PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

IN RE: WATER RESOURCES PLANNING (ACT 220 OF 2002) -DRAFT STATE WATER PLAN

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS PUBLIC HEARING

BEFORE:

BETTY CONNER, COMMITTEE CHAIR LOWER SUSQUEHANNA REGIONAL

WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE

DATE:

13.500 Be

SEPTEMBER 15, 2008, 7:28 P.M.

PLACE:

RADISSON

1150 CAMP HILL BYPASS CAMP HILL, PENNSYLVANIA

DAWN YOUNG DIETRICH, REPORTER NOTARY PUBLIC

MS. CONNER: If everybody would please take their seats, we'll start the official public hearing.

2.0

2.4

2.5

I would like to welcome you this evening to the Lower Susquehanna Region Water Resources public hearing to solicit input on the Draft State Water Plan. My name is Betty Conner and I represent the Lower Susquehanna Regional Water Resources Committee.

With us this evening are members of the Lower Susquehanna Regional Water Resources Committee and staff from the Department of Environmental Protection, DEP. Would those people stand so we can see how many -- first of all, committee members, would you please stand?

(Members stood.)

MS. CONNER: Thank you. Would you like to introduce yourselves starting at this end (indicating).

MR. MEYER: I'm Earl Meyer, Planning Director for Lebanon County.

MR. EDWARDS: Bob Edwards, Rettew Associates.

MR. McCARTY: Tom McCarty, Penn State Extension.

```
MR. BALDWIN: Don Baldwin, Susquehanna
 1
     Electric Company.
 2
                 MR. EVANKO: Ron Evanko representing the
 3
 4
     waters of Pennsylvania.
                 MS. BOYLE: Jineen Boyle, DEP in the
 5
     Harrisburg Regional Office.
 6
 7
                 MR. ESBENSHADE:
                                  Terry Esbenshade
     representing the agriculture industry.
 8
 9
                 MR. FINK: Bill Fink representing the
     industry.
10
                 MR. MORRIS: Bill Morris representing the
11
12
     industry.
                 MR. HINES: Jeff Hines representing
13
     professionals.
14
1.5
                 MR. KYLE: Mike Kyle, Lancaster Area
16
     Sewer Authority representing municipal authorities.
17
                 MS. CONNER: And the third row?
18
                 MR. SEIDL: Steve Seidl representing
19
     professionals.
2.0
                MR. HOSTETTER: Jim Hostetter, Mifflin
21
     County Soil Conservation Director.
22
                 MR. BEAUDUY: Tom Beauduy, Susquehanna
23
     River Basin Commission.
24
                 MS. CONNER: Thank you. And would the
25
     DEP staff members please stand and introduce
```

```
themselves. We'll start over on this side
 1
 2
     (indicating).
 3
                 MS. MOHR: Lori Mohr, DEP Water Planning
     Office.
 4
                 MS. SARVIS: Leslie Sarvis, DEP Water
 5
     Planning Office.
 6
 7
                 MS. SMITH: Ann Smith, DEP Water Planning
     Office.
 8
 9
                 MR. JOSTENSKI: Dave Jostenski, water use
10
     planning.
11
                 MR. GANSELL: Stu Gansell, DEP Water
12
     Planning Office.
13
                 MR. HILL: Mike Hill, water use
14
     planning.
15
                 MR. BRAUND: Jay Braund, water planning
     office.
16
17
                            Paul Zeph, water management.
                 MR. ZEPH:
18
                 MS. CONNER:
                               Thank you.
                                           The purpose of
     this hearing is to solicit input on the Draft State
19
2.0
     Water Plan.
                 This hearing satisfies the requirement
21
     of the Water Resources Planning Act.
2.2
                 Notice of this meeting was published in
23
     the Pennsylvania Bulletin on August 23rd, 2008.
     meeting was also advertised in several area
24
25
    newspapers.
```

In order to give everyone an equal opportunity to comment this evening, I would like to establish the following ground rules: One, I will first call upon the witnesses who have preregistered 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.

Oral testimony is limited to ten minutes for each witness. Organizations are required to designate one witness to represent testimony on its behalf. Each witness is asked to submit three written copies of his or her testimony to aid in transcribing the hearing.

Please state your name and address for the record prior to presenting your testimony. And I think in view of rule number three you need to state the organization you're representing, if there is one such.

