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This hearing was held pursuant to Notice at the
Ground Round, Civic Center Drive, Augusta Maine,
on September 18, 2008, beginning at 1:00 p.m.

Chairman Hilton: Good day. My name is
Ernest Hilton, I'm the Chair of the Board of
Environmental Protection. We are here holding a
public hearing on proposed changes in the water
classification of certain waterbodies and the
adequacy of Maine's water quality goals and water
quality standards. This is in accordance with the
provisions of the State's Water Classification
Program, Title 38 MRSA, Section 464 to 469. I
will be the presiding officer of today's hearing.
Other Board members here today are Wing Goodale, a
biologist with the Biodiversity Research Institute
from Falmouth; Lissa Widoff, who resides in
Freedom; we have Andy Nixon, a retired business
executive from Brunswick; we have Richard Gould, a
code enforcement officer and former legislator and
retired teacher from Greenville; we also have
Nancy Ziegler, who is an attorney from South
Portland and Matt Scott, a retired aquatic
biologist from Belgrade. Do aquatic biologists
ever retire? I'm not sure. The Department staff
person here today is or will be Susan Davies,
she's not here exactly right now, water quality
standards coordinator in the Bureau and Land and
Water Quality. Bureau Director, Andrew Fisk is
also present to address the Board's questions.
The hearing recorder is Joanne Alley of Alley &
Morrisette.
The notice of today's hearing was published
on August 27, 2008 in the Bangor Daily News, the
Kennebec Journal, the Portland Press, the
Lewiston Daily Sun, and the Waterville Morning
Sentinel. Notice was also sent by e-mail on
August 27, 2008 to individuals who were expected
to have an interest in these proceedings. Copies
of the sign-in sheets are on the podium. If you
plan to speak and have not already done so, please
sign in. I will not differentiate for purposes of
this proceeding between persons speaking for or
against the proposed changes since there are many
parts of the proposal; therefore, there is only
one sign-in sheet. Following the Department's
presentation, I will be calling for testimony in
the order that individuals have signed in.
To assist recording of the testimony, I

would ask persons who are testifying to stand at
the podium, state your name and residence and the
name of the organization you represent. Speakers
are asked to remain at the podium for questions
following their presentation. I will invite
questions first from Board members and then from
Department staff. If you intend to submit
exhibits into the record here today, please give
one copy to Susan Davies for the official record.
Written comments on the reclassification proposal
may be submitted at today's hearing or following
the hearing until 5 p.m., on Thursday, October 2,
2008. All written comments or testimony submitted
subsequent to the hearing should be addressed to
Susan Davies, Maine Department of Environmental
Protection, Statehouse Station 17, Augusta, Maine
Now, I'd like to note that because we're giving some extra time, I would ask that you all keep your statements quite brief. I'm going to allocate about four to five minutes per speaker. Any detail should be enclosed in a separate writing and then forwarded on to Ms. Davies. Today's hearing will be transcribed and made available to all Board members. Based on today's testimony and written comments submitted before the comment deadline, DEP staff will prepare a final recommendation for consideration by the Board. Based on the complete record, the Board will vote to approve, deny or amend the reclassification proposal at a future Board meeting to be announced. Copies of the final recommendation will be available upon request. If you wish to receive a copy, please let Susan Davies know.

At this time, I would ask all persons intending to testify to please stand and be sworn in. Do you affirm the testimony you will give will be the truth?

(Whereupon, witnesses respond in the affirmative.)

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Are there any other questions before we proceed? So we'll hear testimony beginning with the staff, Andy Fisk, and I assume Susan -- you say she's on the way?

MR. FISK: Yes, she is.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: She'll be here shortly.

Welcome, Andy.

MR. FISK: Thank you. Again, My name is Andrew Fisk. I'm the Bureau Director for Land and Water Quality. I'm here with Susan. It would have ordinarily been David Courtenmanch, but he is out of the office so I'm spelling for Dave who's head of the Division of Environmental Assessment. I want to briefly review the process that has occurred to date. The Board in preparation for this public hearing has actually gone out and
solicited public input on a number of proposals. We have done that through direct receipt of proposals, conducting three public meetings. These public meetings were publicly noticed, and we also solicited attendance at these meetings from our list of interested stakeholders so that we could get a cross-section of ideas as well as comment on ideas that were submitted directly to us. As noted in the notice, we are in the process of the hearing, and then we will come back to you preparing recommendations for your consideration to advance to the Legislature.

Very briefly, I'd like to go over the basis of our recommendations. Susan, do you want to come on up? The basis of our recommendations come from public input. This is a publicly-driven process. It is also a technical process, but it is driven by the public.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Mr. Fisk, would you bring the microphone a little bit closer?

MR. FISK: Sure, is that better?

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Welcome, Ms. Davies.

MS. DAVIES: Thank you.

MR. FISK: So proposals will come to us for reclassification, change of classification of waters of the State. We look at them in any number of ways. It depends on the type of water body and the adjacent land uses and the actual status of licensed discharges into those water bodies. Smaller water bodies with minimal land use we would look at in a different fashion in terms of recommending something than a larger main stem river that traversed a very populated part of the State and that had many different types of dischargers and land use activities on them. We put a higher data bar on those types of proposals because in those instances we would need to be able to look at either existence of attainment of a proposed classification or the probability of attaining that, and for us to do that, that means we need to have data as well as the possible presence of a water quality model so we can run different scenarios and understand what the probability of attainment would be under the legal
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1 requirements by which we issue licenses to those
2 dischargers. So the main point is we may apply
3 different filters and different bars in making our
4 recommendations on proposals that are put in front
5 of us.
6 I'll just briefly go over the proposals in
7 summary and if Susan would like to add anything in
8 terms of detail, you have the packet and the
9 packet has been available for public review.
10 There are 17 proposals for upgrade. Just one of
11 those is a marine proposal, 16 of them otherwise
12 are river and stream proposals. I would like to
13 note we have modified one proposal. The
14 recommendation for the Class C to Class B change
15 on the Kennebec from Shawmut to Messalonskee,
16 Shawmut Dam to Messalonskee Stream. At this point
17 we would like to modify that proposal to exclude
18 the impoundments within that segment. As I think
19 we described when we brought this forward to you
20 initially, this proposal as it's written is
21 contingent on us obtaining some dissolved oxygen
22 data in those impoundments this season. It was a
23 high flow year. We were not able to get the data
24 that we would have liked to have obtained, so at
25 this point we are not recommending that those
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1 impoundings be upgraded, just the free-flowing
2 segments. So that is a modification that's been
3 in your proposal.
4 This is a little unique. As part of the
5 package we actually have six proposals to change
6 ambiguous or unclear classifications. This could
7 range from a transition from the old Delorme
8 paper-based world into GIS and higher resolution
9 information has shown us sometimes we have
10 ambiguous classifications or classifications that
11 don't necessarily line up or the initial
12 classification we find was not correct. We do
13 also have one segment that is proposed for a use
14 attainability analysis and, again, that is coming
15 to you as a recommendation for you to decide or
16 give us feedback about conducting a use
attainability analysis which is a process that you would go through separately to downgrade or create a sub-category of use on a particular urban stream, and then we do have three proposals that are not being recommended by the Department that we received, and this is largely because we do not feel that there is sufficient data to recommend those proposals at this time, and I believe you will hear testimony on those today and can help you inform our position.

Susan, did you want to --

MS. DAVIS: No.

MR. FISK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you, Mr. Fisk. Any questions from the Board? I was a little bit curious as to -- my understanding is that the statute requires that these be reviewed every three years, and it's been more than three years since the last time this took place. What's the time frame look like here? Why has it been so long?

MR. FISK: There are a number of time frames in the statute that we don't necessarily always get to that correct interval. Largely it was a question of staffing and having the staff resources to mount the work. Susan was named the water quality standards coordinator about three years ago or so, and, again, we felt that -- we had scoped this process close to 18 months or two years ago and we really felt like we have to plan about a full year of preparation and hearings, and that year slid for other priorities, largely getting our report submitted to EPA which says what are your impaired waters and what's the status of the main waters. That was a very difficult process because it transitioned from an in-house database to a national database, and I can tell you Susan labored mightily in the salt mines on that project and it took about twice as long as we thought.
CHAIRMAN HILTON: I've been through one of these once before, and I'm curious as to whether there is any kind of a trajectory, if you will, as to the miles of upgrade that's done and whether the Department has any kind of sense about, say, 15 years out given -- given your efforts to continually have your water quality permits issued on a five-year rotation, is there any kind of a sense as to where we might be, say, 10, 15, 20 years out on this process?

MR. FISK: That's an excellent question, and I think that it's something that I know as a Department and myself personally how do you do that, and I think it's something that we should be doing more of which is let's come up with a long range plan for what our waters are going to look like and can we structure a conversation that captures water quality goals as well as capital investment and the dollars it would take to get to a place. We don't do that well enough right now.

So I think that, yes, the trend lines are all going towards higher classifications and more attainment of classifications, but I couldn't tell you what it would be over 15 years. It is still fundamentally an ad hoc iterative process over these three- or four-year windows.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Yes, Susan.

MS. DAVIES: There has been over the years since the water quality standards program was changed back in 1987 there's been a great deal of activity in order to adjust the classification of specific water bodies to that change in the standards, and so I think that a lot of the activity that perhaps other boards have seen or that you saw previously is trying to get the assigned classification closer to what the current classification standards are in the currently existing law. So there's been a lot of sort of fixing the classifications to better match the standards and criteria that apply and that process has probably -- I wouldn't expect to see it as active as it has been in the future.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Okay. Matt?

MR. SCOTT: I've got a follow-up question
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1 for Susan. In this process, Susan, that we're
2 going through right now as far as rate class goes,
3 the Board adopted a few years ago the numerical
4 and narrative standards on biological criteria,
5 and three major orders that we use in that
6 process. This doesn't change any of that I assume
7 in what we're going through as far as the
8 reclass?
9 MS. DAVIES: No.
10 MR. SCOTT: Those still would be applied as
11 they are established?
12 MS. DAVIES: Correct.
13 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.
14 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Any other questions of
15 staff? Thank you very much. So we'll start with
16 the members of the public, and it might be a good
17 idea to take that list and put it on the table to
18 the side there, and, again, anyone else who wishes
19 to sign up to speak, please do so. So we're going
20 to start with Lee Dassler. Is Lee here?
21 MS. DASSLER: I am.
22 CHAIRMAN HILTON: And Bart Hague is on
23 deck.
24 MS. DASSLER: Good afternoon. Thank you
25 for letting me speak here today. My name is Lee
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1 Dassler. I live in Bolsters Mills on the Crooked
2 River. I've lived there for 16 years. I enjoy
3 the presence of the river. I kayak on the river,
4 and I moved there four years after the river was
5 freed in Bolsters Mills, and everyone was talking
6 about it when I moved in, but they were -- the
7 village was very proud of the fact that their once
8 dam had been unbuilt to allow the river to free
9 flow again and for free transport of the fish
10 upstream, and now that things have changed and I
11 work with the land trust at this moment, I
12 understand the importance of what the village had
14 What I'd like to talk about with you this
15 morning briefly is the role of the western
16 foothills land trust, a land trust based in
17 Norway, Maine, that works in a ten-town area in
18 western Maine, and the Crooked River runs in our
19 region and so we are very involved with the
20 river. Since 2005, 2006, sometime right around
21 that period, the Western Foothills Land Trust has
22 aligned itself with four other land trusts in our
23 region. We realize that not all natural resources
24 behave according to political boundaries, so it
25 was important for us to work on a regional basis.
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1 So we aligned with the Greater Lovell Land Trust,
2 Loon Echo Land Trust, Mahoosuc Land Trust, the
3 Upper Saco Valley River Land Trust and we work
4 together. Our first project was mapping all of
5 the conserved lands in the region that was
6 protected by those land trusts, and the second
7 project that was chosen was called the Crooked
8 River Initiative Project and we're in about the
9 first year and a half of that project, recognizing
10 the importance of the Crooked River to the entire
11 region that we serve. The Crooked River starts
12 just south of the Songo Pond up in Bethel and, of
13 course, runs eventually to the sea, but to Sebago
14 Lake prior to its running to the sea. So the
15 Initiative has had a wonderful partner to date and
16 that has been the Portland Water District, and
17 Paul Hunt from the Water District is here today
18 and will testify in just a bit, but those land
19 trusts are bringing to this collaborative the
20 tools that the land trust has access to, working
21 with landowners along the river corridor, offering
22 them conservation options and being there to help
23 assist in whatever way we can to conserve the
24 watershed along the Crooked River. The Portland
25 Water District, I think Paul will probably talk
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1 about the resources that the PWD has brought to
2 this project which have been magnificent, and we
3 are planning our first public meeting, the first
4 one of four initially, public meetings this autumn
5 to bring together people who are landowners along
6 the Crooked River Watershed, who are town
7 officials there, other conservation-minded people, 8 people involved as stakeholders along the 9 watershed, so opening up meetings to talk about 10 what the Crooked River provides for our area and 11 what needs to happen to see that its waters and 12 its resources are properly conserved, and I'm 13 pleased to say that on Monday we're partnering 14 with another nonprofit, the National Nonprofit 15 Light Hawk, and they're providing us with a plane 16 and a pilot to fly the watershed and film it for 17 these meetings we are going to have. So we'll 18 have a visual overhead from source to sea of the 19 Crooked River. I am not a fisherman nor do I eat 20 fish, but the Crooked River is an impressive 21 fisheries resource for the State of Maine, quite 22 an asset for southern Maine and I know Susan has 23 received a lengthy letter from France Brodigan of 24 the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and 25 Wildlife, but I wanted to step out of my
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1 non-fisheries self and read just a small paragraph 2 from what he's written about the Crooked. The 3 Crooked River not only supports a generically 4 unique and indigenous salmon population but the 5 river's relatively undeveloped and unspoiled 6 shoreline in heavily developing southern Maine 7 creates an attractive destination for anglers and 8 other water-based outdoor enthusiasts. The 9 Crooked also provides the closest opportunity for 10 anglers in Maine's most populated region of the 11 State to fish for wild landlocked Atlantic salmon 12 in a river setting. The Crooked River is the 13 crown jewel of riverine salmon and trout fishing 14 in southern Maine, and other than two sections of 15 the Saco River is the only other Class AA river in 16 rapidly developing southern Maine. So he's the 17 fisheries expert for the Inland Fisheries and 18 Wildlife Department and really has quite a bit of 19 faith and admiration for the Crooked River. 20 I also would like to read something from a 21 gentleman who is not here and also a gentleman 22 I've not met except by e-mail, Bill Townsend, and 23 Bill Townsend is a practicing attorney, and I 24 signed him in saying that I would read for him. 25 Bill Townsend is a practicing attorney in
1 Skowhegan, a former board member of the NRCM, 2 current board member of the Atlantic Salmon Federation and current board member and past president of Maine Rivers, and Bill apologizes for not being able to drive here today but has sent this e-mail for me to read. The Crooked River is 3 the principal spawning tributary of the indigenous wild landlocked salmon of Sebago Lake and 4 generates as much as 70 percent of the species in the lake. The river was identified in 1982, Maine River Study, as one of only seven rivers which are the State's most significant inland fisheries rivers. It is the only one in the heavily populated southern part of the State. In the 1983 Rivers Act, the Crooked River was designated as worthy of special protection because of its fisheries resource. John and Marilyn Hatch have applied to the Maine Department of Environmental Protection for a permit to construct and operate a water powered saw mill at Scribners Mill on the Crooked River basically as a tourist attraction. The Hatches concede in their application that they have alternative methods of powering their proposed sawmill. The fisheries value of the Crooked River should not be compromised. A free-flowing river in which wild native landlocked salmon have existed since the retreat of the glaciers should take priority of the develop plans proposed by Mr. and Mrs. Hatch. So that's the end of what Bill wrote. And I think as a resident of Bolsters Mills, it took us as a human community 150 years of blocking that river via dams, and worthwhile dams, dams that powered our early settlements along the Crooked River in that area, but that river was blocked for 150 years and now it's time that it remains unblocked, and I would urge the Board to reclassify the river as a double A river. Thank you very much.

