

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS PUBLIC HEARING
WASHINGTON, IOWA
OCTOBER 12, 2005 7:00 PM

Ryan Maas: I see a few young faces here, I see a lot. Honestly I'm not throwing stones, what I'm saying is Iowa suffers from losing water caliber. A lot of you folks are from administrations that are in small towns, you represent the economic vision and strategy. Those decisions that are being made in these small towns, and I think you need to ask yourself when you're making these decisions what is it that is going to keep our best and brightest here? What sort of an environment, what sort of local amenities are there going to be that are going to keep people from going to Boston, going to the Silicon Valley, going to Oregon? You know Iowa is a net exporter of it's talent. It's best and it's brightest people are not sticking around. My wife and I, both from Iowa, decided to stay because we want to see a change, we both of our, my parents are certainly from Iowa, we wanted to keep that heritage here. A lot of my classmates didn't, a lot of my classmates have left. The environment that surrounds our small towns is an important amenity that is going to keep people here. So economic development is not just about jobs, not just about handouts from the federal government, it's about making sure your local area is desirable for your young people to stay, to recreate, to raise families. That may mean, kids playing in streams, I don't know how many of you played in streams you know that may have drained through the back field when you were growing up, would you let your kids or your grandkids do that now? And that the question that goes to the heart of the Fishable/Swimmable. I'm a big hunter, I'm a big fisherman, and I care about these things from a selfish point of view, but now as a father, I care about them for my daughter and eventually my granddaughter and grandkids. But hopefully we'll stay in Iowa because Iowa has clean water and they can go down and play in these streams. So I think it's important, I think the spirit of the Clean Water Act is finally being addressed by these rulemaking changes. I think we need to do more, where is the money going to come from? Well part of the money is going to come from those creative people staying, the entrepreneurs and contributing to your tax bases. You're worried about your tax bases shrinking; it might be because the best and brightest and your entrepreneurs are leaving. If you can retain them, your tax base is gonna grow. That might be how it's paid in part. The other thing is, talk to your legislators, it's not the DNR it's the legislators that control your purse savings. I think the saying about "we're all in this together, that each decision to improve a particular municipality's wastewater treatment facility will have benefits for all Iowans, because it's an accumulative effect." Think of each of your counties? Are there ten maybe twenty, small municipalities that have systems that need to discharge? Well yeah, all of those twenty municipalities, that an accumulative effect, and that all adds up and so yes it is Iowan, it benefits Iowa. At the same time, the larger cities may have already made their wastewater treatment improvements so it's a balancing act between saying yes all of Iowans are in it as well as it's everyone's yoke to bear. And I say that the DNR, they have, they certainly are required, they're obligated by regulation to provide financial projections, but talk to your legislators, think about creative ways of financing these projects, because believe me the payoffs will be not next year, you have to think down the road. You got to think about your high school seniors, your valedictorians, is the valedictorian going out of state? What would keep them here? I'm telling you as a person who made the decision myself, it's the promise of things changing, of our waters getting better and the standards that these folks are talking about and down the road, especially with non-point source pollution which I know a lot of you folks are concerned that this 90-95 percent aren't carrying their weight. That needs to change as well but tonight we're talking about a given area and let's move forward with that. So I'm in favor with the regulations, all the creative ways that can be, that come up to address it.

Jay Brady: First off, I'm an Iowan, I'm an environmentalist. I've been working for most of my professional career to improve Iowa waters through the design of wastewater treatment systems. I as I think most of us in this room are for improving Iowa's waters. We differ as to how to most effectively improve our state's waters. I oppose the present rule proposal based on the following. The regulation takes a national goal, and this is a goal of Fishable/Swimmable for all waters and makes it a regulation, taking away the regulatory flexibility inherent in the Clean Water Act. Iowa has a basis for the stream designations that are currently in effect, we should just not throw this basis away and automatically redesignate streams without conducting the appropriate stream assessments and science to support redesignation. I view this rule as spending too much money for too little benefit. We can spend our money more wisely to obtain a much better water quality improvement to addressing non-point sources. This regulation will cost from five hundred to one billion in capital costs, which is based on technically astute people making the regulation to the cost estimate. No offenses to the DNR but sometimes their guesses are more guesses than reality. They say that the operating costs are included over a twenty year life, this five hundred to

