STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT COMMISSION ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS AND CLASSIFICATIONS REGULATIONS

TRIENNIAL REVIEW

15A NCAC 02B .0200

Public Hearings

November 19, 2013
Archdale Bldg, Ground Floor Hearing Room,
512 N. Salisbury Street,
Raleigh, NC

July 15, 2014
Archdale Bldg, Ground Floor Hearing Room,
512 N. Salisbury Street,
Raleigh, NC

July 16, 2014
Statesville Civic Center,
300 South Center Street,
Statesville, NC

***NC Register*:** Publication of Proposed Text
Volume 28, Issue 24, pp 3004-3032
June 16th, 2014

Table of Contents

		Page
SECTION I:	**INTRODUCTION**	**3**
SECTION II:	**BACKGROUND**	**3**
SECTION III:	**SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS**	**5**
SECTION IV:	**FISCAL ANALYSIS PROCESS AND SUMMARY**	**7**
SECTION V:	**PUBLIC HEARINGS SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS**	**8**
SECTION VI:	**HEARING OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**	**9**
SECTION VII:	**PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS**	**13**
SECTION VIII:	**ITEMS FOR STAFF REVIEW – NEXT TRIENNIAL**	**57**

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

ATTACHMENT A: ***NC REGISTER*-NOTICE OF TEXT/ PUBLIC HEARINGS**

ATTACHMENT B: EMC CERTIFICATION OF ADHERANCE TO NC G.S. 150B 19.1

ATTACHMENT C: HEARING OFFICER'S LETTER OF APPOINTMENT

ATTACHMENT D: HEARING OFFICER'S REMARKS

ATTACHMENT E: LIST OF INDIVIDUALS ATTENDING THE PUBLIC HEARINGS

ATTACHMENT F: SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS

ATTACHMENT G: WRITTEN COMMENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

This report is the official record of proceedings related to the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Division of Water Resources (NC DWR) proposal to revise the water quality standards in 15A North Carolina Administrative Code (NCAC) 02B .0200. This report includes written comments received during the public comment period, relevant exhibits, and the final recommendation of the hearing officer as to the proposed revisions to the "Procedures for the Assignment of Water Quality Standards" for consideration by the North Carolina Environmental Management Commission (EMC).

II. BACKGROUND

Every three years the State is required by the federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act or CWA) to review its surface water quality standards and classifications to determine if any changes are needed and, if necessary, to enact those changes. This review process is known as the "Triennial Review." In addition, as part of the Triennial Review, the CWA mandates a review of any variances to surface water quality standards that have been issued by the state. The State of North Carolina held a scoping Public Hearing in Raleigh NC on November 19, 2013 and written comments were accepted, in accordance with the North Carolina Administrative Procedures Act, until the close of the public comment period (January 10, 2014). Mr. Steve Tedder, Environmental Management Commission member and Chairman of the Water Quality Committee of the EMC served as the appointed Hearing Officer. Comments from all parties were considered and reviewed for potential modifications to 15A NCAC 02B regulations. Although submitted comments were varied, most voiced support of modifying and updating the water quality standards to maintain, preserve and protect North Carolina's surface waters.

On March 13, 2014, Mr. Tedder presented recommendations to the EMC for NC Division of Water Resources (NC DWR) staff to evaluate as they drafted proposed changes to the surface water standards in the 15A NCAC 02B regulations. The full report of that public

hearing and the Hearing Officer's recommendations can be found at the following link: http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/emc/march-13-2014

Using the recommendations presented by the Hearing Officer, proposed revisions to the 15A NCAC 02B regulations were drafted by NC DWR staff and presented, along with the accompanying fiscal note required by NC General Statutes (NC G.S.) 150B, to the Water Quality Committee and the full Environmental Management Commission on May 7th and 8th, 2014, respectively.

A record of those proceedings is located at: http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/emc/may-7-2014-wqc and http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/emc/may-8-2014.

Following EMC approval on May 8th, 2014, in accordance with NC General Statutes, Chapter 143-214.1, 143-215.3(a) and 150B, a public notice, containing the proposed amendments and the fiscal note was published in the June 16, 2014 edition of the *North Carolina Register*. (Attachment A or NC REGISTER June 16 2014 . The public hearing announcement was also mailed electronically to all individuals on the DWR Rulemaking Listserve. Additional notice to the public was provided through the Department and Division's websites and a press release was issued by NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources:

- DENR's searchable *Proposed Rules* website (http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/guest/rules),
- DWR's searchable *Proposed Rules* website (http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wq/rules),
- EMC's website under *DENR's Proposed Rules* (http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/emc/),
- DENR's Public Event Calendar (http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/guest/event-calendar).

III. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

The proposed rule text, as published in the *NC Register*, is located in Attachment A (NC REGISTER June 16 2014). The proposed changes to the rules were formatted in accordance with NC Office of Administrative Hearings regulations and comprise the State's Triennial Review of Surface Water Quality Standards. The proposals would implement the following summarized changes to the surface water quality standards for North Carolina:

1) Based on revised US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) research, new health information is available for 2,4 D (a chlorophenoxy herbicide). When implemented, the standard will lower the applicable acceptable human health protective concentration.

2) Updated aquatic life protective concentrations for Arsenic, Beryllium, Cadmium, Chromium III, Chromium VI, Copper, Lead, Nickel, Silver and Zinc are proposed. The revisions reflect the latest scientific knowledge regarding the effects of the pollutants on aquatic organisms. With the exception of Mercury and Selenium, which are both bioaccumulative metals, the state proposes changing from the historical use of Total Recoverable Metals to Dissolved Metal water quality standards. The dissolved fraction more closely estimates the portion of the metal that is toxic to aquatic life. The revised criteria reflect average concentrations that can be present in a water body, but should not result in unacceptable effects to aquatic organisms and the designated use of the water body on both a shorter (acute) and a longer (chronic) term basis.

3) Where metals toxicity to freshwater aquatic life is hardness-dependent, equation-based criterion are proposed. Hardness-dependent metals standards shall be derived using the equations with actual instream hardness in the range of 25 mg/L to 400 mg/L. For National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting purposes, the instream applicable hardness values are defined using the median of instream hardness data collected within the local US Geological Survey and Natural Resources Conservation Service 8-digit Hydrologic Unit. With the exception of Mercury and

Selenium, the proposals allow careful consideration of aquatic life biological integrity for water quality assessment purposes.

4) Variances from applicable standards, revisions to water quality standards, or site-specific water quality standards may be granted by the EMC on a case-by-case basis pursuant to NC GS 143-215.3(e), 143-214.3 or 143-214.1. For metals standards, the proposed language detailed that alternative site-specific standards can be developed when studies are designed in accordance with the "Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition" published by the US EPA (EPA 823-B-94-005a). The mechanisms outlined in the US EPA publication are for the “Water Effect Ratio”, the “Recalculation Procedure”, and the “Resident Species Procedure”. The EMC specifically sought, in the *NC Register* publication, comment on the application of these provisions with respect to modifying the metals criteria.

5) The water quality standards for Iron and Manganese are proposed for removal from the regulations. Both chemicals are federally designated “non-priority pollutants”. The standard for Total Chromium is also proposed for removal, but is replaced by human health and aquatic life protective standards for Chromium III and Chromium VI.

6) Codify the use of 1Q10 stream flows for implementation of proposed acute water quality standards in NPDES permitting and allow the use of the median instream hardness values collected within the local US Geological Survey and Natural Resources Conservation Service 8-digit Hydrologic Unit when calculating permit limits based on proposed hardness-dependent metals standards.

7) The public had the opportunity to comment on three variances from surface water quality standards and federal Clean Water Act Section 316(a) thermal variances. The three surface water standards exemptions consist of two variances from the chloride standard for Mt. Olive Pickle Company (NC0001074) and Bay Valley Foods, LLC (NC0001970) and a variance from the color standard for Evergreen Packaging, d.b.a. Blue Ridge Paper Products (NC0000272).

IV. FISCAL ANALYSIS PROCESS AND SUMMARY

DWR staff conducted outreach activities to potentially financially/environmentally affected parties, including members of the regulated community, environmental groups and state agencies, to determine the impact of the proposed rule changes on their operations. The feedback received from these outreach activities was used to prepare a fiscal analysis, as required by the Administrative Procedures Act (NC G.S. 150B 21-4). Additionally, the EMC approved release of the Fiscal Analysis at its May 8th, 2014 meeting (Attachment B: Certification of Agency). The Agency obtained Office of State Budget Management (OSBM) NC G.S. 150B-19.1 certification on April 23, 2014 that the package met the regulatory principles set in statute (OSBM certification). Link to the agency website pursuant to NC G.S. 150B-19.1(c): http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/guest/rules.The existing 15A NCAC .02B surface water quality regulations serve as a baseline for the fiscal analysis. The analysis assumes the adoption of revised standards to have an estimated cost of $182M over 30 years, Net Present Value (NPV). Costs are likely overestimated due to the fact that the life span of a treatment facility is ~ 20 years, and it is probable that over ~30 years, facilities would need upgrades for replacement/improvement of the plants under normal working circumstances. Local government NPDES dischargers bear about 85% of the cost and the private sector close to 15%. Analysis indicates that approximately 96% of all NC dischargers will not be negatively impacted.

Estimated benefit to the state is $110M over 30 years, NPV, and includes benefits associated with aquatic life maintenance, protection and survival and maintenance and improvements to recreational fishing opportunities. Additional unquantified benefits include improved water quality for other recreational activities, human health, and non-use benefits.

OSBM approval of the finalized Fiscal Note was received by NC DWR on October 8th, 2014. (http://www.osbm.state.nc.us/files/pdf_files/DENR10082014.pdf)

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS - SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS:

The first of two public hearings was conducted in the Ground Floor Hearing Room, Archdale Building, Raleigh NC on July 15th, 2014 at 2:00 PM. Mr. Steve Tedder, Environmental Management Commission member and Chairman of the Water Quality Committee, served as the appointed Hearing Officer for both hearings (Attachment C). Approximately 70 individuals attended the public hearing, with 23 requesting to comment. Mr. Tedder adjourned the hearing at ~4:00 PM after hearing comments from all registered speakers. The Hearing Officer's remarks are contained in Attachment D. A list of registered attendees is contained in Attachment E.

The second public hearing was conducted in the Statesville Civic Center; Statesville, NC on July 16th, 2014 at 3:00 PM. Approximately 50 individuals attended the public hearing, with 12 requesting to make oral comments. Mr. Tedder adjourned the hearing at ~4:30 PM after hearing comments from all registered speakers. A list of registered attendees is contained in Attachment E.

A digital audio recording of the oral comments received at the two hearings is provided http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wq/ps/csu/swtrirev

Approximately 925 written comments were received. (They included ~900 e-mails and letters from private citizens; 13 from business and industries, local governments, representatives of local governments and agricultural interests; 9 from non-governmental organizations; 3 from federal government representatives and 3 letters addressing water quality variances specifically (two supported retention of existing variances and one requested review to be concluded as soon as possible). A brief summary of comments received follows in Attachment F and all written comments received are located in Attachment G.

VI. HEARING OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS:

Following a careful and comprehensive review of all of the oral and written comments, supporting data, and attachments to this record, the hearing officer recommends that the North Carolina Environmental Management Commission:

- **Adopt** proposed modification to **2,4 D** in Water Supply classified waters
- **Adopt Modifications to the Metals Standards, as follows:**
    - Delete existing Total Recoverable Metals chronic standards for the protection of Aquatic Life
        - Exceptions: Mercury and Selenium
    - Maintain current:
        - Total recoverable Mercury standard
        - Total recoverable Selenium standard
    - Adopt the Aquatic Life protective criteria for dissolved metals, as *acute* and *chronic* criterion for the following:
        - Arsenic,
        - Beryllium,
        - Chromium III,
        - Chromium VI,
        - Copper,
            - Allow Biotic Ligand Model, published by US EPA for recalculation of Copper
        - Lead,
        - Nickel,
        - Silver,
        - Zinc,
    - Adopt the Aquatic Life protective recalculated National Recommended Water Quality Criterion (NRWQC) for the dissolved form of:
        - Cadmium (Acute, trout and non-trout and Chronic)

- Where applicable, adopt equation-based water quality standards for dissolved metals.
- Adopt the Aquatic Life criteria with provisions for the application of a Water Effects Ratio (WER), in accordance with published US EPA guidance. Where studies in accordance with protocol derived by the US EPA are not available, the WER will be assumed to be one (1). {*See below for further Hearing Officer comments on the WER recommendation.}.*
- For equation-based hardness dependent metals, adopt instream water quality criteria to be calculated from no less than 25 mg/L to no greater than 400 mg/L hardness.
- With the exception of Mercury and Selenium, adopt regulations for metals that consider the aquatic life biological integrity of a stream to more clearly recognize the synergistic and antagonistic complexities of numerous water quality variables on the actual toxicity of the metals. The Hearing Officer recommends clarifying language to be added to .0211 and .0220 to specifically address the use and implementation of this provision. *{See **Section VII** for the amended language}.*
- Remove existing standards for:
  - Total Chromium
  - Manganese
  - Iron
- Adopt frequency and duration components for instream collection of acute and chronic dissolved metals.

- **NPDES Permitting Provisions**
  - Codify the use of 1Q10 stream flows for implementation of acute water quality standards in NPDES permitting.
  - Adopt the median instream hardness values to be applied in NPDES permit calculations, based upon data contained in the US EPA *Storet* database within the local US Geological Survey (USGS) and Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) 8-digit Hydrologic Unit (HU).

- Retain the existing Action Level policy regulations for Copper, Silver, Zinc and Chloride.

- **Reorganization of regulations**
  - Adopt modified, reorganized regulations for greater clarity.

- **Water Effects Ratio (WER):**
  - The EMC specifically sought comment on modifying the regulations to include specific language for deriving site-specific metal criterion. Per current NC regulations at 15A NCAC 02B .0226, "Exemptions from Surface Water Quality Standards", site-specific water quality standards may be granted by the EMC. Pursuant to federal regulations at 40 CFR 131.10 (g), site specific standards are subject to public review under the federal Clean Water Act. Adoption of a site-specific standard, therefore, is subject to the NC Administrative Procedures Act and review and subsequent approval by the US EPA. The US EPA allows the state to incorporate the site-specific adjustment known as the "Water Effect Ratio" (WER) into its water quality standards; the addition of that language is subject to EPA review and approval. However, once the provisions are in the states' standards, the results of each site-specific application of the WER procedure would be subject to NC public participation permitting requirements, but would not be submitted for further Section 303(c) review.

    WERs are used to derive site specific "multipliers" to account for chemical differences in laboratory dilution water and ambient site waters. Until specific acceptable aquatic toxicity tests are submitted to the Division, the applicable multiplier would be one (1), meaning that the proposed equations are the water quality standard(s) until sufficient data is available to modify it.

    Modifying the criterion to allow for inclusion of the WER expedites the development of a site-specific criterion, while still providing the required public participation and documented protection of aquatic life.

Summary of Recommendations:

The Hearing Officer recommends that the EMC adopt the rule language amendments to 15A NCAC 02B .0200 contained in **Section VII.**

15A NCAC 02B .0206 is proposed for amendment as follows:

15A NCAC 02B .0206 FLOW DESIGN CRITERIA FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS

(a) Water quality based effluent limitations are developed to allow appropriate frequency and duration of deviations from water quality standards so that the designated uses of receiving waters are protected. There are water quality standards for a number of categories of pollutants and to protect a range of water uses. For this reason, the appropriate frequency and duration of deviations from water quality standards is not the same for all categories of standards. A flow design criterion is used in the development of water quality based effluent limitations as a simplified means of estimating the acceptable frequency and duration of deviations. More complex modeling techniques can also be used to set effluent limitations directly based on frequency and duration criteria published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to Section 304(a) of the Federal Clean Water Act as amended. Use of more complex modeling techniques to set water quality based effluent limitations will be approved by the Commission or its designee on a case-by-case basis. Flow design criteria to calculate water quality based effluent limitations for categories of water quality standards are listed as follows:

(1) All standards except toxic substances and aesthetics will be protected using the minimum average flow for a period of seven consecutive days that has an average recurrence of once in ten years (7Q10 flow). Other governing flow strategies such as varying discharges with the receiving waters ability to assimilate wastes may be designated by the Commission or its designee on a case-by-case basis if the discharger or permit applicant provide evidence which establishes to the satisfaction of the Director that the alternative flow strategies will give equal or better protection for the water quality standards. Better protection for the standards means that deviations from the standard would be expected less frequently than provided by using the 7Q10 flow.

(2) Toxic substance standards to protect aquatic life from chronic toxicity will be protected using the 7Q10 flow.

(3) Toxic substance standards to protect aquatic life from acute toxicity will be protected using the 1Q10 flow.

~~(3)~~(4) Toxic substance standards to protect human health will be:

(A) The 7Q10 flow for standards to protect human health through the consumption of water, fish and shellfish from noncarcinogens;

(B) The mean annual flow to protect human health from carcinogens through the consumption of water, fish and shellfish unless site specific fish contamination concerns necessitate the use of an alternative design flow;

(5) Aesthetic quality will be protected using the minimum average flow for a period of 30 consecutive days that has an average recurrence of once in two years (30Q2 flow).

(b) In cases where the stream flow is regulated, a minimum daily low flow may be used as a substitute for the 7Q10 flow except in cases where there are acute toxicity concerns for aquatic life. In the cases where there are acute

toxicity concerns, an alternative low flow such as the instantaneous minimum release may be used on a case-by-case basis.

(c) Flow design criteria are used to develop water quality based effluent limitations and for the design of wastewater treatment facilities. Deviations from a specific water quality standard resulting from discharges which are affirmatively demonstrated to be in compliance with water quality based effluent limitations for that standard will not be a violation pursuant to G.S. 143-215.6 when the actual flow is significantly less than the design flow.

(d) In cases where the 7Q10 flow of the receiving stream is estimated to be zero, water quality based effluent limitations will be assigned as follows:

(1) Where the 30Q2 flow is estimated to be greater than zero, effluent limitations for new or expanded (additional) discharges of oxygen consuming waste will be set at BOD_5= 5 mg/l, NH_3-N = 2 mg/l and DO = 6 mg/l, unless it is determined that these limitations will not protect water quality standards. Requirements for existing discharges will be determined on a case-by-case basis by the Director. More stringent limits will be applied in cases where violations of water quality standards are predicted to occur for a new or expanded discharge with the limits set pursuant to this Rule, or where existing limits are determined to be inadequate to protect water quality standards.

(2) If the 30Q2 and 7Q10 flows are both estimated to be zero, no new or expanded (additional) discharge of oxygen consuming waste will be allowed. Requirements for existing discharges to streams where the 30Q2 and 7Q10 flows are both estimated to be zero will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

(3) Other water quality standards will be protected by requiring the discharge to meet the standards unless the alternative limitations are determined by the Director to protect the classified water uses.