14 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Any questions for Ms. Dassler?
16 MS. DASSLER: Okay.
17 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you very much.
18 Bart?
19 MR. HAGUE: I am Bart Hague, a landowner in
20 Waterford, 376 McWayne Hill Road. I'm also a
21 board member, very much involved in the land trust
22 and the Crooked River Initiative that Lee referred
23 to, as well as now the president of the Congress
24 of Lakes Association. All these organizations
25 have real concern and interest in the protection
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1 of the Crooked River which supplies 70 percent of
2 the direct water flowing into Lake Sebago. Paul
3 Hunt will tell you about the importance of the
4 river, the headwaters protection measures, as well
5 as the lake searching 200,000 people or more. I
6 have culminated a career in water quality
7 management, including water quality standards and
8 land protection going back to the days of Stewart
9 Udall with the National Park Services Initiatives
10 to identify and stake out and obtain protection of
11 the national seashores, and particularly the wild
12 and scenic rivers, very much involved in the
13 development of that legislation, and part of that
14 we had great hopes that the states would develop
15 statewide wild and scenic rivers to protect free
16 flowing rivers of regional and state interest, and
17 Maine is to be commended with its Maine Rivers Act
18 back in the early eighties, I believe, partly as a
19 result of some of the issues with Big A and has
20 adopted a program and designated, among others,
21 the Crooked River as an outstanding river in the
22 classification. Now, the water quality standards
23 of which I was involved since 1965 Clean Water Act
24 essentially evolved as a -- from a series of
25 public hearings just like this one where the
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1 public stated the kinds of uses that they sought
2 for their rivers. I even testified at a hearing
3 in the Washington area. Then with the designated
4 uses, and we'll hear about the uses and values of
5 the Crooked River today, water quality standards
6 essentially reflected the chemical, the physical
and, above all also, the biological criteria that is deemed by the scientists necessary to sustain those uses, and I think that's what we're talking about today. The Crooked River is outstanding as far as contributing high quality water. It's classified as AA except for a couple of segments. I think one segment now. It's an integrated system, in other words, you don't want to break it. You want to have a standard classification for this river because the water quality with water temperature and so on and also particularly the salmon fishery, it supports one of the four native -- genetically native species of landlocked salmon in the State of Maine, and continuity of the river as far as flow, as far as water quality, as far as temperature concern is critical, should not be broken. To give you a picture of the river itself, this is from Waterford, the Town of Waterford's Planning and Implementation Committee.
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1 recommended on scenic areas, these are all photos showing the Crooked River and these photos here, three of them, are part of the McDaniel's Rips that are on part of our family place, which has been in our family and I put on the National Register, the whole place, since 1920s. This shows the kind of habitat we're talking about. I used to take the school teachers down with their children who would raise salmon fry to put them in here because it was deemed to be a excellent place for spawning and for raising the salmon. Any dams or other impediments downstream or break in the triple A -- the double A classification -- I guess I'm going for more now -- would diminish somewhat the value of this. Now, the principal thing I wanted to emphasize is as a culmination of my career melding water quality and landscape protection, we have donated last December a conservation easement protecting the rapids I mentioned, McDaniel's Rips, protecting our ownership of a mile and a half of the river as well as 350 acres of the parcel that constituted the headwaters. I walked this site with Francis Brodigan of IFW with Paul Hunt and Ron Faucher of the Portland Water District, various land trust
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1 people, including Lee, in giving serious
2 consideration whether to include this headwater's
3 land because it was tying up a lot of land. I
4 concluded that we really needed to emphasize
5 protecting those very small but critical headwater
6 streams. We gave up -- we've given up rights to
7 develop the old mill site that was at those rips
8 in the picture because we felt it was critical to
9 maintain the values of this free-flowing river.
10 The whole water quality standards issue is to have
11 the standards meet the criteria that are really
12 required for the designated uses and the emphasis
13 is on an integrated system. We have the salmon
14 spawning, for example, which would be impaired by,
15 for example, additional blockage of the flow as
16 far as not only migration but also any changes in
17 temperature upstream, but all this is downstream
18 and affecting us because it's affecting the kind
19 of fish migration that we're trying to protect.
20 There is also the issue of maintaining and
21 emphasizing --

22 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Mr. Hague --
23 MR. HAGUE: And carrying forward the Maine
24 Rivers Act, the concept of a free-flowing river.
25 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Mr. Hague? Mr. Hague?
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1 MR. HAGUE: Yes.
2 CHAIRMAN HILTON: We have a number of
3 people who want to speak today.
4 MR. HAGUE: Okay, fine, sure. All I can
5 say is that we have due respect. We know that
6 there is a dam issue here lurking behind us. We
7 have due respect for the efforts of the Scribner
8 Hatch family to develop the water power site. We
9 feel that the kind of mill that they would be
10 providing, the kind of historic value, can be done
11 without having to further dam the river or
12 interfere with reclassifying the river.
13 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Any questions?
14 MR. HAGUE: Oh, and I will introduce for
15 the record the first three or four pages of our
16 conservation easement.
17 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you, Mr. Hague.
18 Are there any questions for Mr. Hague?
19 MR. SCOTT: One quick question.
20 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Bart? Mr. Hague?
21 MR. HAGUE: Excuse me.
22 MR. SCOTT: For the record, how many years did you work for EPA? How many years did you spend with EPA? Would you tell the Board for the record?
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1 MR. HAGUE: What?
2 MS. DAVIES: How many years at EPA?
3 MR. HAGUE: Oh, I was one of the founding members. I've been in this game actually 42 years when I retired. I was with Stewart Udall and I started a federal career with the forest and then with Eisenhower's public works planning staff but I went with Udall so that makes it 42.
4 MR. SCOTT: Okay, 42. Thank you.
5 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you very much, Mr. Hague. We have Paul Hunt next and then Steve Sutter.
6 MR. HUNT: Good afternoon, Members of the Board. My name is Paul Hunt, a resident of Gorham and for the last nine years I've been the environmental manager with the Portland Water District. Before that for five years I was the source water protection coordinator at the Maine Drinking Water Program responsible for coordinating protection of all sources of drinking water in Maine.
7 As you may know, the Portland Water District is Maine's largest water and wastewater utility responsible for providing drinking water to one out of six Maine residents living in 11 Maine communities. The source of water for these 200,000 Mainers is Sebago Lake. When you consider how many customers we serve and add to that the hundreds of thousands more that use Sebago Lake to live, to work, to enjoy outdoor recreation, it's easy to see why we certainly think Sebago Lake is
7 one of Maine's most important natural resources.
8 So what does that have to do with the
9 reclassification of the segment of the Crooked
10 River at Scribner's Mills? I'm here to testify
11 today because the Crooked River is the most
12 important feeding tributary to Sebago Lake. As
13 goes the Crooked River, so goes Sebago Lake.
14 Treatment of water is one of the ways that we
15 ensure that the water is safe to drink. Our
16 treatment plant represents an investment of over
17 $20 million dollars in 1993 and it will be upgraded
18 in the next five years to enhance its ability to
19 disinfect water as required by recent amendments
20 to the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act. The
21 ultimate cost and effectiveness of any treatment
22 enhancements are a function of the quality of the
23 water that we start with. The cleaner the lake,
24 the less expensive it is to treat and the more
25 effective is the treatment. Because dirtier water
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1 generally requires addition of more and varied
2 chemicals, many of which produce unhealthy
3 disinfection by-products, the cleaner the lake,
4 the safer the water as well. Source protection,
5 therefore, is the most important public health
6 barrier that water utilities employ. Nothing
7 works as well as simply keeping pollutants out of
8 the lake in the first place. The Federal Safe
9 Drinking Water Act states clearly what one of our
10 legal obligations is, and, I'll quote, control of
11 all human activities which may have an adverse
12 impact on the microbiological quality of the
13 source water. The irony in that requirement is
14 that it falls on water utilities and, yet, in
15 Maine, the authority for actually protecting lakes
16 and rivers that serve as sources of drinking water
17 rests with the State, not with the utilities. So
18 I'm here because we are relying on you.
19 Reclassifying the Crooked River to the highest
20 designation in Maine law will provide the greatest
21 level of protection possible to the primary
22 tributary to Sebago Lake. Keeping Sebago Lake
23 clean will protect the health of our customers
24 better than any form of treatment we can provide
25 and for millions of dollars less. That's why I'm
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1 here to ask you to support the reclassification.
2 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you, Mr. Hunt. Any
3 questions of Mr. Hunt? Thank you. Steve Sutter
4 followed by Steve Hinchman, and I would remind the
5 speakers to keep your -- if you have already
6 prepared remarks, just give a copy to the reporter
7 and to Terry and keep it down to maybe three or
8 four minutes or so, if you could.
9 MR. SUTTER: My name is Steve Sutter. I'm
10 a citizen/owner of a ten-acre riverfront property
11 on the Aroostook River between Presque Isle and
12 Caribou, and it's what's left of a farm that's
13 been in the family since 1854. I'm sure you've
14 noted in the reclassification package that the
15 segment from Presque Isle to Caribou did not move
16 forward from C to B in both 2002 and 2008. I am
17 the author of both of the proposals. The strength
18 of my latest proposal is demonstrated by DEP,
19 their acknowledgment that the water quality model
20 authored by Paul Mitnick predicted Class B
21 dissolved oxygen attainment from Presque Isle to
22 Caribou at simultaneous maximum loading from all
23 point sources on the river. That's a remarkable
24 achievement to stay within such a huge margin of
25 safety; furthermore, the BOD5 and TSS standards
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1 were issued by US EPA in 1977. The technologies
2 have undoubtedly improved and based on my most
3 recent EPA data, normal BOD loadings by
4 dischargers on the Aroostook are most likely below
5 35 percent maximum loading. Even more remarkable,
6 Maine DEP bio-monitoring at Station #595, just
7 across the river from my property indicated Class
8 B attainment in late August of 2001 at 7Q10.
9 That flash summer drought facilitated the largest
10 study effort ever done by DEP in Aroostook County.
11 That drought was a miracle for me and I had prayed
12 for it. With the Department's data, I can
13 demonstrate the Presque Isle to Caribou stretch
14 could reasonably be expected to even meet the
15 draft total phosphorus limits for Class B at
16 normal or even maximum TP loadings. I'll send all
17 of this in or hand it in, but in that miracle
18 drought August 2001, McCain, the largest
19 phosphorus source discharging out at 77 percent of
20 it's flow, about 77 percent of total phosphorus.
21 The relationship to the R is .95. The range in TP
22 concentrations at those three monitoring sites
23 between Presque Isle and Caribou was from 11 to 26
24 parts per billion, a median of 18.5. Guess
25 what? That demonstrates that the Department's
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1 draft TP limits currently at 20 parts per billion
2 for A, 33 for B, it appears the river from Presque
3 Isle to Caribou at 7Q10 was closer to Class A than
4 Class B.
5 Finally, maximum loadings pending nutrient
6 criteria and an assertion the complex model may
7 have to be re-built because algal activity may
8 have increased are all relatively weak bases that
9 I believe are being used by the Department to
10 thwart my strong upgrade proposal. A fact often
11 misunderstood by the public is that assimilating
12 wastewater is not a designated use of Maine
13 waters. I believe reclassification should be
14 based solely on water quality assessment. The DEP
15 regional office in Presque Isle recommends this
16 decision be deferred until 2012 or likely beyond.
17 My recommendation is that this upgrade proposal be
18 included among those recommended to the
19 Legislature at this time based on Title 38,
20 Section 464.4.F(4), that's antidegradation, and
21 I'll read it briefly, when, that's my emphasis,
22 the actual quality of any classified water exceeds
23 the minimum stands of the next highest
24 classification, that higher water quality must be
25 maintained and protected. The Board, my emphasis,
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1 shall recommend to the Legislature that the water
2 be reclassified into the next higher
3 classification. A minor point is that
4 towards the end of June, the regional office in
5 Presque Isle told me that I would now need to go
6 through FOIA, Freedom of Information Act, to look
That was new. That didn't bother me because I had some left over from several years ago to do this analysis, but as a public member, I'm disturbed and privately I'm impressed.