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS PUBLIC HEARING
WASHINGTON, IOWA
OCTOBER 12, 2005 7:00 PM

one billion dollars that we're estimating does not include the capital cost, does not include the financing operation or the future regulatory compliance issues that will come about. Adam talked a little bit about some things that may be down the pipe, I think that there will be things that will come into play for these plans that will be on these redesignated streams. These are real costs being felt by small communities and Iowa citizens. I'm also concerned that the proposed rule is vague and incomplete especially with regards to the B(WW3) I think, pooled conditions, and the Warm Water Assessment Protocol. I believe that we'll have difficulty in assessing streams and enforcing this particular part of the regulation. I oppose the B(WW3) designation as it is currently proposed. I believe a modified form of the protected flow concept is allowable and reasonable for some specific conditions. I would like to see the protected flow concept appropriately modified and retained. I favor regulations that provide a watershed approach to address point and non-point pollution sources as the best solution for our state. I favor regulations that retain a modified protected flow concept for specific conditions. I favor regulations that require stream assessment work to be conducted prior to stream redesignation. This talk about UAA is fine and dandy but I think you're going to see each and every one of the UAA's opposed. By people who just don't want appropriate stream designations. I favor regulations that provide an intermediate water quality designation between general use and B(WW2) that protects for acute toxicity. I believe this intermediate water quality designation should also be protective of chronic toxicity for sensitive species appropriate for this designation. I don't believe the regulations address this appropriately. I favor regulations that account for a no flow condition versus normal flow conditions and I favor regulations that designate the best acceptable treatment technologies as acceptable in these situations when we have small communities on small streams and this would be acceptable in lieu of stringent application of miracle Water Quality Standards. These are my thoughts.

Mark Fink: My name is Mark Fink. I'm the mayor of Gladbrook, Iowa, you know at what point do you stand up and voice your disagreement to propose changes that are intended to improve and projected to impact Iowa communities to the cost of up to one billion dollars. To answer my own questions, I think that point comes when you read information published by the Iowa DNR and their frequently asked questions sheet regarding this proposed topic that says and I quote, "Statewide to proposed changes to Iowa Water Quality Standards will not have a substantial impact on water quality." The League of Iowa Cities estimates that Iowa communities contribute up to five percent of the surface water contamination. Why is the DNR only singling out Iowa municipal and industrial wastewater treatment facilities? We're not causing the problem, but we are expected to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to make improvements that the DNR even acknowledges are not significant. Let's say that if you needed heart surgery and your cardiologist just said that you had to have the balloon angioplasty treatment, and you got done from your surgery and you're meeting with your cardiologist and he says well Mark, you had two arteries that we needed to fix, one was five percent blocked and one was ninety-five percent blocked, we went ahead and fixed the one that five percent blocked but we ignored the ninety-five percent one. Seriously it's an analogy we can attribute this to, it's about the same thing, you probably would not be too happy, and you'd probably go find a new cardiologist. This is a big financial impact that's going to face Iowa communities, another concern I have is that the rule and the fiscal impact statement are vague and incomplete. How many of you have read the fiscal impact statement that was on the website? Did you understand it? You know I didn't, I read it, I read it four times, um, and I have some specific quotes to solidify my statements here. Quoting from your reports that it is recognized that an increase in operational costs would be expected but is not quantified in the assessment. Another section says, several facilities may be impacted by this topic but were not included at this time. Another section says that no economic projection is made of the non-traditional water quality limit and parameters; I don't know what that means. Another sections states, it is understood that a multitude of factors or variables may result in estimates that are either above or below the lower cost estimate or exceed the higher cost estimate and were not considered news to the difficulty of predicting the variable which could apply to any facility. So I think part of this is why we get this three hundred million dollar range of either five hundred to nine hundred sixty million. Or maybe this isn't even included into the nine hundred and sixty, I'm not for sure. I know that where I work, if I turned in something like that, I would get it back from my boss saying why don't you tell me something? And I also have sympathy for your legislators if they have to rely on these documents to make a decision that affects all Iowa communities, I feel sorry for them if that's the information that they get and they're supposed to make an intelligent decision based on those