(e) Receiving water flow statistics will be estimated through consultation with the U.S. Geological Survey. Estimates for any given location may be based on actual flow data, modeling analyses, or other methods determined to be appropriate by the Commission or its designee.

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0211 is proposed for amendment as follows:

Hearing Officer's Proposed Modifications are illustrated as highlighted text:

15A NCAC 02B .0211 FRESH SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS C WATERS

General. The water quality standards for all fresh surface waters are the basic standards applicable to Class C waters. ~~See Rule .0208 of this Section for standards for toxic substances and temperature.~~ Water quality standards for temperature and numerical water quality standards for the protection of human health applicable to all fresh surface waters are in Rule .0208 of this Section. Additional and more stringent standards applicable to other specific freshwater classifications are specified in Rules .0212, .0214, .0215, .0216, ~~.0217,~~ .0218, .0219, .0223, .0224 and .0225 of this Section. Action Levels for purposes of NPDES permitting are specified in Item (22) of this Rule.

(1) Best Usage of Waters: aquatic life propagation and maintenance of biological integrity (including fishing and fish), wildlife, secondary recreation, agriculture and any other usage except for primary recreation or as a source of water supply for drinking, culinary or food processing purposes;

(2) Conditions Related to Best Usage: the waters shall be suitable for aquatic life propagation and maintenance of biological integrity, wildlife, secondary recreation, and agriculture. Sources of water pollution which preclude any of these uses on either a short-term or long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard;

~~(3) Quality standards applicable to all fresh surface waters:~~

(3) Chlorine, total residual: 17 ug/l;

(4)~~(a)~~ Chlorophyll a (corrected): not greater than 40 ug/l for lakes, reservoirs, and other waters subject to growths of macroscopic or microscopic vegetation not designated as trout waters, and not greater than 15 ug/l for lakes, reservoirs, and other waters subject to growths of macroscopic or microscopic vegetation designated as trout waters (not applicable to lakes or reservoirs less than 10 acres in surface area). The Commission or its designee may prohibit or limit any discharge of waste into surface waters if, in the opinion of the Director, the surface waters experience or the discharge would result in growths of microscopic or macroscopic vegetation such that the standards established pursuant to this Rule would be violated or the intended best usage of the waters would be impaired;

(5) Cyanide, total: 5.0 ug/L;

(6)~~(b)~~ Dissolved oxygen: not less than 6.0 mg/l for trout waters; for non-trout waters, not less than a daily average of 5.0 mg/l with a minimum instantaneous value of not less than 4.0 mg/l; swamp waters, lake coves or backwaters, and lake bottom waters may have lower values if caused by natural conditions;

(7) Fecal coliform: shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100ml (MF count) based upon at least five consecutive samples examined during any 30 day period, nor exceed 400/100ml in more than 20 percent of the samples examined during such period. Violations of the fecal coliform standard

are expected during rainfall events and, in some cases, this violation is expected to be caused by uncontrollable nonpoint source pollution. All coliform concentrations are to be analyzed using the membrane filter technique unless high turbidity or other adverse conditions necessitate the tube dilution method; in case of controversy over results, the MPN 5-tube dilution technique shall be used as the reference method;

(8)~~(c)~~ Floating solids, settleable solids, or sludge deposits: only such amounts attributable to sewage, industrial wastes or other wastes as shall not make the water unsafe or unsuitable for aquatic life and wildlife or impair the waters for any designated uses;

(9) Fluorides: 1.8 mg/l;

(10)~~(d)~~ Gases, total dissolved: not greater than 110 percent of saturation;

~~(e) Organisms of the coliform group: fecal coliforms shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100ml (MF count) based upon at least five consecutive samples examined during any 30 day period, nor exceed 400/100ml in more than 20 percent of the samples examined during such period. Violations of the fecal coliform standard are expected during rainfall events and, in some cases, this violation is expected to be caused by uncontrollable nonpoint source pollution. All coliform concentrations are to be analyzed using the membrane filter technique unless high turbidity or other adverse conditions necessitate the tube dilution method; in case of controversy over results, the MPN 5-tube dilution technique shall be used as the reference method;~~

(11) Metals:

(a) With the exception of mercury and selenium, freshwater aquatic life standards for metals shall be based upon measurement of the dissolved fraction of the metal. Mercury and Selenium water quality standards must be based upon measurement of the total recoverable ~~metal.~~ metal; ~~Alternative site-specific metals standards can be developed where studies are designed in accordance with the "Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition" published by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments;~~

(b) Freshwater metals standards that are not hardness-dependent are as follows:

(i) Arsenic, dissolved, acute: WER· 340 ug/l;

(ii) Arsenic, dissolved, chronic: WER· 150 ug/l;

(iii) Beryllium, dissolved, acute: WER· 65 ug/l;

(iv) Beryllium, dissolved, chronic: WER· 6.5 ug/l;

(v) Chromium VI, dissolved, acute: WER· 16 ug/l;

(vi) Chromium VI, dissolved, chronic: WER· 11 ug/l;

(vii) Mercury, total recoverable, chronic: 0.012 ug/l;

(viii) Selenium, total recoverable, chronic: 5 ug/l;

(ix) Silver, dissolved, chronic: WER· 0.06 ug/l;

With the exception of Mercury and Selenium, acute and chronic freshwater aquatic life standards for metals listed above apply to the dissolved form of the metal and apply as a function of the pollutant's water effect ratio (WER). A WER is a factor that expresses the difference between the measures of the toxicity of a substance in laboratory waters and the toxicity in site water. The WER is assigned a value equal to one (1) unless any person demonstrates to the Department's satisfaction in a permit proceeding that another value is appropriately developed in accordance with the "Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition" published by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA-823-B-12-002) hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. Alternative site-specific standards can also be developed when any person submits values that demonstrate to the Commissions' satisfaction that they were derived in accordance with the "Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition, Recalculation Procedure or the Resident Species Procedure".

Hardness-dependent freshwater metals standards are located in Sub-Item (c) and (d) and in Table A: Dissolved Freshwater Standards for Hardness-Dependent Metals;

(c) Hardness-dependent freshwater metals standards are as follows:

(i) Hardness-dependent metals standards shall be derived using the equations specified in Table A: Dissolved Freshwater Standards for Hardness-Dependent Metals. If the actual instream hardness (expressed as $CaCO_3$ or Ca+Mg) is less than 25 milligrams/liter (mg/l), standards shall be calculated based upon 25 mg/l hardness. If the actual instream hardness is greater than 25 mg/l and less than 400 mg/l, standards will be calculated based upon the actual instream hardness. If the instream hardness is greater than 400 mg/l, the maximum applicable hardness shall be 400 mg/l;

(ii) Hardness-dependent metals standards in NPDES permitting: for NPDES permitting purposes, application of the equations in Table A: Dissolved Freshwater Standards for Hardness-Dependent Metals requires hardness values (expressed as $CaCO_3$ or Ca+Mg) established using the median of instream hardness data collected within the local US Geological Survey (USGS) and Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) 8-digit Hydrologic Unit (HU). The minimum applicable instream hardness shall be 25 mg/l and the maximum applicable instream hardness shall be 400 mg/l, even when the actual median instream hardness is less than 25 mg/l and greater than 400 mg/l;

(d) Alternatives:

Acute and chronic freshwater aquatic life standards for metals listed in Table A apply to the dissolved form of the metal and apply as a function of the pollutant's water effect ratio (WER). A WER is a factor that expresses the difference between the measures of the toxicity of a substance in laboratory waters and the toxicity in site water. The WER is assigned a value equal to one (1) unless any person demonstrates to the Department's

satisfaction in a permit proceeding that another value is appropriately developed in accordance with the "Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition" published by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA-823-B-12-002) hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. Alternative site-specific standards can also be developed when any person submits values that demonstrate to the Commissions' satisfaction that they were derived in accordance with the "Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition, Recalculation Procedure or the Resident Species Procedure";

Table A: Dissolved Freshwater Standards for Hardness-Dependent Metals

Numeric standards listed below are calculated at 25 mg/l hardness for illustrative purposes. The Water Effects Ratio (WER) is equal to one (1) unless determined otherwise under 15A NCAC .0211 (d).

Metal	Equations for Hardness-Dependent Freshwater Metals (ug/l)	Standard at 25 mg/l hardness (ug/l)
~~Cadmium, Acute~~	~~{1.136672 [*ln* hardness](0.041838)} · *e*^{0.9151 [*ln* hardness] 3.1485}~~	~~0.82~~
~~Cadmium, Acute Trout waters~~	~~{1.136672 [*ln* hardness](0.041838)} · *e*^{0.9151[*ln* hardness] 3.6236}~~	~~0.51~~
~~Cadmium, Chronic~~	~~{1.101672 [*ln* hardness](0.041838)} · *e*^{0.7998[*ln* hardness] 4.4451}~~	~~0.15~~
~~Chromium III, Acute~~	~~0.316 · *e*^{0.8190[*ln* hardness]+3.7256}~~	~~180~~
~~Chromium III, Chronic~~	~~0.860 · *e*^{0.8190[*ln* hardness]+0.6848}~~	~~24~~
~~Copper, Acute~~	~~0.960 · *e*^{0.9422[*ln* hardness] 1.700}~~	~~3.6~~

	~~Or,~~ ~~Aquatic Life Ambient Freshwater Quality Criteria—Copper 2007 Revision (EPA-822-R-07-001)~~	~~N/A~~
~~Copper, Chronic~~	~~0.960 · e^{0.8545[ln hardness]-1.702}~~ ~~Or,~~ ~~Aquatic Life Ambient Freshwater Quality Criteria—Copper 2007 Revision (EPA-822-R-07-001)~~	~~2.7~~ ~~N/A~~
~~Lead, Acute~~	~~{1.46203 [ln hardness](0.145712)} · e^{1.273[ln hardness] 1.460}~~	~~14~~
~~Lead, Chronic~~	~~{1.46203 [ln hardness](0.145712)} · e^{1.273[ln hardness] 4.705}~~	~~0.54~~
~~Nickel, Acute~~	~~0.998 · e^{0.8460[ln hardness]+2.255}~~	~~140~~
~~Nickel, Chronic~~	~~0.997 · e^{0.8460[ln hardness]+0.0584}~~	~~16~~
~~Silver, Acute~~	~~0.85 · e^{1.72[ln hardness] 6.59}~~	~~0.30~~
~~Zinc, Acute~~	~~0.978 · e^{0.8473[ln hardness]+0.884}~~	~~36~~
~~Zinc, Chronic~~	~~0.986 · e^{0.8473[ln hardness]+0.884}~~	~~36~~

Metal	Equations for Hardness-Dependent Freshwater Metals (in ug/l)	
Cadmium, Acute	WER· [{1.136672-[*ln* hardness](0.041838)} · *e*^{0.9151 [*ln* hardness]-3.1485}]	0.82
Cadmium, Acute, Trout waters	WER· [{1.136672-[*ln* hardness](0.041838)} · *e*^{0.9151[*ln* hardness]-3.6236}]	0.51
Cadmium, Chronic	WER· [1.101672-[*ln* hardness](0.041838)} · *e*^{0.7998[*ln* hardness]-4.4451}]	0.15
Chromium III, Acute	WER· [0.316 · *e*^{0.8190[*ln* hardness]+3.7256}]	180
Chromium III, Chronic	WER· [0.860 · *e*^{0.8190[*ln* hardness]+0.6848}]	24
Copper, Acute	WER· [0.960 · *e*^{0.9422[*ln* hardness]-1.700}] Or, Aquatic Life Ambient Freshwater Quality Criteria—Copper 2007 Revision (EPA-822-R-07-001)	3.6 NA

Copper, Chronic	WER· [0.960 · *e*^{0.8545[*ln* hardness]-1.702}] Or, Aquatic Life Ambient Freshwater Quality Criteria—Copper 2007 Revision (EPA-822-R-07-001)	2.7 NA
Lead, Acute	WER· [{1.46203-[*ln* hardness](0.145712)} · *e*^{1.273[*ln* hardness]-1.460}]	14
Lead, Chronic	WER· [{1.46203-[*ln* hardness](0.145712)} · *e*^{1.273[*ln* hardness]-4.705}]	0.54
Nickel, Acute	WER· [0.998 · *e*^{0.8460[*ln* hardness]+2.255}]	140
Nickel, Chronic	WER· [0.997 · *e*^{0.8460[*ln* hardness]+0.0584}]	16
Silver, Acute	WER· [0.85 · *e*^{1.72[*ln* hardness]-6.59}]	0.30
Zinc, Acute	WER· [0.978 · *e*^{0.8473[*ln* hardness]+0.884}]	36
Zinc, Chronic	WER· [0.986 · *e*^{0.8473[*ln* hardness]+0.884}]	36

~~(d)~~(e) Compliance with acute instream metals standards shall only be evaluated using an average of two or more samples collected within one hour. Compliance with chronic instream metals standards shall only be evaluated using averages of a minimum of four samples taken on consecutive days, or as a 96-hour average;

~~(e)(f) With the exception of mercury and selenium, demonstrated attainment of the applicable aquatic life use in a waterbody will take precedence over the application of the aquatic life criteria established for metals associated with these uses. An instream exceedence of the numeric criterion for metals shall not be considered to have caused an adverse impact to the instream aquatic community if biological monitoring has demonstrated attainment of biological integrity.~~

~~(e)~~(f) Metals criteria will be used for proactive environmental management. An instream exceedence of the numeric criterion for metals shall not be considered to have caused an adverse impact to the instream aquatic community without biological confirmation and a comparison of all available monitoring data and applicable water quality standards. This weight of evidence evaluation will take into account data quality and the overall confidence in how representative the sampling is of conditions in the waterbody segment before an assessment of aquatic life use attainment, or non-attainment, is made by the Division. Recognizing the synergistic and antagonistic complexities of other water quality variables on the actual toxicity of metals, with the exception of Mercury and Selenium, biological monitoring will be used to validate, by direct measurement, whether or not the aquatic life use is supported;

~~(f)~~(12) Oils, deleterious substances, colored or other wastes: only such amounts as shall not render the waters injurious to public health, secondary recreation or to aquatic life and wildlife or adversely affect the palatability of fish, aesthetic quality or impair the waters for any designated uses. For the purpose of implementing this Rule, oils, deleterious substances, colored or other wastes shall include but not be limited to substances that cause a film or sheen upon or discoloration of the surface of the water or adjoining shorelines pursuant to 40 CFR 110.3(a)-(b) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments and additions. This material is available for inspection at the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of ~~Water Quality,~~ Water Resources, 512 North Salisbury Street, Raleigh, North ~~Carolina.~~Carolina; ~~Copies may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402-9325 at a cost of forty-five dollars ($45.00);D.C.;~~

(13) Pesticides:

(a) Aldrin: 0.002 ug/l;

(b) Chlordane: 0.004 ug/l;

(c) DDT: 0.001 ug/l;

(d) Demeton: 0.1 ug/l;

(e) Dieldrin: 0.002 ug/l;

(f) Endosulfan: 0.05 ug/l;

(g) Endrin: 0.002 ug/l;

(h) Guthion: 0.01 ug/l;

(i) Heptachlor: 0.004 ug/l;

(j) Lindane: 0.01 ug/l;

(k) Methoxychlor: 0.03 ug/l;

(l) Mirex: 0.001 ug/l;

(m) Parathion: 0.013 ug/l;

(n) Toxaphene: 0.0002 ug/l;

~~(g)~~(14) pH: shall be normal for the waters in the area, which generally shall range between 6.0 and 9.0 except that swamp waters may have a pH as low as 4.3 if it is the result of natural conditions;

~~(h)~~(15) Phenolic compounds: only such levels as shall not result in fish-flesh tainting or impairment of other best usage;

(16) Polychlorinated biphenyls (total of all PCBs and congeners identified): 0.001 ug/l;

~~(i)~~(17) Radioactive substances:

~~(i)~~(a) Combined radium-226 and radium-228: the maximum average annual activity level (based on at least four samples collected quarterly) for combined radium-226 and radium-228 shall not exceed five picoCuries per liter;

~~(ii)~~(b) Alpha Emitters: the average annual gross alpha particle activity (including radium-226, but excluding radon and uranium) shall not exceed 15 picoCuries per liter;

~~(iii)~~(c) Beta Emitters: the maximum average annual activity level (based on at least four samples, collected quarterly) for strontium-90 shall not exceed eight picoCuries per liter; nor shall the average annual gross beta particle activity (excluding potassium-40 and other naturally occurring radio-nuclides) exceed 50 picoCuries per liter; nor shall the maximum average annual activity level for tritium exceed 20,000 picoCuries per liter;

~~(j)~~(18) Temperature: not to exceed 2.8 degrees C (5.04 degrees F) above the natural water temperature, and in no case to exceed 29 degrees C (84.2 degrees F) for mountain and upper piedmont waters and 32 degrees C (89.6 degrees F) for lower piedmont and coastal plain Waters; the temperature for trout waters shall not be increased by more than 0.5 degrees C (0.9 degrees F) due to the discharge of heated liquids, but in no case to exceed 20 degrees C (68 degrees F);

(19) Toluene: 11 ug/l or 0.36 ug/l in trout classified waters;

(20) Trialkyltin compounds: 0.07 ug/l expressed as tributyltin;

~~(k)~~(21) Turbidity: the turbidity in the receiving water shall not exceed 50 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU) in streams not designated as trout waters and 10 NTU in streams, lakes or reservoirs designated as trout waters; for lakes and reservoirs not designated as trout waters, the turbidity shall not exceed 25 NTU; if turbidity exceeds these levels due to natural background conditions, the existing turbidity level shall not be increased. Compliance with this turbidity standard can be met when land management activities employ Best Management Practices (BMPs) [as defined by Rule .0202 of this Section] recommended by the Designated Nonpoint Source Agency [as defined by Rule .0202 of this Section]. BMPs must be in full compliance with all specifications governing the proper design, installation, operation and maintenance of such BMPs;

~~(l) Toxic substances: numerical water quality standards (maximum permissible levels) for the protection of human health applicable to all fresh surface waters are in Rule .0208 of this Section. Numerical water quality standards (maximum permissible levels) to protect aquatic life applicable to all fresh surface waters:~~

~~(i) Arsenic: 50 ug/l;~~

~~(ii) Beryllium: 6.5 ug/l;~~

~~(iii) Cadmium: 0.4 ug/l for trout waters and 2.0 ug/l for non-trout waters; attainment of these water quality standards in surface waters shall be based on measurement of total recoverable metals concentrations unless appropriate studies have been conducted to translate total recoverable metals to a toxic form. Studies used to determine the toxic form or translators must be designed according to the "Water Quality Standards Handbook Second Edition" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) or "The Metals Translator: Guidance For Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit From a Dissolved Criterion" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-96-007) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments.~~

~~The Director shall consider conformance to EPA guidance as well as the presence of environmental conditions that limit the applicability of translators in approving the use of metal translators;~~