So I've said my piece as briefly as I can.

As a citizen of Aroostook who rushed to get here, thank you for your consideration.

Chairman Hilton: Any questions of Mr. Sutter?

Scott: Yes, Chairman.

Chairman Hilton: Yes, Matt.

Scott: Steve, I want to make it clear for the record that you're proposing to support the upgrade from class --

Sutter: C.

Scott: C to --

Sutter: B, only between Presque Isle and Caribou. It will never make it from Caribou to Fort Fairfield.

I just wanted it clear for the record that you're proposing to support the upgrade from class --

Sutter: C.

Scott: C to --

Sutter: B, only between Presque Isle and Caribou. It will never make it from Caribou to Fort Fairfield.

Chairman Hilton: Thank you.

Sutter: Thank you.
1 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Steve Hinchman, followed by Josh Royte.
3 MR. HINCHMAN: Good afternoon, Chairman Hilton, Members of the Board, my name is Steve Hinchman, I'm the staff attorney for the Conservation Law Foundation in our Brunswick, Maine office. CLF has been involved in protection of water quality in Maine for many years, including some of the waters that are in the memorandum under consideration for reclassification today.
12 State water quality classification State standards are at the heart of the Clean Water Act and the decisions you make recommending to the State Legislature in terms of water quality may be among the most important decisions you make as a Board. I want to emphasize that the Act requires the restoration and maintenance of the chemical, physical and biological integrity of our nation's waters and that was written by our own Ed Muskie. The way that is done is through enforcement of State water quality standards and it's designed for continual improvement, and there's two principles that I hope to convey to you that you can use as you look at each one of these recommendations.
2 The first is what's called the antidegradation provisions, and it's a flat out mandate. You could never enact this in today's legislature, either State or Federal, but this is what the law is, existing uses in water quality to protect those uses shall be protected and maintained. So where existing uses are not protected, in other words, the existing water quality is higher than the current classification, you must raise the classification, and when you make that consideration, you are allowed to consider industrial use as a designated use of water, but that's process water, in other words, that's the input pipe. You are not allowed to consider waste discharge and waste transport as a
designated use. So you're not allowed to consider
the discharge pipe for the industrial use. I just
want to make that part clear. So when the
Department memo says we can't verify that this
body of water, the Aroostook, for example, the one
that was just described, will meet the higher
class at maximum license load, that is an illegal
criterion. If you make your decision on that
basis, it's contrary to the Clean Water Act. So
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1 that's probably the most important piece of that,
2 but the corollary under antidegradation is you
3 can't downgrade an existing classification and
4 remove an existing use if it's meeting that use.
5 The second principle that's very, very
6 important here could be described as an anti
7 backsliding rule, and that you may not downgrade
8 waters that fail to attain designated uses. If
9 those uses are attainable through implementation
10 of effluent limits, either the national
11 technological standards or water quality based
12 standards or through national performance
13 standards, and before you could recommend such a
14 removal, you must do a use attainability analysis,
15 and those are very strict, proscribed procedures,
16 and these are the two ways that the Clean Water
17 Act achieves this goal of continual improvement.
18 As we get better, we have to protect that new
19 higher water quality, and you can't give up and
20 lower standards and make it easier to pollute.
21 CLF supports the upgrades recommended by the
22 staff memorandum, indeed, most of them because of
23 the reasons I just described are actually legally
24 required, specifically if a water body currently
25 meets that higher classification, you must approve
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1 that upgrade and that's true even if a licensed
2 discharger will then when their current permit
3 expires be forced to upgrade their water treatment
4 system. That's the design of the Act. There's no
5 vested right to pollute, rather the Act requires
6 continual improvement. So any discharger may
7 continue under their current permit for the
8 remainder of the permit's five-year term, but upon
9 renewal, if necessary, they may have to invest in
10 additional control.

11 The Androscoggin is another river as a case
12 in point on that. The Department has taken the
13 position that it cannot in good faith recommend
14 the upgrade. This is on page 29 of the staff
15 memo, and I'll just read you their words, that the
16 sampling intensity in a number of sampling
17 locations are insufficient to determine the
18 likelihood of attaining a Class B water quality
19 criteria at maximum licensed loads. Whether or
20 not the Androscoggin deserves to be upgraded, that
21 is an irrelevant consideration. You can't base
22 your decision on the requirements laid out here
23 that you have to look at maximum -- new water
24 quality monitoring at maximum license load. The
25 Act says you can't consider waste transport when

26 you make your decisions. I also want to point out
27 that it's ridiculous -- you all know and we know
28 this from the Androscoggin hearings, if you were
29 lucky enough to be there, nobody operates at
30 maximum license load. It's designed for a buffer
31 so they can safely operate the facility and not
32 get a violation because violations trigger all
33 sorts of consequences. So that maximum license
34 load provision creates an unnecessary and
35 artificially high bar that's very hard to clear,
36 both on the Aroostook and the Androscoggin.
37 Second, as I already said, it's illegal; and,
38 third, many of the dischargers have recognized
39 that generally increasing classification is a good
40 thing. It's been shown over and over again that
41 clean water is an economic boom. We've seen that
42 in Boston Harbor, Portland Waterfront, the Auburn
43 Riverfront, Merry Meeting Bay and the Kennebec.
44 This will be good for Maine. We believe that the
45 data on the Androscoggin which the Department
46 itself says they have no reason to doubt is
47 sufficient to show that existing uses in the lower
48 Andro are improving and that the river should be
49 protected with higher bacteria and dissolved
50 oxygen standards under the Class B designation.
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1 I just want to emphasize that the criterion
2 for the Aroostook River, which is page 30 of the
3 staff memo, the Department has definitively found
4 that the river's existing conditions currently
5 meet Class B. The Department cannot require a
6 showing that it would also meet Class B under
7 maximum license load, nor can it require a showing
8 that it would meet Class B for some future
9 nutrient standard that hasn't even been
10 promulgated. You have to look at current
11 conditions. It meets the standard under current
12 conditions right now according to the Department's
13 own data and, therefore, you're required to
14 recommend the upgrade.
15 Our next major concern is Long Creek, which
16 is page 22 of your memo. The Department is
17 proposing to lower the classification of .3 miles
18 in Long Creek from B to C. Again, here's the
19 legal standard, you can recommend to the
20 Legislature and the Legislature can so move to
21 reduce the standards, in other words, lower the
22 designated uses only if after conducting a use
23 attainability analysis it's conclusively shown
24 that the current standard which in this case would
25 be Class B is not attainable through
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1 implementation of effluent limitations and
2 national performance standards. As you may know,
3 Conservation Law Foundation has filed a petition
4 with the Environmental Protection Agency seeking a
5 determination that stormwater discharges into Long
6 Creek that contribute to the nonattainment of the
7 Class B standard, that would be the hotels, golf
8 courses, office buildings and big box stores in
9 the upper part of that watershed, so you're on the
10 upstream side of 95 in the headwaters of Long
11 Creek, not the Mall side but the other side, most
12 of which were built after this designation went
13 into law in 1990 that these dischargers must
14 obtain Clean Water Act permits and begin to
15 implement controls to clean up their waste. EPA
16 is, we're told, weeks away from issuing a decision
17 on that and we're told that any property with more 
18 than one acre impervious service will begin to 
19 have to control their storm waters to start curing 
20 the problem in Long Creek. So in this case, the 
21 State cannot complete a UAA until that process 
22 goes forward; in other words, you'll never know if 
23 use is attainable through implementation of 
24 effluent standards until you actually start 
25 implementing permits and effluent standards. So
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1 other controls if it's never been done and never 
2 been required. I'd also point out that this is a 
3 very slippery slope -- I'm almost done -- there 
4 are many, many urban impaired streams in Maine and 
5 the other New England States. Everybody is 
6 watching Jepson Brook, the City of Bangor, for
example, here in Maine but also down in Boston. This is a flood gate. You open this flood gate and you're going to get proposals for every urban impaired stream in the State, but it's a problem to get that water body cleaned up so I'll just make a recommendation for you that you might choose to pass on to the Department. A more reasonable approach would be to direct the Department to blend the UAA process with the residual designation process and ask them what portions of the stream can be brought back through best management practices and stormwater controls that currently don't exist and which portions of the stream, for example, because it's underground in a culvert will never be brought back and come back to you with a mixture of recommendations for classification that reflect the requirements of the UAA.

I'm sorry I ran on. I'm happy to answer questions.
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1 questions.

2 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Nancy.

3 MS. ZIEGLER: Back to Long Creek, what are you proposing? You're concerned about what the Department is doing, but what would you like to see happen?

7 MR. HINCHMAN: I would like you -- right now the Department is recommending to downgrade .3 miles from B to C and I recommend that you reject that proposal as not authorized by the Act until you've done a UAA.

12 MS. ZIEGLER: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Matt.

14 MR. SCOTT: Steve, you obviously support the antidegradation policy which the Board does as well, and in this process that we're working, every few years we're continually ratcheting in this process of upgrades. Do you see any -- in relation to Chairman Hilton's question about looking into the future, would there be some narrative language in the four classes that might be changed over time in your opinion that would support the ratcheting process? Do you envision anything like that or are you satisfied with the narratives that are already in the language?
MR. HINCHMAN: One springs to mind immediately and it has to do with the difference between recreational use in and on the water between B and C. If you look at the numerical criteria in the statute for B and C, you'll see that the bacteria criteria, E-coli criteria, are more stringent in B than they are in C, but the reason for that is not explained in the narrative. The point obviously is that, for example, body contact and recreational, that there's less risk of disease because there's less bacteria in a Class B stream than there is in a Class C stream. I think clarifying that the intent of a Class B standard is to enhance the recreational opportunities, particularly body contact recreation, would go a long way toward pushing us towards the type of water restoration we're seeking in Maine which is to allow Mainers and visitors to Maine to maximize recreational use of our great rivers and streams and estuaries.

MR. SCOTT: So not only the narrative but you related in your response to the numericals as well?

MR. HINCHMAN: Yeah, I haven't looked to see if the numerical criteria should be changed or not. I'd just point out that there's no explanation in the narrative of why there are two different numerical standards between B and C on E-coli. Also the Basin is one of the places I frequent that's on the list is one of the most spectacular places in the Maine Coast, and I highly recommend the upgrade and a visit.

MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Yes, Nancy.

MS. ZIEGLER: If you do a UAA on this section of Long Creek in the way that they're talking about doing in the Jepson Creek area, which is a little bit different because it's a concrete channel there I gather, but if you did a UAA, would your goal be to deal with the stormwater runoff that is not being regulated at
this point? Would that be something that you
would hope would be looked at and is there any
mechanism to do that?
MR. HINCHMAN: The point I was trying to
make is that UAA says you can't -- downgrading is
a measure of last resort. You can only do it if
you can show that you can't attain standards
through reasonable use of effluent standards and
national performance standards. In the case of
Jepson Brook where you have long stretches that
are in culverts underground or that are
enchannelized, that's clearly not a situation
where you can fix everything through standards --
enforcement of effluent limitations, but there are
places that you can fix and you could certainly
consider changing those channelized sections and
those culverted sections. Long Brook is a
completely different animal, and in the case of
Long Brook, it's highly likely that if you impose
storm water controls, which haven't existed up to
this point, you will be able to attain standards
across the board at Class B standards. So doing a
UAA in the case of Long Creek would be a waste of
resource in my opinion. First you should go
forward with the stormwater controls, and if that
doesn't work, then come back and recommend
reductions through the UAA process.
MS. ZIEGLER: You would then -- your
recommendation really is that you just take this
one off of this particular reclassification?
MR. HINCHMAN: Yeah, it's a two-part
recommendation. One is to take it off and,
secondly, if you're going to pursue it, you can't
do it through a quote, clarification. There's no
ambiguity. You'd have to do a UAA.
MS. ZIEGLER: Thank you.
MR. HINCHMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HILTON: Steve, it would be really
good if you could provide a synopsis of all that
in writing.
MR. HINCHMAN: I will, yes.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you. We have Josh Royte. I'm going to ask that everybody really try to truncate their remarks and provide -- if you want to provide follow-up in writing, that would be great. We have 50 minutes and we have at least 11 speakers and there may be some more people signed up over there. So that really gets us down to about four minutes apiece, and we're all running over four minutes, and at some point I really start to get tough.

