## ORIGINAL

1	PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION			
2	WATER RESOURCES PLANNING MEETING			
3	(ACT 220)			
4		•		
5	In Re:	Public Meet:	ing	
6				
7				
8				
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS			
10				
11	Ti.			
12		BEFORE:	BETTY CONNER, Chairper	son
13		DATE:	Monday, May 16, 2005	
14		DT 7 CE	at 7:29 p.m.	
15		PLACE:	Radisson Penn Harris 1150 Camp Hill Bypass	_
16	,		Camp Hill, Pennsylvani	ca.
17				
18				
19				
20				•
21				*
22				Jan L. Bucher
23				Reporter-Notary
24				
25				

[				
1	INDEX			
2	SPEAKERS	PAGE		
3	Betty Conner	3		
4	Walter Lyon *	5		
5	Eric Epstein *	11		
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
1.4				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20	* Attachment			
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

rB

CHAIRPERSON CONNER: It's almost 7:30, so if you'd like to take your seats we can begin the formal hearing. I have an opening statement to read to open the hearing.

The purpose of this hearing is to solicit input on water resources management issues in the Lower Susquehanna Basin. This hearing satisfies the requirements of Section 3115(b)(I), Roman Numeral I, of Act 220 of 2002, the Water Resources Planning Act, which requires that each regional committee is to hold at least one combined public meeting and hearing within its region to solicit input on water resources management and water resources planning within the region.

Notice of this meeting was published in the Pennsylvania Bulletin on February 5, 2005, and again on April 30, 2005. The meeting was also advertised in the Harrisburg Patriot News.

In order to give everyone an equal opportunity to comment this evening, I would like to establish the following ground rules. I will, first, call upon the witnesses who have registered to testify at this evening's hearing as included on the schedule of witnesses.

After hearing from these witnesses I will provide any other interested parties with the opportunity to testify as time allows; two, oral testimony is limited

to ten minutes for each witness; three, organizations are requested to designate one witness to present testimony on its behalf; four, each witness is asked to submit three written copies of his or her testimony to aid in transcribing the hearing.

1.1

Please hand me your copies prior to presenting your testimony; five, please state your name and address for the record prior to presenting your testimony and please spell your last name. We would also appreciate your help in spelling names and terms that may not be generally familiar so the transcript can be as accurate as possible.

In addition to or in place of oral testimony presented at today's hearing interested persons may also submit written comments on this proposal. All comments must be received by the Water Planning Office on or before June 30, 2005. Comments should be addressed to the Department of Environmental Protection, Water Planning Office, care of Lori Mohr, P.O. Box 2063, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-2063.

Comments can also be e-mailed to laumohr@state.pa.us. All comments received at today's hearing as well as written comments received by June 30, 2005, will be considered by the Regional Water Resources Committee as we develop the regional component of the

State Water Plan.

1.

1.7

An official comment-response document will not be prepared for comments received at this hearing. Anyone interested in a transcript of this hearing may contact the reporter here this evening to arrange to purchase a copy.

I would now like to call the first witness.

The first witness will be Walter Lyon, Capital Region

Water Board. Why don't you go to the microphone?

MR. LYON: I'm Walter Lyon, L-y-o-n, representing the Capital Region Water Board. My address is 5225 Wilson Lane, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania. And I have copies here plus some additional copies, if anyone would care to have a copy. It's not verbatim, but it hits the highlights of my testimony.

Let me say, first of all, that I echo what others have said here. I really admire what the committees have done in one year. An awful lot has been accomplished and you should be congratulated.

We are lucky in Pennsylvania now to have a law that covers water resources planning, something we've needed for a long time. Our recommendations to this Committee cover two major topics. One is institutional issues and the other really is also an institutional issue because it relates to land and water links.

And I notice in your priorities that land and

water links do have a very high priority in your thinking. And that should be -- you should be congratulated for that.

Now, my first item regarding institutional issues needs to remind you of something that the DEP Citizens' Advisory Board covered in a very fine report in March of 2000, the complete inadequacy of Pennsylvania's water law.