~~(iv) Chlorine, total residual: 17 ug/l;~~

~~(v) Chromium, total recoverable: 50 ug/l;~~

~~(vi) Cyanide, 5.0 ug/l, unless site-specific criteria are developed based upon the aquatic life at the site utilizing The Recalculation Procedure in Appendix B of Appendix L in the Environmental Protection Agency's Water Quality Standards Handbook hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments;~~

~~(vii) Fluorides: 1.8 mg/l;~~

~~(viii) Lead, total recoverable: 25 ug/l, collection of data on sources, transport and fate of lead shall be required as part of the toxicity reduction evaluation for dischargers who are out of compliance with whole effluent toxicity testing requirements and the concentration of lead in the effluent is concomitantly determined to exceed an instream level of 3.1 ug/l from the discharge;~~

~~(ix) Mercury: 0.012 ug/l;~~

~~(x) Nickel: 88 ug/l, attainment of these water quality standards in surface waters shall be based on measurement of total recoverable metals concentrations unless appropriate studies have been conducted to translate total recoverable metals to a toxic form. Studies used to determine the toxic form or translators must be designed according to the "Water Quality Standards Handbook Second Edition" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) or "The Metals Translator: Guidance For Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit From a Dissolved Criterion" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-96-007) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. The Director shall consider conformance to EPA guidance as well as the presence of environmental conditions that limit the applicability of translators in approving the use of metal translators;~~

~~(xi) Pesticides:~~

~~(A) Aldrin: 0.002 ug/l;~~

~~(B) Chlordane: 0.004 ug/l;~~

~~(C) DDT: 0.001 ug/l;~~

~~(D) Demeton: 0.1 ug/l;~~

~~(E) Dieldrin: 0.002 ug/l;~~

~~(F) Endosulfan: 0.05 ug/l;~~

~~(G) Endrin: 0.002 ug/l;~~

~~(H) Guthion: 0.01 ug/l;~~

~~(I) Heptachlor: 0.004 ug/l;~~

~~(J) Lindane: 0.01 ug/l;~~

~~(K) Methoxychlor: 0.03 ug/l;~~

~~(L) Mirex: 0.001 ug/l;~~

~~(M) Parathion: 0.013 ug/l;~~

~~(N) Toxaphene: 0.0002 ug/l;~~

~~(xii) Polychlorinated biphenyls: (total of all PCBs and congeners identified) 0.001 ug/l;~~

~~(xiii) Selenium: 5 ug/l;~~

~~(xiv) Toluene: 11 ug/l or 0.36 ug/l in trout waters;~~

~~(xv) Trialkyltin compounds: 0.07 ug/l expressed as tributyltin;~~

~~(4)~~(22) Action Levels for Toxic ~~Substances:~~ Substances Applicable to NPDES Permits:

(a) ~~Copper: 7 ug/l;~~Copper, dissolved, chronic: 2.7 ug/l;

~~(b) Iron: 1.0 mg/l;~~

(c) ~~Silver:~~Silver, dissolved, chronic: 0.06 ug/l;

(d) ~~Zinc:~~Zinc, dissolved, chronic: ~~50 ug/l;~~36 ug/l;

(e) Chloride: 230 mg/l;

The hardness-dependent freshwater action levels for Copper and Zinc, provided here for illustrative purposes, corresponds to a hardness of 25 mg/l. Copper and Zinc action level values for other instream hardness values shall be calculated per the chronic equations specified in Item (11) of this Rule and in Table A: Dissolved Freshwater Standards for Hardness-Dependent Metals. If the Action Levels for any of the substances listed in this ~~Subparagraph~~Item (which are generally not bioaccumulative and have variable toxicity to aquatic life because of chemical form, solubility, stream characteristics or associated waste characteristics) are determined by the waste load allocation to be exceeded in a receiving water by a discharge under the specified ~~low flow~~ 7Q10 criterion for toxic ~~substances (Rule .0206 in this Section),~~ substances, the discharger shall monitor the chemical or biological effects of the discharge; efforts shall be made by all dischargers to reduce or eliminate these substances from their effluents. Those substances for which Action Levels are listed in this ~~Subparagraph~~Item shall be limited as appropriate in the NPDES permit ~~based on the Action Levels listed in this Subparagraph~~ if sufficient information (to be determined for metals by measurements of that portion of the dissolved instream concentration of the Action Level parameter attributable to a specific NPDES permitted discharge) exists to indicate that any of those substances may be a causative factor resulting in toxicity of the effluent. ~~NPDES permit limits may be based on translation of the toxic form to total recoverable metals. Studies used to determine the toxic form or translators must be designed according to "Water Quality Standards~~

~~Handbook Second Edition" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) or "The Metals Translator: Guidance For Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit From a Dissolved Criterion" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-96-007) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. The Director shall consider conformance to EPA guidance as well as the presence of environmental conditions that limit the applicability of translators in approving the use of metal translators.~~

~~For purposes other than consideration of NPDES permitting of point source discharges as described in this Subparagraph, the Action Levels in this Rule, as measured by an appropriate analytical technique, per 15A NCAC 02B .0103(a), shall be considered as numerical instream water quality standards.~~

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0212 is proposed for amendment as follows:

15A NCAC 02B .0212 FRESH SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS WS-I WATERS

The following water quality standards apply to surface waters within water supply watersheds that are classified WS-I. Water quality standards applicable to Class C waters as described in Rule .0211 of this Section also apply to Class WS-I waters.

(1) The best usage of WS-I waters are as follows: a source of water supply for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes for those users desiring maximum protection of their water supplies; waters located on land in public ownership; and any best usage specified for Class C waters;

(2) The conditions related to the best usage are as follows: waters of this class are protected water supplies within essentially natural and undeveloped watersheds in public ownership with no permitted point source dischargers except those specified in Rule .0104 of this Subchapter; waters within this class must be relatively unimpacted by nonpoint sources of pollution; land use management programs are required to protect waters from nonpoint source pollution; the waters, following treatment required by the ~~Division of Environmental Health,~~Division, shall meet the Maximum Contaminant Level concentrations considered safe for drinking, culinary, and food-processing purposes which are specified in the national drinking water regulations and in the North Carolina Rules Governing Public Water Supplies, 15A NCAC 18C .1500. Sources of water pollution which preclude any of these uses on either a short-term or long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard. The Class WS-I classification may be used to protect portions of Class WS-II, WS-III and WS-IV water supplies. For reclassifications occurring after the July 1, 1992 statewide reclassification, the more protective classification requested by local governments shall be considered by the Commission when all local governments having jurisdiction in the affected area(s) have adopted a resolution and the appropriate ordinances to protect the watershed or the Commission acts to protect a watershed when one or more local governments has failed to adopt necessary protection measures;

(3) Quality standards applicable to Class WS-I Waters are as follows:

(a) MBAS (Methylene-Blue Active Substances): not greater than 0.5 mg/l to protect the aesthetic qualities of water supplies and to prevent foaming;

(b) Nonpoint Source Pollution: none shall be allowed that would adversely impact the waters for use as a water supply or any other designated use;

(c) Organisms of coliform group: total coliforms not to exceed 50/100 ml (MF count) as a monthly geometric mean value in watersheds serving as unfiltered water supplies;

(d) Chlorinated phenolic compounds: not greater than 1.0 ug/l to protect water supplies from taste and odor problems from chlorinated phenols;

(e) Sewage, industrial wastes: none shall be allowed except those specified in ~~Subparagraph~~Item(2) of this ~~Paragraph~~Rule or Rule .0104 of this Subchapter;

(f) Solids, total dissolved: not greater than 500 mg/l;

(g) Total hardness: not greater than 100 mg/l as calcium ~~carbonate;~~carbonate ($CaCO_3$ or Ca + Mg);

(h) Toxic and other deleterious substances:

(i) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for non-carcinogens in Class WS-I waters:

(A) Barium: 1.0 mg/l;

(B) Chloride: 250 mg/l;

~~(C) Manganese: 200 ug/l;~~

~~(D)~~(C) Nickel: 25 ug/l;

~~(E)~~(D) Nitrate nitrogen: 10.0 mg/l;

~~(F)~~(E) 2,4-D: ~~100 ug/l;~~70 ug/l;

~~(G)~~(F) 2,4,5-TP (Silvex): 10 ug/l;

~~(H)~~(G) Sulfates: 250 mg/l;

(ii) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for carcinogens in Class WS-I waters:

(A) Aldrin: 0.05 ng/1;

(B) Arsenic: 10 ug/l;

(C) Benzene: 1.19 ug/1;

(D) Carbon tetrachloride: 0.254 ug/l;

(E) Chlordane: 0.8 ng/1;

(F) Chlorinated benzenes: 488 ug/l;

(G) DDT: 0.2 ng/1;

(H) Dieldrin: 0.05 ng/1;

(I) Dioxin: 0.000005 ng/l;

(J) Heptachlor: 0.08 ng/1;

(K) Hexachlorobutadiene: 0.44 ug/l;

(L) Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (total of all PAHs): 2.8 ng/l;

(M) Tetrachloroethane (1,1,2,2): 0.17 ug/l;

(N) Tetrachloroethylene: 0.7 ug/l;

(O) Trichloroethylene: 2.5 ug/l;

(P) Vinyl Chloride: 0.025 ug/l.

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0214 is proposed for amendment as follows:

15A NCAC 02B .0214 FRESH SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS WS-II WATERS

The following water quality standards apply to surface waters within water supply watersheds that are classified WS-II. Water quality standards applicable to Class C waters as described in Rule .0211 of this Section also apply to Class WS-II waters.

(1) The best usage of WS-II waters are as follows: a source of water supply for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes for those users desiring maximum protection for their water supplies where a WS-I classification is not feasible and any best usage specified for Class C waters;

(2) The conditions related to the best usage are as follows: waters of this class are protected as water supplies which are in predominantly undeveloped watersheds and meet average watershed development density levels as specified in Sub-Items (3)(b)(i)(A), (3)(b)(i)(B), (3)(b)(ii)(A) and (3)(b)(ii)(B) of this Rule; discharges which qualify for a General Permit pursuant to 15A NCAC 2H .0127, trout farm discharges, recycle (closed loop) systems that only discharge in response to 10-year storm events and other stormwater discharges are allowed in the entire watershed; new domestic and industrial discharges of treated wastewater are not allowed in the entire watershed; the waters, following treatment required by the ~~Division of Environmental Health,~~Division, shall meet the Maximum Contaminant Level concentrations considered safe for drinking, culinary, and food-processing purposes which are specified in the national drinking water regulations and in the North Carolina Rules Governing Public Water Supplies, 15A NCAC 18C .1500. Sources of water pollution which preclude any of these uses on either a short-term or long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard. The Class WS-II classification may be used to protect portions of Class WS-III and WS-IV water supplies. For reclassifications of these portions of Class WS-III and WS-IV water supplies occurring after the July 1, 1992 statewide reclassification, the more protective classification requested by local governments shall be considered by the Commission when all local governments having jurisdiction in the affected area(s) have adopted a resolution and the appropriate ordinances to protect the watershed or the Commission acts to protect a watershed when one or more local governments has failed to adopt necessary protection measures;

(3) Quality standards applicable to Class WS-II Waters are as follows:

(a) Sewage, industrial wastes, non-process industrial wastes, or other wastes: none shall be allowed except for those specified in either Item (2) of this Rule and Rule .0104 of this Subchapter; none shall be allowed that have an adverse effect on human health or that are not effectively treated to the satisfaction of the Commission and in accordance with the requirements of the ~~Division of Environmental Health, North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources.~~Division. Any discharger may be required upon

request by the Commission to disclose all chemical constituents present or potentially present in their wastes and chemicals which could be spilled or be present in runoff from their facility which may have an adverse impact on downstream water quality. These facilities may be required to have spill and treatment failure control plans as well as perform special monitoring for toxic substances;

(b) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution: none that would adversely impact the waters for use as a water supply or any other designated use;

(i) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution Control Criteria for Entire Watershed:

(A) Low Density Option: development density must be limited to either no more than one dwelling unit per acre of single family detached residential development (or 40,000 square foot lot excluding roadway right-of-way) or 12 percent built-upon area for all other residential and non-residential development in the watershed outside of the critical area; stormwater runoff from the development shall be transported by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(B) High Density Option: if new development exceeds the low density option requirements as stated in Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) of this Rule, then engineered stormwater controls must be used to control runoff from the first inch of rainfall; new residential and non-residential development shall not exceed 30 percent built-upon area;

(C) Land within the watershed shall be deemed compliant with the density requirements if the following condition is met: the density of all existing development at the time of reclassification does not exceed the density requirement when densities are averaged throughout the entire watershed area at the time of classification;

(D) Cluster development is allowed on a project-by-project basis as follows:

(I) overall density of the project meets associated density or stormwater control requirements of this Rule;

(II) buffers meet the minimum statewide water supply watershed protection requirements;

(III) built-upon areas are designed and located to minimize stormwater runoff impact to the receiving waters, minimize concentrated stormwater flow, maximize the use of sheet flow through vegetated areas, and maximize the flow length through vegetated areas;

(IV) areas of concentrated development are located in upland areas and away, to the maximum extent practicable, from surface waters and drainageways;

(V) remainder of tract to remain in vegetated or natural state;

(VI) area in the vegetated or natural state may be conveyed to a property owners association, a local government for preservation as a park or greenway, a conservation organization, or placed in a permanent conservation or farmland preservation easement;

(VII) a maintenance agreement for the vegetated or natural area shall be filed with the Register of Deeds; and

(VIII) cluster development that meets the applicable low density option requirements shall transport stormwater runoff from the development by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(E) A maximum of 10 percent of each jurisdiction's portion of the watershed outside of the critical area as delineated on July 1, 1993 may be developed with new development projects and expansions of existing development of up to 70 percent built-upon surface area in addition to the new development approved in compliance with the appropriate requirements of Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) or Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(B) of this Rule. For expansions to existing development, the existing built-upon surface area is not counted toward the allowed 70 percent built-upon surface area. A local government having jurisdiction within the watershed may transfer, in whole or in part, its right to the 10 percent/70 percent land area to another local government within the watershed upon submittal of a joint resolution and review by the Commission. When the water supply watershed is composed of public lands, such as National Forest land, local governments may count the public land acreage within the watershed outside of the critical area in calculating the acreage allowed under this provision. For local governments that do not choose to use the high density option in that WS-II watershed, each project must, to the maximum extent practicable, minimize built-upon surface area, direct stormwater runoff away from surface waters and incorporate best management practices to minimize water quality impacts. If the local government selects the high density development option within that WS-II watershed, then

engineered stormwater controls must be employed for the new development;

(F) If local governments choose the high density development option which requires stormwater controls, then they shall assume ultimate responsibility for operation and maintenance of the required controls as outlined in Rule .0104 of this Subchapter;

(G) Minimum 100 foot vegetative buffer is required for all new development activities that exceed the low density option requirements as specified in Sub-Items (3)(b)(i)(A) and Sub-Item (3)(b)(ii)(A) of this Rule, otherwise a minimum 30 foot vegetative buffer for development activities is required along all perennial waters indicated on the most recent versions of U.S.G.S. 1:24,000 (7.5 minute) scale topographic maps or as determined by local government studies. Nothing in this Rule shall stand as a bar to artificial streambank or shoreline stabilization;

(H) No new development is allowed in the buffer; water dependent structures, or other structures such as flag poles, signs and security lights, which result in only de minimus increases in impervious area and public projects such as road crossings and greenways may be allowed where no practicable alternative exists. These activities shall minimize built-upon surface area, direct runoff away from the surface waters and maximize the utilization of BMPs;

(I) No NPDES permits shall be issued for landfills that discharge treated leachate;

(ii) Critical Area Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution Control Criteria:

(A) Low Density Option: new development is limited to either no more than one dwelling unit of single family detached residential development per two acres (or 80,000 square foot lot excluding roadway right-of-way) or six percent built-upon area for all other residential and non-residential development; stormwater runoff from the development shall be transported by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(B) High Density Option: if new development density exceeds the low density requirements specified in Sub-Item (3)(b)(ii)(A) of this Rule, then engineered stormwater controls must be used to control runoff from the first inch of rainfall; new residential and non-residential development density not to exceed 24 percent built-upon area;

(C) No new permitted sites for land application of residuals or petroleum contaminated soils are allowed;

(D) No new landfills are allowed;

(c) MBAS (Methylene-Blue Active Substances): not greater than 0.5 mg/l to protect the aesthetic qualities of water supplies and to prevent foaming;

(d) Odor producing substances contained in sewage or other wastes: only such amounts, whether alone or in combination with other substances or wastes, as shall not cause taste and odor difficulties in water supplies which cannot be corrected by treatment, impair the palatability of fish, or have a deleterious effect upon any best usage established for waters of this class;

(e) Chlorinated phenolic compounds: not greater than 1.0 ug/l to protect water supplies from taste and odor problems from chlorinated phenols;

(f) Total hardness: not greater than 100 mg/l as calcium ~~carbonate;~~carbonate ($CaCO_3$ or Ca + Mg);

(g) Total dissolved solids: not greater than 500 mg/l;

(h) Toxic and other deleterious substances:

(i) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for non-carcinogens in Class WS-II waters:

(A) Barium: 1.0 mg/l;

(B) Chloride: 250 mg/l;

~~(C) Manganese: 200 ug/l;~~

~~(D)~~(C) Nickel: 25 ug/l;

~~(E)~~(D) Nitrate nitrogen: 10 mg/l;

~~(F)~~(E) 2,4-D: ~~100 ug/l;~~70 ug/l;

~~(G)~~(F) 2,4,5-TP (Silvex): 10 ug/l;

~~(H)~~(G) Sulfates: 250 mg/l;

(ii) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for carcinogens in Class WS-II waters:

(A) Aldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(B) Arsenic: 10 ug/l;

(C) Benzene: 1.19 ug/l;

(D) Carbon tetrachloride: 0.254 ug/l;

(E) Chlordane: 0.8 ng/l;

(F) Chlorinated benzenes: 488 ug/l;

(G) DDT: 0.2 ng/l;

(H) Dieldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(I) Dioxin: 0.000005 ng/l;

(J) Heptachlor: 0.08 ng/l;

(K) Hexachlorobutadiene: 0.44 ug/l;

(L) Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (total of all PAHs): 2.8 ng/l;

(M) Tetrachloroethane (1,1,2,2): 0.17 ug/l;

(N) Tetrachloroethylene: 0.7 ug/l;

(O) Trichloroethylene: 2.5 ug/l;

(P) Vinyl Chloride: 0.025 ug/l.

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0215 is proposed for amendment as follows:

15A NCAC 02B .0215 FRESH SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS WS-III WATERS

The following water quality standards apply to surface water supply waters that are classified WS-III. Water quality standards applicable to Class C waters as described in Rule .0211 of this Section also apply to Class WS-III waters.

