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CHAIR: All right.

Good evening, everyone. My name is Terry Fletcher.

I'm the communications director here at the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection. I want to welcome everyone to the virtual public hearing this evening on the proposed changes to Legislative Rule 47 CSR 2, requirements governing water quality standards.

The amendments to 47 CSR 2 include revisions to human health criteria in Appendix E, Subsections 8.23 and 8.25, recommended by the Human Health Criteria Work Group, which is comprised of DEP employees and members of the Environmental Protection Advisory Council. The proposed revisions included updating 35 of West Virginia's criteria for the protection of human health to match the US EPA's 2015 updates and nationally recommended criteria.

The proposed rule also includes the addition of paragraph 8.2.C, which would add a provision to 47 CSR 2 for the evaluation of factors related to human health criteria on a case-by-case basis as part of the EPDES permitting process.
Additionally, DEP is proposing to revise Subsection 8.29.2 of this rule regarding temperature limits for the E2, aquatic life use designation for East River, Greenbrier River, and Summersville Lake and its tailwaters, which exhibit higher natural temperatures than typically expected of trout water streams.

To read this rule in entirety, you can go to the state website. It's available there, and I can add that link to any chat once I finish up my comments here.

The purpose for tonight's hearing is to take additional comments on this proposed rule, not to engage the DEP in open debate or for the agency to answer questions. The decision will not be made this evening. The DEP will review all comments and issue a response to comments document with the Agency's final determination.

A court reporter is in attendance and all comments given tonight will be made part of the official record. In order to have an accurate record of attendees, we ask that you enter your first and last name as well as any groups who you're affiliated with or representing and your email address. The email address you include will have to be how you receive agency's final determination. And similar to an in-person
hearing, which have sign-in sheets and the like - the meeting chat will also be part of the record and that can be released via the Freedom for Information Act.

The comment period for this proposed rule will end at the conclusion of tonight's hearing, and written comments can be submitted via email to WQScomments@WV.gov. And I can also include that link in the meeting chat room.

Each commenter will be given five minutes to speak. If time allows, we will circle back to allow for additional comments. If you wish to speak, we ask that you please use the raise hand function, and I will call on speakers as they appear on my screen. If you are joining us by phone using dial-in, you can press star nine to raise your hand and star six to meet -. We ask, again, that you please clearly state your name and any groups or organizations you represent. We ask that everyone please stay muted unless you've been called on to give your comments and to please stay on top, we can be respectful. Foul language, personal attacks or insults will not be tolerated.

So with that being said, I'm going to move to the comment portion. So if you would like to make a comment, I ask that you please raise your hand now. And
as I mentioned, I'm going to call on folks as they appear on my screen. I will call the first person up and then announce who is on deck so that person can get their comments prepared. So I'll give you a few minutes until everyone can kind of get their names and everything added and to raise their hands and we'll begin taking comments then.

---

(WHEREUPON, THERE WAS A BRIEF INTERRUPTION IN THE PROCEEDINGS.)

---

CHAIR: Ms. Rivard, I have you down. You don't have to keep your hand raised. I'll have you - I'll get to you. Thank you.

Okay. We're going to go with Autumn Crowe first followed by Eileen Curtman. So Autumn, if you would like to begin your comments.

MS. CROWE: Yes. Can you hear me?

CHAIR: Yes.

MS. CROWE: Okay.

Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed revision to our water quality standards. I'm a past scientist for West Virginia Rivers Coalition. Tonight I'm speaking to you
as a mom. You might hear a little background music -
background noise. I'm a full-time working mom who, like
so many parents of young children, I'm so tired. I'm
tired of having to worry about my son's health every time
he swims in the river or drinks water from a mud puddle
or a hose or a faucet.

It's the DEP's job to ensure that our
water is safe to swim in, that it's safe to drink, and
that the fish in our rivers are safe to eat. But now I'm
questioning DEP's intentions with this rule. The changes
to this rule don't ensure that my son can safely play in
our rivers. This rule gives industry the ability to make
changes to the human health criteria and our water
quality standards for some of the most toxic pollutants
known to man without going through the proper procedures
that requires transparency to the public, legislative
approval and EPA approval.

