

---

By Phone: Annette Smith, Corrina Parnapy, Kira Jacobs

In Attendance: Scott Stewart, Rodney Pingree, Marjie Gale, Liz Royer, Robert Pelosi, Meddie Perry, Darlene Autery, Craig Heindel, Jon Kim, Kasey Kathan, Sille Larsen, Michael Smith, Linda Boccuzzo

*Items in italics = further action/discussion may be needed*

Discussion Topics:

**A. Road Salt and Water Quality – Discussion with Corrina Parnapy (Winooski NRCD)**

1. Upcoming Water Quality Analysis

- The district will be working with two partners to look at surface water impacts from road salt. Monitoring of two bodies of water will occur during low flow time frames to see if implemented BMPs have provided any improvement in water quality. Water bodies include Sunderland Brook and others in Essex/Colchester. Goals of the work include understanding the legacy impact of soil profiles.
- The district is pursuing funding for additional well testing, hopefully during the fall (Aug/Sept) during low flow conditions and has submitted a grant to gather other headwater data to supplement the work. The report to come out this winter.

2. First ‘Road Salt Conference – September 29<sup>th</sup> and other training opportunities

- District hosting at the UVM Davis Center, partnering with VTRANS and Local Roads, target audience communities and private contractors – will include equipment displays, sponsors, poster sessions and CEU credits for municipalities.
- New Hampshire is offering Green Snowpro trainings, one for private contractors and another for locals – demos of brine creation and discussion of impact on water quality, terrestrial health and infrastructure.
- New Hampshire is developing new BMPs and is working with private contractors to support reduction of liability insurance – if using a certified applicator.

3. Discussion

- BMPs – VTRANS has some funding available for salt shed covering
- UIC revised rules prohibiting the storage of salt and salt charged sand near a UIC, but there is a counter argument that this type of prevention of impact to groundwater may lead to greater surface water impacts.
- Many municipalities don’t have winter snow management plans in place which lead to liability issues.
- Town of Ryegate currently managing a contamination issue: 3,500 mg/l chloride within residential well adjacent to salt storage area, town discussing municipal water hookup for two properties and testing others within the area
- Need to consider impact of removing secondary standards from the GWPRS as is currently proposed within the draft rules – Health Dept. suggested there could be a case made to move sodium from a secondary to a primary. Would moving sodium to a primary standard have significant impact on hazardous sites management? Sites management only addresses the release of hazardous materials, so there would be minimal impact, but would allow other Agencies the ability to refer to/use the GW Enforcement Standard. The VDH health level of 250 mg/L for sodium will kill aquatic biota.

- *How do VTRANS and municipalities comply with the GWPRS? Statute points towards consideration of the standards by AOT, but doesn't enforce this jurisdiction – Further discussion with Andy Shively and Diane Sherman?*
- *Should we also be discussing how to address chloride use in agricultural practices and personal care products in wastewater systems?*
- Regional planning commissions may serve as a good link to municipalities as all have separate transportation councils: Anecdotally – towns are afraid of reaching out to the state due to fear of enforcement actions regarding salt storage locations. They may know that the current location isn't ideal, but have difficulty finding a better location without some outside feedback.
- *Should we have a discussion with our Environmental Assistance/Enforcement Division to see how to address the RPCs concerns?*

B. **Liz Royer** discussed the upcoming (at the time of the meeting) The Drinking Water and Groundwater Protection Division and the Geological Survey in DEC partnered with Vermont Rural Water (VRWA) and EPA to host two all day workshops, *The Future of Vermont's Drinking Water – How Today's Actions Can Keep Our Water Sources Safe and Clean.*

- 35 registrants in Lyndon and 50 in Manchester included water system operators, town administrators, town and regional planners, a legislator, consultants, state and federal government staff, and others. Many thanks to Kira Jacobs (EPA) and Liz Royer (VRWA) for their leadership, promotion and financial support for these two events.
- Article following workshops in the Bennington Banner.
- Working to compile a handout of resource lists for frequently asked questions – group discussed potential resources for a few questions that were still lingering.
- Funding opportunities for education outreach? SRF's probably not a good source as the funds must directly lead to capital investments. RPC Planning Grants? Can be difficult to incorporate groundwater planning into the grant as there is a specific focus required by ACCD (emergency management planning/drought planning offer one avenue) – *may require some work with ACCD to broaden the consideration of what is good for a planning grant.*

The presentations are available to the public on our web site at:  
<http://dec.vermont.gov/geological-survey/groundwater/2017conference>.