(1) The best usage of WS-III waters are as follows: a source of water supply for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes for those users where a more protective WS-I or WS-II classification is not feasible and any other best usage specified for Class C waters;

(2) The conditions related to the best usage are as follows: waters of this class are protected as water supplies which are generally in low to moderately developed watersheds and meet average watershed development density levels as specified in Sub-Items (3)(b)(i)(A), (3)(b)(i)(B), (3)(b)(ii)(A) and (3)(b)(ii)(B) of this Rule; discharges that qualify for a General Permit pursuant to 15A NCAC 2H .0127, trout farm discharges, recycle (closed loop) systems that only discharge in response to 10-year storm events, and other stormwater discharges are allowed in the entire watershed; treated domestic wastewater discharges are allowed in the entire watershed but no new domestic wastewater discharges are allowed in the critical area; no new industrial wastewater discharges except non-process industrial discharges are allowed in the entire watershed; the waters, following treatment required by the ~~Division of Environmental Health,~~Division, shall meet the Maximum Contaminant Level concentrations considered safe for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes which are specified in the national drinking water regulations and in the North Carolina Rules Governing Public Water Supplies, 15A NCAC 18C .1500. Sources of water pollution which preclude any of these uses on either a short-term or long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard. The Class WS-III classification may be used to protect portions of Class WS-IV water supplies. For reclassifications of these portions of WS-IV water supplies occurring after the July 1, 1992 statewide reclassification, the more protective classification requested by local governments shall be considered by the Commission when all local governments having jurisdiction in the affected area(s) have adopted a resolution and the appropriate ordinances to protect the watershed or the Commission acts to protect a watershed when one or more local governments has failed to adopt necessary protection measures;

(3) Quality standards applicable to Class WS-III Waters are as follows:

(a) Sewage, industrial wastes, non-process industrial wastes, or other wastes: none shall be allowed except for those specified in Item (2) of this Rule and Rule .0104 of this Subchapter; none shall be allowed that have an adverse effect on human health or that are not effectively treated to the satisfaction of the Commission and in accordance with the requirements of the ~~Division of Environmental Health, North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources.~~Division. Any discharger may be required by the

Commission to disclose all chemical constituents present or potentially present in their wastes and chemicals which could be spilled or be present in runoff from their facility which may have an adverse impact on downstream water quality. These facilities may be required to have spill and treatment failure control plans as well as perform special monitoring for toxic substances;

(b) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution: none that would adversely impact the waters for use as water supply or any other designated use;

(i) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution Control Criteria For Entire Watershed:

(A) Low Density Option: development density must be limited to either no more than two dwelling units of single family detached residential development per acre (or 20,000 square foot lot excluding roadway right-of-way) or 24 percent built-upon area for all other residential and non-residential development in watershed outside of the critical area; stormwater runoff from the development shall be transported by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(B) High Density Option: if new development density exceeds the low density option requirements specified in Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) of this Rule then development must control runoff from the first inch of rainfall; new residential and non-residential development shall not exceed 50 percent built-upon area;

(C) Land within the watershed shall be deemed compliant with the density requirements if the following condition is met: the density of all existing development at the time of reclassification does not exceed the density requirement when densities are averaged throughout the entire watershed area;

(D) Cluster development is allowed on a project-by-project basis as follows:

(I) overall density of the project meets associated density or stormwater control requirements of this Rule;

(II) buffers meet the minimum statewide water supply watershed protection requirements;

(III) built-upon areas are designed and located to minimize stormwater runoff impact to the receiving waters, minimize concentrated stormwater flow, maximize the use of sheet flow through vegetated areas, and maximize the flow length through vegetated areas;

(IV) areas of concentrated development are located in upland areas and away, to the maximum extent practicable, from surface waters and drainageways;

(V) remainder of tract to remain in vegetated or natural state;

(VI) area in the vegetated or natural state may be conveyed to a property owners association, a local government for preservation as a park or greenway, a conservation organization or placed in a permanent conservation or farmland preservation easement;

(VII) a maintenance agreement for the vegetated or natural area shall be filed with the Register of Deeds; and

(VIII) cluster development that meets the applicable low density option requirements shall transport stormwater runoff from the development by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(E) A maximum of 10 percent of each jurisdiction's portion of the watershed outside of the critical area as delineated on July 1, 1993 may be developed with new development projects and expansions of existing development of up to 70 percent built-upon surface area in addition to the new development approved in compliance with the appropriate requirements of Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) or Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(B) of this Rule. For expansions to existing development, the existing built-upon surface area is not counted toward the allowed 70 percent built-upon surface area. A local government having jurisdiction within the watershed may transfer, in whole or in part, its right to the 10 percent/70 percent land area to another local government within the watershed upon submittal of a joint resolution and review by the Commission. When the water supply watershed is composed of public lands, such as National Forest land, local governments may count the public land acreage within the watershed outside of the critical area in figuring the acreage allowed under this provision. For local governments that do not choose to use the high density option in that WS-III watershed, each project must, to the maximum extent practicable, minimize built-upon surface area, direct stormwater runoff away from surface waters, and incorporate best management practices to minimize water quality impacts. If the local government selects the high density development option within that WS-III watershed, then

engineered stormwater controls must be employed for the new development;

(F) If local governments choose the high density development option which requires engineered stormwater controls, then they shall assume ultimate responsibility for operation and maintenance of the required controls as outlined in Rule .0104 of this Subchapter;

(G) Minimum 100 foot vegetative buffer is required for all new development activities that exceed the low density requirements as specified in Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) and Sub-Item (3)(b)(ii)(A) of this Rule, otherwise a minimum 30 foot vegetative buffer for development is required along all perennial waters indicated on the most recent versions of U.S.G.S. 1:24,000 (7.5 minute) scale topographic maps or as determined by local government studies. Nothing in this Rule shall stand as a bar to artificial streambank or shoreline stabilization;

(H) No new development is allowed in the buffer; water dependent structures, or other structures such as flag poles, signs and security lights, which result in only de minimus increases in impervious area and public projects such as road crossings and greenways may be allowed where no practicable alternative exists. These activities shall minimize built-upon surface area, direct runoff away from surface waters and maximize the utilization of BMPs;

(I) No NPDES permits shall be issued for landfills that discharge treated leachate;

(ii) Critical Area Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution Control Criteria:

(A) Low Density Option: new development limited to either no more than one dwelling unit of single family detached residential development per acre (or 40,000 square foot lot excluding roadway right-of-way) or 12 percent built-upon area for all other residential and non-residential development; stormwater runoff from the development shall be transported by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(B) High Density Option: if new development exceeds the low density requirements specified in Sub-Item (3)(b)(ii)(A) of this Rule, then engineered stormwater controls must be used to control runoff from the first inch of rainfall; development shall not exceed 30 percent built-upon area;

(C) No new permitted sites for land application of residuals or petroleum contaminated soils are allowed;

(D) No new landfills are allowed;

(c) MBAS (Methylene-Blue Active Substances): not greater than 0.5 mg/l to protect the aesthetic qualities of water supplies and to prevent foaming;

(d) Odor producing substances contained in sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes: only such amounts, whether alone or in combination with other substances or wastes, as shall not cause taste and odor difficulties in water supplies which cannot be corrected by treatment, impair the palatability of fish, or have a deleterious effect upon any best usage established for waters of this class;

(e) Chlorinated phenolic compounds: not greater than 1.0 ug/l to protect water supplies from taste and odor problems from chlorinated phenols;

(f) Total hardness: not greater than 100 mg/l as calcium ~~carbonate;~~carbonate ($CaCO_3$ or Ca + Mg);

(g) Total dissolved solids: not greater than 500 mg/l;

(h) Toxic and other deleterious substances:

(i) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for non-carcinogens in Class WS-III waters:

(A) Barium: 1.0 mg/l;

(B) Chloride: 250 mg/l;

~~(C) Manganese: 200 ug/l;~~

~~(D)~~(C) Nickel: 25 ug/l;

~~(E)~~(D) Nitrate nitrogen: 10 mg/l;

~~(F)~~(E) 2,4-D: ~~100 ug/l;~~70 ug/l;

~~(G)~~(F) 2,4,5-TP (Silvex): 10 ug/l;

~~(H)~~(G) Sulfates: 250 mg/l;

(ii) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for carcinogens in Class WS-III waters:

(A) Aldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(B) Arsenic: 10 ug/l;

(C) Benzene: 1.19 ug/l;

(D) Carbon tetrachloride: 0.254 ug/l;

(E) Chlordane: 0.8 ng/l;

(F) Chlorinated benzenes: 488 ug/l;

(G) DDT: 0.2 ng/l;

(H) Dieldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(I) Dioxin: 0.000005 ng/l;

(J) Heptachlor: 0.08 ng/l;

(K) Hexachlorobutadiene: 0.44 ug/l;

(L) Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (total of all PAHs): 2.8 ng/l;

(M) Tetrachloroethane (1,1,2,2): 0.17 ug/l;

(N) Tetrachloroethylene: 0.7 ug/l;

(O) Trichloroethylene: 2.5 ug/l;

(P) Vinyl Chloride: 0.025 ug/l.

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0216 is proposed for amendment as follows:

15A NCAC 02B .0216 FRESH SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR WS-IV WATERS

The following water quality standards apply to surface water supply waters that are classified WS-IV. Water quality standards applicable to Class C waters as described in Rule .0211 of this Section also apply to Class WS-IV waters.

(1) The best usage of WS-IV waters are as follows: a source of water supply for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes for those users where a more protective WS-I, WS-II or WS-III classification is not feasible and any other best usage specified for Class C waters;

(2) The conditions related to the best usage are as follows: waters of this class are protected as water supplies which are generally in moderately to highly developed watersheds or protected areas and meet average watershed development density levels as specified in Sub-Items (3)(b)(i)(A), (3)(b)(i)(B), (3)(b)(ii)(A) and (3)(b)(ii)(B) of this Rule; discharges which qualify for a General Permit pursuant to 15A NCAC 02H .0127, trout farm discharges, recycle (closed loop) systems that only discharge in response to 10-year storm events, other stormwater discharges and domestic wastewater discharges shall be allowed in the protected and critical areas; treated industrial wastewater discharges are allowed in the protected and critical areas; however, new industrial wastewater discharges in the critical area shall be required to meet the provisions of 15A NCAC 02B .0224(1)(b)(iv), (v) and (vii), and 15A NCAC 02B .0203; new industrial connections and expansions to existing municipal discharges with a pretreatment program pursuant to 15A NCAC 02H .0904 are allowed; the waters, following treatment required by the ~~Division of Environmental Health,~~Division, shall meet the Maximum Contaminant Level concentrations considered safe for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes which are specified in the national drinking water regulations and in the North Carolina Rules Governing Public Water Supplies, 15A NCAC 18C .1500. Sources of water pollution which preclude any of these uses on either a short-term or long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard. The Class WS-II or WS-III classifications may be used to protect portions of Class WS-IV water supplies. For reclassifications of these portions of WS-IV water supplies occurring after the July 1, 1992 statewide reclassification, the more protective classification requested by local governments shall be considered by the Commission when all local governments having jurisdiction in the affected area(s) have adopted a resolution and the appropriate ordinances to protect the watershed or the Commission acts to protect a watershed when one or more local governments has failed to adopt necessary protection measures;

(3) Quality standards applicable to Class WS-IV Waters are as follows:

(a) Sewage, industrial wastes, non-process industrial wastes, or other wastes: none shall be allowed except for those specified in Item (2) of this Rule and Rule .0104 of this Subchapter and none shall be allowed that shall have an adverse effect on human health or that are not effectively treated to the satisfaction of the Commission and in accordance

with the requirements of the ~~Division of Environmental Health, North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources.~~Division. Any discharges or industrial users subject to pretreatment standards may be required by the Commission to disclose all chemical constituents present or potentially present in their wastes and chemicals which could be spilled or be present in runoff from their facility which may have an adverse impact on downstream water supplies. These facilities may be required to have spill and treatment failure control plans as well as perform special monitoring for toxic substances;

(b) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution: none shall be allowed that would adversely impact the waters for use as water supply or any other designated use.

(i) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution Control Criteria For Entire Watershed or Protected Area:

(A) Low Density Option: development activities which require a Sedimentation/Erosion Control Plan in accordance with 15A NCAC 4 established by the North Carolina Sedimentation Control Commission or approved local government programs as delegated by the Sedimentation Control Commission shall be limited to no more than either: two dwelling units of single family detached development per acre (or 20,000 square foot lot excluding roadway right-of-way) or 24 percent built-upon on area for all other residential and non-residential development; or three dwelling units per acre or 36 percent built-upon area for projects without curb and gutter street systems in the protected area outside of the critical area; stormwater runoff from the development shall be transported by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(B) High Density Option: if new development activities which require a Sedimentation/Erosion Control Plan exceed the low density requirements of Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) of this Rule then development shall control the runoff from the first inch of rainfall; new residential and non-residential development shall not exceed 70 percent built-upon area;

(C) Land within the critical and protected area shall be deemed compliant with the density requirements if the following condition is met: the density of all existing development at the time of reclassification does not exceed the density requirement when densities are averaged throughout the entire area;

(D) Cluster development shall be allowed on a project-by-project basis as follows:

(I) overall density of the project meets associated density or stormwater control requirements of this Rule;

(II) buffers meet the minimum statewide water supply watershed protection requirements;

(III) built-upon areas are designed and located to minimize stormwater runoff impact to the receiving waters, minimize concentrated stormwater flow, maximize the use of sheet flow through vegetated areas, and maximize the flow length through vegetated areas;

(IV) areas of concentrated development are located in upland areas and away, to the maximum extent practicable, from surface waters and drainageways;

(V) remainder of tract to remain in vegetated or natural state;

(VI) area in the vegetated or natural state may be conveyed to a property owners association, a local government for preservation as a park or greenway, a conservation organization, or placed in a permanent conservation or farmland preservation easement;

(VII) a maintenance agreement for the vegetated or natural area shall be filed with the Register of Deeds; and

(VIII) cluster development that meets the applicable low density option requirements shall transport stormwater runoff from the development by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(E) If local governments choose the high density development option which requires engineered stormwater controls, then they shall assume ultimate responsibility for operation and maintenance of the required controls as outlined in Rule .0104 of this Subchapter;

(F) Minimum 100 foot vegetative buffer is required for all new development activities that exceed the low density option requirements as specified in Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) or Sub-Item (3)(b)(ii)(A) of this Rule, otherwise a minimum 30 foot vegetative buffer for development shall be required along all perennial waters indicated on the most recent versions of U.S.G.S. 1:24,000 (7.5 minute) scale topographic maps or as determined by local government studies;

(G) No new development shall be allowed in the buffer; water dependent structures, or other structures, such as flag poles, signs and security lights, which result in only de minimus increases in impervious area and public projects such as road crossings and greenways may be allowed where no practicable alternative exists. These activities shall minimize built-upon surface area, divert runoff away from surface waters and maximize the utilization of BMPs;

(H) For local governments that do not use the high density option, a maximum of 10 percent of each jurisdiction's portion of the watershed outside of the critical area as delineated on July 1, 1995 may be developed with new development projects and expansions to existing development of up to 70 percent built-upon surface area in addition to the new development approved in compliance with the appropriate requirements of Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) of this Rule. For expansions to existing development, the existing built-upon surface area shall not be counted toward the allowed 70 percent built-upon surface area. A local government having jurisdiction within the watershed may transfer, in whole or in part, its right to the 10 percent/70 percent land area to another local government within the watershed upon submittal of a joint resolution for review by the Commission. When the designated water supply watershed area is composed of public land, such as National Forest land, local governments may count the public land acreage within the designated watershed area outside of the critical area in figuring the acreage allowed under this provision. Each project shall, to the maximum extent practicable, minimize built-upon surface area, direct stormwater runoff away from surface waters and incorporate best management practices to minimize water quality impacts;

(ii) Critical Area Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution Control Criteria:

(A) Low Density Option: new development activities which require a Sedimentation/Erosion Control Plan in accordance with 15A NCAC 4 established by the North Carolina Sedimentation Control Commission or approved local government programs as delegated by the Sedimentation Control Commission shall be limited to no more than two dwelling units of single family detached development per acre (or 20,000 square foot lot excluding roadway right-of-way) or 24 percent built-upon area for all other residential and non-residential

development; stormwater runoff from the development shall be transported by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(B) High Density Option: if new development density exceeds the low density requirements specified in Sub-Item (3)(b)(ii)(A) of this Rule, engineered stormwater controls shall be used to control runoff from the first inch of rainfall; new residential and non-residential development shall not exceed 50 percent built-upon area;

(C) No new permitted sites for land application of residuals or petroleum contaminated soils shall be allowed;

(D) No new landfills shall be allowed;

(c) MBAS (Methylene-Blue Active Substances): not greater than 0.5 mg/l to protect the aesthetic qualities of water supplies and to prevent foaming;

(d) Odor producing substances contained in sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes: only such amounts, whether alone or in combination with other substances or waste, as will not cause taste and odor difficulties in water supplies which can not be corrected by treatment, impair the palatability of fish, or have a deleterious effect upon any best usage established for waters of this class;

(e) Chlorinated phenolic compounds: not greater than 1.0 ug/l to protect water supplies from taste and odor problems due to chlorinated phenols shall be allowed. Specific phenolic compounds may be given a different limit if it is demonstrated not to cause taste and odor problems and not to be detrimental to other best usage;

(f) Total hardness shall not exceed 100 mg/l as calcium ~~carbonate;~~carbonate ($CaCO_3$ or Ca + Mg);

(g) Total dissolved solids shall not exceed 500 mg/l;

(h) Toxic and other deleterious substances:

(i) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for non-carcinogens in Class WS-IV waters:

(A) Barium: 1.0 mg/l;

(B) Chloride: 250 mg/l;

~~(C) Manganese: 200 ug/l;~~

~~(D)~~(C) Nickel: 25 ug/l;

~~(E)~~(D) Nitrate nitrogen: 10.0 mg/l;

~~(F)~~(E) 2,4-D: ~~100 ug/l;~~ 70 ug/l;

~~(G)~~(F) 2,4,5-TP (Silvex): 10 ug/l;

~~(H)~~(G) Sulfates: 250 mg/l;

(ii) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for carcinogens in Class WS-IV waters:

(A) Aldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(B) Arsenic: 10 ug/l;

(C) Benzene: 1.19 ug/l;

(D) Carbon tetrachloride: 0.254 ug/l;

(E) Chlordane: 0.8 ng/l;

(F) Chlorinated benzenes: 488 ug/l;

(G) DDT: 0.2 ng/l;

(H) Dieldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(I) Dioxin: 0.000005 ng/l;

(J) Heptachlor: 0.08 ng/l;

(K) Hexachlorobutadiene: 0.44 ug/l;

(L) Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (total of all PAHs): 2.8 ng/l;

(M) Tetrachloroethane (1,1,2,2): 0.17 ug/l;

(N) Tetrachloroethylene: 0.7 ug/l;

(O) Trichloroethylene: 2.5 ug/l;

(P) Vinyl Chloride: 0.025 ug/l.