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS PUBLIC HEARING
WASHINGTON, IOWA
OCTOBER 12, 2005 7:00 PM

facts. The report also stated that aerated lagoons and trickling filter facilities will most likely have to upgrade to the activated sludge systems. The statement that there is limited discussion regarding alternative wastewater treatment processes. I did a search on alternative wastewater treatment sources and solutions on Google and it came up about these wetland lagoons. So I started reading about the wetland lagoon systems, they are less expensive to build and they also provide better filtration than an activated sludge lagoon. They get rid of most of the contaminant, they also take out ammonia and they also remove the heavy metals. I found out through reading their research that the reason that they're not well known is a lot of the engineers just don't know very much about them so they're not being used. But I found that it might benefit Iowa cities to dig into this information and find out exactly what these wetland lagoons are about because they last from fifty to one hundred years and they're less costly to operate and maintain where these activated sludge lagoons have a life expectancy of twenty years so every twenty years we're gonna be replacing these systems, so I think we need to find more information and maybe the DNR can help and get more information on the irrigated lagoons and treatment systems. These systems are used in small communities across the United States and large communities such as Phoenix, Arizona. They work in cold environments, that was one of the drawbacks that was noted, but the state of South Dakota, currently has forty artificial wetland treatment facilities in operation and that's the most of any state in the nation, and obviously South Dakota is probably just as cold as it is in Iowa in the wintertime. I think that a feasibility study should be implemented by the DNR to find out all the facts about these irrigated wetlands and solutions because they could make this cost burden come down a lot if implemented. Speaking of the financial impact to communities, the new rules are going to be staggering if this is implemented. Gas prices are at record high, home heating oil prices are expected to rise, and many communities that I'm aware of have a lot of residents on fixed incomes, if you're like my community. Some residents already struggle to make timely payments on their water and sewer utility bills. This past weekend I had the opportunity to speak with a few of our citizens about the proposed rules and I had one citizen tell me that back in 1980 she and her husband and her small child were forced to move from the state of Iowa because they could not afford to live here. Since then they did return to the state but they um, her comment to me was well if these rules are implemented, she says we're probably going to have to move again. I don't know if the gentleman who spoke of people leaving Iowa, well if these higher bills come through people can leave for that reason as well. They feel that they have no future in the state and they've said that with Iowa's lower paying wages that we shouldn't have to pay high water and sewer rates for no reason at all. The Iowa League of Cities estimates that some communities will suffer an additional cost of up to eight hundred and forty dollars per household. To me this is a calling that Iowa DNR acknowledges there will be no significant improvement to water quality. People just simply cannot afford this. I'm only thirty-four years old and I've been involved with local government for the last ten years and I've never seen anything quite like this. When I was a child I could remember watching on the news when it was discovered that the department of defense paid two hundred dollars for a toilet seat and eight hundred dollars for a hammer. I couldn't believe anything like that could happen, nor can I believe anything like could happen as we're facing today. I'm opposed to the DNR's current agenda and I urge that the DNR further study the problem and come up with real solutions that actually better the environment so that all polluters are part of the answer to this problem.

Mike Wenten: I'm a city councilman for the city of Gladbrook. My comments will be rather brief; I just wish to record a protest to the rule changes due to the severe economic impact it will have in my community, Gladbrook, Iowa. Gladbrook is a community of one thousand and fifteen people according to the 2000 census and there's roughly four hundred meters in our community that means that we may raise our sewer rates upon the consumption of water for those residential areas, businesses and commercial buildings. Sewer rates are figurative at point of usage, so I'd like to call my community really roughly a community of less than a thousand because we have a very large nursing home and we have an extended living facility in our community. In 2002 the city of Gladbrook in cooperation with Central Rural Iowa, the DNR, City of Gladbrook and Lincoln constructed a new sewer facility in Gladbrook; this is in the year 2002 this is when it was licensed. This facility is owned and maintained by our community. This cooperative effort resolved the problem for the City of Lincoln north of us because they had a septic system running into laterals, really polluting the ground. Now they pump that system to our sewage disposal plant and we take care of the treatment of that. It also eliminated our small lagoon facility which we developed in the early sixties and brought us up to date. And this was issued in 2002; City of Gladbrook has a twenty year

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS PUBLIC HEARING
WASHINGTON, IOWA
OCTOBER 12, 2005 7:00 PM

debt on this of roughly nine hundred thousand dollars. So we're looking at changing this? If we change this, the League of Cities estimated between sixty and seventy dollars a month per usage in a community of a thousand people. So let's figure sixty dollars a month, times four hundred, times twelve months, that's two hundred and eighty-eight thousand dollars. Our property tax is roughly half of that for the city. What, or how is that going to affect the people? It'd be devastating. Over a twenty year time period, take that same amount, that's five million plus, that's a big chunk of change. That's totally unacceptable, in fact if water improvement would be achieved, that would be another thing, because Mark mentioned, the DNR has mentioned chances of little to any improvement will not be achieved. Gladbrook is really an average type community of a thousand people. Very aggressive, we recently completed the Gladbrook center which is well received by many within the state of Iowa, and outside of the state. We work to upgrade our infrastructure constantly, our storm sewers, our mainstream, our paving our streets. Our cooperation with the city of Lincoln was very instrumental, resolving two problems. We've grown even though I don't believe the plan was for this to happen in small rural communities but it has. So designation of our creek with a very stringent level of ammonia that the point of discharges leaves us in a clock as to a common sense solution. This mandate for change lacks both common sense and any form of good public policy. In fact the future of the backbone of Iowa and many small towns are at stake. Please reconsider.