Instead, industries will be able to
conduct studies, expensive studies, that the average
person wouldn't be able to afford. And if the results of
those scientific studies show that the fish in the river
have less toxins built up in their tissues than EPA
estimated, the industry will be able to discharge
pollutant, toxins, and carcinogens.
This is a horrible idea, sets really bad precedent, and is just plain bad policy. So here's the thing that worries me as a mother. The calculations for the criteria are based upon a life-time exposure to these chemicals with an average body weight for an adult of 80 kilograms or approximately 176 pounds. But I only weigh about 130 pounds, so does that mean I could be at higher risk? And my toddler is 30 pounds. So his little body is not going to be able to metabolize these chemicals the same as a 176-pound adult.

So industry can spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to hire a scientist to determine that our rivers can handle more toxins. And this change could occur through the permitting process where we only have 45 days to comment instead of the year-long process that requires legislative and EPA approval.

So guess what. I don’t have the time or the resources as a full-time working mom to pay attention to and comment on every permit for industries to be given a health criteria. And I don’t have the money or resources to fund a counter study to show that my little boy has a higher risk of getting cancer if exposed to the amount of carcinogens.

West Virginia has the third highest
cancer death rate in the nation. And I bet that there's not one person on here tonight that doesn't know someone who is battling cancer. One of my friend's little boys is fighting cancer right now and it's heartbreaking. It's only going to get worse if this bill is approved. We made our DEP to help protect health, not allow industry to take shortcuts through the permitting process to poison more West Virginians. I oppose this rule change and request that DEP strike paragraph 82C from the rule. And shame on DEP for putting industries' bottom dollar ahead of West Virginians. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Next we have Aileen Curtman followed by Betty Rivard.

Ms. Curtman?

MS. CURTMAN: I am a resident of Berkeley County. I urge the West Virginia DEP to reject the current revisions to the West Virginia Water Quality Standard 47CSR2. The new revision of West Virginia's Water Quality Standards contains one revision that the chemical industry requests, and that revision allows exceptions to the standards if a manufacturer can provide results from a study that indicates that exceeding the
standard will not cause harm.

Who is going to fund that study? Probably the manufacturer. It is almost certain that bias, either conscious or unconscious, will find its way into the study's design and affect the results. That is a well-known phenomenon. It's rooted in the nature of the human mind and it's happened in many other industries.

This revision would put residents who need clean water in the position of having to mount a legal case and challenge the study's findings with results of their own study. It's unrealistic to believe that West Virginia's people have that kind of deep pockets like those that are available to the chemical manufacturers. We, the people, are at a distinct disadvantage here.

After I pay my bills, I certainly don’t have thousands of dollars to donate toward a scientific study over quality of the water that my community depends on. And I say this as I sit in a comfortable home in an affluent county. There are many people in this state who don’t even have the resources to find out about what's happening with their drinking water.

This provision will hit the elderly,
those burdened with multiple jobs, and those with low-income the hardest, while profitable corporations get what they want and continue to pour toxins into the drinking water. That is patently unfair.

The last set of proposed standards that we looked at already had several criteria that were weaker than previously, and now this one culled for manufacturers is absolutely unacceptable.

I see the West Virginia's DEP's mission statement has changed since I have looked it up a couple of years ago. When I looked up the old mission statement today to make sure I have the wording right, I got a horror of horror, not found message. The encouraging words about protecting the environment and serving the people, those have vanished. The website now says the West Virginia DEP's mission is to promote a healthy environment.

By allowing this loophole, the DEP is failing to fulfill even that pitifully, watered-down mission. The West Virginia DEP must not adopt the current revision of West Virginia's Water Quality Standards. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Curtman.

Next we have Betty Rivard followed by
Jim Kotcon.

Ms. Rivard?

MS. RIVARD: Thank you for the opportunity to participate. This is a very generous time of five minutes compared to the usual legislative public hearing of one to two minutes. But I won’t use all that time.

I'm representing the Charleston NAACP Environmental Justice and Climate Change Committee. I want to make three points and then give a little bit of background and make a final statement.