MR. ROYTE: I would have to slip in after he starts getting tough. My name is Josh Royte. I'm with the Nature Conservancy in Brunswick, Maine, and I live in Yarmouth, Maine. The Nature Conservancy has a mission of protecting the biodiversity of life on this planet by protecting terrestrial ecosystems and aquatic systems somewhat later in the game, but starting in 2002 we began assessing all of Maine's fresh waters as part of a large eco regional assessment that was occurring across the Eastern U.S. in all the places where conservancy works. The goal of this assessment is to make sure we identify enough places that can represent the biodiversity that we have in the State at high enough quality in order to maintain the diversity that we have in the State without losing any of the cogs or gears that we know keep these systems functioning. We do not have a classification system for the different types of streams and lakes in the State existing. We developed one with the system that we've used in other states, we've developed it with experts throughout the State of Maine. We reviewed it with them as well as existing water quality data, digitizing Inland Fisheries and Wildlife data that had not been digitized. We looked at the Maine Lakes -- Gem Lakes Study, Maine Natural Areas Program Biodiversity data, Inland Fisheries and Wildlife rare species and significant wildlife habitat data, put this together with diadromous fish data, land cover to do this assessment to...
1 figure out where the most important places to
2 protect biodiversity were, what's the best suite
3 of places where we could protect biodiversity. We
4 put all these data together, we came up with some
5 solution sets, if you will, all the places that
6 might work and still have decent quality where we
7 can maintain the existing biodiversity. We met in
8 five different meetings around the State with the
9 DEP, staff from IF&W, DMR, the Natural Areas
10 Program, the Maine Aquatic biodiversity Project of
11 which this was a part of, the Atlantic Salmon
12 Commission, Trout Unlimited, the Houlton Band of
13 Maliseet Indians, the Penobscot Indian Nation,
14 Acadia National Park, Rachel Carson National
15 Wildlife Refuge, the Wells National Estuarine
16 Research Reserve, the University of Maine, Project
17 Share, the Gulf of Maine Program, the U.S. Fish
18 and Wildlife Service, the Wild Salmon Resource
19 Center and consultants from Woodlot Alternatives.
20 So we reviewed map by map around the State
21 where these streams were, what the values were and
22 what are the best places for protection, what are
23 the best places for mitigation and restoration and
24 came up with what we call a portfolio of sites
25 that we think provide the best opportunity for

1 protection of waters. There are 11 waters which
2 we recommended for upgrades. Some of these -- a
3 good bunch of them are tributaries to streams that
4 have higher ranks. The tributaries, my
5 understanding is, by default were ranked B when
6 the main stems were ranked A, the tributaries
7 didn't come with them. I'm going to go through
8 the list quickly. The first one on the list is
9 actually not a stream but the Basin which Steve
10 just mentioned. The Basin has 2000 acres of its
11 watershed in permanent protection by the Nature
12 Conservancy, and over 80 percent of the shoreline
13 of the Basin. It's in fantastic shape and worthy
14 of an upgrade, has fantastic biodiversity
15 resources in the mud flats and the intact
16 shoreline. The next is Alder Stream, a tributary
17 of the Piscataquis River. It has low dissolved
18 oxygen but that's the type of stream it is.
19 Again, in trying to represent all the types of
20 streams, it means we are going to look at some
21 that are slow, warmer water, lower dissolved
22 oxygen rivers as well as those pristine, tumbling
23 cold brook trout waters. Seboeis Stream
24 tributaries, again, this is a case where the
25 tributaries are B but the main stem is A,
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1 Mattamiscontis is the same, the Souadabscook is
2 the same. The Crooked River is a place where we
3 support the upgrade. The South River is a
4 tributary of Ossipee, again, a huge amount of the
5 watershed is in permanent protection through a
6 Department of Conservation easement that we
7 brokered. That is 8,700 acres that watershed,
8 it's spectacular in for brook trout as well as sea
9 run Atlantic salmon. The Little River is on
10 Salmon Falls, has great diadromous fish runs with
11 efforts to classify all the tributaries of Great
12 Bay, that's one of the important tributaries.
13 Beaver Brook and its tributaries on the
14 Aroostook. That's another default tributary
15 upgrade, Violette Stream and it's tributaries, the
16 Pemaquid River has diadromous fish runs that are
17 kind of outstanding for such a small coastal river
18 and a very intact forested watershed for where it
19 is in the State and the tributaries of the
20 Ducktrap which, as many of you know, has
21 outstanding conservation work up and down the main
22 stem. There are several tributaries that could be
23 upgraded to match that of the main stem. If there
24 are any questions on any of these, I'd be glad to
25 provide details. Thank you.
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1 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Any questions of Mr.
2 Royte? Thank you very much, Josh. Next is Landis
3 Hudson and then we have Jennifer Gray.
4 MS. HUDSON: Good afternoon, Chairman
5 Hilton and Members of the Board, my name is Landis
6 Hudson. I'm the program director for Maine
7 Rivers. I also live with my husband on about a
tenth of an acre in Yarmouth close to the Royal
River. The mission of Maine Rivers is to protect,
restore and enhance the ecological health of
Maine's river systems, and on behalf of our
members and board of directors, thank you for this
opportunity to testify. We are broadly in support
of the upgrades proposed by DEP, but I would like
to summarize a few comments about upgrading
sections of the Crooked River which you've heard
quite a bit about and the Kennebec river.
The Crooked River, Maine's natural
resources, including rivers, are really the
foundations of our health, our economy and our
future, and we believe that the ecological value
and its related economic importance of the Crooked
River should lead us to fully upgrade the Crooked
to AA along its entire length. The current level
of protection is high, but we really believe that

what's the actual value of the Crooked
River? What's the actual ecological or economic
value? It's very hard to say. I have been
reading over Francis Brodigan's comments in
response to the Hatch application and it's not
easy to put a number value on ecological systems.
One way you could do it would be to try and
imagine a replacement value or to try and figure
out exactly how much money is spent on
recreational activities in the Sebago Lake area,
and I can tell you that from my personal
experience recently it's a very busy place. There
are an awful lot of people out there, and the wild
landlocked salmon certainly provides an important
goal for sort of sending people out in that
direction. So the wild salmon produced in the
Crooked River which enter Sebago Lake are terrifically important. In conversation with Francis Brodigan recently, we thought it wasn’t unrealistic to imagine it could certainly be somewhere worth $500,000, $1,000,000 and it's something very important to protect. The existing free passage for salmon on the Crooked River is currently threatened by a proposed dam at the Scribner's Mill, and there's a small stretch of the river which is Class A but this dam, if built as proposed, could actually compromise access to over 66 percent of the salmon spawning habitat, not including tributaries. So it's also not consistent with IF&W fisheries management objectives and could potentially jeopardize attainment of the Department's management goal for landlocked salmon. So it's conceivable that the Department could legally approve the dam application for Scribner's Mill even if the Board votes to upgrade the Crooked River entirely to AA; however, Maine Rivers sincerely hopes that by upgrading the river to AA, it will encourage the DEP to similarly make a decision to protect the river and its assets for the ecological health of the river and its landlocked salmon and its related economic values. The purpose of the designation of the Crooked River as an outstanding river segment in the legislation is the protection of this fishery resource.

I would also like to say a few words about the Kennebec River. As we all know, the Kennebec River has received national attention for its improving ecological health. Twenty-five years ago it would have been hard for most people to imagine how much more vibrant the river and its watershed could become, but thanks to the efforts of many people, it really has improved tremendously, and we believe that these upgrades as proposed show strong commitment to continued improvement. So Maine Rivers’ position is that...
the entire section of the Kennebec River from Skowhegan to Waterville should be upgraded to Class B, not just the free flowing stretches from Fairfield to Waterville. This stretch of river provides an excellent cold water fishery for both rainbow and brook trout and, of course, the recreational activities are of great benefit to central Maine. We are aware that the Departments of Commerce and Interior are considering the implications of an endangered species listing for the Atlantic salmon, and we believe that improvements in water quality implicit in upgrading this section of the Kennebec can only count in Maine's favor with regard to ESA consideration and shows that steps are being taken to improve habitat. We understand that the Department has collected data showing that the stretch of the river from Skowhegan to Waterville attains Class B standards for aquatic life criteria and for dissolved oxygen, and while the Department originally proposed upgrading only half of this stretch, it was reduced last week, we support upgrading this 15-mile segment of the river now; however, if the Board adopts the EPA's recommendations that only the sections outside of the impoundment are upgraded, we would like to advocate for the remaining section of the Kennebec River to be completed as soon as possible.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you. Wing?

MR. GOODALE: A very quick question, do you have any comments on the Aroostook River?

MR. HUDSON: No.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you very much.
7 Maine Audubon supports DEP's proposed 8 reclassification in addition to reclassifying, as 9 Landis just mentioned, the whole segment of the 10 Kennebec between Skowhegan and Waterville. Water 11 quality is critically important to both the people 12 and wildlife in the State of Maine, and we applaud 13 this recognition officially of our progress in 14 improving the water quality on many of our waters 15 here in the State. We concur with the Department 16 of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife and others that 17 the Crooked River is very special and important to 18 our landlocked salmon. One thing I have not heard 19 people mention that IF&W has shared is in the past 20 a number of mill dams were located on the river 21 and severely restricted historical access to much 22 of the river's available salmon spawning and 23 nursery habitat, and over the last several decades 24 much work has occurred to restore, recolonize and 25 re-establish depleted salmon runs within the upper
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1 sections of the river, and I think it's really 2 important to recognize that work and the progress 3 that's been made and upgrade the classification, 4 and it's not just about the salmon in the Crooked 5 River. I understand, as we all know, other fish 6 species find a home in the Crooked River, 7 including the species of concern such as the brook 8 trout, the creep, chub sucker and the white 9 sucker. 10 Maine Audubon also supports reclassifying 11 the entire segment of the Kennebec River from 12 Skowhegan to Waterville. The segment below the 13 Shawmut dam contains a valuable cold water 14 fishery, as you heard, and it's of statewide and 15 regional significance. According to the IF&W's 16 web site, the premier brown trout water in the 17 region and perhaps the State is the Kennebec, and 18 it is that 40-mile reach of the Kennebec from 19 Skowhegan to Augusta that has gained a reputation 20 of one of the best brown trout rivers on the East 21 Coast, and we really need to do all that we can to 22 support these habitats, and we also encourage you 23 to seriously consider the proposal from the 24 Friends of Merry Meeting Bay for the Androscoggin, 25 and I thank you for your consideration.
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1 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Any questions for
2 Jennifer? Thank you very much Jennifer.
3 MS. GRAY: Thank you.
4 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Mike Barden is next
5 followed by Dusti Fourner. Welcome, Mike.
6 MR. BARDEN: Chairman Hilton, Members of
7 the Board, my name is Mike Barden. I'm here on
8 behalf of Maine Pulp and Paper Association. I'll
9 be very brief. Our primary issue is on the
10 Kennebec with the impoundments but DEP has
11 indicated that they don't have the data, and we
12 agree with that. That's all my comments.
13 CHAIRMAN HILTON: I guess a question I
14 would ask is do the mills have -- do the dam
15 owners have the data?
16 MR. BARDEN: I don't think so. I don't
17 think so. My understanding is the last time DEP
18 has collected any DO data is late nineties, and I
19 don't think that includes the impoundment areas
20 either. So we don't have a problem if they want
21 to upgrade it, but we'd like to see the data
22 first.
23 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you. Ms. Faucher,
24 welcome.
25 MS. FAUCHER: My name is Dusti Faucher. I
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1 live at 30 Moose Run in South Casco, and I have
2 been here before the Board before talking about
3 upgrades on the Presumpscot, but today I'm
4 actually talking about the Crooked River which is
5 an upper watershed of the Presumpscot. For the
6 past 12 years, Friends of Presumpscot and other
7 groups have been working on restoration of the
8 Presumpscot. We've been working of migratory fish
9 restoration, improvements in the water quality and
10 increasing the productivity of Casco Bay. As a
11 group, we have worked through the dam relicensing
12 process and all the subsequent appeals that have
13 happened through that, and we have stressed the
14 importance of ecosystem management for the
15 Presumpscot. That is one of the things that we're
16 asking about this, that you --
17 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Could you slow down?
18 MS. FAUCHER: Sorry about that. I'm trying to make that four minutes. So that we can take 20 the Crooked and work it as an entire ecosystem as opposed to segmenting it. That is one of the 22 problems that has happened on the Presumpscot. It's been segmented dam between dam, and we have been working to make sure that the entire system's water quality and fisheries and everything is taken as a whole. So we're asking that that happen on the Crooked as well. So while we're rebuilding the resources of the Presumpscot, we are asking that the Crooked be protected from the misguided request to reestablish a dam at Scribner's Mills or any of the future threats that might occur on this river. It's a rare chance that we have to save this outstanding resource in the midst of all the development of southern Maine and we're hoping that that opportunity won't be lost.

12 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you very much. Any questions for Mrs. Faucher? Thank you, Dusti. And Ron Faucher followed by Nick Bennett.

15 MR. FAUCHER: My testimony and my contact information, and I'll be very brief since everybody has talked about the Crooked and they've done a good job talking about. I'll tell you who I am. My name is Ron Faucher. I live at 30 Moose Run, and I'm here to speak for the classification upgrade. I am a CPESC. I have been for 10 years. That's certified professional erosion sediment control. I'll put my classes on here so I can read the rest of it. Over the -- and also I've worked for the Portland Water District as a watershed protection coordinator for decades. It used to be called a source protection coordinator. I'm still very active in the environmental protection area. I'm president of IRCA, another acronym. It's the International Erosion Control Association. IRCA is an
international organization working for erosion and sediment control all over the world, but I want to talk now about the passion that I've had for 43 years for my service with the Water District.

Water quality doesn't just happen. What it does is there because of what people -- the hard work people are doing in the watershed, meetings, planning meetings, board meetings, all these meetings, school meetings with kids teaching them about the environment. It's just you need the passion to make this happen, and what I'm asking you guys to do is pass this segment of the Scribner's Mill to a Class AA classification.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you, Mr. Faucher.

Any questions for Ron? Nick Bennett. Welcome, Nick.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Chairman Hilton, Members of the Board. My name is Nick Bennett.

I'm the staff scientific for the Natural Resources Council of Maine and I reside in Hallowell, Maine. We support the upgrades in this proposal that the DEP has put before you. Like a few others before me, I plan to focus on the Crooked and the Kennebec and just say a couple words about each of them, hopefully not being repetitive. In terms of the Crooked, I think folks now realize there's a dam application out there at Scribner's Mills which is the one small segment of the Crooked River that is not double A. For some strange reason, most of the Crooked is double A both below and above Scribner's Mills. So there's just a one-mile segment of the river that isn't and we don't know why. That's an oversight that should never have happened, and that river, as you heard from the Portland Water District, is critical to the water quality of the water source for a sixth of the State of Maine. It provides the vast majority of the spawning habitat for landlocked salmon in Sebago Lake. There should not have been the opportunity to put that dam application in, and in addition, unfortunately, although that dam application was complete in February, and I believe there were 16 commenters
who opposed that dam application and none in support of it, the Department has not made a decision, and that's why this issue is sort of confused in front of the Board today, and we think that's unfortunate. Nevertheless, we hope the Department is going to make the right decision on this and reject the dam application and we would urge the Board to please upgrade that segment at Scribner's Mills so this doesn't happen again.