Steve Veysey: I want to thank you all for being here tonight, boy it's been a marathon, I'm Steve Veysey, I live in Ames, I'm here representing the Hawkeye Fly Fishing Association, but I'm also a member of the Iowa Sierra Club. And uh, both organizations are in support of these rules. We appreciate the work the DNR has done and in trying to address the problem of Iowa once again being at the bottom of the pile. The last one of the last in the nation to try and actually have a program that is structured, legally and correctly on the federal Clean Water Act. There's a lot of misinformation about this is going to cost and what it's going to accomplish, I think it will result in water quality improvements in Iowa. These are standards that apply to everyone, they apply to all water quality programs in the state so we have non-point programs related to TMDL's, stormwater permits, down the pipe we hope there will be watershed based permits so we can try to get agriculture to do their share. Large scale agriculture CAFO's that are being issued, NPDES permits, Open feedlot are being issued NPDES permits. So having proper stream designation is kind of the basis of having a water quality program. I want to be sure everyone is clear what Fishable/Swimmable means, because I don't feel DNR always defines these correctly, explains them correctly. Fishable means the presence of aquatic life, that's what it means. Swimmable means any recreation in and on the water, I'm here representing some non government organization but I have been on the governor's water quality task force, I have had a week's training on the Clean Water Act in Washington, DC. I've been involved in these issues for about six years now. So when we have aquatic life we have to protect it, that's what the federal law requires. This isn't about the state is trying to do something above and beyond what is required, it's bringing me up to par to what almost all of the states have been doing for quite some time. And it can be done without undue economic burden, in fact the Clean Water Act includes provisions to mitigate costs, people say how much is it going to cost? There's an easy answer, it will cost exactly what you can afford and not a penny more, there's a guidance document the EPA has that allows you to compute based upon the median income in your community, the current debt load that you have, all of these factors, it calculates what a community under those circumstances ought to be able to afford for wastewater treatment. That's the amount you're expected to come up with in order to improve your treatment technologies. Let's talk for a minute about the treatment technologies that are out there. We have a lot of small communities in Iowa, one gentleman mentioned a lot of them are unincorporated and they don't have collection systems at all. Recently the Iowa Policy Project has produced the white paper, I have one copy of this summary left, which I think I will give to the mayor of Gladbrook if that's okay with you. Ecological wastewater management in Iowa, hope for Iowa's small communities. There are solutions out there, wetlands are one of them, use of flow variable permits are another, you don't have to meet these stringent requirements all the time. You have to meet the requirements when so that your effluent is diluted to a safe level of pollutant. So as long as it's diluted to a safe level of pollutant, at times of normal to high flow in the streams, you're going to be able to discharge considerable amounts. It's at those times of low flow, that's what this is really affecting; at those times of low flow you're going to have to have some auxiliary treatment of some kind. Now that can be additional storage capacity, that can be a land application of the treated effluent, not

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS PUBLIC HEARING
WASHINGTON, IOWA
OCTOBER 12, 2005 7:00 PM

talking about spreading raw hog manure, talking about taking treated effluent which as my wife who works for a nursery describes what's coming out of that pipe is diluted plant food. It's a little high in ammonia, it's got some algae in it, it's like plant food. You grow things with it, whether it be switch grass, hybrid poplars, there are kinds of treatment technologies that can take what you're already doing well and give some additional treatment to it cost effectively. That's why have such strong concerns with our economic analysis, they've done a very poor job in trying to propagate what the real cost of this can be. Certainly if we all went out and bought brand new mechanical plants, that's what it would cost, but there are other ways to do it. It's gonna cost what we can afford and not a penny more, cause that's all the Clean Water Act will require communities to pay, what they can afford. You kind of have to get this message out there. That's all I'm going to say about this. I'm in favor of these rules because I think payback in the long run we're going to have significant improvement in the state of Iowa and even though you may feel like point sources are being singled out from my perspective that's not the case. These apply to everybody and as we get nutrient criteria as the watershed approach is adopted, everybody's in favor of the watershed approach to water quality, watershed approach, that's code word for saying we're actually going to make agriculture have some kind of regulations to comply with, that's what it really means, when you say we have a watershed approach. And I think as farms get larger and larger, and more of them are owned by people who don't even live here anymore it's gonna come to have some kind of a basic level of water quality expectations even from agriculture and I don't think, I'm not opposed to that. I support these rules, thank you for allowing me to comment again and I wish you all the best tonight. Thank you all for coming out.