One, I request that you keep paragraph 8.2.c the way it is now. You said that it adds case-by-case review, but of course, it takes away rule-making review. And that's a big deal.

Number two, we need public participation through the legislative rule-making review process.

Three, I disagree with the lack of a physical amount. Degrading our water quality costs money in healthcare. It affects truism and the outdoor recreation industry which, at one point, recently brought in more money than oil and gas into our economy.

As background, I've been around the
legislature for 30 years, including virtually here in the last session. I worked as staff for three years to the House Co-Chair of Rule-Making Review, and it gave me a chance to see up close through her office. I wasn't in the actual meetings, but through her office what a helpful process that can be. And I've also filed through it when I worked for DHHR.

I've watched industry come in year after year to try to reduce regulations. I've seen zero regard for the people of our state or for those who visit here. I cannot trust them. I don't think they can make the kind of decisions that we need. This rule is - the proposed rule is not the best interests of our citizens, our land, our economy, or our state.

And I just want to apologize. I'm going to have to leave at 6:30 for another Zoom meeting, and I wanted to add that I share the concerns of West Virginia Rivers Coalition, the Environmental Council, and other allied advocates. Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and I also submitted a written comment earlier.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Next, we have Jim Kotcon followed by Christine Wimer.

Mr. Kotcon.
MR. KOTCON: My name is Jim Kotcon. I am the Chair of the Conservation Committee for the West Virginia Chapter of the Sierra Club.

I am speaking specifically tonight about Section 8.2.c, which is a blatantly unfair provision for the public. It creates some major environmental justice issues that has conquered through EPA guidance. It denies the right and access to informed comments by the public because it makes most of the science the province of the regulated entity proposing the change. That regulated entity may have years to prepare their studies. They'll have lawyers and technical experts, and the public would only have 30 days to respond to that proposal. It is manifestly unfair. It is an unbalanced advantage for the pollutants.

The real winners for this proposed change will be our mega corporations that can afford the years of studies the technical experts and the lawyers prepare their proposed revised water quality standard as part of that permitting process. Small mom-and-pop businesses, local West Virginia businesses will be placed at an unfair competitive disadvantage because they will not have the resources to propose these kinds of water quality standard revisions.
West Virginia DEP will create a tremendous workload for itself in evaluating these proposed case-by-case water quality standards. Citizens will have no benefit and the environment will have no benefit.

If DEP insists on keeping this type of a provision for case-by-case water quality standards, they must include language requiring that any regulating entity seeking a revision of a water quality standard through the NPDES permitting process is required to fund a community efficacy group chosen by the community and able to fund their own experts and lawyers with enough time to conduct their own studies to rebut the regulating entity's proposed standard and to propose a more stringent standard, whatever their data justifies them.

If, in fact, and I would estimate that such a fund would require something in the range of $100,000 to a million dollars, depending on the quality of that, if, in fact, the regulating entity can demonstrate and the community has a chance to clearly rebut that proposed standard, that might be considered valid. But that is a cost of the regulating entity.

We, the citizens, should not have to bear that cost. Local businesses should not have to
compete with that type of an activity, and DEP should not
and must not bear the administrative burden within their
limited funds of trying to analyze water quality
standards on a case-by-case basis. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Next we have Christine Wimer followed
by Hannah King.

Christine Wimer?

MS. WIMER: Thank you.

Christine Wimer, Jefferson County
Foundation. Thank you for having us this evening and
thank you for the generous time allotment.

I strongly encourage the West Virginia
DEP to strike paragraph 8.2.c from the rule. In West
Virginia, we must start to recognize human health as a
resource that is critical to the long-term success of our
state economy and our state as a whole. We need to stop
choosing economic winners and losers by allowing large
corporations to abide by one set of rules while requiring
small businesses to abide by another set of rules.

Paragraph 8.2.c does just this, as well
as disadvantaging - as well as advantaging large
corporations over the general public and those whose
businesses depend on water quality.
The environmental impacts of many of these large corporations leads to negative health impacts on workers and the general population. This is, in effect, a subsidy of the large corporations as the government must take on the responsibility of serving a tax base that has found - sorry. Serving an increasingly sicker, more disabled, less independent, less productive, less prolific tax base that has found itself in this state largely through no fault of their own due to the health effects of the government-sanctioned environmental degradation through and by loopholes for large corporations, such as this.