For example, you talk about critical areas and it's very appropriate that you pay attention to those. But Pennsylvania as a state does not have a law to implement those critical areas. It also doesn't have a law that allows you to regulate the use of ground water. So the regulation of water quantity and ground water should be number one on your agenda.

Before coming here I looked at the law that creates these committees, these water planning committees, and it very clearly states -- it doesn't say may. It says you shall look at these institutional issues including regulatory ones and the adequacy of laws.

So that would be our highest priority item, that you take a look at the adequacy of the laws that are on the books in the State of Pennsylvania to implement the things you are planning for us.

Number two is adequacy of resources. It asks

the question, Do we have adequate personnel with adequate 1 training and knowledge to implement the recommendations 2 you're making and other personnel and budget issues? 3 And I bring to your attention one very 4 significant, immediate, high-priority budget issue because 5 in the 2004 federal budget cycle the federal government 6 has cut way down on the money available to the National Weather Service for flood forecasting. And I would hope 8 that you would pay some attention to that. 9 That budget has been not only cut 10 significantly, but it has been eliminated as a line-item 11 So whether or not the Commission gets their money budget. 12 is an administrative decision within the National Weather 13 Service. 14 CHAIRPERSON CONNER: Excuse me. Did you mean 15 the Susquehanna River Basin Commission? 16 What did I say? 17 MR. LYON: Yes. National Weather Service. CHAIRPERSON CONNER: 18 MR. LYON: Well, the National Weather Service 19 actually gets the funds for that purpose. The Susquehanna 20 River Basin Commission uses that information to do flood 21 forecasting. 22

And having been a state water administrator
during the 1972 Agnes flood, I can assure you that the
money that is saved in this basin due to accurate

forecasting of floods is 1,000 if not 10,000 times as much as what this is costing us. We're talking about \$2- to \$3 million. We're talking about a lot more damage than that.

1.4

My second recommendation relates to the management of water infrastructure. I think the gentleman earlier, I believe from Middletown, mentioned the fact that a lot of our communities in this region are suffering from economic depression.

I don't know what the value is. I hope you will find out about the water infrastructure in your south basin. That's a big item. Again, the law that creates your process here tells you to do that. You should know the condition of your water infrastructure, the water systems, the sewer systems, the dams, and all the things that relate to water.

I can tell you as an experienced administrator that we're having a very serious problem with, number one, sprawl and, number two, maintaining sewer systems in this state. The gentleman earlier in this session brought up the issue of infiltration in-flow. The cost of waiting too long to properly fix these systems is going to be sky-high.

We have a serious problem in this area and I urge you to pay attention to it. In Philadelphia the

situation got so serious that they got a federal court order. And then after that court order they did a great job in doing what I would call asset management.

But just to finish this point, EPA recently, two or three years ago, put out a program called the Gap. And what they are talking about is the gap that is arising between the ability of people to pay their water and sewer bills and the rise in those bills which is almost logarithmic.

My wife told me that East Pennsboro Township alone is going to have to spend \$40 million to meet the Chesapeake Bay -- is it \$4 million?

VOICE: \$8 million.

MR. LYON: \$8 million. Sorry. \$8 million.

The decimal point leads a very uncertain life in my -- \$8 million. Still a lot of money for one municipality. I can guarantee you the sewer service charges in East Pennsboro Township to remove the nitrogen from their sewage treatment, from their effluent, are going to be significant.

The point that EPA made in connection with the Gap Program is there's going to be fewer and fewer low-income families that can meet the cost of our water infrastructure.

Finally, and I'll make that very brief because

I can see that you've already given that a lot of attention, is the linkage between water and land planning. That is an important area that needs a lot more attention than it has been given to so far.

1.2

In our report from the Capital Region Water
Board to you we list about 20 categories of linkages
between land and water planning. Number one is source
protection for drinking water supplies. Number two is Act
537 and the Sewage Facilities Act.

