step up to the podium for your testimony.
If you have any written comments, if you leave them with us, that'd be great.

MR. HARTMAN:
Carol, I do not have any written comments, but I will say that my comments, about two minutes, so if anyone else would like my additional eight minutes ---. Do you need me to spell my name or organization? It's Jim Hartman, H-A-R-T-M-A-N, and the organization I represent is the Pennsylvania Groundwater Association.

I have two issues which I'd like to bring forth today. The first is that there is a lack of state-wide residential well construction standards in Pennsylvania. We feel this is necessary to protect groundwater resources. Several counties have adopted standards on their own, but there is no state-wide standards in existence in the Commonwealth.

Second issue is that Pennsylvania does not require well drillers to be licensed. We need to establish minimum competency standards for those
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having access to groundwater resources.

All surrounding states have licensing requirements. We think that Pennsylvania, without having being forced into it, should develop our own standards beyond --- with our surrounding areas. Thank you.

CHAIR COLLIERS:

Thank you, Mr. Hartman. The next speaker registered is Jan Bowers of the Chester County Water Resources Authority.

MS. BOWERS:

I'll gladly take your eight minutes. I'm Jan Bowers with Chester County Water Resources Authority, West Chester, Pennsylvania. And I would like to just provide a few comments for those of you who are on the committee to think about. First of all, I recognize that for those two pages, summarizes an incredible amount of thought from all of you and this probably does not clearly articulate all the details. So I may be saying things that are already redundant to what you are thinking, but I just wanted to put forward
a few thoughts as perhaps reminders, or
reinforcement, or if you hadn't been
thinking about them, things that I'd ask
you to look for.

First of all, to follow up on
John Hokstra's (phonetic) analogy — not
analogy, but example of a municipality who
has gone out of their way to protect their
area as a rural character area. We really
do need to articulate carefully and clearly
how to guide economic develop decisions
about heavy water users into the right
areas so that we don't inadvertently cut
the legs out from under municipalities such
as that. And yet we do need to find ways
to effectively guide those heavy water use
industries into the right areas where
there's enough water, but also with a
desire for that kind of growth, and the
other resources, transportation, whatever
it might be, to support them. But we're
going to have to address that at the local
level. It needs to be clearly addressed in
the state and regional plant or we could
end up misleading ourselves inadvertently.
Item number two is one that I know some of you aren't going to want to hear, but I need to say it. It has to do with dams. And despite all the good efforts and appropriate efforts to eliminate orphaned dams and abandoned dams, we still have to accept the fact that we still have quite a few working dams in the watershed. What we don't have are the adequate resources to provide for dam safety. Fortunately for Pennsylvania, Bedford Lakes was in New Jersey, unfortunate for New Jersey. It is a matter of time before a similar situation can happen in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania has probably the best dam safety program across the country. It is a great regulatory program, for those who are regulated, we like to think it's tough, it's a tough one. But even DEP doesn't have enough resources to manage that program effectively, and certainly dam owners, and while they should be responsible for maintaining their dams, some of them just don't have the wherewithal or the financial resources to
do it. If we overlook that problem of flood mitigation of not keeping up that flood control infrastructure, we will, in fact, be creating a lot more problems down the road. So funding to maintain and support education and getting it out there to support dams that are there, and dam safety, and the flood control infrastructure that is in place.

On Water Resource Management, we hear a lot of talk about stormwater utilities, and yet to the best of our solicitor's ability and others, we have yet to find any legal platform within the state upon which to build stormwater utility. Whether its utility or some other mechanism, there has to be something put in place to allow for revenues to be generated for stormwater management. We all talk about the need for money, it all comes out of the tax payers' pocket one way or another. But some way, somehow we need to come up with a way to do that, what's best. Give that authority to municipalities, set up a utility, add it to the school tax;
it's going to be a tax however you do it, but we need to keep dealing with that issue.

Also, on stormwater, Act 167 is drastically under funded, and yet it is the state's leading strategy for addressing and enhancing stormwater management across the state. Without sufficient funding in that program and enhancement to the scope and implementation of that program, we're missing an opportunity to let the state-wide basis address the water resources. We're fortunate to be part of the Act 167 program, however, for a 26-square mile watershed, because of limitations in state funding, it's going to take us four years to get that study done. That's just one of, I don't remember how many hundreds, of watersheds the state is trying to have done.