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0218 is proposed for amendment as follows:

15A NCAC 02B .0218 FRESH SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS WS-V WATERS

The following water quality standards apply to surface water supply waters that are classified WS-V. Water quality standards applicable to Class C waters as described in Rule .0211 of this Section also apply to Class WS-V waters.

(1) The best usage of WS-V waters are as follows: waters that are protected as water supplies which are generally upstream and draining to Class WS-IV waters; or waters previously used for drinking water supply purposes; or waters used by industry to supply their employees, but not municipalities or counties, with a raw drinking water supply source, although this type of use is not restricted to WS-V classification; and all Class C uses. The Commission may consider a more protective classification for the water supply if a resolution requesting a more protective classification is submitted from all local governments having land use jurisdiction within the affected watershed;

(2) The conditions related to the best usage are as follows: waters of this class are protected water supplies; the waters, following treatment required by the ~~Division of Environmental Health,~~Division, shall meet the Maximum Contaminant Level concentrations considered safe for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes which are specified in the national drinking water regulations and in the North Carolina Rules Governing Public Water Supplies, 15A NCAC 18C .1500; no categorical restrictions on watershed development or wastewater discharges are required, however, the Commission or its designee may apply management requirements for the protection of waters downstream of receiving waters (15A NCAC 02B .0203). Sources of water pollution which preclude any of these uses on either a short-term or long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard;

(3) Quality standards applicable to Class WS-V Waters are as follows:

(a) Sewage, industrial wastes, non-process industrial wastes, or other wastes: none shall be allowed that have an adverse effect on human health or that are not effectively treated to the satisfaction of the Commission and in accordance with the requirements of the ~~Division of Environmental Health, North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources.~~Division. Any discharges or industrial users subject to pretreatment standards may be required by the Commission to disclose all chemical constituents present or potentially present in their wastes and chemicals which could be spilled or be present in runoff from their facility which may have an adverse impact on downstream water supplies. These facilities may be required to have spill and treatment failure control plans as well as perform special monitoring for toxic substances;

(b) MBAS (Methylene-Blue Active Substances): not greater than 0.5 mg/l to protect the aesthetic qualities of water supplies and to prevent foaming;

(c) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution: none that would adversely impact the waters for use as water supply or any other designated use;

(d) Odor producing substances contained in sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes: only such amounts, whether alone or in combination with other substances or waste, as will not cause taste and odor difficulties in water supplies which can not be corrected by treatment, impair the palatability of fish, or have a deleterious effect upon any best usage established for waters of this class;

(e) Chlorinated phenolic compounds: not greater than 1.0 ug/l to protect water supplies from taste and odor problems due to chlorinated phenols; specific phenolic compounds may be given a different limit if it is demonstrated not to cause taste and odor problems and not to be detrimental to other best usage;

(f) Total hardness: not greater than 100 mg/l as calcium ~~carbonate;~~carbonate ($CaCO_3$ or Ca + Mg);

(g) Total dissolved solids: not greater than 500 mg/l;

(h) Toxic and other deleterious substances:

(i) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for non-carcinogens in Class WS-V waters:

(A) Barium: 1.0 mg/l;

(B) Chloride: 250 mg/l;

~~(C) Manganese: 200 ug/l;~~

~~(D)~~(C) Nickel: 25 ug/l;

~~(E)~~(D) Nitrate nitrogen: 10.0 mg/l;

~~(F)~~(E) 2,4-D: ~~100 ug/l;~~70 ug/l;

~~(G)~~(F) 2,4,5-TP (Silvex): 10 ug/l;

~~(H)~~(G) Sulfates: 250 mg/l.

(ii) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for carcinogens in Class WS-V waters:

(A) Aldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(B) Arsenic: 10 ug/l;

(C) Benzene: 1.19 ug/l;

(D) Carbon tetrachloride: 0.254 ug/l;

(E) Chlordane: 0.8 ng/l;

(F) Chlorinated benzenes: 488 ug/l;

(G) DDT: 0.2 ng/l;

(H) Dieldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(I) Dioxin: 0.000005 ng/l;

(J) Heptachlor: 0.08 ng/l;

(K) Hexachlorobutadiene: 0.44 ug/l;

(L) Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (total of all PAHs): 2.8 ng/l;

(M) Tetrachloroethane (1,1,2,2): 0.17 ug/l;

(N) Tetrachloroethylene: 0.7 ug/l;

(O) Trichloroethylene: 2.5 ug/l;

(P) Vinyl Chloride: 0.025 ug/l.

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0220 is proposed for amendment as follows:

Hearing Officer's Proposed Modifications are illustrated as highlighted text:

15A NCAC 02B .0220 TIDAL SALT WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS SC WATERS

General. The water quality standards for all tidal salt waters are the basic standards applicable to Class SC waters. Additional and more stringent standards applicable to other specific tidal salt water classifications are specified in Rules .0221 and .0222 of this Section. Action Levels, for purposes of NPDES permitting, are specified in Item (20) of this Rule.

(1) Best Usage of Waters: any usage except primary recreation or shellfishing for market purposes; usages include aquatic life propagation and maintenance of biological integrity (including fishing, fish and functioning PNAs), wildlife, and secondary recreation;

(2) Conditions Related to Best Usage: the waters shall be suitable for aquatic life propagation and maintenance of biological integrity, wildlife, and secondary recreation. Any source of water pollution which precludes any of these uses, including their functioning as PNAs, on either a short-term or a long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard;

~~(3) Quality standards applicable to all tidal salt waters:~~

~~(a)~~(3) Chlorophyll a (corrected): not greater than 40 ug/l in sounds, estuaries, and other waters subject to growths of macroscopic or microscopic vegetation. The Commission or its designee may prohibit or limit any discharge of waste into surface waters if, in the opinion of the Director, the surface waters experience or the discharge would result in growths of microscopic or macroscopic vegetation such that the standards established pursuant to this Rule would be violated or the intended best usage of the waters would be impaired;

(4) Cyanide: 1 ug/l;

~~(b)~~(5) Dissolved oxygen: not less than 5.0 mg/l, except that swamp waters, poorly flushed tidally influenced streams or embayments, or estuarine bottom waters may have lower values if caused by natural conditions;

(6) Enterococcus, including *Enterococcus faecalis*, *Enterococcus faecium*, *Enterococcus avium* and *Enterococcus gallinarium*: not to exceed a geometric mean of 35 enterococci per 100 ml based upon a minimum of five samples within any consecutive 30 days. In accordance with 33 U.S.C. 1313 (Federal Water Pollution Control Act) for purposes of beach monitoring and notification, "Coastal Recreational Waters Monitoring, Evaluation and Notification" regulations (15A NCAC 18A .3400) are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments;

~~(c)~~(7) Floating solids, settleable solids, or sludge deposits: only such amounts attributable to sewage, industrial wastes or other wastes, as shall not make the waters unsafe or unsuitable for aquatic life and wildlife, or impair the waters for any designated uses;

~~(d)~~(8) Gases, total dissolved: not greater than 110 percent of saturation;

~~(e) Enterococcus, including *Enterococcus faecalis*, *Enterococcus faecium*, *Enterococcus avium* and *Enterococcus gallinarium*: not to exceed a geometric mean of 35 enterococci per 100 ml based upon a minimum of five samples within any consecutive 30 days. In accordance with 33 U.S.C. 1313 (Federal Water Pollution Control Act) for purposes of beach monitoring and notification, "Coastal Recreational Waters Monitoring, Evaluation and Notification" regulations (15A NCAC 18A .3400) are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments;~~

(9) Metals:

(a) With the exception of mercury and selenium, tidal salt water quality standards for metals shall be based upon measurement of the dissolved fraction of the metals. Mercury and Selenium must be based upon measurement of the total recoverable ~~metal.~~ metal; ~~Alternative site-specific standards can be developed where studies are designed according to the "Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition" published by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) hereby incorporated by reference, including any subsequent amendments;~~

(b) Compliance with acute instream metals standards shall only be evaluated using an average of two or more samples collected within one hour. Compliance with chronic instream metals standards shall only be evaluated using averages of a minimum of four samples taken on consecutive days, or as a 96-hour average;

~~(c) With the exception of mercury and selenium, demonstrated attainment of the applicable aquatic life use in a waterbody will take precedence over the application of the aquatic life criteria established for metals associated with these uses. An instream exceedence of the numeric criterion for metals shall not be considered to have caused an adverse impact to the instream aquatic community if biological monitoring has demonstrated attainment of biological integrity;~~

(c) Metals criteria will be used for proactive environmental management. An instream exceedence of the numeric criterion for metals shall not be considered to have caused an adverse impact to the aquatic community without biological confirmation and a comparison of all available monitoring data and applicable water quality standards. This weight of evidence evaluation will take into account data quality and the overall confidence in how representative the sampling is of conditions in the waterbody segment before an assessment of aquatic life use attainment, or non-attainment, is made by the Division. Recognizing the synergistic and antagonistic complexities of other water quality variables on the actual toxicity of metals, with the exception of Mercury and Selenium, biological monitoring will be used to validate, by direct measurement, whether or not the aquatic life use is supported.

(d) Acute and chronic tidal salt water quality metals standards are as follows:

(i) Arsenic, acute: WER· 69 ug/l;

(ii) Arsenic, chronic: WER· 36 ug/l;

(iii) Cadmium, acute: WER· 40 ug/l;

(iv) Cadmium, chronic: WER· 8.8 ug/l;

(v) Chromium VI, acute: WER· 1100 ug/l;

(vi) Chromium VI, chronic: WER· 50 ug/l;

(vii) Copper, acute: WER· 4.8 ug/l;

(viii) Copper, chronic: WER· 3.1 ug/l;

(ix) Lead, acute: WER· 210 ug/l;

(x) Lead, chronic: WER· 8.1 ug/l;

(xi) Mercury, total recoverable, chronic: 0.025 ug/l;

(xii) Nickel, acute: WER· 74 ug/l;

(xiii) Nickel, chronic: WER· 8.2 ug/l;

(xiv) Selenium, total recoverable, chronic: 71 ug/l;

(xv) Silver, acute: WER· 1.9 ug/l;

(xvi) Silver, chronic: WER· 0.1 ug/l;

(xvii) Zinc, acute: WER· 90 ug/l;

(xviii) Zinc, chronic: WER· 81 ug/l;

With the exception of Mercury and Selenium, acute and chronic tidal saltwater quality aquatic life standards for metals listed above apply to the dissolved form of the metal and apply as a function of the pollutant's water effect ratio (WER). A WER is a factor that expresses the difference between the measures of the toxicity of a substance in laboratory waters and the toxicity in site water. The WER is assigned a value equal to one (1) unless any person demonstrates to the Department's satisfaction in a permit proceeding that another value is appropriately developed in accordance with the "Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition" published by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA-823-B-12-002) hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. Alternative site-specific standards can also be developed when any person submits values that demonstrate to the Commissions' satisfaction that they were derived in accordance with the "Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition, Recalculation Procedure or the Resident Species Procedure";

~~(f)~~(10) Oils, deleterious substances, colored or other wastes: only such amounts as shall not render the waters injurious to public health, secondary recreation or aquatic life and wildlife or adversely affect the palatability of fish, aesthetic quality or impair the waters for any designated uses. For the purpose of implementing this Rule, oils, deleterious substances, colored or other wastes shall include but not be limited to substances that cause a film or sheen upon or discoloration of the surface of the water or adjoining shorelines pursuant to 40 CFR 110.3;

(11) Pesticides:

(a) Aldrin: 0.003 ug/l;

(b) Chlordane: 0.004 ug/l;

(c) DDT: 0.001 ug/l;

(d) Demeton: 0.1 ug/l;

(e) Dieldrin: 0.002 ug/l;

(f) Endosulfan: 0.009 ug/l;

(g) Endrin: 0.002 ug/l;

(h) Guthion: 0.01 ug/l;

(i) Heptachlor: 0.004 ug/l;

(j) Lindane: 0.004 ug/l;

(k) Methoxychlor: 0.03 ug/l;

(l) Mirex: 0.001 ug/l;

(m) Parathion: 0.178 ug/l;

(n) Toxaphene: 0.0002 ug/l;

~~(g)~~(12) pH: shall be normal for the waters in the area, which generally shall range between 6.8 and 8.5 except that swamp waters may have a pH as low as 4.3 if it is the result of natural conditions;

~~(h)~~(13) Phenolic compounds: only such levels as shall not result in fish-flesh tainting or impairment of other best usage;

(14) Polychlorinated biphenyls: (total of all PCBs and congeners identified) 0.001 ug/l;

~~(i)~~(15) Radioactive substances:

~~(i)~~(a) Combined radium-226 and radium-228: The maximum average annual activity level (based on at least four samples, collected quarterly) for combined radium-226, and radium-228 shall not exceed five picoCuries per liter;

~~(ii)~~(b) Alpha Emitters. The average annual gross alpha particle activity (including radium-226, but excluding radon and uranium) shall not exceed 15 picoCuries per liter;

~~(iii)~~(c) Beta Emitters. The maximum average annual activity level (based on at least four samples, collected quarterly) for strontium-90 shall not exceed eight picoCuries per liter; nor shall the average annual gross beta particle activity (excluding potassium-40 and other naturally occurring radio-nuclides) exceed 50 picoCuries per liter; nor shall the maximum average annual activity level for tritium exceed 20,000 picoCuries per liter;

~~(j)~~(16) Salinity: changes in salinity due to hydrological modifications shall not result in removal of the functions of a PNA. Projects that are determined by the Director to result in modifications of salinity such that functions of a PNA are impaired will be required to employ water management practices to mitigate salinity impacts;

~~(k)~~(17) Temperature: shall not be increased above the natural water temperature by more than 0.8 degrees C (1.44 degrees F) during the months of June, July, and August nor more than 2.2 degrees C (3.96

degrees F) during other months and in no cases to exceed 32 degrees C (89.6 degrees F) due to the discharge of heated liquids;

(18) Trialkyltin compounds: 0.007 ug/l expressed as tributyltin;

~~(l)~~(19) Turbidity: the turbidity in the receiving water shall not exceed 25 NTU; if turbidity exceeds this level due to natural background conditions, the existing turbidity level shall not be increased. Compliance with this turbidity standard can be met when land management activities employ Best Management Practices (BMPs) [as defined by Rule .0202 of this Section] recommended by the Designated Nonpoint Source Agency (as defined by Rule .0202 of this Section). BMPs must be in full compliance with all specifications governing the proper design, installation, operation and maintenance of such BMPs;

~~(m) Toxic substances: numerical water quality standards (maximum permissible levels) to protect aquatic life applicable to all tidal saltwaters:~~

~~(i) Arsenic, total recoverable: 50 ug/l;~~

~~(ii) Cadmium: 5.0 ug/l; attainment of these water quality standards in surface waters shall be based on measurement of total recoverable metals concentrations unless appropriate studies have been conducted to translate total recoverable metals to a toxic form. Studies used to determine the toxic form or translators must be designed according to the "Water Quality Standards Handbook Second Edition" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) or "The Metals Translator: Guidance For Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit From a Dissolved Criterion" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-96-007) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. The Director shall consider conformance to EPA guidance as well as the presence of environmental conditions that limit the applicability of translators in approving the use of metal translators;~~

~~(iii) Chromium, total: 20 ug/l;~~

~~(iv) Cyanide: 1.0 ug/l;~~

~~(v) Mercury: 0.025 ug/l;~~

~~(vi) Lead, total recoverable: 25 ug/l; collection of data on sources, transport and fate of lead shall be required as part of the toxicity reduction evaluation for dischargers that are out of compliance with whole effluent toxicity testing requirements and the concentration of lead in the effluent is concomitantly determined to exceed an instream level of 3.1 ug/l from the discharge;~~

~~(vii) Nickel: 8.3 ug/l; attainment of these water quality standards in surface waters shall be based on measurement of total recoverable metals concentrations unless appropriate studies have been conducted to translate total recoverable metals to~~

~~a toxic form. Studies used to determine the toxic form or translators must be designed according to the "Water Quality Standards Handbook Second Edition" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) or "The Metals Translator: Guidance For Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit From a Dissolved Criterion" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-96-007) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. The Director shall consider conformance to EPA guidance as well as the presence of environmental conditions that limit the applicability of translators in approving the use of metal translators;~~

~~(viii) Pesticides:~~

~~(A) Aldrin: 0.003 ug/l;~~

~~(B) Chlordane: 0.004 ug/l;~~

~~(C) DDT: 0.001 ug/l;~~

~~(D) Demeton: 0.1 ug/l;~~

~~(E) Dieldrin: 0.002 ug/l;~~

~~(F) Endosulfan: 0.009 ug/l;~~

~~(G) Endrin: 0.002 ug/l;~~

~~(H) Guthion: 0.01 ug/l;~~

~~(I) Heptachlor: 0.004 ug/l;~~

~~(J) Lindane: 0.004 ug/l;~~

~~(K) Methoxychlor: 0.03 ug/l;~~

~~(L) Mirex: 0.001 ug/l;~~

~~(M) Parathion: 0.178 ug/l;~~

~~(N) Toxaphene: 0.0002 ug/l;~~

~~(ix) Polychlorinated biphenyls: (total of all PCBs and congeners identified) 0.001 ug/l;~~

~~(x) Selenium: 71 ug/l;~~

~~(xi) Trialkyltin compounds: 0.007 ug/l expressed as tributyltin.~~

~~(4)~~(20) Action Levels for Toxic ~~Substances:~~Substances Applicable to NPDES Permits:

(a) ~~Copper:~~Copper, dissolved, chronic: ~~3 ug/l;~~3.1 ug/l;

(b) ~~Silver:~~Silver, dissolved, chronic: 0.1 ug/l;

(c) ~~Zinc:~~Zinc, dissolved, chronic: ~~86 ug/l;~~81 ug/l

If the chronic Action Levels for any of the substances listed in this ~~Subparagraph~~Item (which are generally not bioaccumulative and have variable toxicity to aquatic life because of chemical form, solubility, stream characteristics or associated waste characteristics) are determined by the waste load allocation to be exceeded in a receiving water by a discharge under the ~~specified low~~7Q10

flow criterion for toxic ~~substances (Rule .0206 in this Section),~~substances, the discharger shall be required to monitor the chemical or biological effects of the discharge; efforts shall be made by all dischargers to reduce or eliminate these substances from their effluents. Those substances for which Action Levels are listed in this ~~Subparagraph~~Item ~~may~~shall be limited as appropriate in the NPDES permit if sufficient information (to be determined for metals by measurements of that portion of the dissolved instream concentration of the Action Level parameter attributable to a specific NPDES permitted discharge) exists to indicate that any of those substances may be a causative factor resulting in toxicity of the effluent. ~~NPDES permit limits may be based on translation of the toxic form to total recoverable metals. Studies used to determine the toxic form or translators must be designed according to: "Water Quality Standards Handbook Second Edition" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) or "The Metals Translator: Guidance For Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit From a Dissolved Criterion" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-96-007) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. The Director shall consider conformance to EPA guidance as well as the presence of environmental conditions that limit the applicability of translators in approving the use of metal translators.~~

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

SECTION VIII:
HEARING OFFICER'S SUMMARY OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE STAFF REVIEW

In addition to the recommendations to be considered for adoption, the Hearing Officer has identified items in the current water quality standards that are of significant interest to the US EPA, other federal agencies, businesses, municipalities, Non-governmental Organizations and the general public. The Hearing Officer recommends that DWR staff review national guidance on the following parameters and consider the costs and benefits of modifying these criteria in the next Triennial Review:

For the Protection of Aquatic Life:

- Review National Recommended Water Quality Criterion (NRWQC) for Ammonia
- Review Draft National Recommended Water Quality Criterion (NRWQC) for Selenium
- Review current Dissolved Oxygen criterion for potential modification to assure protection of spawning areas, examine the necessity or utility of duration/frequency and depth requirements.
- Nutrients:
    - The Hearing Officer recommends that DWR continue to move forward with the "NC Nutrient Criteria Development Plan" (NC NCDP) with the objective to receive recommendations from the Scientific Advisory Council on potential EMC actions. http://portal.ncdenr.org/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=fda0bd83-a5cc-454a-b035-11979364f80f&groupId=38364

For the Protection of Human Health

- Review Revised NRWQC recreational bacteria criterion
- Review NRWQC methyl mercury criterion:
    - Request staff to carefully consider addition or modification to current Mercury standard
- Staff should keep abreast of the US EPA updated draft NRWQC for human health and aquatic life for chemical pollutants and advise the EMC when the additional criteria are finalized.