C. **Blasting Practices and Groundwater Monitoring Plans – Revisions to the old practice – Scott Stewart**

- Natural Resources Board/Act 250 has been referring to an old draft practice and BMPs regarding blasting at quarries. Scott, Marjie and Michael Smith have been revising the BMPs for blasting plan. The groundwater monitoring plan component has been taken out of the BMPs and made into a stand-alone practice. The BMPs are available on the VGS website (regional commissions may or may not follow the BMPs). DEC Office of Policy and Planning will be coordinating with the Natural Resources Board on these and other revised practices.
- There is a March 2017 'Groundwater Monitoring Plan for Blasting Activities, Act 250 Criteria 1, 3 and 9E' available on the Office of Planning's [website](#). Revisions to this draft are still in progress, but the OPP is choosing to keep the March version posted and active as they're uncomfortable asking applicants to comply with draft guidance, but want something in place.
- Current revisions to the groundwater monitoring plan are for rock quarries that remove 5,000 cubic yards or more in one year. However, OPP has suggested making this practice apply to any project (development) where blasting is used (>5,000 cubic yards/year). There was specific discussion around this possible expansion and its implications for development. It was strongly suggested by the

committee that the GWCC or a subgroup including other stakeholders – developers, blasting specialists, etc. be actively involved in the creation of any expanded blasting practice.

- Discussion of suggestions for GW Monitoring Plan: should consider pre-blast BTEX in addition to nitrates/nitrites, turbidity etc., need to consider frequency of testing (30, 60 and 90 days post-blasting may not be feasible (i.e. blasting occurring once a month for 20 years = continuous monitoring, generally the plan needs to keep the customization component of the historic plan.
- There isn't good implementation of the plans currently – limited testing, follow-up or consistency. The PSB relies on the Agency's protocols, but limitations on jurisdiction/authority make it fairly ineffective.
- Process for moving the draft forward – currently under ANR internal with some legal review, the draft practice will be released to the GWCC for comment, but not sure of timeline – probably July. ***The GWCC was clear that they want to be involved in the development of any procedure/policy that applies to non-quarry blasting and GW Monitoring.***

#### D. Legislative/Rules Updates

- S.10 – Requirement to provide municipal water supply to residential supplies contaminated by PFCs; included adoption of language on Class IV groundwater management allowing potable supplies to be drilled under guidance of specific considerations provided by the Secretary: Bill signed June 2 in Bennington.
- S.103 – Toxics Bill – put on the wall, but not taken up, unlikely to be returned to when legislature returns to session.
- GWPRS – Internal comments will be wrapping up soon, going to do workshops with interested groups (ACCD, Health etc.) prior to ICAR to hopefully stream line the process. A meeting has been scheduled with AAFM (Agency of Agriculture) to discuss their comments and the GES table from VDH. A meeting with VDH will be scheduled to discuss the GES table soon. Hoping to go to ICAR in July but most likely August, and ***get the final draft to GWCC*** around this same time for comment.

#### E. Other Topics

- Sille attended a private well conference in IL – several states discussed the issue of abandoned wells being a large source of groundwater contamination – has this been an issue in VT?
  - Uncertain, abandoned wells have caused issues, but most have been detected when the well is being removed, not due to a major contamination issue.
  - Closure of wells – tremie grout fill from bottom up. Current practice and the new water supply rules will allow for sand/bentonite fill sequencing for clean wells to preserve fracture/flow patterns as has previously been approved.
- Kira – New England is hosting the National Groundwater Protection conference September 27-29<sup>th</sup> – will send call for abstract to the GWCC list, working to incorporate a drinking water protection session and issues specific to New England session.

---

NEXT MEETING: July 13<sup>th</sup> 1 pm at the ANR Annex