The second segment I wanted to talk about is the proposed upgrade for the Kennebec. In it's initial proposal, the Department proposed upgrading from C to B the entire segment from below the Shawmut Dam to Waterville-Fairfield. We weren't very happy about that, although it did include the fishery at Shawmut, really that whole stretch of river from Skowhegan to Waterville is a very good fishery and all of it should be protected as Class B. That's the last segment of the Kennebec that's Class C and it meets Class B standards according to all of the data that DEP has. In 2002, the last time you went through this reclassification proposal, I came before you and asked the Board to please upgrade that segment. At that time the Department said, no, we don't have the aquatic life data so we don't know whether it meets aquatic life standards. Well, now they have those data and it does meet aquatic life standards for that whole segment from Skowhegan to Waterville, and so we were very disappointed to hear at the last second that not only were they not going to propose an upgrade for the whole class B segment, but they weren't even going to propose an upgrade for the Shawmut to Waterville section that they initially proposed. Now, I understand that this past summer was a hard summer to get data, and I know that the Department tried to get some data but, again, I think the Department has a lot of data and all of those shows that this segment meets standards. So if the Board is going to accept the Department's
recommendation and not upgrade this full segment, we would strongly urge that the Board make it clear to the Department that as soon as possible they need to get the data that they need to upgrade this last remaining Class C segment of the Kennebec, and with that I'll be happy to take any questions.

MR. GOODALE: Any comment on the Aroostook River?

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Nick, I'd like to know do you have any idea when the dam was taken out on the Crooked River?

MR. BENNETT: '72 I believe.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: So it's been free flowing and I take it when they took it out it's actually gone or are there remnants left? Was it officially removed or has it just been washed out?

MR. BENNETT: No, it was removed.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: So it's been free flowing for 36 years?

MR. BENNETT: That's my understanding.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: And you don't have any particular idea -- I should have asked this of somebody else I suppose, but it just never occurred to me. You have no idea why the Department might have left that one last stretch?

MR. BENNETT: No, that's definitely a question for the Department.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Yeah. The last time we went through this reclassification, the issue of this segment of the Kennebec came up then, and we talked about how much data they had, and it appeared even then that they might have had enough data to do this. I'm also a little bit concerned, just as you are, with the fact that even though there's a three-year interim -- statutory interim between these reclassification proceedings it's been five or six years now, and Mike indicated
that there's a paucity of DO data. Is that your understanding also?

MR. BENNETT: Well, DEP did two, what they call -- I think they call them synoptic surveys which basically means intense surveys of the river in '97 and '98, and they collected a whole bunch of DO samples from the river, and there was one sample, you know, out of hundreds I think that didn't meet standards essentially, and that was in '97. In '98, which was a dryer year, all the samples met standards, and I actually asked the Department, you know, where were all those samples located, do you have any samples in the impoundments, and they sort of scratched their heads and said, well, we're not sure. So maybe between now and when I had that conversation they came up with the answer, no, we have no data from the impoundments. I find that a little troubling if that's true and, again, you know, if that's really the case and the Department really feels that there's an issue with these impoundments and I have never heard that before, I mean, I think maybe there's some concern about thermal stratification and having another Androscoggin and, you know, I don't know. The statute, as Steve Hinchman said, if the data says it meets standards, you upgrade it. The Department has a lot of data from the Kennebec River. It's a very intensely-studied river, and they're not upgrading it, and, again, it's been six years since the last time we went through this. So I would ask the Department very carefully to look at all of the data it has available.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Typically in your experience or to your understanding is the only source of data that which comes through from qualified scientific studies or can it come through -- for instance, the VLMP or whatever it is, program collects all sorts of water quality from various lakes around the State.

MR. BENNETT: Right.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Is that data recognized as having any kind of scientific value?

MR. BENNETT: That data or those data, yes,
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1 are I think very highly regarded. I know Friends
2 of Merry Meeting Bay and Kennebec Valley Trout
3 Unlimited have a lot of data for the Kennebec and
4 I would strongly encourage the Department to look
5 at those data if they have data for the
6 impoundments and, again, I'm just stunned that in
7 two big synoptic surveys of the type the
8 Department did in 1997 and 1998 they don't have
9 any DO data from the impoundments. I just find
10 that difficult to believe. If it's true, you
11 know, all right, but, again, if that's the case,
12 that's, you know, a reason why the Department
13 really needs to go out and get these data and get
14 this upgrade passed because I don't want to be
15 here six years from now asking the Board to do
16 this again which seems not unlikely under the
17 circumstances. So I would look at those Friends
18 of Merry Meeting Bay data. I think I would look
19 at those data for the lower Androscoggin too. I'd
20 encourage you to look at those data.
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1 impoundment being constructed, correct?
2 MR. BENNETT: Correct.
3 MR. SCOTT: Now, go back to Shawmut and the
4 Kennebec and the two impoundments, if it's
5 upgraded to a B, that doesn't change the character
6 or the use of those -- existing uses of those
7 dams, correct?
8 MR. BENNETT: Correct.
9 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.
10 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Any other questions?
11 Thank you very much, Nick. Next up is John
12 Burrows. I'd like to point out that we've lost
13 one member of the Board. Dick Gould just left. I
14 was going to say that we're going to be losing
15 another member at 3:00, but I've just been
16 informed that even with fewer than six, we still
have an adequate quorum for proceeding. So much
of our time constraint has been lifted here. That
is not an invitation to speak longer. We still
have to have four as a quorum, and we need to
actually leave here by 4:00. Mr. Burrows.
22 MR. BURROWS: Great. Thank you very much,
Chairman Hilton, Members of the Board. My name is
John Burrows. I am the Maine coordinator for the
Atlantic Salmon Federation. I'm here today to
represent both ASF and our Maine Council, which is
comprised of 20 different angling, conservation
and watershed groups from across the State, and in
the interest of full disclosure, I'm also the new
president of Maine Rivers and you heard Program
Director Landis Hudson beforehand. In my
testimony, I will be both brief and I will try not
to repeat too much of what you have heard already
and try to focus on some of the other proposed
upgrades that have not been mentioned.
The mission of the Salmon Federation is to
promote the conservation and wise management of
the Atlantic salmon and its environment. Here in
Maine we have a membership of about 2,000
individuals between both ASF and our Maine
Council. I will mention briefly our strong
support for the upgrade to the Kennebec River.
Nick spoke very well about the importance of that,
as did Landis before him. For 15 or so years my
organization has worked extremely hard to restore
this river as well as many other groups, agencies
and individuals. The health of the Kennebec today
is just phenomenal compared to what it was just
ten years ago before the Edwards Dam was removed,
and if the water quality has improved, the
fisheries are abundant and growing year by year.
7 backwards and allow degradation to happen, and 8 that's why the proposed upgrades both to the 9 Kennebec from Shawmut -- from the Shawmut Dam down 10 to Waterville as well as the proposed upgrades on 11 some of the tidal tributaries, Cobbossee, Bond 12 Brook, Togus are very important. The lower 13 tributaries are important habitat for wild 14 Atlantic salmon as well as sea run trout and a 15 number of other native diadromous fish species. 16 Protecting those and improving those to Class B is 17 extremely important and certainly well 18 worthwhile. In terms of the main stem Kennebec, 19 I, too, was here six years ago testifying in 20 support of upgrading the entire section from 21 Skowhegan down to Waterville, and I agree with Mr. 22 Bennett that all the data that's out there shows 23 that in terms of dissolved oxygen and aquatic life 24 bacteria that we know that the Kennebec is either 25 meeting those standards or is reasonably expected
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1 to be maintaining those standards, and so 2 upgrading that section to Class B I don't think is 3 an unrealistic goal for the Kennebec River if you 4 say it's not meeting those standards currently, 5 which we do think it is.
6 In addition to other large rivers, I would 7 like to mention the Androscoggin River which 8 you'll be hearing about from other folks more 9 after me. I think, hopefully as everyone on the 10 Board knows, recently the federal services, the 11 Federal fisheries agencies, recommended listing 12 Atlantic salmon in the Androscoggin, Kennebec and 13 Penobscot Rivers as an endangered species under 14 the Federal Endangered Species Act. This 15 certainly has strong implications, not just for 16 dams and land use practices and the watershed but 17 also water quality, and water quality issues were 18 identified by the Federal services as a 19 significant impediment to the Atlantic salmon 20 restoration, and so that's something to be mindful 21 of when thinking about the Kennebec upgrade and 22 also the Androscoggin upgrade because a section of 23 the Androscoggin River from the Durham boat launch 24 down to Merry Meeting Bay was also designated or 25 proposed to be critical habitat for Atlantic
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1 salmon. So that's an extra layer of scrutiny in terms of regulatory processes that anything that happens in that section will have to be looked at and assessed in terms of its impacts. Certainly water quality is one of those major things which will be looked at in the future. So it's my understanding that Friends of Merry Meeting Bay have some data from this section. There's certainly a lot of strong community support for that upgrade, and that's something I hope that the Board will look at carefully and strongly consider.

The only other two things I'll mention are a couple of the smaller rivers, one of which is the Ducktrap River and this is a salmon river which was listed as endangered back in 2000. It's one of the smallest salmon rivers in Maine which was listed at the time, and it has one of the most genetically unique runs of salmon left here in Maine and the U.S. The entire main stem of the Ducktrap is Class AA, and there are several tributaries to that which are proposed to be upgraded to Class A. Certainly the water quality standards are meeting Class A there, and this is an important river and tributaries for both salmon
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1 as well as brook trout, and so we definitely recommend upgrading those tributaries. Finally, I will mention the Souadabscook River. Back ten years ago ASF and our Maine Council removed the grist mill dam on the Souadabscook River in Hamden. Removing this dam opened up the entire watershed to Atlantic salmon, American chad, to river herring and American eel, and now the Souadabscook has the largest run of river herring anywhere in the Penobscot drainage because of that. This is an extremely important tributary for all of those species. Currently all 13 of the river, the main stem of the river above the head of tide is classified as double A, and there are several tributaries being proposed to be upgraded to Class A. These include West Branch
17 and Browns Brook and these are extremely high
18 value habitat for Atlantic salmon and because of
19 that, we support fully upgrading those tributaries
20 as well. That is all I have and I'll be happy to
21 answer any questions.
22 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Yes, Matt.
23 MR. SCOTT: John, you and I spent a lot of
24 time together working in the Downeast rivers and
25 that Endangered Species Act process. My question
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1 for you on the Kennebec, Androscoggin and
2 Penobscot, all three, in your opinion, John, do
3 you think all three would be listed or do you
4 think the Services might consider one over the
5 other?
6 MR. BURROWS: Well, the way they have it
7 set up now, they're recommending adding those
8 three rivers to the existing DPS and the distinct
9 population segment level or DPS is the lowest
10 level that they can list at. They can look below
11 that at certain areas that have different
12 management regimes for, you know, different
13 portions of that broader area, but they can't list
14 the Penobscot, say, threatened and the Kennebec as
15 endangered. All the rivers from the Dennys River
16 down to the Androscoggin have to be the same.
17 They don't have any flexibility to go below that.
18 MR. SCOTT: Well, you recall in the
19 hearings in the process Downeast there was a lot
20 of concern about what this might do to activity,
21 where it's industrial, commercial or individuals.
22 Did you think that sort of activity could still
23 prevail as far as the current activities in those
24 watersheds?
25 MR. BURROWS: I certainly do, and I think
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1 in terms of what happened Downeast, you know, it
2 was very unfortunate that there was a lot of awful
3 rhetoric that happened eight, nine years ago over
4 the listing and fortunately all those dire
5 predictions didn't take place. We certainly have
6 strong businesses and industries down there in
7 terms of forest products, in terms of the
8 aquaculture industry, which is doing much better
9 these days, and the blueberry industry and they
10 got a lot of help and assistance in dealing with
11 some of their long-standing issues which were
12 having a negative impact on the rivers and streams
13 down there. There certainly has been an added
14 layer of what some would call protections, others
15 would say bureaucracies, but as a whole, it
16 certainly has done a good job there, and I think
17 most folks you would talk to that are involved in
18 those industries would say that the listing has
19 not been an economic burden to them. In terms of
20 the larger rivers, you're dealing with much bigger
21 scale problems. These watersheds are much more
22 developed. They have huge development in terms of
23 hydropower. You've got the pulp and paper mills
24 and a lot more municipal dischargers on these
25 rivers. I think all those things will be allowed
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1 to continue to happen. They aren't going to close
2 down the mills and rip out every dam on all these
3 rivers; however, there will have to be some
4 careful consideration and scrutiny given to the
5 level of protections which are currently in place,
6 everything from wastewater licenses to fisheries,
7 passage of dams and other things, and I think it's
8 somewhat uncharted territory and I think it will
9 be interesting to see how it plays out, and our
10 big hope is we don't have the huge controversy
11 which we had last time, we can just move ahead and
12 focus on the restoration because a lot of great
13 work has been done over the past decade or so and
14 hopefully that will continue on these larger
15 rivers.
16 MR. SCOTT: So our decision as far as the
17 upgrades and this process as far as those rivers
18 are concerned would not interfere with the listing
19 process?
20 MR. BURROWS: No, I certainly don't think
21 so. That listing won't be finalized for probably
22 at least a year or so; however, in the future, you
23 know, assuming -- whether or not the rivers are
24 listed as endangered or threatened, there may not
25 be much difference between the two and the rivers
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1 will certainly be listed as one or the other. So
2 in the future when licenses come up for renewal,
3 there will be that added layer of looking at it to
4 make sure the protections and stuff are very
5 adequate. So in terms of reclass in the future, I
6 think there will be much greater pressure put on
7 in terms of making sure that those rivers are
8 meeting higher standards. So anything you can do
9 now to upgrade I think will certainly make the
10 State look much better in that light in the
11 future.
12 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank
13 you, John. I think it was important to have that
14 for the record.
15 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Any other questions for
16 Mr. Burrows? Thank you very much. We have next
17 Dave Jones and then Ed Friedman. Welcome, Mr.
18 Jones.
19 MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
20 Members of the Board, my name is Dave Jones. I'm
21 a resident of Bowdoinham but I work as the
22 director of public services for the City of
23 Lewiston. I'm here to talk to you a little bit
24 about Jepson Brook, and I've got a strong belief
25 that a picture is worth a thousand words and
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1 seeing as we're trying to keep on schedule, I'll
2 use all those thousand words here. This is a map
3 showing what Jepson Brook is, the so-called Jepson
4 Brook. It actually is about a 12,000 linear foot
5 stream, quote, unquote, that goes from Garcelon
6 Bog all the way down through and eventually
7 discharges into the Androscoggin River. Of the
8 12,000 linear feet of stream, about 900 feet of it
9 is natural stream bed from this point to here.
10 From Garcelon Bog all the way down to this point
11 where you see this little yellow dot, it looks
12 like this, all right, basically underground pipe
13 or concrete culverted areas and stuff. So this
14 all started about back in the 1960s. They had a
15 lot of flooding problems in that area. It's
16 generally a residential area, and they went
17 through the whole permitting process and decided
18 the best way to address the issue is to actually
19 put in these open culverts or pipe areas and stuff
20 and they began construction back about in the
21 early 1970s. A little later on around 1972 or 3
22 or 4 or somewhere in that area is when EPA came
23 out and had all the different states actually
24 classify different streams at whatever the
25 classification was. The state didn't have an
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1 opportunity to actually go out and visit every
2 single stream and identify where it was, and there
3 was a lot of streams that were just block
4 classified. Jepson Brook fell into that category
5 and it was automatically classified as a Class B
6 stream. Quite frankly, looking at the stream the
7 way it is, and this was under construction at the
8 time probably, I don't think that the Department
9 would have classified the stream as a Class B as
10 it did if they had actually been able to go out
11 and see it. They didn't have the time to do that
12 obviously. It really wasn't an issue until about
13 four years ago. I got a call and I had a
14 technician from the Department saying that she was
15 trying to gain access to Jepson Brook to do some
16 sampling and she'd never seen a stream like this
17 before and didn't understand what it was that she
18 was looking at, and I said, well, what is it
19 you're trying to do, and she says I'm trying to
20 get some sampling because we're looking at the
21 classifications of the different streams and
22 stuff. That was the first we'd actually heard
23 something about this. It was a year or so later
24 that the urban stream standards came out and now
25 all of a sudden the city is looking at it and
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1 saying, wholly cow, we've got some impacts here
2 and we need to do something about this. So we
3 began talking with the Department at that time,
4 but what I want you to keep in mind is looking at
5 the map and looking at what we're talking about
6 here, keep in mind from here all the way down
7 through to here it looks like this. Okay, that is
8 not a Class B stream. No matter what we do to it
9 it's not going to become a Class B stream unless
10 we take out those sections there, and I don't
11 think that's an economically-feasible action. The
12 Department has looked at and recommended that we
13 do a study to identify what classification we
14 might be able to achieve for that lower 800 or 900
15 feet at least for the river. We support that, and
16 that's all I've got to say.
17 CHAIRMAN HILTON: So how does -- so I take
18 it the storm water drains throughout the city
19 through the -- the drainage just kind of dumps
20 right into the --
21 MR. JONES: Most of the water that actually
22 comes down through here, and Andy Fisk and I
23 actually went to the headwaters and actually
24 watched what was going into the upper reaches,
25 most of the water actually comes out of Garcelon
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1 Bog. Now, Garcelon Bog is about a 180-acre area
2 that's protected by the city. It's pretty unique
3 in that it's right inside kind of the urban part
4 of the city, and it's a protected area of
5 wildlife. We've got deer and fox and all kinds of
6 stuff that run through there, and it does collect
7 storm water from the surrounding areas that feeds
8 in through the bog and then eventually into Jepson
9 Brook, if you will. There are also areas along
10 this stretch here that actually feed in, it's
11 storm water coming through from other areas.
12 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Is your storm water
13 system in that part of the city designed to empty
14 into the stream or into the river?
15 MR. JONES: It -- well, most of the storm
16 water system actually goes into this stream and
17 then eventually gets down to the river.
18 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you. Any other
19 questions? Thank you very much. We're losing
20 another Board member. Mr. Nixon has just left.
21 Ed Friedman. We still have an adequate number
22 here for a quorum for this hearing. Welcome, Ed.
23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
24 Members of the Board. We're down to I think one
25 Board member that I don't recognize now. I'm the
chairman of Friends of Merry Meeting Bay. Most of you know that we've been here a number of times over the last few years regarding safe passage for fish. The recent decision by National Marine Fisheries Service and Fish and Wildlife Service bears out our petition to expand the Atlantic salmon listing and also a subsequent lawsuit aimed at pushing that decision. So it's good to see that the feds are at least backing up some of our safe passage issues, and we're still in Supreme Court here in Maine over some appeals regarding Board decisions. I want to thank all of our volunteer monitors, trained water quality monitors that have made my being here possible and made our proposal possible to upgrade the lower Androscoggin from the vicinity of Durham boat launch on down into Merry Meeting Bay, and I want to thank the municipalities as well for the efforts they've put in and considerable expense they've put in over the years in upgrading their facilities, and it's quite clear from our data that conditions on the river more than meet Class B standards. It's also clear that there is CSO work to be done but that is not -- that does not really have a bearing on your decision here.