NORTH CAROLINA REGISTER

VOLUME 28 • ISSUE 24 • Pages 2975 – 3111

June 16, 2014

I. EXECUTIVE ORDERS
Executive Order No. 51 ..... 2975 – 2976
Executive Order No. 52 ..... 2977 – 2979
Executive Order No. 53 ..... 2980 – 2981

II. IN ADDITION
Environmental Management Commission – Public Notice. 2982
Health Service Regulation, Division of – COPA 2983

III. PROPOSED RULES
Environment and Natural Resources, Department of
Environmental Management Commission ..... 3004 – 3032
Insurance, Department of
Agent Services Division ..... 2984 – 2985
Justice, Department of
Criminal Justice Education and Training Standards Commission ..... 2985 – 3004
Occupational Licensing Boards and Commissions
Irrigation Contractors Licensing, Board of ..... 3032 – 3034
Landscape Architects, Licensing Board of ..... 3034 – 3040
Soil Scientists, Board for Licensing of ..... 3040 – 3041

IV. RULES REVIEW COMMISSION ..... 3042 – 3052

V. CONTESTED CASE DECISIONS
Index to ALJ Decisions ..... 3053 – 3069
Text of ALJ Decisions
12 DHR 09028 ..... 3070 – 3074
12 OSP 04550 ..... 3075 – 3082
13 EDC 16807 ..... 3083 – 3087
13 OSP 02680 ..... 3088 – 3108
14 EHR 00662 ..... 3109 – 3111

PUBLISHED BY
The Office of Administrative Hearings
Rules Division
6714 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-6714
Telephone (919) 431-3000
Fax (919) 431-3104

Julian Mann III, Director
Molly Masich, Codifier of Rules
Dana Vojtko, Publications Coordinator
Tammara Chalmers, Editorial Assistant
Lindsay Woy, Editorial Assistant

This publication is printed on permanent, acid-free paper in compliance with G.S. 125-11.13

Commission must meet, and submit documentation to the Standards Division verifying his or her compliance with, the following requirements:

(1) Hold a current license, certification or registration from another jurisdiction which is substantially equivalent to or exceeds the requirements required for certification;

(2) Be in good standing with the issuing agency and not been disciplined by the agency that has the jurisdiction to issue the license, certification or permit; and

(3) Demonstrate competency in the occupation by:

(A) Having completed continuing education comparable to the education and training required for the type of certification for which the application is being made, as determined by Paragraph (b) of this Rule; or

(B) Having engaged in the active practice of that occupational specialty for at least two of the five years prior to the date of application.

(d) A military trained individual or military spouse seeking General Certification as a law enforcement officer must meet, at a minimum, the requirements of Rule .0403(a)(2) of this Section. The Division shall review the documents received to determine if any additional training is required to satisfy the certification requirements of this Subchapter.

(e) In the event the applicant's prior training is not substantially equivalent to the Commission's standards, the Commission shall prescribe as a condition of certification, supplementary or remedial training deemed necessary to equate previous training with current standards.

(f) Where certifications issued by the Commission require satisfactory performance on a written examination as part of the training, the Commission shall require such examinations for the certification.

~~(d)~~(g) In those instances not ~~specifically~~ incorporated within this ~~Section~~ Rule or where an evaluation of the applicant's prior training and experience determines that required attendance in the entire Basic Law Enforcement Training Course would be impractical, the Director of the Standards Division is authorized to exercise his discretion in determining the amount of training those persons shall complete during their probationary period.

~~(e)~~(h) The following criteria shall be used by ~~division~~ Standards Division staff in evaluating prior training and experience of local confinement personnel to determine eligibility for a waiver of training requirements:

(1) Persons who hold probationary, general, or grandfather certification as local confinement personnel and separate after having completed a commission-accredited course as prescribed in ~~12 NCAC~~ Rule ~~9B~~ .0224 or .0225 of this Subchapter and have been separated for more than one year shall complete a subsequent commission-accredited training course in its entirety and successfully pass the State Comprehensive Examination during the probationary period as prescribed in ~~12 NCAC 9B .0401(a);~~ Rule .0401(a) of this Section;

(2) Persons who separated from a local confinement personnel position after having completed a commission-accredited course as prescribed in ~~12 NCAC~~ Rule ~~9B~~ .0224 or .0225 of this Subchapter and who have been separated for less than one year shall serve a new 12 month probationary period, but need not complete an additional training program;

(3) Applicants who hold or previously held "Detention Officer Certification" issued by the North Carolina Sheriffs' Education and Training Standards Commission shall be subject to evaluation of their prior training and experience on an individual basis. Where the applicant properly obtained certification and successfully completed the required 120 hour training course, and has not had a break in service in excess of one year, no additional training will be required; and

(4) Persons holding certification for local confinement facilities who transfer to a district or county confinement facility shall ~~satisfactorily~~ complete the course for district and county confinement facility personnel, as adopted by reference in 12 NCAC ~~9B~~ 09B .0224, in its entirety and successfully pass the State Comprehensive Examination during the probationary period as prescribed in ~~12 NCAC 9B .0401(a).~~ Rule .0401(a) of this Section.

Authority G.S. 17C-2; 17C-6; 17C-10; 93B-15.1.

TITLE 15A – DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

***Notice** is hereby given in accordance with G.S. 150B-21.2 that the Department of Environment and Natural Resources intends to amend the rules cited as 15A NCAC 02B .0206; .0211; .0212; .0214-.0216; .0218; .0220.*

Agency obtained G.S. 150B-19.1 certification:

☒ **OSBM certified on:** *April 23, 2014*

☐ **RRC certified on:**

☐ **Not Required**

Link to agency website pursuant to G.S. 150B-19.1(c): *http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/guest/rules*

Proposed Effective Date: *January 1, 2015*

Public Hearings:
Date: *Tuesday, July 15, 2014*
Time: *2:00 p.m.*
Location: *Ground Floor Hearing Room, Archdale Building, 512 N Salisbury St., Raleigh, NC*

Date: *Wednesday, July 16, 2014*
Time: *3:00 p.m.*
Location: *Statesville Civic Center, 300 South Center Street, Statesville, NC*

Reason for Proposed Action: *The Environmental Management Commission (EMC) will conduct public hearings to consider proposed permanent amendments to various rules that establish the surface water quality standards for North Carolina. These proposed amendments comprise the State's Triennial Review of Surface Water Quality Standards, which is mandated by the federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act or CWA). If adopted, the proposals would implement the following changes to the surface water quality standards for North Carolina:*

1) Based on revised US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) research, new health information is available for 2,4 D (a chlorophenoxy herbicide). When implemented, the standard will lower the applicable acceptable human health protective concentration.
2) Updated aquatic life protective concentrations for Arsenic, Beryllium, Cadmium, Chromium III, Chromium VI, Copper, Lead, Nickel, Silver and Zinc are proposed. The revisions reflect the latest scientific knowledge regarding the effects of the pollutants on aquatic organisms. With the exception of Mercury and Selenium, which are both bioaccumulative metals, the state proposes changing to dissolved metal water quality standards. The dissolved fraction more closely estimates the portion of the metal that is toxic to aquatic life. The revised criteria are average concentrations that can be present in a water body, but should not result in unacceptable effects to aquatic organisms and the designated use of the water body on both a shorter (acute) and a longer (chronic) term basis. Where metals toxicity is hardness-dependent, applicable hardness values are defined. With the exception of Mercury and Selenium, the proposals allow careful consideration of aquatic life biological integrity to take precedence over ambient standard violations for water quality assessment purposes.
3) The standards for Iron and Manganese are proposed for removal. Both chemicals are federally designated "non-priority" pollutants. The standard for Total Chromium is also proposed for removal, but is replaced by human health and aquatic life protective standards for Chromium III and Chromium VI.
4) Codify the use of 1Q10 stream flows for implementation of acute water quality standards in NPDES permitting. Allow the use of the median instream hardness values in calculating permit limits based on proposed hardness-dependent metals standards.
5) The public will have the opportunity to comment on three variances from surface water quality standards and federal 316(a) thermal variances. The three surface water standards exemptions consist of two variances from the chloride standard for Mt. Olive Pickle Company and Bay Valley Foods, LLC (formerly Dean Pickle and Specialty Products Company) (NC0001074 & NC0001970) and a variance from the color standard for Evergreen Packaging (d.b.a. Blue Ridge Paper Products) (NC0000272). Information concerning any of these variances can be obtained by contacting the individual named in the comment procedures.
6) Variances from applicable standards, revisions to water quality standards, or site-specific water quality standards may be granted by the Environmental Management Commission on a case-by-case basis pursuant to GS 143-215.3(e), 143-214.3 or 143-214.1. For metals standards, the proposed language details that alternative site-specific standards can be developed when studies are designed in accordance with the "Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition" published by the US EPA (EPA 823-B-94-005a). The mechanisms outlined in the US EPA publication are for the Water Effect Ratio, the Recalculation Procedure, and the Resident Species Procedure. The EMC is seeking comment on the application of these provisions with respect to modifying the metals criteria.

Comment Procedures*:*
It is important that all interested and potentially affected persons or parties make their views known to the EMC whether in favor of, or opposed to, any and all of the proposed amendments and current regulations. As the state and US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) have a strong interest in assuring that the decisions are legally defensible, are based on the best scientific information available, and are subject to full and meaningful public comment and participation, clear records are critical to the administrative review by the EMC and the US EPA.
The public hearing will be recorded. It will consist of a presentation by DWR staff, followed by an open comment period. The EMC appointed hearing officer may limit the length of time that you may speak, if necessary, so that all those who wish to speak will have an opportunity. You may attend the public hearing to make verbal comments and/or submit written comments. You may present conceptual ideas, technical justifications, or specific language you believe is necessary and relevant to 15A NCAC 02B surface water quality classifications and standards regulations. No items will be voted on and no decisions will be made at this hearing.

In case of inclement weather on either of the two published hearing dates, a continuance date for the public hearing has been established as July 29th , 1:30 p.m., Ground Floor Hearing Room, Archdale Building, 512 North Salisbury Street, Raleigh, NC. A recorded message regarding any continuance to the hearing record will be available at the below noted telephone number.

Comments may be submitted to: *Connie Brower, 1611 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-1611; phone (919) 807-6416, main line (919) 707-9000; fax (919) 807-6497; email DWR-Classifications-Standards@ncdenr.gov*

Comment period ends: *5:00 p.m. Friday, August 22, 2014*

Procedure for Subjecting a Proposed Rule to Legislative Review: If an objection is not resolved prior to the adoption of the rule, a person may also submit written objections to the Rules Review Commission after the adoption of the Rule. If the Rules Review Commission receives written and signed objections after the adoption of the Rule in accordance with G.S. 150B-21.3(b2) from 10 or more persons clearly requesting

review by the legislature and the Rules Review Commission approves the rule, the rule will become effective as provided in G.S. 150B-21.3(b1). The Commission will receive written objections until 5:00 p.m. on the day following the day the Commission approves the rule. The Commission will receive those objections by mail, delivery service, hand delivery, or facsimile transmission. If you have any further questions concerning the submission of objections to the Commission, please call a Commission staff attorney at 919-431-3000.

Fiscal impact (check all that apply).

☐ **State funds affected**
☐ **Environmental permitting of DOT affected**
Analysis submitted to Board of Transportation
☒ **Local funds affected**
☒ **Substantial economic impact (≥$1,000,000)**
☐ **No fiscal note required by G.S. 150B-21.4**

CHAPTER 02 – ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SUBCHAPTER 02B – SURFACE WATER AND WETLAND STANDARDS

SECTION .0200 – CLASSIFICATIONS AND WATER QUALITY STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO SURFACE WATERS AND WETLANDS OF NORTH CAROLINA

15A NCAC 02B .0206 FLOW DESIGN CRITERIA FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS

(a) Water quality based effluent limitations are developed to allow appropriate frequency and duration of deviations from water quality standards so that the designated uses of receiving waters are protected. There are water quality standards for a number of categories of pollutants and to protect a range of water uses. For this reason, the appropriate frequency and duration of deviations from water quality standards is not the same for all categories of standards. A flow design criterion is used in the development of water quality based effluent limitations as a simplified means of estimating the acceptable frequency and duration of deviations. More complex modeling techniques can also be used to set effluent limitations directly based on frequency and duration criteria published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to Section 304(a) of the Federal Clean Water Act as amended. Use of more complex modeling techniques to set water quality based effluent limitations will be approved by the Commission or its designee on a case-by-case basis. Flow design criteria to calculate water quality based effluent limitations for categories of water quality standards are listed as follows:

(1) All standards except toxic substances and aesthetics will be protected using the minimum average flow for a period of seven consecutive days that has an average recurrence of once in ten years (7Q10 flow). Other governing flow strategies such as varying discharges with the receiving waters ability to assimilate wastes may be designated by the Commission or its designee on a case-by-case basis if the discharger or permit applicant provide evidence which establishes to the satisfaction of the Director that the alternative flow strategies will give equal or better protection for the water quality standards. Better protection for the standards means that deviations from the standard would be expected less frequently than provided by using the 7Q10 flow.

(2) Toxic substance standards to protect aquatic life from chronic toxicity will be protected using the 7Q10 flow.

(3) Toxic substance standards to protect aquatic life from acute toxicity will be protected using the 1Q10 flow.

~~(3)~~(4) Toxic substance standards to protect human health will be:

(A) The 7Q10 flow for standards to protect human health through the consumption of water, fish and shellfish from noncarcinogens;

(B) The mean annual flow to protect human health from carcinogens through the consumption of water, fish and shellfish unless site specific fish contamination concerns necessitate the use of an alternative design flow;

(5) Aesthetic quality will be protected using the minimum average flow for a period of 30 consecutive days that has an average recurrence of once in two years (30Q2 flow).

(b) In cases where the stream flow is regulated, a minimum daily low flow may be used as a substitute for the 7Q10 flow except in cases where there are acute toxicity concerns for aquatic life. In the cases where there are acute toxicity concerns, an alternative low flow such as the instantaneous minimum release may be used on a case-by-case basis.

(c) Flow design criteria are used to develop water quality based effluent limitations and for the design of wastewater treatment facilities. Deviations from a specific water quality standard resulting from discharges which are affirmatively demonstrated to be in compliance with water quality based effluent limitations for that standard will not be a violation pursuant to G.S. 143-215.6 when the actual flow is significantly less than the design flow.

(d) In cases where the 7Q10 flow of the receiving stream is estimated to be zero, water quality based effluent limitations will be assigned as follows:

(1) Where the 30Q2 flow is estimated to be greater than zero, effluent limitations for new or expanded (additional) discharges of oxygen consuming waste will be set at BOD_5= 5 mg/l, NH_3-N = 2 mg/l and DO = 6 mg/l, unless it is determined that these limitations will not protect water quality standards. Requirements for existing discharges will be determined on a case-by-case basis by the Director. More stringent limits will be applied in cases where violations of water quality standards are

predicted to occur for a new or expanded discharge with the limits set pursuant to this Rule, or where existing limits are determined to be inadequate to protect water quality standards.

(2) If the 30Q2 and 7Q10 flows are both estimated to be zero, no new or expanded (additional) discharge of oxygen consuming waste will be allowed. Requirements for existing discharges to streams where the 30Q2 and 7Q10 flows are both estimated to be zero will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

(3) Other water quality standards will be protected by requiring the discharge to meet the standards unless the alternative limitations are determined by the Director to protect the classified water uses.

(e) Receiving water flow statistics will be estimated through consultation with the U.S. Geological Survey. Estimates for any given location may be based on actual flow data, modeling analyses, or other methods determined to be appropriate by the Commission or its designee.

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0211 FRESH SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS C WATERS

General. The water quality standards for all fresh surface waters are the basic standards applicable to Class C waters. ~~See Rule .0208 of this Section for standards for toxic substances and temperature.~~ Water quality standards for temperature and numerical water quality standards for the protection of human health applicable to all fresh surface waters are in Rule .0208 of this Section. Additional and more stringent standards applicable to other specific freshwater classifications are specified in Rules .0212, .0214, .0215, .0216, ~~.0217,~~ .0218, .0219, .0223, .0224 and .0225 of this Section. Action Levels for purposes of NPDES permitting are specified in Item (22) of this Rule.