And in that connection a report that's been in the mill from the 10,000 friends of Pennsylvania and was picked by the Brookings Foundation indicates that Act 537, a state act, actually encourages sprawl. And sprawl means more sewer pipe and more water pipe per person which means a higher and higher cost.

Other areas where water and land planning interact is obviously on water recharge areas which have already been mentioned, wetlands, water supply sources, flood plains, non-point sources, stormwater management, well-head protection, and general suburban development.

I won't list the other ten lower priority
items. There are a lot of items. One of the
recommendations in this document which I'm going to give
you -- and I'll keep this short because I've been too
long -- is that we really need to consider a water and

land management code for Pennsylvania.

Our laws regarding water and land in part are inadequate and in another part are very fragmented. And we need to put them together into a unified law that combines water and land management.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON CONNER: Thank you, Mr. Lyon. And you're going to give the copies up front here. Our next testimony is from Mr. Eric Epstein.

MR. EPSTEIN: You're the most important person here tonight. An original and a copy and then ten copies for the --

CHAIRPERSON CONNER: Thank you.

MR. EPSTEIN: You're welcome. Betty, I'm only going to be about two or three hours. I'm Eric Epstein, chairman of Three Mile Island Alert, which is a safe energy organization formed in 1977, two years before the accident at TMI. We monitor Three Mile Island, Peach Bottom, the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station up in Berwick.

I'm also the chairman of the EFMR Monitoring
Group which is a non-partisan group which monitors
radiation levels at Three Mile Island and Peach Bottom and
invests in remote robotic technology.

Before I begin I would like to insert a

political plug. Go vote tomorrow for Growing Greener.

It's important. And, hopefully, you will be able to get out early and often. In fact I would strongly urge you to be diagnosed with multi-personality disorder so you can vote many, many times.

1.4

The main issue of what I'm going to talk about tonight is nuclear power which we believe to be an environmental orphan. It's pretty clear that if you look at the Lower Susquehanna, millions of gallons are used daily. And that's just the fact to cool super-heated cores and just to perform normal industrial applications.

If you look in your testimony, I've broken down the three plants that are on the Susquehanna. Two,

I think, are out of the Lower Susquehanna River Basin up in -- there's two reactors up in Berwick which are boiling-water reactors. We actually have two at TMI, one is crippled, and three at Peach Bottom, one of which is a 40-megawatt gas reactor which has been retired.

At any rate, the reactors that are now operating on the Lower Susquehanna all three units came on line in '74. We have one unit at TMI. It's approximately 850 megawatts. There are about 1100 megawatts times two at Peach Bottom.

There are times because of the age of this reactor that they return water into the river in excess of

110 degrees. And I can tell you as a child who grew up in this area TMI used to be a great place to swim. And I'm not talking about the big fish, but the warm water.

1.8

And it's not uncommon for these plants to discharge chlorinated water which is necessary to minimize bacterial contamination. And recently they've been discharging Clamtrol which is necessary to defeat Asiatic clam at the station.

The problem of this is none of this is monitored for or checked. Essentially it goes in unchecked, unmonitored. Whether it's water consumption, fish consumption, fish kills, thermal inversion, or effluent discharges, nuclear power is looked at as kind of like a benign monster on the side of the shore.

If you remember back to the 2002 drought when I think 66 out of 67 of our counties had inadequate water stocks, everybody was asked to conserve except the nuclear power plants.

And just to give you a sample of the magnitude of the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station -- and this is one of the newer plants, actually, probably the newest plant in the northeast part of the country. The plant draws 40.86 million gallons of water a day from the river.

Each unit, that's 14.93 millions gallons per

day, loses vapor out of the cooling tower stack while 11 million gallons are returned to the river. And, again, if you look at my footnotes, I took the tech spec from Susquehanna and put it in my testimony that will document and verify this information which is actually -- you can get it from PPL's Environmental Permit Report.