Don Saxton: I'm Don Saxton, mayor of the city of Oxford, seven hundred plus people, and uh Adam I don't envy you your job tonight, coming out in front of this group and we've been kind to you I think. First of all I was going, I'm not one to deny that goals of clean streams are commendable, we all agree with that. But how we get there I think is where we're not in agreement. I feel that those of us who are the holders of permits to discharge in our streams are kind of a targeted group at this time, and representing up to five percent of the problem you have direct control over us. I mean we hold these permits, the permits come up for renewal, the standards change, you get notified that before the renewal comes through you have to submit a plan on what you're going to do so you'll be able to meet these requirements. And we like a lot of people that treatment plants built in the fifties find in later years in non-compliance. We have done improvements that were needed, ours were over half a million dollars, fortunately we did have a significant grant, but we're still paying off a lot of debt that's mostly two hundred dollars now. That was because of ammonia standards. I would like to see the other ninety-five percent that our polluters consider that there are some efforts to bring those folks, whoever they may be, whatever they may be into compliance also. I realize that can't be done all at once, but like I said I consider that ninety-five percent more or less untouchables at this time. And also to those of us who are discharging if we become non-compliant, we can be fined x number of dollars a day everyday we're in non-compliance, it's been done, and it's been threatened. We haven't been threatened but other communities have been the victims of that type of thing. Having to increase rates four hundred percent is not a good way to have to finance this; I think I might have to head over to Paddle Hill rather quickly if even thought such a thing. So I see the potential the astronomical financial impact on some of us and this goes along as presented as some would like to see it. As I say I'm certainly not opposed to clean streams and so forth, but let's back up a minute and not move so quickly and take another look as to how we might be able to do this. Thank you.

Dawn Pettingill: I'm state representative Dawn Pettingill, and I represent Benton County and the northern portion of Iowa County. There are eighteen cities in my district, ten of which are on the impacted dischargers list. I would not be doing my duty if I did not stand up here even though I'm on record, which is a little nerve racking, but I would not be doing my duty to my communities if I did not stand up and say that I am against these rule changes immediately. First of all I would like to start by saying that I love our environment, I love our state and I'm not against moving forward to comply with the Clean Water Act, it's just hatefully I am against that. I would like to tell you a little bit about my district and the city that I come from. I used to be a mayor of a small town in Benton County and we have had wastewater problems since 1994. We have done five income surveys and been deemed to be a low income town every time and the reason we did the low income surveys was to be able to qualify for a community development block grant. However, we never were awarded the grant so then we asked the DNR to put

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS PUBLIC HEARING
WASHINGTON, IOWA
OCTOBER 12, 2005 7:00 PM

us under administrative order, we asked to be in trouble so, hoping that it would give more priority in applying for that grant and a state revolving fund. I am sorry to say that we still after two years have been under administrative order, have not received any money to bring out system up to date and that's based on the current standards, not on any better standards. So why am I bringing all that up? Because that's a control discharge plant and they're supposedly supposed to discharge twice a year and are having to discharge more than that. But I'm bringing it up because of money. The money is not there for that town to bring it up to the standards as they are now, and there's been elusions to the fact that the money will be there if you need it and you're only going to spend as much as you can, but that's just not true. The engineer's report and the calculation of what a town of a hundred and sixty people are going to spend its six hundred and thirty five thousand dollars to bring it up to what we need to be now. And they won't be affected now, but the ten cities that are on the list, they already have eleven million dollars of debt currently and one plant went on line this spring. And that plant they owe almost three million dollars for the next twenty years. So to then come down and say you need to improve that, that they just got a permit for, I think it's unreasonable. I did promise to relay on some comments from the ten cities in this hearing. One mayor said, why did they let us build a wastewater plant that would need immediate updating? City clerk, this will drive small towns out of business, we'll have to move out of town to avoid paying the increases in sewer bills. Another city clerk, people are struggling with the cost of utilities now we're going to lose people, we'll lose tax base and the people to pay for a system that's only five years old. One mayor said we have the highest sewer rates in east central Iowa, our rates are a base rate of twenty-five dollars with an additional three dollars and four cents for every thousand gallons of water after that. The increase of the rates will drive people out of town. And then my favorite was one of the mayor said is this the shotgun approach or what? Anyway, I wondered why when I first heard about this why it's almost thirty years old or is it thirty years old, I'm not sure, but why we've been approving new facilities that aren't compliant with the Clean Water Act? And to me a good approach would make new facilities comply and as facilities need to upgrade, make them comply, at the very least make sure that we do an assessment to the streams before we decide what Fishable/Swimmable instead of doing it a hundred percent Fishable/Swimmable and then change that designation down. I think we should make the designation to begin with correct and then go from there. But there's a lot of room to work and we need flexibility and we need to be able to do waivers and make sure that we get those assessed when it's done. But I did ask every one of my cities if they're for clean water, and they said absolutely they're for clean water, and I agree with the gentleman that it is a good economical tool to make sure that we have a place to recreate and we have good drinking water, but the cities can't bear the burden of it.

