

**Des Moines Public Hearing**  
**07/09/09**

**Jim McElvogue:** Yeah my name is Jim McElvogue, and I'm here representing IWPCA as their president. Would like to thank DNR for working with us to establish these new rules. We think that they are a vast improvement over the interim rules that actually has some really well researched scientific standards, this is always welcomed. We do want to encourage passing of these rules. The other comments I'd like to make is we would like in the future for DNR to fund their own research. We are not polluters, we are stewards of the environment. Would also, would rather have protection for those communities that may be hung out to dry with these regulations with no viable treatment options. We would just as soon have the protection of cost effective definition be done before the standards that aren't able to be complied with or established. That's it.

**Rich White:** My name is Rich White and I'm the executive director of the Iowa Limestone Producers, I would like to begin by thanking the DNR for many hours of research that went into this rulemaking and for allowing me the opportunity to comment. Years ago Iowa established a Total Dissolved Standards of a thousand milligrams per liter and chloride standards of 230 milligrams per liter. To my knowledge there was little scientific basis for this criteria. Few other states have a TDS standard and the states that do set their limits as high as five thousand milligrams per liter. In large areas of Iowa the state's naturally occurring groundwater already exceeds the current one thousand milligrams per liter of the TDS Standard. If you're unfortunate enough to be located in an area where the groundwater, where water exceeds these arbitrary limits you're looking at the required use of old effluent toxicity testing to monitoring groundwater discharge. These tests are both complex and very expensive. Since 2005 the DNR has been working to establish a science based formula to protect Iowa's lakes, streams and rivers from any effects related to dissolved solids and chloride. The current rulemaking is accumulation of those efforts spent over the four years since that time. It abandons the old and arbitrary standards and moves Iowa to a science based formula. The rule before says that the result of Dr. Steven Sochek, ecotoxicologist and entomologist at the Illinois Natural History Survey, Charles Stephan at the US Environmental Protection Agency's Duluth, Minnesota lab, Dr. Connie Dou, Senior Environmental Engineer here at the Iowa Department of Natural Resources and others. Additional support for this process can be found in our neighbors to the east. After extensive review by both the Illinois EPA and US EPA, similar research was used to establish the existing Illinois standards. We congratulate the DNR on its hard work and support the adoption of the Water Quality Standards Chloride, Sulfate and Total Dissolved Solids Rulemaking. Thank you.

**Greg Sindt:** I'm Greg Sindt, from Bolton-Menk, Engineers in Ames. I have a written statement that I'll give to you Adam for the record. I'm a member of the techno-advisory committee to DNR on Water Quality Standards, I'm also a consulting

engineer that represents municipal and industrial wastewater dischargers who will be impacted by the proposed rules. The IDNR staff has worked cooperatively with US EPA in developing the proposed rules. These proposed rules are a significant improvement on EPA's 1988 National Chloride Toxicity Guideline Criteria. Many states are considering application of the Iowa Chloride Standards to their own state programs. The proposed rules were developed with assistance from the Iowa Water Pollution Control Association members. Over 100 members assisted DNR staff in monitoring wastewater facility affluent and stream water quality. In addition IWPCA members provided significant technical information and review. These rules are based on the very good technical approach that complies with US EPA protocol for developing numerical water quality standards for toxic constituents. The hardness dependent chloride and sulfate standards are applicable to Iowa's hard waters. I support the deletion of the interim Total Dissolved Solids Rule, the proposed Chloride and Sulfate numerical criteria will provide adequate aquatic life protection for the most common toxic dissolved solids found in Iowa waters. I encourage and request IDNR to consider alternative methods for compliance with the proposed standards including, site specific standards that consider the required level of protection for aquatic species that are expected to be present in low flow receiving streams; effluent diffusers and mixing zone studies for relief from the more stringent acute standards. This rule will have significant impacts on many municipal and industrial dischargers. Municipalities with hard water supplies and home water softeners or central ion exchange softeners will be impacted significantly. IDNR should consider economic impacts in the application for the chloride standards and provide adequate compliance schedule durations. In summary I think this set of rules is some of the best technical work produced by IDNR staff. The rules were developed with the cooperative technical effort between IDNR, US EPA and the regulated public. It may serve a model for future rule development in Iowa and throughout the nation. Thank you.

**Debbie Neustadt:** So this is something I have concerns about and has been expressed by other environmentalists. And I've already talked about it and you've already addressed it, and I know that Iowa cannot be stricter than what the Federal Government allows. So having a mixing zone of initial dilution are things that are allowed under EPA guidelines, but not necessarily supported the Sierra Club.

**Lew Olson:** I'm Lou Olson and I'd like to thank DNR for the technical assignment of the rules. They are very well developed and is quite durable. The concerns I have, I'm a, we have a lot of redheads in my family and we have sensitive skin and to ask homeowners that have similar skin not have softened water would perhaps expose us to certain health ramifications. I also have lots of family that are in Northwest Iowa and involved in various livestock operations, and having soft water for appropriate sanitation, maintenance of food handling equipment is absolutely essential. We cannot really clean food handling equipment without soft water. I'm a little worried about the potential ramifications without some type of economic criteria or sensitivity. In the next two years we'll be sewerage a

lot of communities that are currently unsewered and most of these communities or many of them frequently have homes that have old well systems that are drawing very hard water, I'm a little worried about how this is going to interact with that effort to sewer unsewered communities because we'll be creating new NPDES systems and I'm not an expert on water quality, I know enough to be dangerous but good and bad. But just doing some back of the envelope crunching of some of those numbers, granted you can do some enclosed situation of consideration of what kind of aquatic life might be available in low flow streams because some of these communities will be creating essentially new streams with their flow. So I think the rule itself is very good and technical, but I'm worried about future ramifications and interactions with other ongoing obligatory and water quality initiatives.