

**Coastal Health Strategy Team  
Conference Call Notes (not minutes)  
March 10, 2005**

**Recap Maumee Bay State Park Meeting**

*Executive Committee and Co-Chairs*

Overlapping issues(OI): NPS – crafting alternative approaches and recommended action for stormwater (urban and rural) and septic-related goals. CSOs/SSOs as they relate to pathogens will also be covered. Coastal Health will focus on CSO/SSO issues, especially in the alternative approach and recommended action section. Stormwater related water quality concerns once the pollutant has hit the water (or tributary) are also topics for Coastal Health’s alternative approaches and recommended actions. (Their initiation and transfer on the land is the purview of NPS) Overlap is appropriate, and the Executive Committee will make suggestions for further refinement based on their review of the April 21 drafts. .

OI PBT – (further remarks forthcoming)

Monitor and/or control PBTs in CSO discharge should be addressed by both teams.

OI AOC (remarks forthcoming)

OI Habitat (remarks forthcoming)

Drinking water quality is an issue for the Coastal Health team to address.

Prioritizing goals – CSOs/SSOs will likely be a major priority (according to Governors earlier communications on Executive Committee). The Executive Committee’s comments on prioritization are attached for review.

Recommended action strategy. This is not just an ask from Congress but needs to include actions for all levels of institutions (see Recommended Action outline in today’s agenda)

Cost estimating (remarks forthcoming)

Timeline - We must present a draft of our entire chapter by April 21<sup>st</sup>.

*Coastal Health Team Meeting*

Revised problem and goal statements as distributed. Further revised by others up to March 9<sup>th</sup>. Sought drafting assistance from team members – Gary Fujita contributed Alternative Approach draft for review and modification.

Clarified research needs – David Rockwell has provided the team with extensive information.

David Rockwell: USGS indicates that the primary sources of pollution are urban (75%)

**Current Coastal Health Team effort**

*Seeking drafting assistance from all team members*

Dale Bryson: by putting dates on our goals, we may be letting people off the hook.

Marcia Jimenez: The Executive Committee has asked us for specific achievable targets.

Dale Bryson/Margaret Wooster: It is important that we do not undercut existing deadlines that are already established policy, (e.g. Great Lakes Strategy, IJC). What kind of deadlines are CSO operators in the Great Lakes under right now? Dale and Margaret’s comments on this subject are on the website discussion forum.

Shannon from MI : If some of those dates have passed, note why they passed without being implemented and lay the ground work for getting by the obstacles.

David Rockwell: We should site sources for these dates.

Marcia Jimenez: We need volunteers to lay out what the goal chronology should be (with some goals as stepping stones for others) and, for every date currently set in the goals, review what dates are already established in existing policies.

Mark Kwitowski: A very important part of the document will be in establishing that funding needs to be available before actions can be implemented. So establishing a definitive date for fund availability, or basing the goal on the date of this availability is realistic.

**ACTION:** Margaret Wooster and David Rockwell will revise goal time line based on dates.

## **Alternative Approaches**

*Recap input received from team March 2-9*

Mark Kwitowski (and another) We need to think about sprawl, impermeable surfaces, urbanization and land use in our recommendations: in some cases, an extension of wastewater infrastructure is not appropriate.

Dale Bryson: What do we mean by alternatives? Are we working in the abstract here, or do we really want to create something that can be moved forward?

What we are talking about here is individual decisions made at the City or State level. We need a needs assessment by state.

An alternative statement should be to fund the state programs at the level that they can enforce their permits.

Another alternative statement should be that the SRF should be funded enough.

Toby and David Rockwell: Currently, a chief source of (CSO) funding is coming from the states. The Federal portion is sinking. If the Feds are serious about CSOs, we should recommend that the federal grant program be reinstated. Individual cities and states do not have the money to come up with loan repayment funds.

Marcia Jimenez: Should these statements be part of the cost feasibility section of the alternative approach section. Refer to Gary Fujita's write up?

Toby: The problem is not lack of intent in the policy language, it is that it is too big a drain on resources (staff, financial, other) at the local and state (and even Federal) levels

Christine Alexander: Michigan is in its 10<sup>th</sup> year of separating its CSO's. It has a policy in place and is implementing it.

Toby: IL is pursuing CSO permit achievement through federal SRF matching loans that are repaid by municipalities.

Erv Baugh: Cleveland is adopting a 30 year (rather than 20 year) schedule because this is more palatable for communities needing to raise their share for the match.

Mark Kwitowski: We should not forget the blending factor, which has not come up much, but really should be addressed by our team.

**ACTION:** One rep from each state (Julie K. and Shaili Pfeifer- WI, Toby- IL, Christine Alexander – MI – who for the rest of the G.L. states?) send Co-Chairs what it is that state is undertaking.

David Rockwell has shared the 2000 clean water needs survey (and will post it on the listserve). 2004 has not yet been finalized.

A comparison between this needs survey and what the state's are doing will indicate the gaps.

**ACTION:** Julie and Holly Wirick will craft alternative analysis for goals D, E, N, W.

David Rockwell (or Dale Bryson or Toby?) We need to give the Feds justification to treat us differently than they have in the past (by presenting a convincing approach to our goals).

## **Report from on-going efforts group**

Very thorough document is complete. Will now include Drinking Water. Send Julie Kinzelman ([Julie.kinzelman@cityofracine.org](mailto:Julie.kinzelman@cityofracine.org)) your input. She is going to organize the report by goal, now that the team's goals are more solidified.

## **Next Steps**

In preparation for our next conference call, we need to have drafts of recommended actions. The outline for this section of the chapter is as follows:

- Summary of actions
- Recommended timeframe
- Projected benefits and costs
- Best-suited entity for actions

Federal  
Tribal  
State  
Local (including cities, counties, towns, etc.)  
Regional/Binational Commissions  
Other Great Lakes Bodies  
NGO's  
Industry  
Agriculture  
When is success achieved and work done

**Schedule for upcoming conference calls**

Conference Call IV: March 29, 2005 (Tuesday) 12:00 Central Time

Subject: Recommended Action Strategy

Conference Call V: April 18, 2005 (Monday) 12:00 Central Time

Subject: Entire draft prepared for April 21 distribution to Executive Committee