And we have six people registered to testify and the first one is Eric Epstein. Would you come to one of the microphones to give your testimony, please.

MR. EPSTEIN: My name is Eric Epstein.

2.2

2.3

2.4

I'm Chairman of Three Mile Island Alert. We have entered comments beginning at the original meeting dating back quite a bit. Actually we did apply for a position on the Committee and were rejected, but it seems you have a stellar staff here and I'm sure that our views have been advocated.

1.0

1.4

In the last couple of years, we have testified before DEP on the connective proposal down at Peach Bottom, we've testified before the Susquehanna River Basin Commission on the PPL Susquehanna Upgrade and we just offered testimony on the PPL Holtwood License Extension, so we've been in and only involved with issues on the Lower Susquehanna.

And at issue for us tonight is after we looked at your priorities -- and it's difficult to understand if you finalized priorities because I saw there were draft priorities and we encapsulate them in our testimony and frankly we don't have any problems with the priorities.

The problem is we have in our belief an absence of prioritizing the two nuclear power plants on the Lower Susquehanna that use a lot of water and have a huge impact, and what we were asking -- and based again on energy consumption. I think the

SRBC's figures are somewhere around a, what, 50 percent increase by 2025, 315 million gallons a day being utilized from the river for energy products.

We'd like to see more of an emphasis on energy, especially aging nuclear power plants; Peach Bottom 2 and 3, Three Mile Island. You know one will likely be relicensed and upgraded through 2034. So these would be aging plants.

1.

. 10

2.0

Peach Bottom has already had a number of problems with water use. As some of you in the room know, last year they were assessed a settlement or a fine -- I'm sure Tom can talk about it -- at Peach Bottom, \$640,000 for not properly abiding by an application before the Susquehanna River Basin Commission for an upgrade. PPL was assessed a larger fine within the last year.

I just want to read a little portion of the testimony to give you our perspective on what we're saying, and apparently we're seeing something that's a little different from what you're seeing. This what we see.

We saw water shortages on the Lower Susquehanna and they reached critical levels in the summer of 2002. For the month of August 2002, sixty-six out of the sixty-seven counties in the

state were below normal precipitation. These were really huge deficits in Lancaster County and York County and Dauphin County where TMI and Peach Bottom operate. In fact, Peach Bottom wasn't shut down until they were forced to shut down by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission actually due to a large fish kill.

2.0

2.1

2.3

2.5

And so what we're seeing is when I go in my neighborhood, we're being asked to conserve and we're being asked to be efficient. We see nuclear power plants that for the most part are exporting power outside of the basin, in many instances outside of the state. So they're using a resource and they're getting it at a pretty reasonably subsidized cost.

And so it's difficult to ask people to engage in conservation efforts, efficiency efforts, when they look at -- it doesn't have to be TMI or Susquehanna. It could be Brunner Island. It could be the dams that are on the river. It could be the proposed ethanol plant or the proposed coal gasification plant. I'd like to see a little balance, because when you do these education programing it's more or less designed, designated, to hit consumers or residential customers.

I'd also like to point out -- and again, this was just -- let me just read -- and this is from the Fish and Boat Commission -- a little narrative to give you some idea of what the fish kill looks like at a nuclear power plant.

It's hard to know just what the impact is on fisheries because cool water intakes have been under the radar screen compared to some types of pollution, said Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission Aquatic Resources Chief Leroy Young. But any time you have a man-induced impact on top of what nature is doing, you're affecting the ecosystem.

A former Peach Bottom nuclear power plant employee said he was, quote, 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 the tunnels and swim into wire baskets, said the man who lives in southern Lancaster County. There were hundreds and hundreds of fish killed each day, Stripers and bass and walleye and gizzard shad.

The point is one of your priorities is recreation and striking a balance and, you know, my sense would be -- and if you go to page six of my testimony, actually we prescribed six remedies and

I'll go through them quickly. One would be that you ask the commission or, in your powers committee, to recommend to DEP that they eliminate the drought exemptions for nuclear power plants and power generators learn to conserve water like everybody else. This is different from the compensatory measures that the SRBC asked folks to do up in the lake in the northern part of the state.

In addition to that -- this is pretty novel -- the amount of water used proportionate to the percentage of energy generated and shipped out of the basin needs to be assessed. We're essentially giving a subsidy to an EDC that doesn't operate in our river basin. So if we're looking about economic development, let's develop here.