(1) Best Usage of Waters: aquatic life propagation and maintenance of biological integrity (including fishing and fish), wildlife, secondary recreation, agriculture and any other usage except for primary recreation or as a source of water supply for drinking, culinary or food processing purposes;

(2) Conditions Related to Best Usage: the waters shall be suitable for aquatic life propagation and maintenance of biological integrity, wildlife, secondary recreation, and agriculture. Sources of water pollution which preclude any of these uses on either a short-term or long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard;

~~(3) Quality standards applicable to all fresh surface waters:~~

(3) Chlorine, total residual: 17 ug/l;

(4)~~(a)~~ Chlorophyll a (corrected): not greater than 40 ug/l for lakes, reservoirs, and other waters subject to growths of macroscopic or microscopic vegetation not designated as trout waters, and not greater than 15 ug/l for lakes, reservoirs, and other waters subject to growths of macroscopic or microscopic vegetation designated as trout waters (not applicable to lakes or reservoirs less than 10 acres in surface area). The Commission or its designee may prohibit or limit any discharge of waste into surface waters if, in the opinion of the Director, the surface waters experience or the discharge would result in growths of microscopic or macroscopic vegetation such that the standards established pursuant to this Rule would be violated or the intended best usage of the waters would be impaired;

(5) Cyanide, total: 5.0 ug/L;

(6)~~(b)~~ Dissolved oxygen: not less than 6.0 mg/l for trout waters; for non-trout waters, not less than a daily average of 5.0 mg/l with a minimum instantaneous value of not less than 4.0 mg/l; swamp waters, lake coves or backwaters, and lake bottom waters may have lower values if caused by natural conditions;

(7) Fecal coliform: shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100ml (MF count) based upon at least five consecutive samples examined during any 30 day period, nor exceed 400/100ml in more than 20 percent of the samples examined during such period. Violations of the fecal coliform standard are expected during rainfall events and, in some cases, this violation is expected to be caused by uncontrollable nonpoint source pollution. All coliform concentrations are to be analyzed using the membrane filter technique unless high turbidity or other adverse conditions necessitate the tube dilution method; in case of controversy over results, the MPN 5-tube dilution technique shall be used as the reference method;

(8)~~(c)~~ Floating solids, settleable solids, or sludge deposits: only such amounts attributable to sewage, industrial wastes or other wastes as shall not make the water unsafe or unsuitable for aquatic life and wildlife or impair the waters for any designated uses;

(9) Fluorides: 1.8 mg/l;

(10)~~(d)~~ Gases, total dissolved: not greater than 110 percent of saturation;

~~(e) Organisms of the coliform group: fecal coliforms shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100ml (MF count) based upon at least five consecutive samples examined during any 30 day period, nor exceed 400/100ml in more than 20 percent of the samples examined during such period. Violations of the fecal coliform standard are expected during~~

~~rainfall events and, in some cases, this violation is expected to be caused by uncontrollable nonpoint source pollution. All coliform concentrations are to be analyzed using the membrane filter technique unless high turbidity or other adverse conditions necessitate the tube dilution method; in case of controversy over results, the MPN 5-tube dilution technique shall be used as the reference method;~~

(11) Metals:

(a) With the exception of mercury and selenium, freshwater aquatic life standards for metals shall be based upon measurement of the dissolved fraction of the metal. Mercury and Selenium water quality standards must be based upon measurement of the total recoverable metal. Alternative site-specific standards can be developed where studies are designed in accordance with the "Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition" published by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments;

(b) Freshwater metals standards that are not hardness-dependent are as follows:

(i) Arsenic, dissolved, acute: 340 ug/l;

(ii) Arsenic, dissolved, chronic: 150 ug/l;

(iii) Beryllium, dissolved, acute: 65 ug/l;

(iv) Beryllium, dissolved, chronic: 6.5 ug/l;

(v) Chromium VI, dissolved, acute: 16 ug/l;

(vi) Chromium VI, dissolved, chronic: 11 ug/l;

(vii) Mercury, total recoverable, chronic: 0.012 ug/l;

(viii) Selenium, total recoverable, chronic: 5 ug/l;

(ix) Silver, dissolved, chronic: 0.06 ug/l;

Hardness-dependent freshwater metals standards are located in Sub-Item (c) and in Table A: Dissolved Freshwater Standards for Hardness-Dependent Metals;

(c) Hardness-dependent freshwater metals standards are as follows:

(i) Hardness-dependent metals standards shall be derived using the equations specified in Table A: Dissolved Freshwater Standards for Hardness-Dependent Metals. If the actual instream hardness (expressed as $CaCO_3$ or Ca+Mg) is less than 25 milligrams/liter (mg/l), standards shall be calculated based upon 25 mg/l hardness. If the actual instream hardness is greater than 25 mg/l and less than 400 mg/l, standards will be calculated based upon the actual instream hardness. If the instream hardness is greater than 400 mg/l, the maximum applicable hardness shall be 400 mg/l;

(ii) Hardness-dependent metals standards in NPDES permitting: for NPDES permitting purposes, application of the equations in Table A: Dissolved Freshwater Standards for Hardness-Dependent Metals requires hardness values (expressed as $CaCO_3$ or Ca+Mg) established using the median of instream hardness data collected within the local US Geological Survey (USGS) and Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) 8-digit Hydrologic Unit (HU). The minimum applicable instream hardness shall be 25 mg/l and the maximum applicable instream hardness shall be 400 mg/l, even when the actual median instream hardness is less than 25 mg/l and greater than 400 mg/l;

Table A: Dissolved Freshwater Standards for Hardness-Dependent Metals
Numeric standards listed below are calculated at 25 mg/l hardness for illustrative purposes.

Metal	Equations for Hardness-Dependent Freshwater Metals (ug/l)	Standard at 25 mg/l hardness (ug/l)
Cadmium, Acute	{1.136672-[*ln* hardness](0.041838)} · *e*^{0.9151 [*ln* hardness]-3.1485}	0.82
Cadmium, Acute Trout waters	{1.136672-[*ln* hardness](0.041838)} · *e*^{0.9151[*ln* hardness]-3.6236}	0.51
Cadmium, Chronic	{1.101672-[*ln* hardness](0.041838)} · *e*^{0.7998[*ln* hardness]-4.4451}	0.15
Chromium III, Acute	0.316 · *e*^{0.8190[*ln* hardness]+3.7256}	180
Chromium III, Chronic	0.860 · *e*^{0.8190[*ln* hardness]+0.6848}	24
Copper, Acute	0.960 · *e*^{0.9422[*ln* hardness]-1.700} Or, Aquatic Life Ambient Freshwater Quality Criteria—Copper 2007 Revision (EPA-822-R-07-001)	3.6 N/A
Copper, Chronic	0.960 · *e*^{0.8545[*ln* hardness]-1.702} Or, Aquatic Life Ambient Freshwater Quality Criteria—Copper 2007 Revision (EPA-822-R-07-001)	2.7 N/A
Lead, Acute	{1.46203-[*ln* hardness](0.145712)} · *e*^{1.273[*ln* hardness]-1.460}	14
Lead, Chronic	{1.46203-[*ln* hardness](0.145712)} · *e*^{1.273[*ln* hardness]-4.705}	0.54
Nickel, Acute	0.998 · *e*^{0.8460[*ln* hardness]+2.255}	140
Nickel, Chronic	0.997 · *e*^{0.8460[*ln* hardness]+0.0584}	16
Silver, Acute	0.85 · *e*^{1.72[*ln* hardness]-6.59}	0.30
Zinc, Acute	0.978 · *e*^{0.8473[*ln* hardness]+0.884}	36
Zinc, Chronic	0.986 · *e*^{0.8473[*ln* hardness]+0.884}	36

(d) Compliance with acute instream metals standards shall only be evaluated using an average of two or more samples collected within one hour. Compliance with chronic instream metals standards shall only be evaluated using averages of a minimum of four samples taken on consecutive days, or as a 96-hour average;

(e) With the exception of mercury and selenium, demonstrated attainment of the applicable aquatic life use in a waterbody will take precedence over the application of the aquatic life criteria established for metals associated with these uses. An instream exceedence of the numeric criterion for metals shall not be considered to have caused an adverse impact to the instream aquatic community if biological monitoring has demonstrated attainment of biological integrity.

~~(f)~~(12) Oils, deleterious substances, colored or other wastes: only such amounts as shall not render the waters injurious to public health, secondary recreation or to aquatic life and

wildlife or adversely affect the palatability of fish, aesthetic quality or impair the waters for any designated uses. For the purpose of implementing this Rule, oils, deleterious substances, colored or other wastes shall include but not be limited to substances that cause a film or sheen upon or discoloration of the surface of the water or adjoining shorelines pursuant to 40 CFR 110.3(a)-(b) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments and additions. This material is available for inspection at the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of ~~Water Quality,~~ Water Resources, 512 North Salisbury Street, Raleigh, North ~~Carolina.~~Carolina; ~~Copies may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402-9325 at a cost of forty-five dollars ($45.00);~~

(13) Pesticides:

(a) Aldrin: 0.002 ug/l;

(b) Chlordane: 0.004 ug/l;

(c) DDT: 0.001 ug/l;

(d) Demeton: 0.1 ug/l;

(e) Dieldrin: 0.002 ug/l;

(f) Endosulfan: 0.05 ug/l;

(g) Endrin: 0.002 ug/l;

(h) Guthion: 0.01 ug/l;

(i) Heptachlor: 0.004 ug/l;

(j) Lindane: 0.01 ug/l;

(k) Methoxychlor: 0.03 ug/l;

(l) Mirex: 0.001 ug/l;

(m) Parathion: 0.013 ug/l;

(n) Toxaphene: 0.0002 ug/l;

~~(g)~~(14) pH: shall be normal for the waters in the area, which generally shall range between 6.0 and 9.0 except that swamp waters may have a pH as low as 4.3 if it is the result of natural conditions;

~~(h)~~(15) Phenolic compounds: only such levels as shall not result in fish-flesh tainting or impairment of other best usage;

(16) Polychlorinated biphenyls (total of all PCBs and congeners identified): 0.001 ug/l;

~~(i)~~(17) Radioactive substances:

~~(i)~~(a) Combined radium-226 and radium-228: the maximum average annual activity level (based on at least four samples collected quarterly) for combined radium-226 and radium-228 shall not exceed five picoCuries per liter;

~~(ii)~~(b) Alpha Emitters: the average annual gross alpha particle activity (including radium-226, but excluding radon and uranium) shall not exceed 15 picoCuries per liter;

~~(iii)~~(c) Beta Emitters: the maximum average annual activity level (based on at least four samples, collected quarterly) for strontium-90 shall not exceed eight picoCuries per liter; nor shall the average annual gross beta particle activity (excluding potassium-40 and other naturally occurring radio-nuclides) exceed 50 picoCuries per liter; nor shall the maximum average annual activity level for tritium exceed 20,000 picoCuries per liter;

~~(j)~~(18) Temperature: not to exceed 2.8 degrees C (5.04 degrees F) above the natural water temperature, and in no case to exceed 29 degrees C (84.2 degrees F) for mountain and upper piedmont waters and 32 degrees C (89.6 degrees F) for lower piedmont and coastal plain Waters; the temperature for trout waters shall not be increased by more than 0.5 degrees C (0.9 degrees F) due to the discharge of heated liquids, but in no case to exceed 20 degrees C (68 degrees F);

(19) Toluene: 11 ug/l or 0.36 ug/l in trout classified waters;

(20) Trialkyltin compounds: 0.07 ug/l expressed as tributyltin;

~~(k)~~(21) Turbidity: the turbidity in the receiving water shall not exceed 50 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU) in streams not designated as trout waters and 10 NTU in streams, lakes or reservoirs designated as trout waters; for lakes and reservoirs not designated as trout waters, the turbidity shall not exceed 25 NTU; if turbidity exceeds these levels due to natural background conditions, the existing turbidity level shall not be increased. Compliance with this turbidity standard can be met when land management activities employ Best Management Practices (BMPs) [as defined by Rule .0202 of this Section] recommended by the Designated Nonpoint Source Agency [as defined by Rule .0202 of this Section]. BMPs must be in full compliance with all specifications governing the proper design, installation, operation and maintenance of such BMPs;

~~(l) Toxic substances: numerical water quality standards (maximum permissible levels) for the protection of human health applicable to all fresh surface waters are in Rule .0208 of this Section. Numerical water quality standards (maximum permissible levels) to protect aquatic life applicable to all fresh surface waters:~~

~~(i) Arsenic: 50 ug/l;~~

~~(ii) Beryllium: 6.5 ug/l;~~

~~(iii) Cadmium: 0.4 ug/l for trout waters and 2.0 ug/l for non-trout waters; attainment of these water quality standards in surface waters shall be based on measurement of total recoverable metals concentrations unless appropriate studies have been conducted to translate total recoverable metals to a toxic form. Studies used to determine the toxic form or translators must be designed according to the "Water Quality Standards Handbook Second Edition" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) or "The Metals Translator: Guidance For Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit From a Dissolved Criterion" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-96-007) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. The Director shall consider conformance to EPA guidance as well as the presence of environmental conditions that limit the applicability of translators in approving the use of metal translators;~~

~~(iv) Chlorine, total residual: 17 ug/l;~~

~~(v) Chromium, total recoverable: 50 ug/l;~~

~~(vi) Cyanide, 5.0 ug/l, unless site-specific criteria are developed based upon the aquatic life at the site utilizing The Recalculation Procedure in Appendix B of Appendix L in the Environmental Protection Agency's Water Quality Standards Handbook hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments;~~

~~(vii) Fluorides: 1.8 mg/l;~~

~~(viii) Lead, total recoverable: 25 ug/l, collection of data on sources, transport and fate of lead shall be required as part of the toxicity reduction evaluation for dischargers who are out of compliance with whole effluent toxicity testing requirements and the concentration of lead in the effluent is concomitantly determined to exceed an instream level of 3.1 ug/l from the discharge;~~

~~(ix) Mercury: 0.012 ug/l;~~

~~(x) Nickel: 88 ug/l, attainment of these water quality standards in surface waters shall be based on measurement of total recoverable metals concentrations unless appropriate studies have been conducted to translate total recoverable metals to a toxic form. Studies used to determine the toxic form or translators must be designed according to the "Water Quality Standards Handbook Second Edition" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) or "The Metals Translator: Guidance For Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit From a Dissolved Criterion" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-96-007) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. The Director shall consider conformance to EPA guidance as well as the presence of environmental conditions that limit the applicability of translators in approving the use of metal translators;~~

~~(xi) Pesticides:~~

~~(A) Aldrin: 0.002 ug/l;~~

~~(B) Chlordane: 0.004 ug/l;~~

~~(C) DDT: 0.001 ug/l;~~

~~(D) Demeton: 0.1 ug/l;~~

~~(E) Dieldrin: 0.002 ug/l;~~

~~(F) Endosulfan: 0.05 ug/l;~~

~~(G) Endrin: 0.002 ug/l;~~

~~(H) Guthion: 0.01 ug/l;~~

~~(I) Heptachlor: 0.004 ug/l;~~

~~(J) Lindane: 0.01 ug/l;~~

~~(K) Methoxychlor: 0.03 ug/l;~~

~~(L) Mirex: 0.001 ug/l;~~

~~(M) Parathion: 0.013 ug/l;~~

~~(N) Toxaphene: 0.0002 ug/l;~~

~~(xii) Polychlorinated biphenyls: (total of all PCBs and congeners identified) 0.001 ug/l;~~

~~(xiii) Selenium: 5 ug/l;~~

~~(xiv) Toluene: 11 ug/l or 0.36 ug/l in trout waters;~~

~~(xv) Trialkyltin compounds: 0.07 ug/l expressed as tributyltin;~~

~~(4)~~(22) Action Levels for Toxic ~~Substances:~~ Substances Applicable to NPDES Permits:

(a) ~~Copper: 7 ug/l;~~Copper, dissolved, chronic: 2.7 ug/l;

~~(b) Iron: 1.0 mg/l;~~

~~(c)~~(b) ~~Silver:~~Silver, dissolved, chronic: 0.06 ug/l;

~~(d)~~(c) ~~Zinc:~~Zinc, dissolved, chronic: ~~50 ug/l;~~36 ug/l;

~~(e)~~(d) Chloride: 230 mg/l;

The hardness-dependent freshwater action levels for Copper and Zinc, provided here for illustrative purposes, corresponds to a hardness of 25 mg/l. Copper and Zinc action level values for other instream hardness values shall be calculated per the chronic equations specified in Item (11) of this Rule and in Table A: Dissolved Freshwater Standards for Hardness-Dependent Metals. If the Action Levels for any of the substances listed in this ~~Subparagraph~~ Item (which are generally not bioaccumulative and have variable toxicity to aquatic life because of chemical form, solubility, stream characteristics or associated waste characteristics) are determined by the waste load allocation to be exceeded in a receiving water by a discharge under the specified ~~low flow~~ 7Q10 criterion for toxic ~~substances (Rule .0206 in this Section),~~ substances, the discharger shall monitor the chemical or biological effects of the discharge; efforts shall be made by all dischargers to reduce or eliminate these substances from their effluents. Those substances for which Action Levels are listed in this ~~Subparagraph~~Item shall be limited as appropriate in the NPDES permit ~~based on the Action Levels listed in this Subparagraph~~ if sufficient information (to be determined for metals by measurements of that portion of the dissolved instream concentration of the Action Level parameter attributable to a specific NPDES permitted discharge) exists to indicate that any of those substances may be a causative factor resulting in toxicity of the effluent. ~~NPDES permit limits may be based on translation of the toxic form to total recoverable metals. Studies used to determine the toxic form or translators must be designed according to "Water Quality Standards Handbook Second Edition" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) or "The Metals Translator: Guidance For Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit From a Dissolved Criterion" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-96-007) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. The Director shall consider conformance to EPA guidance as well as the presence of environmental conditions that limit the applicability of translators in approving the use of metal translators.~~

~~For purposes other than consideration of NPDES permitting of point source discharges as described in this Subparagraph, the Action Levels in this Rule, as measured by an appropriate analytical technique, per 15A NCAC 02B .0103(a), shall be considered as numerical instream water quality standards.~~

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0212 FRESH SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS WS-I WATERS

The following water quality standards apply to surface waters within water supply watersheds that are classified WS-I. Water quality standards applicable to Class C waters as described in Rule .0211 of this Section also apply to Class WS-I waters.