The problem is that this plant is a closed-cycle plant. And it recycles intake water reducing the volume of water taken to the plant. Peach Bottom is not. TMI is kind of an amalgam. If you look at Peach Bottom, they use and treat potable water from the Susquehanna River daily, 280- to 360,000 gallons.

And if you haven't been down to Peach Bottom, although I am anti-nuclear, it's a gorgeous sight, much different than TMI. The river channels are about 60 feet deep. You get to TMI and it's anywhere from two to four feet deep. You can walk across the river.

Dramatic change in the river. I'm sure you've done this, but if haven't, go down the river and it is very industrialized. Across from TMI you'll see Bruner Island. There's also a little hydro dam you may not be aware of. It's -- I wouldn't say take a canoe because we may never see you again. But if you can, the river changes dramatically along the basin.

At any rate, at Peach Bottom, again, just to

draw to your attention the drought in 2002, 14 counties were placed on drought watch. This is probably no news to you.

I wanted to point out that the precipitation

deficits at or exceeding ten inches in 2002 when these three plants were operating at full capacity were recorded in Dauphin County which is where most of TMI is situated. You may not know it, but some of it is situated in Lancaster County. The greatest deficit was Lancaster County, 14.6 inches. And York County one month received no water. And that's where Peach Bottom is located.

Peach Bottom didn't conserve any water until they were forced to shut down. Why? Again, this is something that most people are unaware of. It was a massive fish kill which happens regularly at these plants, receives little to no publicity. It was a massive Gizzard Shad fish kill which shut the plant down on August 30, 2002.

TMI presents other problems. You may not be aware of the fact that TMI-2 is not cleaned up. There hasn't been a human entry in the basement since March '79. You have a plant that is in post-defueling monitored storage but has not been decontaminated or decommissioned.

In addition to that, the low-level radioactive

1.1.

1.5

waste facility at TMI is below the flood plain which to me is just not a smart engineering move. By the way, the low-level radioactive waste site for TMI and Peach Bottom closes in 2008. So these facilities will be storing more low-level radioactive waste on site. And in Peach Bottom right now I think they have 1100 metric tons of high-level waste.

However, this is not the point of my testimony, but just to give you some background on what we've been doing. If you look at my testimony, we have documented 25 years of environmental-related water problems at TMI.

I'm not going to read that. I'm already pretty unpopular as it is. The main point that I wanted to bring to your attention today is -- and you're aware of this -- on July 9, 2004, Final Phase 2 Rule implementing Section 316(b) is going to affect both of these nuclear power plants.

All you need to do is look at Exelon's current annual report. The reason I am bringing this to your attention is that millions of fish, both game and consumable, fish eggs, shell fish, other organisms are sucked out of the Lower Susquehanna River on a daily basis.

We're talking millions killed annually. And these plants are going to have to invetorize [sic] the

mortality rates and identify species of aquatic life affected by their water intakes. Now, they're going to have a choice to make in terms of implementing fish protection measures such as screens with fish return systems or traveling screens with backwash devices.

I think we have a bigger problem in TMI and

Peach Bottom and the reason is this. TMI has cut staffing

25 percent in five years. In the last five years Peach

Bottom has cut 10 percent. Two of the largest staffs that

have been cut have been in environmental monitoring and

health physics.

So you're being asked to implement 316(b) with less people. You can hate me; most people do. But I just ask you to do the math. Less people to implement a new regulation. It's not going to happen. It's a leap of faith.

Let me read you a quote, if I may, from the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission. It's hard to know just what the impact on fisheries is because cool-water intakes have been under the radar screen compared to some other types of pollution. This is according to Leroy Young. But anytime you have a man-induced impact on top of what nature is doing you're affecting the ecosystem.

Here's a -- and this guy asked not to be identified -- a former Peach Bottom employee. And I'm

just going to read, quote, was sickened by the large number of sport fish he saw sucked out of the Susquehanna. Quote, When the water comes in fish would swim in through tunnels and swim into wire baskets.

11.

