

Amended Meeting Notes

Partnership for the Saginaw Bay Watershed **Beach Closings Task Group Meeting**

Partnership for the Saginaw Bay Watershed Board Members are:

Zygmunt Dworzecki – Director
Taylor Hollis – Director
Laura Ogar-Vice-Chair
Dennis Zimmerman - Secretary

Pete Frauson- Treasurer
David Karpovich– Director
Glenn Rowley – Director

Jim Hergott- Director
Elan Lipschitz - Director
Bill Wright – Chair

June 5, 2017 10 am to 12 pm

Bay County Building - 3rd Floor Personnel Conference Room
515 Center Avenue Bay City, Michigan

Summary of Meeting's Action items:

- *12th meeting of the Task Group for Beach Closings/BUI Review. Chair/Wright* convened the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

Group Members present included: **Dworzecki, Frauson, Hollis, Ogar, Rowley, Sivy, Strasz, Wright and Zimmerman.**

Also attending were: **Mike Duranczyk** – County Commissioner, **Carol Injasoulian** – Bay City Waste Water Treatment Plant and **Jo Ellen Strieter** - Administrative Contractor.

Motion by Zimmerman to approve meeting notes. **Motion seconded by Rowley.** Discussion followed on clarification of meeting notes. **Motion carried without dissent.**

Per **Wright** Old Business will be covered under new business.

New Business Points of Discussion

- Consider Dividing Area of Concern (AOC) into two separate entities; the Saginaw River and the Saginaw Bay.
- There have been no beach closings on the Saginaw River, because there are no beaches on the Saginaw River.
- The Water Quality Standard set is for recreational use, the Saginaw River gets less total body contact than Saginaw Bay.
- Beaches are closed at different times than the Saginaw River is closed. The State's BUI removal criteria are tied to the Integrated Report of impaired water bodies. While this report lists the Saginaw River as impaired, it does not list Saginaw Bay. Our concern here as stewards of the AOC is to include anything that is contaminated whether it be the Saginaw River or the Saginaw Bay.
- We propose focusing on the Saginaw Bay as the site of beaches in this AOC.
- We propose sticking with the state's criteria (Integrated Report listing) for the Saginaw River and directing our focus on the Saginaw Bay.
- Beaches are our primary focus.

- There does not appear to be any correlation between the Kawkawlin River being contaminated and beaches on Saginaw Bay being contaminated. The Water Quality Standard on the Kawkawlin River has been under 300 E. coli per 100 ml for the last year and the River has not been closed.
- We have focused on 9 public Beaches and the data provided by **Frauson** from Beach Guard has shown 96% of the E. coli samples taken have been below 300 E. coli per 100 ml.
- Discussion/Question - does every beach have to reach 95% or do the counts have to average 90%? **Frauson** – According to Beach Guard, our percentage numbers have been better for the last 3 years. Any 1000 counts would identify hot spots. 6 times South Linwood Beach surfaced as a hot spot.
- We believe 3 consecutive years is a good criterion if measuring compliance with full-body contact Water Quality Standards. We would need to identify the source and have a plan for source control. At Linwood Beach, we would need to rule out sanitary sewer leakage as the cause. We will look for sources of funding to support sampling.

Motion by Dworzecki to propose a Beach Closings BUI removal criterion linked to the Water Quality Standard of 300 E. coli per 1000 ml.– including Source identification and tracking, and remediation plans for the Partnership to review. **Motion seconded by Zimmerman. Motion carried without dissent.**

BUI Removal Standard Criteria Statement

95% of the number of samples for E. coli taken at a pre-selected list of Saginaw Bay beaches and reported in the Beach Guard database should not exceed the daily geometric mean full-body contact Water Quality Standard of 300 E. coli per 100 ml. during 3 consecutive years. Further, not more than 1% of the sample results should exceed the partial-body contact water quality standard of 1000 E. coli per 100 ml.

The Task Group will work on formalizing this statement via emails and will present at next meeting.

Motion by Dworzecki to recommend Source identification and control plans to fix E. coli contamination affecting targeted beaches. **Motion seconded by Zimmerman.** Discussion proceeded on clarification of motion. **Motion carried without dissent.**

Strasz/Sivy – The Bay County Health Department and SVSU sample and report for E.coli only. They do not do source identification of birds, bovine or human. Bird markers don't work in Saginaw Bay. SVSU is storing samples, and will process them in the fall. They are filtering 2 samples per beach each time they sample.

Other discussion points included:

- The PAC Grant may be able to give us some sampling funds.

- Can we get source Tracking? (Human-bovine). Our main priority is to show if contamination is human or non-human and to determine whether we've reached the BUI Removal Standard Criteria as stated above.
- Our area is from Tawas to Port Austin, and one question is, "How do we compare to non-AOC areas?" We believe no one is perfect.
- We will need to get source control plans in place for beach closings/delisting strategy. We may need to develop and report an aggregate of multiple sites' numbers. The Partnership for the Saginaw Bay Watershed would need to see the source control plans.
- We have a list of sites reporting repeat sample results over 1000. We could specify these locations for source testing.
 These sites are:
 In Huron County – Bird Creek
 In Bay County – Wenona Beach, Brissette Beach and Linwood beach.
 In Arenac County – Singing Bridge and Whites Beach.

To get to a point where we can recommend BUI removal, we would have to have someone investigate why the E. coli contamination is happening. We would need to identify and track sampling and remediation efforts in tributaries that contribute E. coli to Saginaw Bay at points that impact targeted beaches and prevent us from removing this BUI. This criterion would protect public health and encourage efforts to achieve Water Quality Standards. To remove the BUI while any site(s) continue to report violations of the Water Quality Standard we would need to have a source management plan in place. We could still remove the BUI if there is a plan in place to follow up.

Source Control Plans – If these are developed for sources of Human, Bird and Bovine E. coli, we then as the Public Advisory Committee would note their status in any BUI removal recommendation we submit to DEQ. Stakeholders in contributing tributary watersheds could administer source control plans or work with regulators to identify relevant sources.

Ogar Strasz, Frauson, Sivy – Develop a sampling plan for the 6 identified beaches. Get a cost and work on getting samples from other beaches.

Adjourn – 12:25 pm moved by **Sivy** and supported by **Zimmerman**.

Respectfully submitted, Jo Ellen Strieter, Administrative Contractor

"Financial assistance for this project was provided, in part, by the Michigan Areas of Concern Program, Office of the Great Lakes, Department of Environmental Quality, and by the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, through a grant from the Environmental Protection Agency."

