MEMORANDUM

To: Groundwater Advisory Council
From: H. Bokuniewicz
Concerning: Minutes of the meeting of 17 June 2002
Date: October 9, 2002 – REVISED EDITION

PRESENT

H. Bokuniewicz
S. Jones
B Nemickas
D. Paquette
W. Prospect
S. Robbins
K. Roberts
W. Spitz

REGRETS

N. Bartilucci
T. Green
L. Koppelman
J. Milazzo
V. Minei
J. Mirando
M. Nofi
G. Proios
P. Ramirez
M. Schoonen

1. Preliminary dates for the next meeting. There will be no meeting in July or August. In 2002-2003, we will plan on following this schedule. All meetings are on Monday 9:30 –11:00 AM on:

   - 23 September
   - 21 October
   - 18 November
   - 16 December
   - 27 January, 2003
   - 24 February, 2003
   - 31 March, 2003
   - 28 April and
   - 2 June, 2003

2. Sy Robbins had provided revisions to the minutes of the last meeting. Discussion at that meeting was clarified by Sy and Wayne: when it was said that there were “no standards for many of these (degradates)”, it was implied that there were no standards other than the standard of 50 ppb for unspecified organic contaminants.

3. Dan O’Rourke could not attend this meeting to discuss SWAP. It seems there has been some problem assembling the needed data. For example, there were some 100 wells in the model without corresponding pumpage data. Upon investigation it was discovered that almost all of these were, in fact, offline. Land use maps in Nassau had some problems. The East End was in good shape but land use in western Suffolk
has not been verified in the field. The DEC has provided the data requested, including coverage of superfund sites but had not had any response from CDM.

There is a SWAP coordinating committee meeting next week (Tuesday the 25th).

4. It was noted that Sarah Meyland has an “Institute” web site, which can be reached from being linked to the site for the Citizens Campaign for the Environment. The description of the groundwater system is good. There is also discussion of current issues.

5. Last week we held a “charrette” at Stony Brook for the DEC on MTBE remediation plans at Uniondale and Lindenhurst. (Bill participated and I attended some of it). It was a diverse, group including scientists, engineers, biochemist as well as regulators who were given the information on the two sites in advance. They then divided into smaller working groups to consider solutions, considering the pros and cons of various options as well as the practical limitations imposed by the specific site conditions. The process provided important reinforcement for the variety of options being considered by the DEC.

The level of modeling raised some concern. The modeling that was done didn’t seem as appropriate as it could have been; the Brooklyn-Queens MODFLOW model was used but the section of interest in Nassau was near its boundary and, perhaps, the complete set of available data was not taken advantage of. Basic questions that were raised could probably be (or have been) answered by the Nassau County Dynflow model. This model is FOIable but it is not yet in MODFLOW format or, as yet, compatible with Visual MODFLOW. This will be done by CDM under the SWAP and turned over to the county by 2003.

The situation emphasizes the need for a centralized database and modeling clearinghouse to make both the Nassau and Suffolk models available and up-to-date. This same issue was raised by Senator’s DiNapoli’s hearing at Stony Brook two years ago. (Senator DiNapoli now chairs the State’s Environmental Committee). Confusion engendered by a multiplicity of models and the need to use the state-of-the-art to address regional problems were both issues that were raised then. Public funds, in time and effort, would be saved by a clearinghouse. The SWAP product due in 2003 may provide an opportunity to establish such a facility at the University. The Institute will initiate discussions now with State Health, the counties, and DEC to see if this course of action can be pursued. It would probably require a State commitment of one to two hundred thousand dollars per year.

6. The SCDHS Pesticide report will be sent to the members of this committee. It was suggested that the next newsletter cover this topic. A revised report has been sent to the DEC essentially without speculation on possible impacts to marine resources.

7. The county legislature held two public hearings on the pesticide issue at which the Institute, SCWA, and SCDHS, among others, provided testimony. They may want to pursue the adoption of existing European standards on some of these compounds and intend to contact Dr. Brownawell to learn more about the European experience.

One issue of water supply will be the transmission of water from the Pine Barrens to the East End. (Perchlorate alone may force this issue, if not pesticides). There would
seem to be reason to revise the Comprehensive Water Supply Management Plan in light of the new realities. This was first done in 1987 but never adopted. The Water Authority is studying the relative economics of filtering versus transport and intends to have a report ready in the fall. One issue is that of drawdown in the Pine Barrens and possible impacts to the Peconic River. The Institute may have a policy student interested in working in this arena. We’ll contact Herman Miller in case a student project might be helpful.

8. Updates:

a. The seepage experiment was conducted in Shelter Island in May. Over twenty investigators participated and an evening session was held attended by Ray Cowen, Bill Spitz, Sy Robbins and others. A second workshop is planned for the fall to present the preliminary results of this exercise.

b. The Water Week Poster Contest drew over 120 entries. The prizes were once again provided by the Water Conference. A list of winners is attached.

c. The Guerrera Award will be presented this year to John Rapaglia, a graduate student working on surface water/groundwater interactions.

d. The newsletter on lawn care should be ready for review before the end of the month.

e. The Pine Barrens Research Forum will be held on Thursday October 3 at BNL. The theme this year is on pests (ticks, deer, mosquito, oak worm, invasive plants).

f. With the help of the Water Authority (who provided $40,000) and of Kevin Dunn, the VEEP program of groundwater education remained active during the first half of 2002 and new volunteer educators are being trained. We have fairs, etc. lined up for the summer. We are planning a workshop to review and update education resources for the VEEP volunteers. Chris Smith and the Cooperative Extension will help with this and it was pointed out that the Water Authority’s animated water cycle is available on the WEB for use in this effort.

9. Next Meeting: See you in September (September 23).