In addition to that, I'd like to look at a fair market value or differential between the water that goes into a plant and the water that's not returned. That's water consumed. That's point three.

Point four is we'd like to see, if possible, you guys get more involved with license extensions and upgrades on aquatic impacts of power plants.

In addition, if it's possible to quantify

and qualify the impact of these plants on sport and commercial fishing and access an annual reconciliation tariff to offset financial losses.

B, quantify and qualify fish (game or consumable), fish egg, shellfish, other organisms that will be harmed or killed annually by nuclear generating stations.

And C, quantify and qualify the impact that nuclear power plants have on shad ladders, also eel access which I think is being taken into consideration now.

Rather than read through the other issues, I just want to raise a couple of issues with you that I haven't seen you discuss. One is emerging contaminants, and we have a major tritium problem at just about every nuclear power plant in the country. Tritium is a radioactive isotope. It's an element of hydrogen. It's naturally produced in the upper atmosphere. The problem is when it -- in water you can't get rid of it.

If you look at our testimony, you'll see the documentation of tritium problems that have been occurring at Peach Bottom and Three Mile Island. We also have a problem with it at our landfills.

Some of the remedies that we've

suggested: What are the systems and the components of a licensed facility that contain radioactive contaminated water? I mean, they're storing this on site, it makes its way to the river and then into the bay.

What methods are being used to monitor leakage of radioactive contaminated water from the systems and components? If you look at most of the reps of the companies, they're average. In other words, you have these affluent monitors and they average a quarter average or monitor -- you know, for an annual average there's really no rate or good real-time way for us to induce what's going in the river and at what temperatures.

And we'd like to see -- I don't even know if this exists -- the largest leak rate that can remain undetected by current monitoring standards.

In addition we suggested a couple other points, and this is on page eight of our testimony. Comment two is from our earlier testimony. I don't know that people didn't get it or don't want to get it. This largely has to do with 316(a) and 316(b). And our frustration is this:

We recognize that those rules are in court right now, but at some point they're not going

to be in court and we're going to have to comply with 316(a) and (b). And what's frustrating from us, people from the environmental or consumer side of the issue, is every time you go to court and say, look, we sued for ten years to have these implemented, the industry which is represented tonight, you know, appealed it and now they're not being implemented.

2.2

2.3

2.4

What I'd like folks to consider -- at some point 316(a) and (b) are going to be implemented. What are you going to do when you license a plan, you don't take current conditions or factor current conditions regarding 316(a) and (b)?

All of our cites are here on pages ten through eleven. These are the most current cites that we were able to deduce.

Comment three -- and I don't know if this is something you get into and I don't really -- because of the fact the Eagles game is starting soon and I have a ten-minute remedy here -- I mean, let's be honest about our priorities -- then the Phillies are off tonight, so you don't have to go back and forth between the stations.

MS. CONNER: You've got one more minute.

MR. EPSTEIN: I think you have to pay more attention to invasive species. I think Asiatic

clam and zebra mussels are a very real threat.

They've been detected up north. We've had Asiatic clams down south. I haven't seen anywhere in your documents mention what happens or what kind of problems that we may confront with invasive species.

2.0

The final point I'll make is something that just came up and I'd urge you to pay attention to. We have no problem, for instance, with the recent plan by PPL Holtwood to bank water at Lake Aldred to more or less offset Brunner Island scrubbing mechanisms.

What we have a problem with and what I'd want everybody to be aware of is approving a water banking plan for a nonexisting plant. Our concern is that PPL wants to build another nuclear power plant and there may be some water banking scheme afoot that doesn't necessarily designate an entity that's been licensed or been approved. So that's the only thing we would caution about water banking.

Conclusion. Look, we don't take issue with the priorities you identify. We only ask that you expand your priorities to include two nuclear power plants on the Lower Susquehanna River which have been upgraded and will probably be further upgraded and likely to have license extensions until

the year 2034.

1.5

2.3

And thanks for giving me the opportunity.

MS. CONNER: Thank you, Mr. Epstein.

That was exactly ten minutes.

Our next testimony is from Todd Reichart.

MR. REICHART: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee and ladies and gentlemen of the audience. My name is Tom Reichart and I am a sixth generation water well driller with Reichart Well Drilling, Incorporated in Hanover, Pennsylvania, and also a certified professional geologist in the State of Pennsylvania.

