MEMORANDUM

To: Groundwater Advisory Council
From: H. Bokuniewicz
Concerning: Minutes of the Meeting of 5 March 2001
Date: March 8, 2001

PRESENT

N. Bartilucci
H. Bokuniewicz
J. Milazzo
B. Nemickas
D. Paquette

REGRETS

J. Dillon
S. Jones
L. Koppelman
M. LoGrande
V. Minei
M. Nofi
G. Proios
W. Prospect
P. Ramirez
S. Robbins
K. Roberts
M. Schoonen
W. Spitz

1. The weather was bad so attendance was sparse. We will postpone the discussion of the minutes, the pesticide program and the draft of the monitoring newsletter to the next meeting (April 23, 2001).

2. U.S.G.S. monitoring in Nassau County essentially stopped in December 2000. It is limited now to what is done by the County at 450 “line” wells. Of course, the gap in the streamflow records, some of which go back seventy years or so, cannot be recovered. The U.S.G.S. has signed a cooperative agreement with Southampton and East Hampton for monitoring primarily of surface waters. In addition, they continue a monitoring program in Queens (water level, some streams, and water quality) on a year-to-year basis.

The water supply model for the North Fork is just about ready and apparently CDM has started working on a model of the South Fork. Models will be available then for the entire Island although with incompatibilities in grid spacing and scale.
3. To aid in the direction of research at the University, the following topics were discussed.

a. There continue to be some concern over EPA standards with regard to Arsenic and Radon and a requirement to monitor “unregulated” contaminants (mostly organics). Bruce Brownawell has a proposal into the EPA to begin investigations of pharmaceuticals in groundwater and he is working on another with the U.S.G.S. It was suggested that such work include measurements in the open water of north shore embayments, which receive sewage effluent.

b. There is also continued interest in the use of fertilizers. It was suggested that studies of the application of fertilizers be investigated in terms of the timing of applications, the types used, root uptake and leaching. Experimental plots might be established on SCWA property for test projects.

c. It was suggested that the new pesticide law, which resources that notification of neighbors some time (48 hours?) before applying pesticides may reduce the use of pesticides by unfavorable (perhaps emotional) reactions. It was not clear what recourse the neighbors had if they object, but it would be interesting to track the impact of the new law on the amount of pesticides used.

d. Although there are only a few wells contaminated with MTBE (The SCWA has one in Montauk and one in Hauppauge, for example) Legislators Alden and Postal would like to allocate $85,000 to explore suing MTBE manufacturers for clean-up costs. In general, remediation technology does exist but it is not very cost effective. Even with nitrogen contamination, it is usually more economical to abandon a well for an alternate supply rather than to treat well water, and some biological treatments which require the addition of a carbon source and bacteria are inappropriate for public water.

e. The plume from the EPA superfund site at the Grumman Lab in Old Bethpage is of concern to several water districts – Massapequa (Frank Flood Commissioner), The Town of Hempstead, and Bethpage. This may be supplying TCE to the Magothy. Gerhaty and Miller did the groundwater model for Grumman and The Navy.

Another plume of concern is that at the Calverton site, which are probably solvents and could be a threat to the Peconics. There is also a sewage treatment plant on site that goes into a pond in site and eventually into the headwaters of the Peconics. They may relocate the discharge north of the moraine (to go eventually into Long Island Sound). In any event, the effluent is very dilute. Some of the buildings on site have their own cesspools.

4. The next meeting will be at the Office of the Suffolk County Water Authority on Monday April 23, 2001 9:30 – 11:00 AM.