Steve Laforey: I represent Shiloh, We're a non-profit church organization, just south of Kalona. We have a three cell aerated lagoon that was built in the mid-eighties, it was built with a master plan built out of a twenty-year plan in mind, we're a little slow in getting there and we still have a lot of faith and we're going to. I think we're about eighty-five thousand gallons a day, our actual is probably about three thousand estimated. And I would daresay our discharge probably improves the quality of the nearby English River, would be my guess. I'm sad to say that, because I do believe in clean water, in fact our organization takes a strong stand and we don't use chemicals on our property, we use bio-friendly things, cleaning products, things that go down the sewer, anyway, I have some literature that the DNR published which many of have read early, I don't want to labor it, but I think of with a high cost of almost a billion dollars, that's a lot of money. I know on point four of your water quality FAQ's the question was asked what improvements will we see in the quality of the water as a result of these changes? And the last sentence reads eighty-ninety percent of Iowa's water pollution comes from rain washing over the land and into streams and lakes rather than from city and industrial treatment plants. Statewide to propose changes to Water Quality Standards will not have a substantial impact on water quality. The Iowa Rural Water Association in a letter August 19, 2005, told its community members and regional systems that agriculture was the cause of ninety-five percent of Iowa's water quality impairment will not be impacted because their activities do not require an NPDES permit nor are they regulated by the state. The cost to Iowa's communities is staggering, particularly when the improvement of the water quality will be minimal. I think it's already been stated here tonight but I would just raise that you're barking up the wrong tree and second question why would the small communities and organizations be forced to make such expensive improvements while the agricultural polluters are allowed to go free and it's Mayor Mark, thank you, the

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS PUBLIC HEARING
WASHINGTON, IOWA
OCTOBER 12, 2005 7:00 PM

reason everybody laughed when you made the comment you did about the five percent to ninety-five percent artery is because everyone agreed with you. That's all I have to say.

Steve Clayton: Obviously I think everybody in the room is wants good quality water. But I don't think we're going to get a bang for our taxpayer's dollars, everybody's said this tonight and I think the legislature needs to hear it, the ninety-five percent is where the problem is. We're going to gain one percent on the five percent we're going to treat. Are we actually gaining anything? Agriculture might kick it up a notch and we're still up there at a high limit. You're not going to gain anything by doing this. I'm going to fumble through this, but I don't think a billion dollars for one percent is at all worth the tax payer's money. I just don't see it. How many people have a stream that they're discharging to that there's a farmer that has cattle on it or have a hog lot or a field that abuts to it and then you have runoff from all of those, that's a constituent that's going into your streams and that needs to be looked at a lot harder than we are, I think we are being singled out because we're easier to get ahold of. I think the municipalities; we're organized so we're easier to get ahold of. And DNR, no offense, but they have a noose around their necks; they can force us to do this stuff. Someone needs to make a noose and they need to put it around the Agricultures.

Marge Harmsen: I agree wholeheartedly with what this man just said, I'm for a clean water also, but I think the farmers should be the ones too. We live right by farmers that are letting stuff go in there and people have got lupus, I think the farmers should be too. I meet with other gentlemen from Iowa, I guess Iowa DNR, we talked about they were going to be included but you said they weren't, that farmers are not going to be included. You said that things like the hog farms, that's not right. I just think they should be included in this.

Brian Hannah: I'm Brian Hannah from South English, Iowa. I guess I'm just the do it yourself construction concerned citizen, I also I live in South English, we don't have municipal sewer yet, and of course they've been doing the roundabout thing with the financing and like that legislator thing, they've gone through all that. I just want to bring up some basic points that I believe are important, like one I'm for this alternative systems, like the gravel wetlands and according to the Iowa Policy Project, they'd said that the city of Granger had done something similar to that, and I was kind of hoping that South English when they did implement their new system would do that. Of course all their studies and stuff that they've done so far haven't even brought those issues up. So maybe the DNR could issue real simple handbooks for cities that would include the alternative systems and stuff like that. You know KISS we want to keep it simple stupid. I would like to be able to install my own sewer system myself, dig it all in by hand, not necessarily a city system but I'd like to be able to put in my own leech bed and stuff like that and I'd like to be able to not have to worry about whether this leech bed I'm digging in by hand is going to have to be inspected and stuff like that. I just want to be able to follow the handbook and get it done. So bringing that up, also in this nice handbook you should be making for all us KISS people, I would like to see addressing the issue of recycling gray water, at the household level as well as you know cities you know we're putting in down there riverside they're putting in this huge casino deal they're putting in two water wells for that casino and all that, I'm just like, I mean I don't know what the city of Riverside's really got in mind and I don't know if they showed up here or not, I'm just like why wouldn't you recycle some of that gray water to water that, from the city of Riverside to water that huge green golf course that they're going to put there instead of pumping it out of the ground and using nice clean drinkable water for something like that. So I think cities could address this gray water issue a lot more seriously than what they have been. I'm against the financial impact on the cities of this, and I'm for the clean drinking water fundamentally. So I guess I'm confused as to whether I'm for this legislation or against this legislation but I'm but I'm for individual freedom I mean I feel that if there is sewage system in this city I should feel I should be able to put my own water well in and I should be able to get free water out of the ground or use a cistern and recycle that and discharge that into if there's an existing city system, discharge into that for free. So I'd like to see some harmony with that if possible, I really don't like some of these towns they have mandatory water bills where they charge even if your water's turned off and stuff like that and you know the city, like the storm sewer systems, they're throwing all that free water right down and into the creek. They could be grabbing that stuff up and watering golf courses or something like that, so there's a lot of things that are a important with all this natural stuff, but you know nature is very powerful it's more powerful than man, and we need to be in harmony in nature, this is kind of the Indian in me