For almost a hundred and twenty years, my company has been drilling water wells and developing groundwater throughout the State of Pennsylvania, and therefore I understand and advocate both from a practical and technical standpoint the need to prioritize residential water well construction standards and proficiency-based licensing requirements for water well drillers in the State Water Plan.

Each year more than 15,000 new residential wells are drilled and constructed in Pennsylvania, the majority of which are installed

without any regulations regarding minimum casing length, routing and sealing of the annular space, sampling requirements for potability, et cetera.

2.0

2.2

2.3

2.4

Moreover, Pennsylvania as a state has the second highest number of residential water wells in the United States, yet is only one of two states that does not have any standards pertaining to the construction or regulation of those wells. More than thirty-seven percent of Pennsylvania's population, or about four and a half million people, derive their drinking water from a residential well.

As a whole, the water well drillers of Pennsylvania have been good stewards of the State's groundwater resource; however, as with any other unregulated industry, there are bound to be those who employ poor construction practices and shoddy work in the name of profitability. There can be no other issue as self-evident with respect to public health and safety as access to clean, safe, protected drinking water.

It is quite ironic that public water supply wells in the State of Pennsylvania have mandated construction standards and are regulated.

It is almost as if we are saying to the over four and a half million people who derive their water supply

from a residential well that your drinking water just doesn't matter.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, if nothing else stands out from my testimony here this evening, at least let it be this: That the water well drillers of Pennsylvania want to be regulated in the form of mandatory construction standards for all residential water wells drilled in the State and proficiency-based licensing requirements for all Pennsylvania water well drillers.

We want these action items so that we can purge our ranks of any, quote-unquote, bad apples who may be out there performing unlicensed, unregulated work and so that we can promote and ensure public health and safety in the form of clean, safe and protected drinking water from residential water wells.

I would ask this committee to give these two action items the highest priority in the final draft of the State Water Plan.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, this concludes my testimony and I thank you.

MS. CONNER: Thank you, Mr. Reichart.

Our next testimony is from Tom Keyes.

MR. KEYES: Hello. My name is Thomas P.

Keyes. My address is 1312 South Tulip Drive, West Chester, Pennsylvania. I'm president of Thomas G. Keyes, Incorporated, a water well contractor. Been in business for over -- since 1945, been a member of the Pennsylvania Groundwater Association and National Groundwater Association for many years. I'm certified by the National Groundwater Association as a certified well driller and pump installer. I've been in the business myself for thirty-eight years drilling wells.

1.8

I have reviewed the State Water Plan. I have a recommendation for a revision to the water plan document. The Draft Water Plan Principles document of the Pennsylvania State Water Plan should be revised to elevate recommendation two in its water quality section to become its fourth principle priority in its draft list of three principle priorities.

Water quality recommendation two states the Commonwealth should enact legislation for the certification of well drillers and the establishment of private water well construction standards.

Why does Pennsylvania need these standards for proper construction? There's many things. First of all, over thirty-seven percent of

the Pennsylvania population use groundwater as a potable water source. At least groundwater resources in Pennsylvania need to be protected against contamination entering through improperly constructed residential wells.

1.0

2.0

2.4

It is estimated that more than 15,000 new water wells are constructed in Pennsylvania each year. The absence of any residential well construction standards allow wells to be improperly constructed and to threaten the quality of Pennsylvania's groundwater.

Pennsylvania's one of only two states in the nation with no residential well construction standards. The other forty-eight states all have standards for proper construction of residential wells to protect their groundwater resources.

Many public water systems have used groundwater as their source. Pennsylvania requires all public water supply wells to be properly constructed to protect the quality of groundwater and the health of the public drinking the water from its public water system.

Properly constructed residential water wells also protect the quality of the groundwater from the aquifers. Contamination entering the

groundwater through improperly constructed residential wells can move within the aquifer and impact neighboring wells and also the public wells.

1.0

1.4

2.2

2.5

This is some of the reasons why I think that you should have the water plan principles -- changes recommendation to and bring it up to the fourth priority. Thank you.

 $\mbox{MS. CONNER:} \quad \mbox{Thank you very much,} \\ \mbox{Mr. Keyes.} \\$

Our next testimony is from David Powell.

MR. POWELL: Good evening, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak before you this evening. My hat's off and I applaud every one of you who have been on these State Water Committee meetings for four, five, six years now. Quite a daunting task.

