts?
- Detect and remediate/eliminate?

To Do Action: Figure out a better terminology (*resolution discussions: direct and indirect*)

To do ?: Combine goals 2 and 3: Dry Weather and Improved Beach Management or 1 and 2: Wet Weather and Dry Weather. *Resolution: Decided to discuss recommended actions as tools to select from for remediation and prevention of causes of coastal health problems.*

Algal blooms (wet), beach sands (dry)

End goal: contact with near shore waters of G.L. will pose minimum feasible risk to human health

Problem Statement: As stated

How do we test for risk to human health?

Recommended Action – make it strategic:

- Cost accounting - support cost projections
- Implementing agencies
- Steps to achievement

- Overall benefit statement to introduce section

Co-Chair Action: *An intro paragraph with Lead Actors and Short and Long Term Goals – education as an overarching theme.*

Recommended Actions:

Are these the right five problem categories

How would we rank them?

Use CSO/SSO in problem statement for Wet Weather overflows

Top Priority: **Remediate** and **prevent** adverse impacts to coastal health by controlling direct and indirect sources of pollutants (that are identified through assessment). **Protect** Drinking water quality

A. Assessment (microbial assessment, sanitary survey, rapid testing)

- Selection of most appropriate tool is dependent on assessment that identifies source

Federal accelerate *review* and *approval of*, and establish acceptable *policy* for, Rapid Time Testing¹.

Local utilize these approved tools to access real time data to make decisions.

Local implement standardized sanitary survey and reporting to manage recreational waters

B. Remediation and Prevention Tools/recommended actions (*in/direct sources listed in problem statement*):

- Refine and create recommended actions that define lead actors; steps to achievement; dates; measurable outcomes.
- Support recommended actions cost projections.
- Recommended actions each include *education*/public right to know, a **Local** action
- Recognize existing programs

CSO/SSO: top Federal priority

Include stormwater BMPs

Include Long Term Control Plans

Education – Public right to know

Illegal and malfunctioning septic and private sewer

Stormwater (ag, industrial, urban landscape)

Release from contaminated sediments

Avian and animal deposition

Education--Action/Reaction: *why clean up after pet; why don't feed the birds; why remove trash from beach.*

Contamination from boaters

Federal (and local) - Promulgate and enforce regulation to take action against boaters who discharge waste to coastal waters (by 20XX).

Educate boaters about impact of improper discharge of boater waste

Shedding from bathers

Local - Increase shower facilities public beaches (how many by when)

Inconsistent compliance with sewage treatment and control

Lack of storm and wastewater enforcement

Aging and overloaded wastewater treatment infrastructure and collection

¹ Rapid Time Assessment is a monitoring tool, not an assessment tool. Is it misplaced?

Prioritization – beyond one priority:

- Priority Setting Matrix (Appendix C) correct? What about other 50% of closures?
- Priorities for units of government? Priorities for geographic areas?

Discussion:

Do we think that there should be one priority for each category, or does one category have several recommended actions that should be prioritized?

Kinzelman: Communities have a tool – to 1. *assess their own conditions*; to 2. *identify the cause of – coastal health, in order to 3. remediate to improve their coastal health*. Each category is a different tool, depending on what each community identifies.

Need good beach management tools.

Need an element of education.

Top Priority: Remediate adverse impacts to coastal health by controlling direct and indirect sources (that are identified through assessment).

Tools for controlling indirect and direct sources (pulled from our 4-21-05 recommended actions)

Assessment:

- Microbial assessment
- Sanitary Survey

Potential Sources

- CSO/SSO
- Illegal and malfunctioning septic and private sewer
- Stormwater (ag, industrial, urban landscape)
- Release from contaminated sediments
- Avian and animal deposition
- Contamination from boaters
- Shedding from bathers
- Inconsistent compliance with sewage treatment and control
- Lack of storm and wastewater enforcement
- Aging and overloaded wastewater treatment infrastructure and collection

Geographic Priorities?