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS PUBLIC HEARING
WASHINGTON, IOWA
OCTOBER 12, 2005 7:00 PM

speaking because if you look at Katrina, the storm that destroyed New Orleans, and you look at what happens from the ground up and that takes you that if you have to start over from scratch, what would you do in an emergency? What would you do if this was a third world country? What would you do if we didn't have enough money and we were all third world country people like Africa? Septic tanks work, they do work, I know this, they break down bacteria, you throw some Rid-X in there, they digest; they can do something to help us out. Once it goes from there, you know if it comes into a leech bed or it gets into a pipe and ends up in some kind of pond down the street or something where it's you know cleaned up by a bunch of plants that are just taking the nutrients and the ammonia in these things out, it's really seems kind of a simple matter and I think it shouldn't cost as much as everybody with all these mechanical sludging machines and I think we're just making it too complicated and I just think we need to simple it up. Because the technology has been here. Septic tank technology is an ancient technology that does work, I mean even it, and I mean it's the gray water that's the problem is, cause once that gray water hits that septic tank it flushes all that bad stuff out that septic tank and that's what's getting out into that creek bed. So if we address the gray water issue and we divert that to our lawns or something else or use the wetland issue I mean I think it's a fairly cost effective way to confront it. So I just like to see it all simplified. That's about all I have to say, thank you very much.

Theresa Galluzzo: Hello my name is Theresa, and I am in support of these stricter water qualities standards. Because I think of the chance for us to see what we can do to improve our water qualities. Despite all these eye popping numbers that we've been hearing about tonight, There are some alternatives which several people have already mentioned. These alternatives are not taken into account of the cost the DNR projected because the ecological wastewater treatment solutions are site specific and they couldn't be included. However these treatment exist they've been proven on the ground to work, they can improve our water quality and significantly lower the cost of cleaning our wastewater for communities. Such technologies include alternative sewers, constructed wetlands, enhanced pond systems, media filters, strip irrigation, etcetera. And as I said before, they cost considerably less and the more effectively treat our wastewater. These technologies can be used in the seven hundred and thirty nine communities in Iowa that don't have any sewage treatment and discharge one point two billions of untreated water into our waterways. They can also be used in communities that already have existing treatment technologies to supplement their treatment as add ons. Many people have brought up tonight the ninety-five percent of the water quality is coming from somewhere else, and I do believe we need to address that problem too, but we're talking about tonight is the point-source problem and why shouldn't we address all the water quality problems that we have? So if we take advantage of these alternative technologies and Iowa's can do attitude instead of saying no we can't do this. Take advantage attitudes, look at these alternatives available, I think we need to go ahead and do this. Additional, I work at the Iowa Policy Project, the report which has been mentioned tonight, we recently released a report that details these alternative wastewater treatment technologies and shows where they've been used on the ground. I've brought copies of the executive summary with me tonight if anybody I can set it on the back table there, the full report is available online at www.iowapolicyproject.org it talks about these technologies, talks about where they've worked before and we can use these things to improve Iowa's water quality even if cost were the problem, the one billion dollars we've been talking about...there are some significantly impacted areas from these wastewater treatment systems, and the children play in these streams, I bet their life is worth one billion dollars to their parents. So I think this is something we need to really, really work on.