TMDLs, dealing with water quality from stormwater, specifically stormwater TMDLs. They're beginning to show up across the state, however, there needs to be increased. --- improving how the
TMDLs have calculated. They're becoming regulation and yet the basis of these calculations of these loadings of how much pollution they're coming off and how do you divvy that up. When you really get down to looking at the numbers, how accurate is it, and then we're going to be expecting municipalities to clean up their stormwater effluent to meet those limits that may not even be realistic. So improving how they're developed and simultaneously, here's the challenge, simultaneously accelerating getting them done and getting them out there. TMDLs are going to be one of the best strategies for actually getting watersheds cleaned up. NPDES phase two is covering some of it, but we got to have both of those things going simultaneously. So support and emphasis on the TMDL program I think is important.

I notice that you have riparian management mentioned, but I think given the fact that the Schuylkill watershed is --- has been used as a test area, a pilot area, or riparian to corridor
management and riparian bumpers, I think it might be worth actually specifying for riparian bumpers and particularly small stream riparian bumpers, a one-year priority.

Waste water management was not given a lot of emphasis here on your list. There are a few things you consider is whether or not it actually warrants its on pole under leaking water in land. Encouraging alternative waste water management technologies, land application versus stream discharge. Nitrogen removal systems rule out septic systems. Rectifying failing systems and systems that are still discharging directly into streams, and also local system management programs. A lot can be done on waste water, as I know you know.

With regard to your bullet on promote water resource space planning and zoning, I'd caution you that perhaps the wording is the way it is just for the sake of making a mistake. But I'm hopeful that what you mean in that bullet is rather than
basing your planning and zoning solely on water, that you're looking to promote planning and zoning that is consistent with and minimizes the impact on water resources. There is a big difference.

I'd like to acknowledge and thank you for your bullet under institutional coordination that does support -- good local county municipal planning. We appreciate that as we do a number of other agencies in the county and municipalities.

You mentioned about amending the municipalities planning code to allow governments to address more effectively water resource issues. I would suggest that it should be not just in the municipalities planning code, but amending state regulations, period. If the state regulations were better, perhaps there wouldn't be so much demand on the municipalities to feel that they had to pick up the task of doing some of that management and regulation themselves. So I would encourage that you look for water resources.
resource management at a higher level than
the municipalities and to veer off of them
and do a good job so you don't feel that we
have to step in.

On education, clearly a
priority and a need, and based on what we
heard tonight, I think part of your key
priority bullets ought to be to develop a
massive regional working campaign. And I
don't --- and I strongly agree, and I think
we've all experienced, we're water resource
professionals, we're not marketers. We
need to engage the help of people that know
how to sell. We know how to manage water.
Let's get some funding commitments to bring
really good marketing campaign to help
educate. And part of that is going to be
prioritizing what you want your message to
be. You can take any one of the bullets on
your sheet of priorities and have a whole
public outreach program on any one of them.
So pick one, do it well, but I strongly
emphasize that we need to engage people who
know how to sell.

You have a bullet about
increasing private sector awareness to watershed to limit it to just developers, engineers and planners. I would suggest, keep in mind the broader scope of all private sector land owners and operators. The commercial people, the institutional people, the golf courses, et cetera, et cetera. Please report to private property owner.

I won't comment on the education. It was brought up about what do about changing this concept of lawns and getting over the image of the manicured lawn. And I would suggest that it's one of those strategies. Looking at alternative yard landscaping approaches, and I would recommend consideration of expanding the Smart Yard Program that Delaware has been promoting, that actually gets out into residential yards and helps you re-lscape your yard in a way that's attractive for the half million dollar homeowner, but also effective in an environmental perspective.

So I appreciate your
consideration, I appreciate the effort that you're doing and thanks for letting me give you local comments tonight. Thank you very much.

CHAIR COLLIER:

Those were the two members of the audience that had signed up to give testimony. Do I have others? Anyone else for testimony? Then I hereby adjourn this hearing at 8:23 p.m. Thank you very much.

* * * * * * *

PUBLIC MEETING CONCLUDED AT 8:23 P.M.

* * * * * * *