Where are there existing programs?

Remediation Tools: Actions for Communities, Federal Govt. And Long Term/Short Term goal
Chronology is: Identify Sources/Remediate or Prevent their Impacts/Educate

If we focused on assessment to remediation, our recommended actions would be applicable to broad range of lawmakers including Congressman in states with inland waters

What about all those things we've already done in G.L. – one of actions is that we enforce CSO plans and add to it with new action.

Problem Statement – more inclusive:

- Include as second sentence: “This results in the need to close beaches, restrict drinking water consumption, issue fish consumption advisories and mechanically remove blue and green algae.”
- Include in list of causes: “and ecosystem/food web changes caused by aquatic invasive species” – especially their impact on water quality
- Include water skiers, users of personal watercraft, and scuba divers.

Discussion:

USGS: Fish Consumption Advisories by PBT strategy team?

Kinzelman: AIS covered by AIS strategy team?

Co Chair Action Resolution: Mention it in the problem statement and then refer to another strategy team.

Toxic algae/cladophora are not same thing. Toxic algae covered by which team?

Co Chair Action: Recommendation/footnote to further define water uses e.g. (water skiers, users of personal watercraft, and scuba divers) or to encompass all degrees of body contact from EPA.

Co-Chair Action AIS: re: AIS impact on near shore water quality.

DZ Action: Add drinking water to problem statement

Overlap Issue: re: pH levels are closing beaches. Industrial legacy – PBT team

Issue: groundwater recharge problem. E.g. animal waste (sea gulls) infiltrating groundwater and then impacting *e. coli* levels in near shore waters.

WW Action Jimenez: Aging infrastructure: Leaks backshore and makes its way into nearshore water. – putting resources toward maintenance and repair of aging infrastructure. (*resolution – will be a remediation tool*)

Survival of *e.coli* in Algal Blooms

Karst setting (e.g. Thunder Bay)

Desired State Overarching Goal/EndGoal

- Is the date right?
- Include Clean Water Act – Swimmable/Fishable/Drinkable?

Discussion:

What is the END GOAL?

Keeping in mind strategy that Jimenez described (long, mid, short, intermediate goals)– we need to rethink our ultimate dates.

Shall we keep it as a year goal to measure against? Or “for future generations.”

Schwarz: Makes sense not to have a date associated with it, especially if you have activities that are going to take place after the date.

End goal = desired state? We want to eliminate the risk to human health. Our vision should be much more than what we can accomplish. Should our end goal be limited to the 7th generation?

The word “feasible” is limiting.

Need specific milestones for each of our dates

Recommended Actions need to have specific goals:

WW Action: E.g. Include “Long Term Control Plans.” “Actions/Ramifications will be taken against communities that do not have long term control plans.”

The initial action should make the greatest difference on our endpoint.

Co-Chair Action – Rewrite Endpoint/Overarching Goal: Desired State: Clean Water Act (positive statement) to start. Specific categories titled “indicators” or “restoration objectives”. And then “minimum risk....”

Document needs to be filled with measurable goals. E.g. we want the G.L. to be fishable and swimmable by 2015.

Dates drive action. Important for our Overarching Goal – End Goal

Desired state: Drinkable, fishable and swimmable (dependent on other teams)

Resolution: For this document: leave it at 2010 and bring the issue to Executive Committee.

DW/WW Action: Put specific dates by each of the 5 categories.

Other

- Outstanding research needs: 1. List of existing regulations, rules and programs; 2. Dates footnoted with reference back to source

Action Kinzelman: Introduce list of on-going efforts (Appendix E) with an ‘assessment’

What are other teams listing? Is there list the same?

Based on CH Strategy – what are the existing regs, programs etc. Use this to test if our recommended actions have the teeth to be implemented, or if we need to recommend a new regulation/program.

Action Bryson: Will create a straw man list of programs

Action Coffee: email Bryson NPD's document