

Ground Water Report To Congress

Summaries of State Ground Water Conditions

**Prepared by the
Ground Water Protection Council
In cooperation with the
Association of State Drinking Water Administrators
and the
Association of State and Interstate
Water Pollution Control Administrators**

October 1999

Ground Water Report to Congress State Fact Sheets

Introduction

On behalf of the following states, The Ground Water Protection Council, the Association of State Drinking Water Administrators, and the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators are pleased to submit to the 106th United States Congress the attached fact sheets that briefly highlight portions of each state's ground water protection program. Although not a part of the EPA's "Ground Water Report to Congress," these state summaries give state specific examples of references in the Report and should be considered an addendum to it. Recognizing that these are only summaries, additional more comprehensive information is available from the individual states.

As the Nation's concern over water resources increases, the importance of protecting ground water as a resource has become increasingly evident. In order to achieve the goals of The Clean Water Act and The Clean Water Action Plan increased attention must be given to ground water. Surface water is commonly hydraulically connected to ground water but this interaction is often overlooked in water management considerations and policy. Many states have expressed their desire to shift from the reactive mode of ground water remediation to the proactive mode of pollution prevention. Funding of source water protection under the Safe Drinking Water Act amendments of 1996 is clearly a step in the right direction. However, the source water program does not protect ground water not currently being used for a public drinking water source nor does it focus on private water supplies.

States cite the following examples of the cost of ground water contamination:

1. Minnesota: From 1982 through July 1994, 26 community water suppliers spent \$44,401,724 to provide safe and adequate drinking water following ground water contamination of their wells.
2. In Michigan alone, ground water contamination has resulted in the need to replace 8,000 drinking water wells. From 1989 to 1999, Michigan has authorized \$290,162,046 for expenditures on cleaning up ground water contamination or other environmental contamination activities. This figure does not include Superfund money.
3. So far, the City and County of Honolulu Board of Water Supply estimates that they will have spent over 30 million dollars for existing and proposed treatment facilities required by contamination of sources.
4. In Kentucky atrazine is detected in 31 percent of spring samples, and 1.4 percent of samples exceeded the drinking water standard for atrazine.
5. The estimated cost of cleaning up the 18 Superfund sites in New Hampshire is \$350 to \$400 million. The state has spent \$45 million to clean up 883 leaking underground storage tank (UST) sites.

Unfortunately, ground water contamination is not merely a result of past practices but is an ongoing problem. While we continue to spend billions on ground water remediation states do not have secure dedicated funding to support comprehensive ground water protection efforts. A secure national funding source for ground water protection and monitoring programs is needed. At the present time, EPA recommends that 15% of the total CWA Section 106 Grant funding be allotted for ground water programs. However, as with other potential funding sources, this does not guarantee a minimum level of funding for state ground water programs given the myriad of other demands for CWA Section 106 money.

States cite the following issues as most needed for the protection of our ground water resources:

State Issues Most Commonly Cited in the Fact Sheets	
Problem	Solution
1) The federal ground water protection laws and programs are fragmented. This has resulted in fragmented programs at the state and local levels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ States are not looking for new federal legislation. However, The Clean Water Action Plan should be expanded to include coordinated ground water protection at the federal level.
2) Many states do not feel that they have comprehensive groundwater programs in place due in large part to lack of funding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Comprehensive ground water protection programs need to be funded on par with the Clean Water Action Plan.
3) There is no comprehensive, reliable, dedicated source of funding for ground water protection.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Congress recognized this in Section 1429 of the Safe Drinking Water Act. This Section should be considered for funding. ✓ There needs to be a dedicated source of funding for ground water protection. Current recommended funding allocations under the Clean Water Act are needed for activities like TMDL development and NPDES permits.
4) Sources of continuous contamination of ground water. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Class V injection wells b) Pesticide metabolites c) MTBE d) Infiltration ponds (used to help comply with NPDES requirements). e) Animal feeding operations f) Above ground storage tanks, unregulated underground storage tanks and petroleum pipelines. g) Ground water over pumping is causing land subsidence and the drying up of wetlands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ States need a dedicated source of ground water funding above and beyond current levels of environmental funding ✓ Ground water protection must become a priority in the overall national approach for water quality monitoring. ✓ The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency needs to develop an agency wide approach to ground water protection. A commonly cited example would be for the RCRA program to make inspections a priority in wellhead and source water protection areas as some states are already doing.
5) There is a lack of understanding of ground water as a resource and a lack of ambient ground water monitoring data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ A comprehensive analysis of the resource is needed. Similarly, the quality and quantity of ground water that is necessary to support healthy ecosystems needs to be better understood. ✓ Mapping and monitoring of ambient ground water quality and quantity is necessary nationwide. ✓ States and EPA need to devote more resources to evaluating how effective protection efforts are, and how they can be made more effective. ✓ States need an accessible electronic data management system.