

**Approved
Board of Director Minutes**

Partnership for the Saginaw Bay Watershed

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

September 11, 2017 – 10:00 am to 12:00 pm - Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes

Bay County Building -3rd Floor Personnel Conference Room

515 Center Avenue Bay City, Michigan

Summary of Meeting's Action Items:

- Submission and acceptance of August 7, 2017 Minutes
- Treasurer's Update
- SPAC Update
- AOC Coordinator Update
- Beach Closing BUI Task Force Update
- LaMP
- Next Meeting Date October 2, 2017

Chair/Wright convened the meeting at 10:03 a.m. **We do not have a quorum so all motions will need to be approved at the October meeting.**

Board Members present included: **Dworzecki, Frauson, Lipschitz, Wright and Zimmerman.**
Also present were: **Warren Smith** and **Jo Ellen Strieter**– Administrative Contractor

Motion by Zimmerman to approve the minutes of our Regular Board Meeting from August 7, 2017. **Motion seconded Dworzecki. Motion carried without dissent.**

Administrative Matters: -

Frauson gave the treasurer's report with a balance of \$8,373.15. **Motion by Zimmerman** to accept the treasurer's report. **Motion seconded by Dworzecki. Motion carried without dissent.** **Wright** updated the board with information that we can now use our own DUNS #. We will be able to bill the DEQ directly for contract items.

SPAC report by **Zimmerman** – The next SPAC meeting will be held October 10th and 11th at the Anderson Building in Lansing and will include the Legislative Briefing. **Zimmerman** will email the State and Federal Elected Official List.

NO AOC Coordinator Update

Old Business-

Beach Closings BUI Restoration Criteria – The below Criteria was submitted to the DEQ.

Saginaw River/Bay Area of Concern (AOC)

Beach Closings Beneficial Use Impairment (BUI) due to Pathogens

Beach Closings BUI Restoration Criteria August 2017

The Public Advisory Council (PAC) with the Saginaw River/Bay Area of Concern (AOC) developed the following restoration criteria in consideration of water quality standards and historic data and information on the River and Bay.

The Saginaw River/Bay AOC Beneficial Use Impairment (BUI) of Beach Closings due to Bacteria/Pathogens will be considered restored when,

1. For three (3) consecutive years:
 - a. At least 95% of the samples taken for E. coli during the seasonal (May 20 to September 10) weekly sampling program at public recreational beaches along the Saginaw Bay between Au Sable Township Park (Beach Guard ID 2100) (Iosco County) and Huron County Bird Creek County Park (Beach Guard ID 452) do not exceed the daily geometric mean or daily composite value for full-body contact water quality standard of 300 E. coli per 100 ml.
 - b. Of these same samples, no more than 1% of the daily geometric means or daily composite values are greater than 1000 E. coli per 100 ml.
 - c. Each Individual public beach on the Saginaw Bay meets Water Quality Standards for E. Coli not less than 90% of the time sampled.
 - d. Beaches that have a history of spikes* above 1000 E. coli per 100 ml or have repeated measurements above the full body contact water quality standard of 300 E. coli per 100 ml, will have sources identified and will meet the conditions of a., b., and c. above.
2. Source Control Remediation Plans are in place for sources of pathogenic bacteria previously identified in the Remedial Action Plan 1994, which are:
 - a. Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants;
 - b. Failing Septic Systems or otherwise improperly treated wastewater from on-site disposal;
 - c. Animal Manure;
 - d. Land spreading of Sewage Solids.

Source Control Remediation Plans will, at minimum, identify the local and/or state agency with direct oversight responsibility of the source or activity; describe the methods of pollution control that guide the source or activity (permits, registration, etc.); identify the Best Management Practices (BMP's) for these sources or activities, with a reference to any administrative rules or environmental regulations that pertain to the activity, including a description of any escalating compliance actions and/or penalties for non-compliance that may exist in State and/or local regulations. Updated contact information for public reporting of problems shall be included.