Really briefly because most of this stuff has been said, I assume you all have our proposal. I know you've gotten letters of support or will from the Brunswick Town Council, Merry Meeting Audubon, a lot of individuals but from the Maine DEP's own guidelines, when proposing an upgrade in classification recommend waters that either presently attain or with reasonable application of improved treatment or best management practices could reasonably be expected to attain the standards and criteria of a higher proposed class. Well, we're there, we're more than there.

We also have a section -- a quote in our proposal from a Supreme Court case Bangor Hydro v the Board of Environmental Protection 1991 where the key words are classification is goal oriented as
17 required by the Clean Water Act. What that says
18 is that even if you're not exactly there, the
19 point of this whole exercise is to drive up,
20 ratchet up, as Matt said earlier, the quality of
21 our water, and we set a precedent in 2002, our
22 data were used by the DEP and with a proposal of
23 ours to upgrade the lower Kennebec, and we didn't
24 even actually have any bacteria data then but a
25 deal was made with the Augusta Sanitary District
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1 to give them X amount of years to kind of come up
2 to speed there but our DO data were there and
3 backed up that upgrade. I should also say to
4 digress that we do have DO data from Solon,
5 Norridgewock, Skowhegan, Waterville on the
6 Kennebec. We don't have anything like in the
7 middle of the SAPPI impoundment, and those data
8 are all on our Web site now. DEP has them all.
9 I'm assuming that some of the folks here have them
10 as well. I know we have one of our Kennebec
11 monitors here, and probably lastly -- two more
12 points quickly and then I'll let you ask me some
13 questions if you have any, Steve Hinchman brought
14 up the no wastewater business here, use of the
15 water body to receive or transport wastewater
16 discharges is not considered an existing use for
17 purposes of this antidegradation policy and then
18 really the most important, when the actual quality
19 of any classified water exceeds the minimum
20 standards, the next highest classification, that
21 higher water quality must be maintained and
22 protected. The Board shall, not may, shall
23 recommend to the Legislature that that water be
24 reclassified in the next higher classification.
25 And I'll close with saying that brings to mind we

Page 86
1 had a hearing in Auburn a few weeks ago and Nick
2 Bennett and others were there and the DEP members
3 that were there were sort of casting around
4 saying, well, what do you think, what do you feel
5 to the members of the public there, and Nick made
6 the excellent point that it sounded like they were
asking for -- looking for a referendum on water quality, and this is really dictated in statute, and I've just cited, and other people have cited as well, the governing statute here. So I appreciate your taking the time to review our proposal and we support the others as well, the other upgrades. This is a constant effort to ratchet up levels. We were supposed to have no discharge by the mid eighties according to the Clean Water Act and here we are. So I'll be happy to answer any questions for you about data, about protocols. Peter Milholland from Friends of Casco Bay is here. We train and work with them, EPA certified program, and you've used our data before.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Just a second, Ed, did you come in too late to get sworn?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I didn't get sworn in. I signed in. I thought we started at 1:30.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: I think that you and also Mr. Ward, and is there anybody else who came in that has signed in that needs to be sworn in?

Okay, everybody who hasn't been sworn in yet who plans to or has just testified, please raise your right hand. Do you all affirm that the testimony that you either have given or will be giving is the truth?

(Whereupon, witnesses respond in affirmative.)

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Okay. So we'll start with questions and Wing is first.

MR. GOODALE: Maybe it's already in the record but I just want to make sure that the data you've collected is available to us on the Board. We can't go to Web sites and whatnot, so please submit it as part of --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Let me clarify. It's submitted to the DEP. I assume it made its way to you.

MS. BERTOCCI: Not yet.
CHAIRMAN HILTON: It hasn't yet.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, it was -- the proposals went to Susan Davies and I assumed all those proposals would make their way to the BEP.

MR. GOODALE: I want to make sure.

MR. SCOTT: It will eventually.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Susan or Andy, can you assure that that data gets to us?

MR. FISK: Sure, absolutely.

MR. GOODALE: Going along with that is one of the comments is that you did not do a QAPP, quality assurance project plan. I've done that many times myself. To that effect, if you could also include detailed methods on how you collected your data so that I can look at those, that would be helpful.

MR. FRIEDMAN: We can do that, and as I say, we basically come under the Friends of Casco Bay QAPP.

MR. GOODALE: Because that's specifically said, while the Department has no reason to question Friends of Merry Meeting Bay data, it does not have an approved QAPP.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Peter can address that I hope, and I'll be happy to fill in any holes for you and remind you that the Department has used our data before.

MR. GOODALE: Thank you. Finally, however, sampling numbers, sampling locations are insufficient to determine likelihood of attainment of Class B water quality criteria at maximum licensed loads, and if you could just include a reference on what the maximum license loads are so as I look at your data I can --

MR. FRIEDMAN: I would ask that you get that from the Department, if you would. That's a false premise there and I addressed that with the wastewater comment. Wastewater is not to be included in this issue, wastewater discharges, and this frankly is an excuse. It's been used before to essentially set -- and what it does is it sets
an artificial limit on water classification upgrades. Five years, six years in the case of DO data, business as usual, for every discharge on the river we're meeting Class B standards, that tells me that the license limits are set too high.

MR. GOODALE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Nancy?

MS. ZIEGLER: Yeah, I think Wing asked most

17 of the questions I was going to ask. My one question to you is do you believe that having an approved -- I gather that means approved by the Department -- quality assurance project plan is what you need to present in order to do this classification?

MR. FRIEDMAN: No, I don't believe that. We have a very active group, we've been doing it for years, we're well trained. As I say, we work with Friends of Casco Bay, they have an approved QAPP multiple times. If you're going to throw out our data, which you've used before, you're going to throw out their data, it's better than anyone in the State probably, and I would ask you to consider that please.

MR. SCOTT: I wanted to thank Ed for that comment because it goes back to your earlier question, Mr. Hilton, of the use of volunteer data for quality assurance and quality control.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I'd also like to point out if I could that at least more or less the DEP has historically had a plan where they essentially rotate between watersheds once every five years or so, major watersheds. We've got data that's taken monthly from April to October for multiple years. So they are the best data out there. Volunteer data, yeah, there's going to be a glitch here and there as there is with anybody, but these are the
best data out there on both rivers frankly.

Chairman Hilton: So when you say that your data -- the Department has used your data in the past, in what sort of a proceeding? Was it used in a licensing proceeding?

Mr. Friedman: No, in this same proceeding in 2002 we proposed an upgrade for the Kennebec from Augusta down to Abagadasic Point in Merry Meeting Bay.

Chairman Hilton: And they explicitly used your data?

Mr. Friedman: Well, we submitted it and they supported our proposal.

Chairman Hilton: Okay. Wing?

Mr. Goodale: Do you have a report that goes along with the data?

Mr. Friedman: Yeah, there's a proposal.

It's not just raw data, and, again, I apologize, I assumed that all these proposals made their way to you.

Mr. Goodale: Okay, so that summarizes your data?

Mr. Friedman: Yeah.

Mr. Goodale: Will we get those, Andy?

Mr. Fisk: Sure, absolutely.

Mr. Goodale: Great.

Chairman Hilton: I know nothing at all about these QAPPs. Do you know -- have you looked at or how familiar might you be with the QAPP or I can ask --

Mr. Friedman: If you could ask Peter, that would be great. I know we actually started work on our own years ago, and I forget but there was an issue around turbidity or something which isn't part of what we're dealing with here for standards, and we never -- we never actually finished it. Again, we're working with people that have one and we're part of that program.

Mr. Goodale: And you followed their protocol?