He lives in southern Lancaster County. There were hundreds and hundreds of fish killed each day,

Stripers and Bass and Walleye and Gizzard Shad and all kinds of fish. It took a forklift to carry them out.

This is substantial. And this is a gentleman who is pro-nuclear. TMI has a similar system for disposing of fish and other organisms that make it through the intake maze. According to their spokesperson, If they get that far, they're not going back. They are dumped into a container and disposed of.

However, TMI is looking for exemption from 316(b) because they say they don't use as much water as Peach Bottom; specious argument since they only have one reactor and Peach Bottom has two.

In my opinion and the opinion of the organization I represent, nuclear power plants are the most menacing predator on the Lower Susquehanna River.

Any comprehensive and substantive water management plan must include Three Mile Island and Peach Bottom Atomic Power Stations.

Before I get to the recommendations, and

there's only five, I want to point out Peach Bottom has been relicensed to operate for an additional 20 years.

Peach Bottom has been upgraded. TMI is in the process of being relicensed and will probably be upgraded.

You can upgrade the capacity of the nuclear power plant up to 20 percent. So regardless of how you feel about nuclear power, there's going to be considerable water consumption, increased consumption for at least the next 20 years.

My suggestion, my wish list, if you will, would be to form a joint monitoring task fish -- force. I don't know that you could form a task fish; although, that would be interesting kind of on the carp anomaly -- but the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission, the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, and I think you need to bring the United States Coast Guard in.

Last year we wrote regulations that have deployed the Coast Guard at Three Mile Island to Peach Bottom. So you may have an ally there. But the two main points for this task force, if possible, is to assess and, if necessary -- and this is not going to be popular -- fine and penalize power plants for water infractions and any adverse economic impacts they create for commercial and recreational fishing.

Major industry for our state. Behind agriculture tourism is No. 2 in our state economy. I would suggest that any proceeds from punitive or civil fines be contributed to the Growing Greener Fund or donated to the O&M costs associated with the shad ladder infrastruture on the Susquehanna.

Number two and, perhaps, more importantly for me is I think the task force and, if not the task force, this Committee or this Commission needs to examine the PUC's policies and regulations relating to, quote, withdraw and treatment of water, unquote. This is known as the cost of water under Public Utility Code, Title 66.

Second recommendation, I've asked you to compile and concurrently track and monitor water-related transgressions at these nuclear power plants, whether they're biological or aquatic, economic impacts to fisheries or recreations, consumption levels, reliability and potability.

Also, it's unfortunate but my organization is the only organization that does real-time monitoring at Three Mile Island or Peach Bottom. We maintain real-time gamma monitoring systems. And that's only for atmospheric ambient releases. There are no monitors in place right now to monitor what's put into the river.

I would hope and urge people to consider

1.0

implementing temperature monitoring at the point a nuclear power plant effluent discharges.

And the last point -- and this may seem a bit silly. I just think we take water for granted. I really do. I would love to see you implement a public education campaign that promotes the value of water as a commodity and an economic asset.

I went to college on the West Coast and believe me, the people out there realize that water comes at a premium. And the water politics are amazing. So my last recommendation is at some point -- and you have a great crowd out here -- but at some point people begin to value the importance of water. I think it's a resource they take for granted.

I want to conclude by echoing what I said earlier which will probably nominate me for a multi-personality disorder and that's thanks for sitting through this. I'm sure that the compensation is minimal and a lot of work has gone into it.

So to your credit, if you don't mind, I'd like to give you a round of applause for all the work that you've done.

CHAIRPERSON CONNER: Thank you for your testimony. I let you go on because we only had two people registered to give testimony. And I appreciate your

recommendations. MR. EPSTEIN: I have extra copies, if anybody would like them. CHAIRPERSON CONNER: Do we have anybody else who would like to testify? (No response.) CHAIRPERSON CONNER: Well, if there's nobody else, then I would hereby adjourn the meeting at 7:58 p.m. And thank you all for coming. And please send in your comments, if you have any additional ones, to DEP. Thank you. (Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at 7:58 p.m.)