This subsidy for larger corporations perpetuates the dichotomy of winners and losers in our economy. We must start to level the playing field, stop picking winners and losers, stop the corporate subsidies, and start prioritizing human health and the environment for the long-term health and sustainability of our economy, our people, and our state. Please strike paragraph 8.2.c. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Next we have Hannah King, followed by Madison Ball.

Hannah?
MS. KING: Hi. Thank you for this opportunity to speak tonight on this issue. My name is Hannah King, and I am here on behalf of West Virginia Environmental Council to speak in support of West Virginia DEP adopting the rest of the EPA-recommended human health criteria updates, but a strong opposition of the language of a possible loophole for corporations to weaken our water quality standards. This loophole allows for industries to further pollute our waters by allowing them to conduct their own studies and apply for permits, which bypasses the normal process of revising water quality standards here in the State of West Virginia.

This gives a disadvantage to smaller businesses as they are less likely to afford these expensive studies, as well as the residents in these heavy industrialized areas who face further pollution. Allowing this shortcut language will reduce public input and awareness and give yet another handout to large industries instead of holding them accountable for their actions and communions.

With the third highest cancer death rate in the country, we should keep our human health criteria as stringent as possible and not allow shortcuts for industries to further pollute our waters and our
people. Please strike paragraph 8.2.c from the rule to keep our rivers and people safe.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Next we have Madison Ball.

Madison.

MS. BALL: Thank you.

I just wanted to, again, say thank you for holding this public hearing. I wanted to echo the comments made by West Virginia Rivers both as the restoration program manager for Friends of the Cheat and as a West Virginia citizen.

Friends of the Cheat has been working for over 25 years to restore the Cheat River watershed from acid mine drainage, and we've had great success. And it's extremely concerning to think that perhaps this success could be then undone with a loophole such as that described in paragraph 8.2.c.

Additionally, we host many outdoor educational events and activities, such as community paddling events and snorkeling events that revolve around river use and outreach. And a lot of these events, we highlight our clean streams and rivers. And the thought that that can be jeopardized is concerning to us. And we
would like to see paragraph 8.2.c struck from the proposal. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Next we have Angie Rosser followed by Linda Frame.

Angie.

MS. ROSSER: There we go. This is Angie Rosser. I’m the executive director for the West Virginia Rivers Coalition, and today we submitted our technical written comments that I'd just like to summarize a few points.

One - one point that hasn't been brought up yet is that yes, we're glad to see the DEP finally move on updating the criteria to comport with EPA's current recommendation on the standards that West Virginia currently - for the chemicals that West Virginia currently has standards for.

However, there are approximately 35 chemicals included in EPA's 2015 recommendations that West Virginia simply doesn't even regulate. We do not have standards for them. So it is past time for DEP to give serious consideration to these chemicals that we know are harmful to human health, that EPA has established recommended criteria for. Yet, West Virginia
has not made any effort to consider or adopt those. So we urge DEP to revise this rule and include those additional 35 criteria that West Virginia needs to regulate. Our surrounding states are regulating these chemicals. So again, we see a case of West Virginia lagging behind and putting West Virginia residents undeservedly at more of a public health risk than our neighboring states.

    And I'll just restate a few things related to paragraph 8.2.c, which we also adamantly oppose as a new work around for that benefit industry and puts the public at a severe disadvantage. It moves us in the complete wrong direction in terms of increasing public input and participation and transparency. It eliminates legislative review, which is another means of public transparency and participation. And as others have said, it disadvantages the public. It creates a yet more unlevel playing field when those larger corporations, who can afford the studies to make their case, are the winners and we, the public, who would bear the impact of these moving standards do not have the resources at our disposal to be able to do our own studies to refute this, especially on the expedited timeline that this revision proposes. There are 45 days
for the public to scrutinize and respond to what the
industry's petitioning for.

And that paragraph is very vague and
unclear about the petition process, what is the standard,
what is the threshold, who decides. Does DEP have even
the resources to be able to provide adequate scrutiny and
scientific review of these types of petitions? No. In
many ways, the DEP is already fairly under-resources.