There's so much that needs to be done and your task in front of you, it's got to be a little bit overwhelming I'm sure.

MS. CONNER: Could you identify yourself, please?

MR. POWELL: Yes. I'm sorry. My name is David Powell. I am a Pennsylvania resident. I'm a water well contractor located down in the southeastern part of the State.

My remarks this evening will be focused on groundwater. From what I've heard of the planning committee's and the State Water Plan's efforts, a lot of it seems to be focused on surface water, and probably rightfully so. That's where most of the water that is being used right now is located is on the surface.

.8

1.2

2.2

2.5

But right now there's some other issues that I think really need to be addressed, and that is with the groundwater and that's where I'm going to direct my comments this evening.

One-tenth of one percent of the consumable water on this planet is located underground, okay? It's an area that needs to be elevated in your water plan as far as priority. It's important that our streams are clean and that the power plants have enough power and enough water, the agriculture. That is all important and I understand that.

But right now in Pennsylvania the groundwater is getting a short shift when it comes to this water plan. And I don't mean that directed at anyone that's been working extremely hard on this. I understand some of the politics involved and what's involved in these things, but I think that the

groundwater is not getting the proper elevation and importance that it deserves.

2.0

2.5

You had heard from some of my colleagues that 15,000 wells are drilled in this state every single year. That's the second most in the country, yet we are one of two states in the country that do not have any standardized construction standards for well-to-well construction or the meaningful licensure for the people who are doing that.

In Pennsylvania, if you want to cut somebody's hair you have to go to school and pass a state test to get a license. In Pennsylvania, anybody in this room by week's end, for less than \$100, could be a state licensed water well contractor and start putting holes in the ground.

Does anybody in this room think that makes sense? I don't and I'm here today representing my company and as a person who actually uses the groundwater in this state, and that is absolutely shameful that we can't regulate something as important as someone who's putting holes in the ground that could potentially contaminate the groundwater.

Now, we were looking at your computer models here which may be showing some areas of

concern when it comes to the amount of water in the future. If you get to that point and you have to start relying on the groundwater but you don't protect it now, it won't be suitable to use when you need it in ten or 2034 or whatever years you're looking at. We need to protect it now.

1.0

Once groundwater is ruined and contaminated, it doesn't get treated overnight. It takes a long time to remediate problems underground. We need to take care of it now.

One of the most growing industries in the state right now and around the country and the world is the geothermal heating and cooling market. Fuel prices rising the way they are have just driven this market beyond belief.

Currently my company is drilling ten geothermal wells for every one water well I drill, okay? They are very unregulated. We are putting boreholes in the ground, and there's a lot of companies out there doing it, and they're not grounding these wells properly. They are just sources of contamination potential.

In addition to that, there are tens of thousands of wells every year in this state which are being abandoned, existing communities that had public

water before the public water lines have run through the area and the people tie into the public water, and what do they do with their water well? Nothing. They just leave it there.

1.0

2.0

Again, that is a hole right to the aquifer that is going to end up contaminating that aquifer if it's not taken care of. It's extremely important that these issues be elevated in your State Water Plan.

So in summary, what I would like to recommend that -- on page 53 of the water quality section, recommendation two reads, the Commonwealth should enact legislation for the certification of water well drillers and the establishment of private water well construction standards. And while I'm grateful that this issue is even mentioned in your document, it's not enough. It is buried within hundreds of pages of recommendations.

What I would like to see happen is that this recommendation two on page 53 be elevated to the status of principal priority that is listed on page fourteen. It needs to be a priority. If it's just going to get buried in this legislation, nothing's going to happen.

Now, I am a member of the Pennsylvania

Groundwater Association and that organization has been doing a lot over the last thirty years to try to get the legislature to do something about this issue, but it just won't happen. DEP just sits on its hands, it won't do anything. I'm not sure why and I'm not here to ruffle feathers. I'm sure there are some valid reasons.

I'm not one who loves regulations. I have enough paperwork to do between this tax and that tax and this paperwork and this, that and the other thing.

You know, that's how I spend my time is pushing paper around. So I'm not looking to have regulations for the sake of regulations, but I am a contractor who realizes that sometimes you need to have certain regulations. This is that instance where the water well industry and the protection of the groundwater in this state needs to be regulated properly.

And I do most of my work in Chester

County which has some very good regulations. They

make sense. They would really be a great standard

for this state.

Thank you.