Mr. Friedman: Yes. I'll say that they don't do bacteria. They do dissolved oxygen and pH and so do we and so forth, but our bacteria sampling is done using a ColiQuant EZ bacteria
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1 fecal and non-fecal coliform monitoring kit from
2 Lemont, very standard, it's all pre-measured,
3 everything, all you have to do is count the
4 colonies basically, incubate the thing and count
5 the colonies.
6 MR. GOODALE: Thank you.
7 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you, Ed. The next
8 person I have is Neil Ward. I've heard reference
9 to others as perhaps speaking. They need to sign
10 in if they haven't already.
11 MR. WARD: Chairman Hilton, Members of the
12 Board,
13 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Neil, just a second.
14 Peter, beyond you, is there anyone else who is
15 going to be speaking? Have you signed in, sir?
16 And who else? Okay, and you've signed in, all
17 right, good. It looks like we have four more
18 speakers.
19 MR. WARD: Chairman Hilton, Members of the
20 Board, thank you for this opportunity to speak.
21 My name is Neil Ward, I'm program director for the
22 Androscoggin River Alliance. I didn't think I
23 would be back before this Board quite as quickly
24 as this, but I did want to thank the Board for
25 moving our river forward following the last
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1 hearings on the Androscoggin.
2 As I said, I'm the program director for the
3 Androscoggin River Alliance and I'm speaking on
4 their behalf. We're asking that you approve the
5 petition filed by Friends of Merry Meeting Bay to
6 upgrade the lower Androscoggin for two reasons;
7 first, as a matter of law; and, second, as a
8 matter of public responsibility. The reasons the
9 Department gives for not recommending upgrading do
10 not stand up to legal scrutiny. The Department
11 says that it must decide whether the river could
12 meet Class B standards if the sources upstream
13 emitting all the pollution into the river --
14 excuse me -- emitting all the pollution that their
15 permits allow but Maine law sets a different
16 standard, not maximum license loads at low flow
17 but actual conditions of the river today. There's no need for more modeling about the mills and other sources. The best available data says that the lower Androscoggin does currently meet Class B standards, and the Department says that it has no reason to question Friends of Merry Meeting Bay's data. Second, we should upgrade as a matter of public responsibility. The Department's written explanation of the reclassification process says,
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1 quote, upgrades of classifications are appropriate where it is socially and economically desirable to attain higher standards. We have data shared with the agency last week that indicates that an upgrade is clearly desirable. Over the last year, 35 Bowdoin College students surveyed parents and students in high schools from Brunswick, Topsham, Lisbon, Lewiston/Auburn and Rumford, 960 people answered the survey, and I will get you the survey. I didn't bring it with me, but I will make sure you get a copy of the survey. The survey indicates that people think the lower Androscoggin River is dirtier than it actually is, that large numbers use the river anyways, and that they agree the river should become cleaner, 38 percent rate the river in poor health and another 38 percent in fair health. People do think the river is important to their communities, 51 percent say it's important to their communities because it makes their towns a nicer place to live, and 41 percent say the river is important because it's useful for industry. Whichever the reason they give, that the river makes the towns nicer places or that it helps industry, they want the same future for their river. Even though they think the river is not in good health, they still use the river actively, 32 percent of respondents fish, boat or swim in the river. Sadly, students are less optimistic about the river. They're less likely to think the river is very important to their communities or to make their communities
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1 think the river is not in good health, they still use the river actively, 32 percent of respondents fish, boat or swim in the river. Sadly, students are less optimistic about the river. They're less likely to think the river is very important to their communities or to make their communities
7 nicer places to live. They also use the river
8 less than the adults. This data clearly says, to
9 use the Department's words, it is socially
10 desirable and appropriate to upgrade the lower
11 Androscoggin.
12 The Board and the Department have it within
13 their power to change public perception about the
14 lower Androscoggin. You have it in your hands to
15 encourage people to use the existing trails and
16 boat launches along the river, build more trails,
17 boat launches and parks, make prudent investments
18 in businesses along the river corridor and
19 continue our efforts to clean up the remaining
20 sources of pollution. If you look at the Clean
21 Water Act, you see that the process of upgrading
22 is designed to direct you to do this precise
23 thing. The law says that if the river can meet
24 higher standards, the Department must upgrade it.
25 Upgrading will not take jobs away from the mills
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1 up river. The river already meets Class B
2 standards. Upgrading, however, will create jobs
3 in Lewiston/Auburn, Lisbon, Durham, Topsham and
4 Brunswick.
5 You can take credit for the good work that
6 you, the towns, the mill, the Legislature, the
7 Department and others have done to clean up the
8 river so far. There's more to do, of course, but
9 we are making progress. Please encourage the
10 Department to change their position on
11 reclassifying the lower Androscoggin, and if it's
12 too late to do that, please vote to support
13 upgrading the river, and we look forward to
14 working with the Department and the Board and the
15 Legislature to make our river cleaner and an
16 economic asset for our communities, and also on
17 behalf of the board of selectmen and the residents
18 of the town of Durham, they have asked me to
19 submit their letter of support in reclassifying
20 the river, and you will receive other letters
21 before the comment period closes. Thank you.
22 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you, Mr. Ward. Any
23 questions? Thank you. Next we have Richard
24 Lawrence and then Richard Kelly.
25 MR. LAWRENCE: Thank you. I appreciate the
1 opportunity to speak to you today. I'm a former
2 selectman from Benton. I was a selectman for 18
3 years.
4 MS. ZIEGLER: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear
5 that.
6 MR. LAWRENCE: I'm sorry, I'm a former
7 selectman from Benton. I've been a selectman 18
8 of the last 30 years there, and Benton, as you may
9 know, is on the east side of the Kennebec River.
10 It's the rural side, and we span the Shawmut Dam
11 both up and down stream and also down to our
12 neighbor Winslow, and so we have a great interest
13 in seeing an upgrade to the Kennebec in that
14 stretch. As I say, we're on the rural side. I've
15 been there for 40 years, and in that time I've
16 seen a real change, a change from when the river
17 was brown with bark and logs and you couldn't see
18 anything but the brownness of the water. That's
19 changed. Back then nobody would think of swimming
20 in the river. Most people if they had any luck
21 lived somewhere else. The river smelled and it
22 wasn't a pleasant sight. The people -- the
23 creatures that enjoyed it were the snapping
24 turtles because they could catch ducks from
25 underneath without the ducks even seeing them as
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1 they rose up. Well, nowadays there are a lot of
2 fish there, a lot of fishermen there. The river
3 is beautiful. When you cross the bridges from
4 Benton to Fairfield you can see boaters, swimmers,
5 the water quality is great, and it's a visually
6 stunning change. I'm not speaking from the
7 science. I think you heard that from others. I'm
8 also bringing greetings from Peter Garrett who has
9 established the Kennebec Messalonskee Trail which
10 now runs from Benton to Winslow and from Oakland
11 to Waterville, a 23-mile long trail system. It
12 wouldn't have been conceivable 30 or 40 years ago
13 that they would do this. You walk along this
14 trail and you feel as though you're in the
15 wilderness or you're in nature. You can look
16 across it to the urban parts of Fairfield and
17 Waterville but you have a feeling that this river
18 has changed, and I think we can celebrate that and
19 I hope part of the celebration will be
20 reclassifying this river. Thank you very much.
21 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Questions? Mr. Lawrence,
22 I've got one question and that is, right there
23 where the bridges cross from Fairfield to Benton
24 is that a free flowing stretch or is there an
25 impoundment right there?
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1 MR. LAWRENCE: It's free flowing there, 
2 although I suppose the impoundment from Waterville
3 may affect that area. To the island there's
4 always a lot of water moving there.
5 CHAIRMAN HILTON: How far above there is it
6 to the Shawmut Dam?
7 MR. LAWRENCE: The Shawmut Dam, I'd say
8 about two miles and then Benton extends about a
9 mile above the Shawmut Dam to Clinton.
10 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Yup.
11 MR. LAWRENCE: A beautiful stretch, lots of
12 farms, farms that were there from the late 1700s
13 and they're still operating today, although
14 they're milking 800 cows instead of 20.
15 CHAIRMAN HILTON: I come from that area.
16 Thank you very much.
17 MR. LAWRENCE: Thank you.
18 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Mr. Kelly.
19 MR. KELLY: Mr. Chairman, Commission, I'm
20 here representing the Friends of the Basin which
21 is the other major group which represents the
22 other owners of the shore of the Basin for which
23 the Maine Nature Conservancy owns a large portion
24 of the Basin, and just to express our wholehearted
25 enthusiasm and support for upgrading the
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1 classification of the Basin. I'm also the
2 resident agent for the Brightwater Corporation
3 which owns approximately a mile and a half of the
4 basin both in the area of the basin itself in the
5 Narrows. I can also say that that is a part of --
6 that group is a part of the Friends of the Basin
and it's really 21 families that have been part of the summer community in Maine since 1925. If some of you have never been in the Basin, it's one of the most remarkable little pieces of estuary on the Maine Coast. It has been used by generations for yachts that come in and up along the coast and if you come in on a summer's afternoon at 3:00 and look into the water as they come into the Basin, the yachts will come in, 25, 30, 40 on a busy weekend. It's known in all of the cruising guides in New England as one of the most remarkable spots for coming in. It's as though you're in an inland lake. It also has many archeological sites of considerable value. It's been inhabited by people for over 6,000 years, and we're just the present custodians and feel thrilled that the Nature Conservancy has acquired this large tract of land and we support the upgrade completely, and if any of you would like to come visit the Basin, give me a call next spring. My outboard died so it's at the shop over in East Vassalboro right now getting repaired but next year I'd be glad to take anybody who wants to go for a ride who hasn't been there. So it's a great spot and my testimony is not technical. It comes from -- my first visit was in 1937. So I know pretty much all of it. I've taken two wives on canoeing trips there.

Chairman Hilton: Not at the same time I hope.

Mr. Lawrence: It works every time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Hilton: I have one question or a couple. One is, I'm looking at this little chart.

Mr. Kelly: Yes.

Chairman Hilton: And is the Nature Conservancy's preserve is that to the south and the east? Is that where it's located?

Mr. Kelly: I can show you -- kind of from here it's kind of hard to say. If you come into the basin, they own a portion of land that fronts on the New Meadows just below Sebasco and before the Narrows which is the entrance to the basin.

They do not own the land which is in the
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1 entrance. Brightwater is on the south side of the
2 entrance and a private family owns the portion on
3 the left side. This is a little larger and so you
4 can see that the area -- the Basin itself is right
5 here and we're talking about, as I understand --
6 I'm not exactly sure where the exact border is but
7 we're trying to include the entrance because
8 that's where a great deal of the water comes in
9 and out twice a day, and the basin itself, this is
10 the Brightwater section and then this part is
11 owned by the Nature Conservancy and private owners
12 here who also have -- who are part of the Friends
13 of the Basin who were very much committed to
14 maintaining the water quality and the natural
15 appearance of the environment.
16 CHAIRMAN HILTON: From what I can gather,
17 everything you see there that's brown is part of
18 the Nature Conservancy?
19 MR. KELLY: Is the Nature Conservancy.
20 This is Brightwater which has its own internal
21 protection in terms of development. This land
22 here has no specific developments but it doesn't
23 have a right-of-way to allow electricity to get in
24 there.
25 CHAIRMAN HILTON: You say there's no
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1 development there at all now?
2 MR. KELLY: There are three small cottages
3 owned by one family, a local Phippsburg family,
4 who are very nice people. I'm not being critical
5 of them when I say that.
6 CHAIRMAN HILTON: And where is your group?
7 Your group is the Brightwater section?
8 MR. KELLY: Brightwater is here. Our
9 cottage is right here built in 1930.
10 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you very much. Any
11 other questions for Mr. Kelly? Matt.
12 MR. SCOTT: Just a comment, Mr. Kelly. You
13 don't have to be technical, Mr. Kelly. Anecdotal
14 comments are appreciated. We're a citizen board
15 and we represent all the citizens.
16 MR. KELLY: Okay, thank you.
CHAIRMAN HILTON: Our final speaker unless someone else wants to is Peter Milholland, Friends of Casco Bay. Welcome.

MR. MILHOLLAND: Good afternoon, Board. I hadn't had anything prepared to speak to you today but I would like to be in support of two of the proposals, one that is the proposal for the Basin for the upgrade, and the other is for the Androscoggin by Friends of Merry Meeting Bay.

I can speak a bit about the Basin. Friends of Casco Bay is an organization that has supported the work by Friends of the Basin. In fact, a number of the volunteers who live within the Basin have been volunteers for Friends of Casco Bay. We have an organization that runs a water quality monitoring program that we're now in our 16th year of monitoring the health of Casco Bay. Over the years we've had over 116 water quality stations in the bay and the data that is collected by both volunteers and staff is EPA approved with a quality assurance project plan called QAPP. The QAPP that's been approved for Friends of Casco Bay has gone through three iterations now with EPA and it really spells out the structure of the program soup to nuts really for the whole program, how the volunteers collect the water quality data, how they're trained, how they're retrained, how the kits and supplies within the kit are quality assured, what their expiration dates are and so on. It's really quite an arduous process to go through writing a QAPP with EPA, but we feel at Friends of Casco Bay that it's a very important process to do because data that gets collected by volunteers has credibility to it, it has some teeth, it has been used in a number of occasions in Casco Bay.

To speak on behalf of Friends of Merry Meeting Bay, I have personally trained a number of their volunteers. We've been collaborating on water quality work that Friends of Merry Meeting
Bay has done for nine years now, and their
volunteers are trained side by side with our
nine volunteers. They're also run through a pretty
rigorous quality assurance session that we hold
every year which is a retraining for volunteers to
make sure that, again, their kits are up to date,
all the equipment works, we have them go through
various stations where we know the sort of answers
to the processes that they're supposed to do their
-- supposed to measure temperature and salinity,
they do a dissolved oxygen test in our presence,
and we validate the tests that they do and we
compare their results to what our results are or
our known sort of standards, so to speak, and we
have sort of a leeway that we give them. They
need to fall within a certain criteria and pass,
and for nine years now volunteers for Friends
Merry Meeting Bay have passed quite well. I have
worked with members of Friends of Merry Meeting
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1 Bay over the years to develop a QAPP for their
2 organization. It's been in process for a few
3 years. I know material has been submitted to EPA
4 for their QAPP. I believe at the moment it's
5 still in process or may not have been worked on.
6 Due to the nature of people who come in and go out
7 of organizations, somebody may have been working
8 on it for a while and sort of dropped the ball at
9 one point and have not been working on it. Again,
10 it is quite a process to deal with EPA. So I
11 guess I'm here to answer any of your questions
12 regarding water quality issues or QAPPS or any of
13 that kind.
14 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Yes, Mr. Goodale.
15 MR. GOODALE: At the risk of more
16 paperwork, knowing how QAPPS can be having written
17 one myself, could you submit that as part of your
18 testimony for part of our record?
19 MR. MILHOLLAND: QAPP for Friends of Casco
20 Bay?
21 MR. GOODALE: Yes, the QAPP that Friends of
22 Merry Meeting Bay is following.
23 MR. MILHOLLAND: Yes, that can be done
24 easily enough.
25 MR. GOODALE: Great, and do you have the
same confidence in Friends of Merry Meeting Bay's data as you do in your own?