And as has been said, we are very
cconcerned about exacerbating environmental justice issues
in the state, that these petitions will likely come from
corporations already located in highly industrialized
parts of the state, which are already disadvantaged,
already facing economic health through multiple forms of
marginally - marginalization and challenges.

So this moves the state in the wrong
direction. And just to wrap this up, we've also put in
our comments why we think 8.2.c is unlawful, why it's
unfair, unbalanced, and it's unneeded. There is already
a process that promotes more transparency and public
input to revise water quality standards. We have many,
many ways that industry gets breaks, whether it's through
variances, compliance schedules, mixing zones. This is
just another example how the state agency is bending over
backwards to benefit industry and giving them a break while public health takes a back seat.

Thanks for your consideration.

CHAIR: Thank you, Angie.

Next we have Linda Frame.

Linda.

MS. FRAME: Hi. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIR: Yes.

MS. FRAME: Thank you.

My name's Linda Frame. I am president of the West Virginia Environmental Council, and I would like to thank the DEP and all those in attendance today for speaking out on this important issue and providing this platform for us.

Hannah King is our outreach coordinator and she spoke on behalf of the Environmental Council. And I would just like to say that we have signed on to the letter being delivered by West Virginia Rivers Coalition and we strongly support their comments.

But I did want to just take a moment. I wasn't going to speak, but I was inspired by the first speaker, Autumn Crowe, who is a full-time working mom with a toddler and concern about her son's health. So I'm going to take off my environmental council hat for a
moment and put on my mom hat.

On the other end of the spectrum, I have two boys who used to be toddlers 20-some years ago. And I worked to protect the environment back then and I'm back at it now. They have grown and they've left the state. They've watched what's happened here for the last 20 years. They've watched the battles that we've gone through and really, I sort of feel like a déjà vu all over again.

Some of the same folks that have been fighting this issue for all these years are back here asking again for the DEP to do its job. I really ran out of reasons to tell my two sons to stay. You know, you really don’t want your children to stay in a place that's got the third highest cancer death rate in the nation. You really don’t want your children to stay in a place that's that dangerous. And when there's an agency and the political world, they really don’t seem to care that much about the people and puts industry first.

It's hard to get young people to stay. Imagine how difficult it is to convince young people to come here. So I just want to ask the DEP to please let's not do this all over again.

Not everybody has the means to move
away. Some of the folks most affected by increased
toxins are going to be people that can't leave. So
please, put people first. Put people ahead of industry
and help provide young people a reason to stay instead of
another reason to leave.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Next I'm seeing a --- it says Warren's
Mini. I'm not sure who that might be. We can circle
back.

Next I have A Duane Nichols.

MR. NICHOLS: Thank you. Can you hear
me okay?

CHAIR: Yes, sir.

MR. NICHOLS: I appreciate the service
that many have given to the West Virginia DEP over the
past years. I particularly want to acknowledge I'm aware
of the hard work of Scott Van Rover and the hard work of
Ed McGuire and many others.

But there is a crying need for
environmental education in our state. There's a crying
need for the DEP to bring forward programs to familiarize
the public with chemical substance abuses and the
aspects, characteristics of those that can impact the
environment and impact public interest. This is a crying need.

I was shocked to learn just this past week that PFF substances, perfluoralkyl substances, has been used in fracking operations. Obviously, that is something that the public interest could never approve.

So if our DEP is not aware of this, if they're not investigating it fully, if they're not attempting to rid this out, prevent it, mitigate it, whatever's required, then this would be a serious omission.

On behalf of the Monongahela Area Watershed Compact, I've worked to bring forward concerns for the Monongahela River. Just now the TDS level is above 400, and this is not a violation of federal code, but it is a warning that we have reached the level of concern that is not new, but is something that we cannot sustain because it means that in the future that there can easily be occurrences that bring us to critical levels beyond the 500 for the total dissolved solids.

We know, for example, that the mine water accumulating in the mines has continued to flow. Even when it's treated, there still is effluent that brings TDS levels up in the stream. We know that mining
operations up at the Tiger River watershed are continuous
to bring increased levels of TDS in our streams.