MS. CONNER: Thank you very much,

25 Mr. Powell.

2.4

Our next testimony is from Michael Helfrich.

1 1

1.8

2.0

2.3

MR. HELFRICH: Good evening. Michael Helfrich. I'm the Lower Susquehanna Riverkeeper and I represent the members of stewards of the Lower Susquehanna, 324 West Market Street, York, Pennsylvania 17401.

Now, I have not had a chance to review the whole plan, so I've been working on things like a million eels trying to get up the Conowingo Dam, which they can't get up, and the loss of our mussel populations in the river because the eels can't get up, and the 316(a) and 316(b) issues, things like Peach Bottom having a Conowingo pool 102 degrees last summer a mile downstream from their facility.

So I'm not sure if everything I have to say is exactly relevant to the work that you're doing, but I'm going to throw five or six minutes worth of stuff out here anyhow.

The first thing I would like to say is that it sounds like our well drillers are well represented here. Sorry; pardon the pun. But I'm not sure that we're going to have to worry about them too much longer because we're paving so fast that we're losing groundwater perviousness and I would

like to see the Commission be studying the levels of groundwater, how much -- I mean, I don't understand -- and perhaps you are all doing this, but we really need to understand more about our supply of groundwater and how much is running off in these short spurts after the storms.

We have situations like in Adams County where you pointed out that that is an area of concern for water supply and they're losing groundwater so they want to import surface water so they can pave more so they'll have less pervious surface so they'll have less groundwater, so I guess then they're going to want more of the Susquehanna water. You see, these things are spirals that if we don't control them at the beginning they just continue to spiral downward.

So I would like to see the Commission look more at trying to get these communities to understand that by increasing development they are losing the resources that they do have available to them and are going to make this industry that we've heard well represented certainly have to work harder to find their water to help these folks that are out in the suburbs or -- I'm sorry, out in the rural areas.

Let's see here. And the suburbs am I hearing? And the suburbs, okay. Good.

Let's see. I'm glad that Mr. Epstein brought up emerging contaminants because one of my big concerns about this -- and I have over the break here heard that there is some investigation on water quality issues, but I have a big concern about only evaluating water quantity issues without comparing them as regards to unregulated contaminants.

If we do things like count 3.5 million gallons of groundwater the same as we count 3.5 million gallons of water coming from a wastewater treatment plant that can have 80,000 unregulated contaminants in it, I think we are really doing ourselves a disservice and our future generations a disservice to count those waters the same.

So I'm glad that you are taking some of the first steps we need to understand more about our water supply, but I do not believe that all water sources are created equal.

And with all due respect to the wonderful things that some of these folks representing agriculture and representing our electricity producers and our water suppliers -- a lot of these folks are doing wonderful things -- and wastewater

treatment plants I'm sure -- but every time those waters are used there is a certain problem that goes along with that water use.

Then we have to make sure that we're understanding that the amount withdrawn for agriculture -- we have to understand whether that water now has more pollutants in it when it runs off than it had. In some places in this community, particularly in Lancaster and York Counties, you might end up that the farm runoff has less pollutants than the spring that they got the water out of in the first place.

I know that's certainly true in Southern York County in areas and particularly around Lititz/Manheim areas where the water phosphates and nitrates are so high that just the water itself is a fertilizer. So I think we've really -- I hope we don't just wait for our superiors, or whatever they want to call themselves at the EPA, to -- for them to regulate us. I hope we have some understanding and some ability to evaluate science ourselves.

I mean, we are finding estrogen and estrogen-mimicking hormones or contaminants in our waterways. We are finding that the fish are having immunity deficiencies caused by some problems that

are not completely understood yet. So I hope I'm not digressing too far here, but I really hope that we do have more of a look and a value given to the water as it's coming out from these different sources.

2.1

And for the folks concerned about 316(a) and 316(b) issues, I can assure that there will be some actions taken to encourage the implementation of better 316(a) and 316(b) mitigation techniques because the water keepers are a part of the lawsuit against EPA to get that done, so we will -- and the lawyers for them are also representing folks here in this community.

I think that is most of my notes. But once again, I just want to repeat for the record that I appreciate the idea and it's good that we are finally getting down to subwatershed levels, but let's not forget the macro issues here as well.

If there are problems on the main stem, that means there are problems in our tributaries. They may have enough dissolved oxygen and the water might still currently be cool enough to be okay in those tributaries, but once it gets out in our wonderful, meandering, shallow Susquehanna River it's having a hard time.