MR. MILHOLLAND: I do, absolutely. The volunteers that have been collecting data in the sections of the Androscoggin River have been doing it for many years. We have records that go back to when they've been recertified by us and with Friends of Merry Meeting Bay and have quite good confidence with their data.

MR. GOODALE: I haven't done DO sampling for quite some time, but as I recall, it's not terribly complicated. It's fairly simple sampling?

MR. MILHOLLAND: Actually, it can be quite complicated. What the volunteers do is called a Winkler titration test and, Winkler titration is a chemical process that measures dissolved objection in the water. The accuracy of the Winkler titration is quite good, in fact, a lot of researchers, Friends of Casco Bay included, use a Winkler test to calibrate instruments that are $10,000 to $15,000 pieces of equipment. So it's really the gold standard for measuring dissolved oxygen.

MR. GOODALE: I did those in high school.

You just reminded me of that.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: Any questions? I've got one. I'm curious as to when you go through this training process with these volunteer monitors, do they as individuals get certified?

MR. MILHOLLAND: They as individuals are under sort of our QAPP policy with EPA, so to speak. They go through certification with us, they have to come in, go through all the procedures for restocking equipment, they go through various stations that get -- their results need to be compared to our results within a certain limitation. There's no sort of paper certification necessarily that we give them, but we do submit their names and dates to EPA when called upon if there's any question of data. We
17 do have records of our volunteers, again, who have
18 been sampling in the Basin as well as Friends of
19 Merry Meeting Bay who have gone through that
20 process for several years.
21 CHAIRMAN HILTON: And does the VLMP have
22 the same sort of process, the same sort of a QAPP,
23 do you know?
24 MR. MILHOLLAND: I don't know.
25 CHAIRMAN HILTON: It strikes me that Casco
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1 Bay -- Friends of Casco Bay is sort of -- could
2 act as sort of like a parent so you could actually
3 bring any number of people in underneath your QAPP
4 it sounds like.
5 MR. MILHOLLAND: Provided that they follow
6 the guidelines that we set forth in our program
7 and that they go through retrainings and we
8 document how well they've done. Certainly that
9 could happen.
10 CHAIRMAN HILTON: So there is sort of a
11 certification process. I mean, there's this
12 training that you folks supervise as to both your
13 people and other people, Friends of Merry Meeting
14 Bay, Friends of Casco Bay?
15 MR. MILHOLLAND: Yup.
16 CHAIRMAN HILTON: So would there be -- can
17 you see any reason why the data collected by the
18 Merry Meeting Bay people would be less trustworthy
19 than others?
20 MR. MILHOLLAND: No, not at all. I mean,
21 in all essence, members of Friends of Merry
22 Meeting Bay who have been doing sampling follow
23 the same protocol with the exception of fecal
24 coliform because we do not collect fecal coliform
25 data, but dissolved oxygen and temperature and so

ALLEY & MORRISETTE REPORTING SERVICE
207-495-3900

Page 111
1 on, you know, the protocol is identical. They use
2 our protocol so I have no issue with their data.
3 CHAIRMAN HILTON: And just so I'm clear, so
4 the QAPP process is an EPA process?
5 MR MILHOLLAND: It's an EPA process. There
6 is a representative now at DEP that can read and
7 review QAPPs, but for many years it was a process
8 that dealt through the organization and a
9 representative at the EPA Quality Assurance Office
10 and we continue to work with EPA since we have a
11 relationship with them.
12 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Why is it so -- is it, in
13 fact, difficult for an organization to get a QAPP
14 certification? I mean, it sounds like you just
15 rubber stamp -- I shouldn't say rubber stamp --
16 but if Merry Meeting Bay is just going to take
17 yours, change the title on it and submit it and
18 showed that they were capable of following through
19 on it, wouldn't that be --
20 MR. MILHOLLAND: That's a good question.
21 The QAPP involves more than just the procedures
22 and methods and collecting the data. It really is
23 a document that talks about the whole organization
24 and your approach to collecting the data but also
25 how you quality assure that data, how the data
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1 gets handled once it's collected, what type of
2 database is it and how are there checks and
3 balances performed on that data. It's really kind
4 of a road map for the whole procedure that the
5 organization approaches towards doing that data
6 collection. Again, we've worked with friends of
7 Merry Meeting Bay to develop a QAPP for their
8 organization and, again, it's in process. I know
9 for Friends of Casco Bay it was a two-year process
10 from when we started collecting data until we
11 actually got approval from EPA. There's a real
12 give and take with EPA quality assurance officers
13 to really validate your QAPP.
14 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you very much. Any
15 other questions? Yes, Matt.
16 MR. SCOTT: Yeah, Ernie, a follow-up with
17 Wing's question, Peter, since you mentioned the
18 titration method, the Winkler method in
19 particular, I assume you're very familiar with the
20 standard methods?
21 MR. MILHOLLAND: Yes.
22 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you very much. Is
23 there anyone else who wanted to speak before us?
24 I see two more people. I need to have you sign in
25 and if the other gentleman would also come down
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1 and sign in. Do you both affirm that everything
2 you're going to testify to will be the truth?
3 (Witnesses respond in the affirmative.)
4 MR. PONTE: Good afternoon, Board and
5 Chairman. My name is Greg Ponte. I live in West
6 Gardiner. I'm an avid angler, a member of Trout
7 Unlimited here in Maine. I've spent quite a bit
8 of time on the Kennebec and the Crooked and the
9 Androscoggin that we're talking about. There will
10 be data that was sent in that you will see
11 obviously that's been discussed today, but I'm
12 also in favor of Skowhegan down to Waterville, and
13 five years ago I attended a public meeting on the
14 Scribner's Mills. I went in on the mill site on
15 the west side of the river and at that time was
16 the first time it was approached that the Hatch
17 family was going to try to rebuild a dam, and
18 since that time there's been an application and
19 for some reason Dana Murch I feel has been sitting
20 on it since February for whatever reason. There's
21 been a lot of comments sent back and forth on this
22 particular proposal, but I just want to mention
23 one thing and, that is, I visited also the
24 Bolsters Mill site which was done primarily by the
25 White family right there in the Harrison section
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1 of the area, and they built the first rock ramp
2 here in Maine on that site. The Region A ripped
3 out the dam and the locals wanted to keep that
4 small little impoundment so they put a rock ramp
5 in, but it's a unique rock ramp because even
6 during a drought year the water actually goes
7 underneath the ramp instead of over the ramp so it
8 actually has fish passage all the time. The only
9 comment I'll make about that Scribner's Mills spot
10 is, in essence, there's a dam there already. If
11 you look at it, it's not a natural site, meaning
12 when they put the bridge in and they put in the
13 pen stock that goes over to this facility that's
14 there, they already narrowed up this river. So
15 when they want to put this dam back in, they're
16 basically trying to put a dam underneath the
bridge. The bridge has got two abutments to get over and then they filled this in. So if you'd looked at this place back in the 1700s the river would have been wider there. That's just something to consider. There's already a narrow constriction there already. So to me, putting a more narrow constriction is just going to lead into an impoundment that warm water species will just have a great ability to take any small fry that are in the river of the landlock and that's basically all. I just wanted to bring up that point about the -- because I didn't hear anybody talk about Scribner's that actually talked about the site itself, and the DEP has all the plans on that particular site that they're evaluating to this day. I don't know when they're going to come up with a decision. I'm just surprised that here we are eight months or seven months later and we're still waiting to hear something about this. If you have any questions, you can ask.

Chairman Hilton: Any questions? Yes, Matt.

Mr. Scott: Greg, for the Board, would you tell the Board your long-standing position and expertise with Trout Unlimited? I think we should know.

Mr. Ponte: Let's see, where do I start? I'm a lifetime member of Trout Unlimited, former chair of the Maine Council of Trout Unlimited, current New England Embrace-A-Stream grant so, for example, this year I'm going to Tampa, Florida, I just found this out. For the last four years I've represented New England. So if anybody wants to do a grant and receive Trout Unlimited money, they have to get the straight-face test from me in November. If they can't convince me, they sure as hell are not going to convince my friends from Alaska, Wyoming, Colorado, et cetera. It's just not going to work. So that means if you're in Connecticut or Vermont or wherever, so last year...
we were able to award $20,000 to Inland Fisheries and Wildlife to Mary Gallagher in the research division, also $10,000 went to the Batten kill and for the last -- oh, since I've been involved with it for four years representing New England, we've been able to get at least $10,000 to $20,000 here in Maine. We also got an additional $10,000 in Orland on Hot Hole Brook because they needed to release $78,000 of NRCS money but they needed private money and we finally was able to get them 10 grand which freed up the 78 grand. That's just in the last year alone. I could go back all over the state, Depot Brook in southern Maine, Sunday River, South Bog Stream, Sandy River, you get the idea. Let's see, past president of Kennebec Valley Trout Unlimited.

CHAIRMAN HILTON: You need to slow down a little bit.
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1 Trout Camp, 12 kids, we pick 12 kids with LL Bean and Patagonia.
3 MR. SCOTT: I think that's good.
4 MR. PONTE: You get the idea. Also a government -- no, Governor appointee of the Capital Riverfront Improvement District here in Augusta. I'm the only person on the environmental side of that. It's the only -- the CRID board is the only entity by the Legislature that was created. When Edwards Dam was taken out, they started a 15-person board and most of the people on this board are by position, senators, representatives of the area, meaning Augusta, of course, the city manager and people like that. There's a few people like myself appointed by the Governor to be on the board. I've been retired for nine years for the Merchant Marine and I fish a lot.
19 MR. SCOTT: I've got one other question.
20 Frances Brodigan's name was brought up during this hearing process today, and Frances was on television this morning with the Asian Coy. Any concerns about that being spread, say, in these training systems that we're talking about classification?
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1 MR. PONTE: Well, as you well know, Matt,
2 the coy is a carp, and we've got grass carp in the
3 Kennebec since the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
4 decided in the late 1800s to stick carp -- they
5 were stuck in 16 counties in Maine, only two have
6 them, Sagadahoc and Kennebec, and they're both in
7 the Kennebec. I don't think any of them have
8 reached the upper part. I don't know if anybody
9 has caught one in Waterville. I know you did a
10 lot of studies down in south Gardiner which seemed
11 to be like the strong pothole for carp, if you
12 wanted carp, go to south Gardiner. I'm not sure
13 what the impact would be. It seemed like somebody
14 must have drained their aquarium. I know people
15 prize these fish. I'm surprised that coy was
16 actually -- when I turned on the news this morning
17 there was my friend Frances with this coy. It
18 really surprised me because people pay a lot of
19 money for these fish and so I'm just surprised. I
20 mean, I've known like Colby College and other ones
21 who have a little pond, Bates College, when the
22 kids are going home for the summer, they'll throw
23 them in the local puddle. Those are different
24 because they're contained, but I know the
25 Department has a policy to go in there and kill
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1 them, no questions asked. So this will be quite
2 interesting. The good news is the coy is really a
3 bright-colored fish. It reminds me of some of the
4 weird fish I've seen in the southern states where
5 they take certain trout and mix them all up and
6 you end up with this white rainbow. I mean, it's
7 kind of weird but that's the only thing we have in
8 our favor is this fish is like bright orange, but
9 once they start disturbing the water column, they
10 will create havoc for everything else in that
11 pond, to say the least.
12 CHAIRMAN HILTON: Thank you very much, and
13 finally we have Lawrence Faiman I think it is.
14 MR. FAIMAN: Yes, thank you, Lawrence
15 Faiman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the
16 Board. I really didn't expect --
CHAIRMAN HILTON: You might want to just spell your last name for the record.

MR. FAIMAN: My name is Lawrence Faiman, F-A-I-M-A-N, and I'm the president of the Androscoggin River Alliance. I didn't intend to speak today, but just being here and witnessing the enthusiasm shown by so many people, I felt the need just to say a couple of words, especially in light of the words that the gentleman said about it being a citizens board and you accept citizen comments. I'm not a technical person, but I am extremely interested in seeing the upgrade of the Androscoggin as proposed. I'm not a native of the area. I've been associated with the area for many years. My wife is a native, and she had a school reunion this summer and the people at the reunion -- the reunion was right on the Androscoggin River, and the people were talking about the river back when and the change between then and now. It's remarkable what the people were saying, and the improvement in the river is also remarkable. As you probably know, there has been literally millions of dollars spent on the improvement of the river. The Lewiston/Auburn Wastewater Treatment Facility has spent upwards of 13 million dollars thus far improving their sewer overflows into the river. They are on line to complete that project within the next two or three years. Our organization in anticipation of this hearing has met with representatives of cities all along the river from within the area that's being proposed for the upgrade. Each of those cities was extremely enthusiastic about accomplishing the upgrade. As Mr. Ward indicated a few minutes ago, I think he submitted a letter from the town of Durham, we expect to have letters from Topsham, Brunswick, Lisbon, which will be submitted to you. Each of these from the heads of -- the chairman of the boards of those cities indicating their enthusiastic support for your recommendation.
For upgrade. From my viewpoint, again, being fairly new to the area, it's readily apparent that people see the Androscoggin as the lifeblood of their communities, and they are just anxious to have this river improved. I think that the upgrade of the river will provide a stimulus to them which will give them the impetus and momentum to work toward improving what they see as the lifeblood passing through their cities and will give them the ability to market their areas as an environment which will provide their citizens with an improved economic lifestyle and the ability to generate economic benefits from this river which for so long has literally been shunned by the communities. I think that they foresee right now that the time is at hand to allow this river to become, as was mentioned earlier, what Edmund Muskie had foreseen that it could be, and I'm just speaking from the heart.
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Again, I'm not a technical person but I do sincerely appreciate your time and hope that you will take into consideration what the previous speakers have said concerning the Androscoggin and recommend the upgrade.

**CHAIRMAN HILTON:** Thank you, Mr. Faiman.

**MR. FAIMAN:** Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN HILTON:** Questions? Seeing none, thank you very much. There being no one else who wishes to speak, I think we've come to the end of our speakers' list and I would declare the hearing closed.

(Whereupon, the above-named hearing was concluded at 3:45 p.m.)
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