Dave Ratla: My name is Dave Ratla, I'm an Iowater Volunteer, and I look at this a little bit different than all of you. I monitor all the streams throughout Iowa and Johnson county and I'm starting on my third year. I get in the water, I was down at the watersheds. Granted the DNR they know me here and everything, we have sewer communities that are discharging. Right now all the springs are dried up and there's a town up there that is discharging directly into a tile for five miles that goes directly into the stream. I was taught early in my water testament career that when we study the water, we're actually studying the watershed, the watershed, the land that the water goes over, through to the creek. People are putting into the water, poor farming practices, now when I'm monitoring the water now, I'm finding that analogy is a reality. We're seeing human waste getting put into the stream. I'll tell you a story a couple of weeks ago, we have an Iowater monitor that was testing a stream below a wastewater treatment plant of a city and we been experiencing some odors that we can't explain. Sometimes the odors are very subtle, sometimes

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS PUBLIC HEARING
WASHINGTON, IOWA
OCTOBER 12, 2005 7:00 PM

they get very strong, the Iowater monitor was out setting in what we call traps, and was overcome by some odors and chemical smells. This particular monitor had about forty-five years experience wading in the streams. And he burned his nose, burned his face and tell you within fact that he bleed in his nose on and off for about two weeks, where is this place at? Three hundred and forty-five feet from the front step from Cape Whitman Elementary School. You guys sit here and say this is going to cost us money to fix this. You're right, a few years ago in 1994, my septic system went out in my house, I'm one of the few septic systems left today, leech field went out, the Iowa County, Johnson County Board of Health guy came out and says well David if you put the leech field in this way because you won't pass the perk, put in this much more leech field we'll allow it to go through. I said great let's do it. That cooperatior said Dave I can't be here for a month, I said okay, let's get back here in a year. One year later, Board of Health guy says not quite, you realize you can't flush your toilet, I got three kids. Dave you can't flush your toilet. Well it cost me three or four thousand dollars to get that fixed, luckily Sears was having a sale on port-o-potties, and I had to train the kids on how to use port-o-potties, that's inconvenience, three kids going out of the house. It was something I had to pay in order to use the toilet, I was with the Iowa Policy Project and listen to the author of that, and I recommend all of you cities and get it and read it and then only then every city and every DNR person should have to take a test so they will understand what is in it. The cost of having to pay this, get in the water with me sometime, see what's flowing downstream, I can take you to streams where you can see sewage out going for five miles. We walked the streams here a few weeks ago where we put probes into the sludge coming out of the wastewater treatment plants it was the area of twenty-five, thirty foot long , five or six foot wide where we had ammonia levels excessive of ten? Where we had chloride that we could measure, I can't measure, where we had phosphate levels of ten. And a school just right down the stream, what happens if one of those kids get hurt? Don't tell me this costs too much. A guy once told me, Dave do you have to pay to poop? I said yeah, I turned that around, you have to pay to poop? Why is it fair for all the rest of us to take care of your problems? You take your money put it into your infrastructure, you fix your problem, or quit pooping, the DNR would have a lot less problems.

Tony Chancellor: I'm the mayor of Keota; I'm going to keep this short and sweet. I am opposed to the cost of the DNR proposed water quality standards; this is an irresponsible way to spend taxpayer's money. I think if we're going to spend a upwards of a billion dollars to take care of this, we should probably be taking care of more than five percent of the problem.

David Plyman: City administrator here in Washington, I'd like to welcome all of you to the city of Washington for tonight's meeting, I probably should have gotten up at the start to do that. On behalf of Ed Brown our mayor and our city council. They had a conflict meeting tonight so they sent me to this one, but they are very much interested in the outcome of this issue. City of Washington will be sending written correspondence, just to keep it brief. The city supports the position that has been taken by the League of Iowa Cities and other professional wastewater professional associations that we belong to. The bottom line is that we have to seek a balance between cost and benefit, and whether or not we look at the relationship between agriculture versus industrial, residential pollution or the cost benefit between making improvements at the water plant versus some other community improvements, they're all a big spaghetti bowl mix of issues that our local elected officials have to address. And we're the ones who have to shut off the water to the low to moderate income families that have trouble paying the bills and that's why we're really sensitive to the cost issue. We have to make arrangements for payment plans that can't afford water. And when the state changes these regulations, there is a real effect that resides in our communities. When we hear that there's going to be a minimal change in the water quality out in the creeks, relative to the huge impact on the cost that our people will have to pay, that raises a question mark for us. If we could see some real benefit surrounding our communities I think we'll be right there. The reference given at the school, I find that really hard to imagine how a city would knowingly allow that to occur, because the kids that live in that community, those families are very concerned about that. We are concerned here; we're not opposed to clean water by any means. But there has to be a serious cost benefit analysis conducted where the small increase in water quality is measure against the cost in other areas, not just financial, but the diversion of those resources from other community benefits. And that's something I think we all have to think about.