And to get back to that -- one last

comment. To get back to the impervious surface, I would like to see more -- and I saw a brief piece of the temperature studies. I would like to see some more comprehensive temperature studies of what is coming down these tributaries and then what is coming into the Susquehanna River.

1.3

2.3

2.4

We seem to be transforming our watershed from a watershed of spring heads that put water out at 45 to 55 degrees to a watershed of parking lots that puts water out at 80 to 110 degrees and I can't help but think that changing those original temperatures, those runoff temperatures, has to be having part of the impact on the Lower Susquehanna Watershed.

Thank you very much.

MS. CONNER: Thank you, Mr. Helfrich.

The next testimony is from Walter Lyon.

MR. LYON: Thank you, Madame Chair. I appreciate the opportunity to speak here for the Capital Region Water Board. The Board covers approximately the same area. It's slightly smaller than the area covered by your committee.

The testimony that I'm about to give has two interesting points. It echoes much of what has been said already because it emphasizes the policy

and management areas of water management. Much of what you have in your report is descriptive material. I hope, like these gentlemen do, that you'll give more effort and more time to policy and management issues.

1.4

2.4

We gave you the same report on May 16, 2005 in the same room and I will briefly in five minutes summarize what I said then.

I notice on your web page you say your input is needed. I know the Board was very concerned with the fact that there was no summary prepared of the 2005 testimony that was given and we hope that will change this year.

Essentially we make four points. They echo some of what has been said here. The State's water law's essentially obsolete. We have no authority to regulate groundwater and regulation of surface water is limited to public drinking water supplies.

We have in Pennsylvania no authority to regulate water beyond the drinking water level. Of course, the Susquehanna River Basin Commission does have that kind of authority, and if we don't get a state law in that area the Commonwealth might seriously consider turning that function over to the

Susquehanna River Basin Commission at least for the Susquehanna River Basin.

1.1

2.3

My next point relates to the adequacy of resources. We feel that for the State of Pennsylvania the Department of Environmental Resources does not have adequate numbers of professional personnel to do this kind of a job. And, of course, I'm not only referring to water planning, but also water management.

My third point relates to water infrastructure which covers both water and wastewater. All of us know that we have a lot of sprawl these days and a lot of that infrastructure is not well managed. There is such a thing called asset management, and if we don't pay attention to that the water and sewer bills in the future are going to go far beyond the ability of many of our households to pay those bills. That's particularly true in view of the energy crunch. We need to be reminded that an awful lot of energy goes into pumping water and wastewater in the Commonwealth.

Our final point relates to the fact that our laws regarding land and water management are dovetailed in many, many places. Wetlands, floodplain zoning, groundwater, they're all

interlocked. We have on the order of thirty to forty different laws administered by different agencies at different levels of government to the point that water and land management are virtually impossible and what we really need is a water-land management code.

I have copies which I'll be happy to share with you.

MS. CONNER: Could you repeat that last

That is the substance of our testimony.

sentence? What we need is a water management code?

MR. LYON: Yes.

MS. CONNER: C-o-d-e?

MR. LYON: C-o-d-e. What I mean by that is for the Pennsylvania Bar Association/the environmental group to take all the laws that relate to water management and land management, and they'll find that many of them link water and land management, and put them into a unified code, very similar, for example, to the Public Utility Code. We have a fine code in that area. We need a code in the field of water and land management.

MS. CONNER: Thank you, Mr. Lyon.

Are there any other people that wish to

(There was no response.)

testify?

MS. CONNER: In that case, I will read the rest of the statement. In addition to or in place of oral testimony presented at today's hearing, interested persons may also submit written comments on this proposal.

Comments should be addressed to the Department of Environmental Protection Water Planning Office, P.O. Box 2063, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-2063. Comments can also be e-mailed to -- the e-mail address is epstatewaterplan@state.pa.us. Contact sheets with this information are available from DEP staff persons.

Do we have those available? Okay. See Lori or Leslie.

All comments received at today's hearing, as well as written comments received prior to September 30th, 2008, will be considered by the Regional Water Resources Committee. 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 hereby adjourn this hearing at 8:20 p.m.

```
(The proceedings were concluded at 8:20
 1
 2
      p.m)
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this copy is a correct transcript of same. Dietrich, Dawn Young Di-Notary Public