I'm particularly concerned about the
manner in which frack water residues are being disposed
of. If you take, for example, down in Tyler County, the
Middle Island Creek is flowing from West Union down to
Middlebourne on down to St. Mary's. And there is a
disposal site almost within earshot of Middlebourne of
where the fracking companies continue to pool the
wastewater. And this is going to be a problem for years
to come when we accumulate these toxic wastes.

So these are examples of the reasons
why we need to have strong environmental alerts,
regulations, and why there would never in this day and
age be a reason to create loopholes or other ways to
subvert the control and protection of the environment and
concern for the public interest.

In conclusion, I would like to say that
the West Virginia DEP and the director have a role and
responsibility to our state that goes beyond the
individual spelled-out regulations, a role, a
responsibility to advocate for and protect our state and
help to coordinate with other states in order to achieve
a better environment.
The greatest example comes with the Mon River where it enters Pennsylvania and where then the Ohio River comes back down, becomes part of West Virginia. So the coordination with Pennsylvania is essential and should be ramped up and if nothing else on base to provide leadership in that regard, given the fact that the Mon River rises here in our state and the Ohio River is part of our state over the entire length from Hancock County all the way down to - Hancock, Brooke, Ohio, Marshall, Wetzel, Tyler, Pleasants, Wood, Jackson, Mason, Cabell and Wayne. Can you imagine a stream over all that distance and without regard, we have seen not that much protection?

Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Nichols.

I'm going to circle back. We've got a participant with Warren Mini?

MR. PEASCOE: Yeah. I'm Warren Peascoe. I'm in Wood County. I sent my email on that for you.

I don’t have prepared things, but I'm a Ph.D. chemist. I've worked in the chemical industry for 30 years. I've been in Wood County for 20 years. And
the DEP has a very, I guess, hard job trying to regulate industry. And I want to thank them for the job they're doing, but I think that they are not doing enough.

And when I came down - when I first came down here, I walk with braces and crutches. Some friends helped me - introduce me to kayaking, so I've paddled on many of the rivers around in the state, and I'm really impressed with them. We took one trip on the New River where we spent an overnight camping. And on that trip, we were with a commercial company and we were required to use portable outhouse, but it had some buckets. And if we had to go to the bathroom for a bowel movement, we did it in the bucket. And so what we took in with us, we carried out. Individuals carried out.

It seems to me that an industry should be required to carry out their own excrement just like the people do. And so you know, I just want to draw that analogy and hope that we can maintain the rivers, the beauty.

I love being out into it. I've seen the Cheat River where you go down there and there's acid mine drainage and, you know, you come out of the water and needing to wash off your equipment and everything from contamination. So you know, something needs to be
done.

And removing and putting in loopholes like everyone's describing is not the way to go. So thank you. Thank you for having the public hearings and everyone has prepared more detailed things of the problems. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Peascoe. I’m not seeing any other hands raised. Are there any other commenters? Anybody else that wishes to speak?

Okay. We're not seeing any new hands raised. Is there anyone here who has already provided comments that would like to make additional comment?

Going once, going twice.

Mr. Kotcon, did you have another comment?

MR. KOTCON: This is sort of an interesting observation, but I counted ten out of ten speakers tonight who are opposed to the proposed changes. And I'm just wondering why is anybody for that? Thank you.

CHAIR: Do we have any other additional comments anyone who has already spoken that would like to speak again?
Okay.

If there be no other comments, this will conclude the DEP's virtual public hearing on Proposed Changes to Legislative Rule 47CSR2, Requirements, Governing Water Quality Standards. Again, a copy of the proposed rule is available on the Secretary of State website. And I will add that thank you to Group Chat. I'll take a minute to copy that link down if you need it.

Again, we ask that everyone put your first and last name in the Group Chat here with your email address, your Meeting Chat, so that we have an accurate count of attendees and to also receive your final determination from the agency.

The comment period is now closed. We want to thank everyone for your interest and for taking the time to attend this hearing. We ask that you please stay safe and have a good evening. Thank you.

* * * * * * *

HEARING CONCLUDED AT 6:50 P.M.

* * * * * * *
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