*Representative public recreational beaches for the BUI restoration criteria with repeated Beach Guard reported sampling results above 1000 E. coli per 100 ml include (with associated Beach Guard ID Number): Whites Beach 1164, Singing Bridge 1162, South Linwood Beach 361, Brissette Beach 360, Wenona Beach 1485, Bird Creek County Park 452.

081617A

The DEQ will accept or reject. If the DEQ rejects it will go back to the Task Group to rework.

Motion made by Dworzecki to accept the wording in the 081617A locally developed Beach Closings BUI Restoration Criteria. It is recommended to approve this action at the October meeting with a quorum present. **Motion seconded by Zimmerman. Motion carried without dissent.**

Frauson will check with **Ogar** to see if the Press Release can go out.

Strieter will work on the display for upcoming events. To include pictures from our website, a list of beneficial use impairments, the AOC programs, map of beaches closed. Members were asked to submit possible items for the display to **Strieter** by Wednesday the September 13th.

New Business-

LaMP – a thank you from the Board to **Dworzecki, Karpovich and Ogar** for the work they did on the LaMP document below.

LAMP Draft: Review

Section 3.2: A Healthy Watershed: Headwaters and uplands: Agricultural lands

This section says that responsibly farmed lands are beneficial to the watershed, and it describes a few common best practices for farmland management and conservation. To achieve better compliance, steps should be taken to continue to educate farmers about the relationship between responsible farmland management and water quality. Furthermore, the farmers that do practice proper conservation measures should continue to be recognized (i.e. through the voluntary programs such as MAEAP). Finally, monetary incentives for taking land out of production for conservation purposes (such as for vegetative buffer strips) should continue to be used to maintain current levels of conservation and bring additional land into the programs.

Section 3.2: A Healthy Watershed: Headwaters and uplands: Urban Centers

This section describes a few green infrastructure methods to protect water from runoff out of urban areas. Rain gardens, forested areas, porous surfaces, and other are described. It is indicated that both large and small examples can minimize runoff damages. However, green infrastructure projects are typically done on a very small scale and in small pockets in select communities. More widespread implementation of these practices would be beneficial, but the cost is often very high. There should be mechanisms for funding of these activities. Furthermore, the public in general may not be aware of the benefits of urban green infrastructure, and therefore education is necessary to generate more support for public funding.

Section 4.4: Chemical contamination: Table 7

Much of the cleanup responsibility for the listed chemical contamination issues falls on the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers. Many of the listed issues have been known for decades. We urge that there be, in general, quicker federal responses to local requests for study and clean-up of the problem areas.

Section 4.6: Nutrients and algae

Nutrients from anthropogenic sources, both rural and urban, have well known effects on the growth of both harmful and nuisance algal blooms. However, these connections are not well understood by the public. Therefore, more education will be helpful in convincing people to become proactive in addressing issues related to nutrient runoff. Furthermore, in some geographic areas, regulations are found to be insufficient to address nutrient runoff issues. For instance, the state of Michigan does not specify upper nutrient concentrations or loading levels allowed for streams as do some other states (such as Wisconsin). Setting these limits (much like Michigan does for dissolved oxygen levels) would give management targets that are enforceable.

Section 5.0: Lake-wide Actions

This section outlines many actions being undertaken to correct issues in the Lake Huron watershed. However, the effects of groundwater withdrawal from irrigation operations and bottling companies on aquifer damage through inadequate recharge is not covered. Groundwater chemical contamination is mentioned as an issue, and it is related to groundwater recharge. So, the broader issue of groundwater depletion from excessive withdrawals should be addressed.

General statement:

The LAMP draft addresses many of the concerns for the Lake Huron watershed and provides guidance in which departments will be responsible for certain issues. However, what is lacking are the procedures for following through with the actions, procedures for verifying action effectiveness (checks and balances), and timelines for implementation.

Motion by Zimmerman to adjourn the meeting at 11:30 am. **Motion seconded by Lipschitz.**

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.”