(1) The best usage of WS-I waters are as follows: a source of water supply for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes for those users desiring maximum protection of their water supplies; waters located on land in public ownership; and any best usage specified for Class C waters;

(2) The conditions related to the best usage are as follows: waters of this class are protected water supplies within essentially natural and undeveloped watersheds in public ownership with no permitted point source dischargers except those specified in Rule .0104 of this Subchapter; waters within this class must be relatively unimpacted by nonpoint sources of

pollution; land use management programs are required to protect waters from nonpoint source pollution; the waters, following treatment required by the ~~Division of Environmental Health,~~ Division, shall meet the Maximum Contaminant Level concentrations considered safe for drinking, culinary, and food-processing purposes which are specified in the national drinking water regulations and in the North Carolina Rules Governing Public Water Supplies, 15A NCAC 18C .1500. Sources of water pollution which preclude any of these uses on either a short-term or long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard. The Class WS-I classification may be used to protect portions of Class WS-II, WS-III and WS-IV water supplies. For reclassifications occurring after the July 1, 1992 statewide reclassification, the more protective classification requested by local governments shall be considered by the Commission when all local governments having jurisdiction in the affected area(s) have adopted a resolution and the appropriate ordinances to protect the watershed or the Commission acts to protect a watershed when one or more local governments has failed to adopt necessary protection measures;

(3) Quality standards applicable to Class WS-I Waters are as follows:

(a) MBAS (Methylene-Blue Active Substances): not greater than 0.5 mg/l to protect the aesthetic qualities of water supplies and to prevent foaming;

(b) Nonpoint Source Pollution: none shall be allowed that would adversely impact the waters for use as a water supply or any other designated use;

(c) Organisms of coliform group: total coliforms not to exceed 50/100 ml (MF count) as a monthly geometric mean value in watersheds serving as unfiltered water supplies;

(d) Chlorinated phenolic compounds: not greater than 1.0 ug/l to protect water supplies from taste and odor problems from chlorinated phenols;

(e) Sewage, industrial wastes: none shall be allowed except those specified in ~~Subparagraph~~ Item (2) of this ~~Paragraph~~ Rule or Rule .0104 of this Subchapter;

(f) Solids, total dissolved: not greater than 500 mg/l;

(g) Total hardness: not greater than 100 mg/l as calcium ~~carbonate;~~carbonate ($CaCO_3$ or Ca + Mg);

(h) Toxic and other deleterious substances:

(i) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for non-carcinogens in Class WS-I waters:

(A) Barium: 1.0 mg/l;

(B) Chloride: 250 mg/l;

~~(C) Manganese: 200 ug/l;~~

~~(D)~~(C) Nickel: 25 ug/l;

~~(E)~~(D) Nitrate nitrogen: 10.0 mg/l;

~~(F)~~(E) 2,4-D: ~~100 ug/l;~~70 ug/l;

~~(G)~~(F) 2,4,5-TP (Silvex): 10 ug/l;

~~(H)~~(G) Sulfates: 250 mg/l;

(ii) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for carcinogens in Class WS-I waters:

(A) Aldrin: 0.05 ng/1;

(B) Arsenic: 10 ug/l;

(C) Benzene: 1.19 ug/1;

(D) Carbon tetrachloride: 0.254 ug/l;

(E) Chlordane: 0.8 ng/1;

(F) Chlorinated benzenes: 488 ug/l;

(G) DDT: 0.2 ng/1;

(H) Dieldrin: 0.05 ng/1;

(I) Dioxin: 0.000005 ng/l;

(J) Heptachlor: 0.08 ng/1;

(K) Hexachlorobutadiene: 0.44 ug/l;

(L) Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (total of all PAHs): 2.8 ng/l;

(M) Tetrachloroethane (1,1,2,2): 0.17 ug/l;

(N) Tetrachloroethylene: 0.7 ug/l;

(O) Trichloroethylene: 2.5 ug/l;

(P) Vinyl Chloride: 0.025 ug/l.

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0214 FRESH SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS WS-II WATERS

The following water quality standards apply to surface waters within water supply watersheds that are classified WS-II. Water quality standards applicable to Class C waters as described in Rule .0211 of this Section also apply to Class WS-II waters.

(1) The best usage of WS-II waters are as follows: a source of water supply for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes for those users desiring maximum protection for their water supplies where a WS-I classification is not feasible and any best usage specified for Class C waters;

(2) The conditions related to the best usage are as follows: waters of this class are protected as water supplies which are in predominantly undeveloped watersheds and meet average watershed development density levels as specified in Sub-Items (3)(b)(i)(A), (3)(b)(i)(B), (3)(b)(ii)(A) and (3)(b)(ii)(B) of this Rule; discharges which qualify for a General Permit pursuant to 15A NCAC 02H .0127, trout farm discharges, recycle (closed loop) systems that only discharge in response to 10-year storm events and other stormwater discharges are allowed in the entire watershed; new domestic and industrial discharges of treated wastewater are not allowed in the entire watershed; the waters, following treatment required by the ~~Division of Environmental Health,~~ Division, shall meet the Maximum Contaminant Level concentrations considered safe for drinking, culinary, and food-processing purposes which are specified in the national drinking water regulations and in the North Carolina Rules Governing Public Water Supplies, 15A NCAC 18C .1500. Sources of water pollution which preclude any of these uses on either a short-term or long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard. The Class WS-II classification may be used to protect portions of Class WS-III and WS-IV water supplies. For reclassifications of these portions of Class WS-III and WS-IV water supplies occurring after the July 1, 1992 statewide reclassification, the more protective classification requested by local governments shall be considered by the Commission when all local governments having jurisdiction in the affected area(s) have adopted a resolution and the appropriate ordinances to protect the watershed or the Commission acts to protect a watershed when one or more local governments has failed to adopt necessary protection measures;

(3) Quality standards applicable to Class WS-II Waters are as follows:

(a) Sewage, industrial wastes, non-process industrial wastes, or other wastes: none shall be allowed except for those specified in either Item (2) of this Rule and Rule .0104 of this Subchapter; none shall be allowed that have an adverse effect on human health or that are not effectively treated to the satisfaction of the Commission and in accordance with the requirements of the ~~Division of Environmental Health, North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources.~~ Division. Any discharger may be required upon request by the Commission to disclose all chemical constituents present or potentially present in their wastes and chemicals which could be spilled or be present in runoff from their facility which may have an adverse impact on downstream water quality. These facilities may be required to have spill and treatment failure control plans as well as perform special monitoring for toxic substances;

(b) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution: none that would adversely impact the waters for use as a water supply or any other designated use;

(i) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution Control Criteria for Entire Watershed:

(A) Low Density Option: development density must be limited to either no more than one dwelling unit per acre of single family detached residential development (or 40,000 square foot lot excluding roadway right-of-way) or 12 percent built-upon area for all other residential and

non-residential development in the watershed outside of the critical area; stormwater runoff from the development shall be transported by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(B) High Density Option: if new development exceeds the low density option requirements as stated in Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) of this Rule, then engineered stormwater controls must be used to control runoff from the first inch of rainfall; new residential and non-residential development shall not exceed 30 percent built-upon area;

(C) Land within the watershed shall be deemed compliant with the density requirements if the following condition is met: the density of all existing development at the time of reclassification does not exceed the density requirement when densities are averaged throughout the entire watershed area at the time of classification;

(D) Cluster development is allowed on a project-by-project basis as follows:

(I) overall density of the project meets associated density or stormwater control requirements of this Rule;

(II) buffers meet the minimum statewide water supply watershed protection requirements;

(III) built-upon areas are designed and located to minimize stormwater runoff impact to the receiving waters, minimize concentrated stormwater flow, maximize the use of sheet flow through vegetated areas, and maximize the flow length through vegetated areas;

(IV) areas of concentrated development are located in upland areas and away, to the maximum extent practicable, from surface waters and drainageways;

(V) remainder of tract to remain in vegetated or natural state;

(VI) area in the vegetated or natural state may be conveyed to a property owners association, a local government for preservation as a park or greenway, a conservation organization, or placed in a permanent conservation or farmland preservation easement;

(VII) a maintenance agreement for the vegetated or natural area shall be filed with the Register of Deeds; and

(VIII) cluster development that

meets the applicable low density option requirements shall transport stormwater runoff from the development by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(E) A maximum of 10 percent of each jurisdiction's portion of the watershed outside of the critical area as delineated on July 1, 1993 may be developed with new development projects and expansions of existing development of up to 70 percent built-upon surface area in addition to the new development approved in compliance with the appropriate requirements of Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) or Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(B) of this Rule. For expansions to existing development, the existing built-upon surface area is not counted toward the allowed 70 percent built-upon surface area. A local government having jurisdiction within the watershed may transfer, in whole or in part, its right to the 10 percent/70 percent land area to another local government within the watershed upon submittal of a joint resolution and review by the Commission. When the water supply watershed is composed of public lands, such as National Forest land, local governments may count the public land acreage within the watershed outside of the critical area in calculating the acreage allowed under this provision. For local governments that do not choose to use the high density option in that WS-II watershed, each project must, to the maximum extent practicable, minimize built-upon surface area, direct stormwater runoff away from surface waters and incorporate best management practices to minimize water quality impacts. If the local government selects the high density development option within that WS-II watershed, then engineered stormwater controls must be employed for the new development;

(F) If local governments choose the high density development option which requires stormwater controls, then they shall assume ultimate responsibility for operation and maintenance of the required controls as outlined in Rule .0104 of this Subchapter;

(G) Minimum 100 foot vegetative buffer is required for all new development activities that exceed the low density option requirements as specified in Sub-Items (3)(b)(i)(A) and Sub-Item (3)(b)(ii)(A) of this Rule, otherwise a minimum 30 foot vegetative buffer for development activities is required along all perennial waters indicated on the most recent versions of U.S.G.S. 1:24,000 (7.5

minute) scale topographic maps or as determined by local government studies. Nothing in this Rule shall stand as a bar to artificial streambank or shoreline stabilization;

(H) No new development is allowed in the buffer; water dependent structures, or other structures such as flag poles, signs and security lights, which result in only de minimus increases in impervious area and public projects such as road crossings and greenways may be allowed where no practicable alternative exists. These activities shall minimize built-upon surface area, direct runoff away from the surface waters and maximize the utilization of BMPs;

(I) No NPDES permits shall be issued for landfills that discharge treated leachate;

(ii) Critical Area Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution Control Criteria:

(A) Low Density Option: new development is limited to either no more than one dwelling unit of single family detached residential development per two acres (or 80,000 square foot lot excluding roadway right-of-way) or six percent built-upon area for all other residential and non-residential development; stormwater runoff from the development shall be transported by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(B) High Density Option: if new development density exceeds the low density requirements specified in Sub-Item (3)(b)(ii)(A) of this Rule, then engineered stormwater controls must be used to control runoff from the first inch of rainfall; new residential and non-residential development density not to exceed 24 percent built-upon area;

(C) No new permitted sites for land application of residuals or petroleum contaminated soils are allowed;

(D) No new landfills are allowed;

(c) MBAS (Methylene-Blue Active Substances): not greater than 0.5 mg/l to protect the aesthetic qualities of water supplies and to prevent foaming;

(d) Odor producing substances contained in sewage or other wastes: only such amounts, whether alone or in combination with other substances or wastes, as shall not cause taste and odor difficulties in water supplies which cannot be corrected by treatment, impair the palatability of fish, or have a deleterious effect upon any best usage established for waters of this class;

(e) Chlorinated phenolic compounds: not greater than 1.0 ug/l to protect water supplies from taste and odor problems from chlorinated phenols;

(f) Total hardness: not greater than 100 mg/l as calcium ~~carbonate;~~carbonate ($CaCO_3$ or Ca + Mg);

(g) Total dissolved solids: not greater than 500 mg/l;

(h) Toxic and other deleterious substances:

(i) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for non-carcinogens in Class WS-II waters:

(A) Barium: 1.0 mg/l;

(B) Chloride: 250 mg/l;

~~(C) Manganese: 200 ug/l;~~

~~(D)~~(C) Nickel: 25 ug/l;

~~(E)~~(D) Nitrate nitrogen: 10 mg/l;

~~(F)~~(E) 2,4-D: ~~100 ug/l;~~70 ug/l;

~~(G)~~(F) 2,4,5-TP (Silvex): 10 ug/l;

~~(H)~~(G) Sulfates: 250 mg/l;

(ii) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for carcinogens in Class WS-II waters:

(A) Aldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(B) Arsenic: 10 ug/l;

(C) Benzene: 1.19 ug/l;

(D) Carbon tetrachloride: 0.254 ug/l;

(E) Chlordane: 0.8 ng/l;

(F) Chlorinated benzenes: 488 ug/l;

(G) DDT: 0.2 ng/l;

(H) Dieldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(I) Dioxin: 0.000005 ng/l;

(J) Heptachlor: 0.08 ng/l;

(K) Hexachlorobutadiene: 0.44 ug/l;

(L) Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (total of all PAHs): 2.8 ng/l;

(M) Tetrachloroethane (1,1,2,2): 0.17 ug/l;

(N) Tetrachloroethylene: 0.7 ug/l;

(O) Trichloroethylene: 2.5 ug/l;

(P) Vinyl Chloride: 0.025 ug/l.

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0215 FRESH SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS WS-III WATERS

The following water quality standards apply to surface water supply waters that are classified WS-III. Water quality standards applicable to Class C waters as described in Rule .0211 of this Section also apply to Class WS-III waters.

(1) The best usage of WS-III waters are as follows: a source of water supply for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes for those users where a more protective WS-I or WS-II classification is not feasible and any other best usage specified for Class C waters;

(2) The conditions related to the best usage are as follows: waters of this class are protected as water supplies which are generally in low to moderately developed watersheds and meet average watershed development density levels as specified in Sub-Items (3)(b)(i)(A), (3)(b)(i)(B), (3)(b)(ii)(A) and (3)(b)(ii)(B) of this Rule; discharges that qualify for a General Permit pursuant to 15A NCAC 02H .0127, trout farm discharges, recycle (closed loop) systems that only discharge in response to 10-year storm events, and other stormwater discharges are allowed in the entire watershed; treated domestic wastewater discharges are allowed in the entire watershed but no new domestic wastewater discharges are allowed in the critical area; no new industrial wastewater discharges except non-process industrial discharges are allowed in the entire watershed; the waters, following treatment required by the ~~Division of Environmental Health,~~ Division, shall meet the Maximum Contaminant Level concentrations considered safe for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes which are specified in the national drinking water regulations and in the North Carolina Rules Governing Public Water Supplies, 15A NCAC 18C .1500. Sources of water pollution which preclude any of these uses on either a short-term or long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard. The Class WS-III classification may be used to protect portions of Class WS-IV water supplies. For reclassifications of these portions of WS-IV water supplies occurring after the July 1, 1992 statewide reclassification, the more protective classification requested by local governments shall be considered by the Commission when all local governments having jurisdiction in the affected area(s) have adopted a resolution and the appropriate ordinances to protect the watershed or the Commission acts to protect a watershed when one or more local governments has failed to adopt necessary protection measures;

(3) Quality standards applicable to Class WS-III Waters are as follows:

(a) Sewage, industrial wastes, non-process industrial wastes, or other wastes: none shall be allowed except for those specified in Item (2) of this Rule and Rule .0104 of this Subchapter; none shall be allowed that have an adverse effect on human

health or that are not effectively treated to the satisfaction of the Commission and in accordance with the requirements of the ~~Division of Environmental Health, North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources.~~ Division. Any discharger may be required by the Commission to disclose all chemical constituents present or potentially present in their wastes and chemicals which could be spilled or be present in runoff from their facility which may have an adverse impact on downstream water quality. These facilities may be required to have spill and treatment failure control plans as well as perform special monitoring for toxic substances;

(b) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution: none that would adversely impact the waters for use as water supply or any other designated use;

(i) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution Control Criteria For Entire Watershed:

(A) Low Density Option: development density must be limited to either no more than two dwelling units of single family detached residential development per acre (or 20,000 square foot lot excluding roadway right-of-way) or 24 percent built-upon area for all other residential and non-residential development in watershed outside of the critical area; stormwater runoff from the development shall be transported by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(B) High Density Option: if new development density exceeds the low density option requirements specified in Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) of this Rule then development must control runoff from the first inch of rainfall; new residential and non-residential development shall not exceed 50 percent built-upon area;

(C) Land within the watershed shall be deemed compliant with the density requirements if the following condition is met: the density of all existing development at the time of reclassification does not exceed the density requirement when densities are averaged throughout the entire watershed area;

(D) Cluster development is allowed on a project-by-project basis as follows:

(I) overall density of the project meets associated density or stormwater control requirements of this Rule;

(II) buffers meet the minimum statewide water supply watershed protection requirements;

(III) built-upon areas are designed and located to minimize stormwater runoff impact to the receiving waters, minimize concentrated stormwater flow, maximize the use of sheet flow through vegetated areas, and

maximize the flow length through vegetated areas;

(IV) areas of concentrated development are located in upland areas and away, to the maximum extent practicable, from surface waters and drainageways;

(V) remainder of tract to remain in vegetated or natural state;

(VI) area in the vegetated or natural state may be conveyed to a property owners association, a local government for preservation as a park or greenway, a conservation organization or placed in a permanent conservation or farmland preservation easement;

(VII) a maintenance agreement for the vegetated or natural area shall be filed with the Register of Deeds; and

(VIII) cluster development that meets the applicable low density option requirements shall transport stormwater runoff from the development by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(E) A maximum of 10 percent of each jurisdiction's portion of the watershed outside of the critical area as delineated on July 1, 1993 may be developed with new development projects and expansions of existing development of up to 70 percent built-upon surface area in addition to the new development approved in compliance with the appropriate requirements of Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) or Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(B) of this Rule. For expansions to existing development, the existing built-upon surface area is not counted toward the allowed 70 percent built-upon surface area. A local government having jurisdiction within the watershed may transfer, in whole or in part, its right to the 10 percent/70 percent land area to another local government within the watershed upon submittal of a joint resolution and review by the Commission. When the water supply watershed is composed of public lands, such as National Forest land, local governments may count the public land acreage within the watershed outside of the critical area in figuring the acreage allowed under this provision. For local governments that do not choose to use the high density option in that WS-III watershed, each project must, to the maximum extent practicable,

minimize built-upon surface area, direct stormwater runoff away from surface waters, and incorporate best management practices to minimize water quality impacts. If the local government selects the high density development option within that WS-III watershed, then engineered stormwater controls must be employed for the new development;

(F) If local governments choose the high density development option which requires engineered stormwater controls, then they shall assume ultimate responsibility for operation and maintenance of the required controls as outlined in Rule .0104 of this Subchapter;

(G) Minimum 100 foot vegetative buffer is required for all new development activities that exceed the low density requirements as specified in Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) and Sub-Item (3)(b)(ii)(A) of this Rule, otherwise a minimum 30 foot vegetative buffer for development is required along all perennial waters indicated on the most recent versions of U.S.G.S. 1:24,000 (7.5 minute) scale topographic maps or as determined by local government studies. Nothing in this Rule shall stand as a bar to artificial streambank or shoreline stabilization;

(H) No new development is allowed in the buffer; water dependent structures, or other structures such as flag poles, signs and security lights, which result in only de minimus increases in impervious area and public projects such as road crossings and greenways may be allowed where no practicable alternative exists. These activities shall minimize built-upon surface area, direct runoff away from surface waters and maximize the utilization of BMPs;

(I) No NPDES permits shall be issued for landfills that discharge treated leachate;

(ii) Critical Area Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution Control Criteria:

(A) Low Density Option: new development limited to either no more than one dwelling unit of single family detached residential development per acre (or 40,000 square foot lot excluding roadway right-of-way) or 12 percent built-upon area for all other residential and non-residential development; stormwater runoff from the development shall be transported by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(B) High Density Option: if new development exceeds the low density requirements specified in Sub-Item (3)(b)(ii)(A) of this Rule, then engineered stormwater controls must be used to

control runoff from the first inch of rainfall; development shall not exceed 30 percent built-upon area;

(C) No new permitted sites for land application of residuals or petroleum contaminated soils are allowed;

(D) No new landfills are allowed;

(c) MBAS (Methylene-Blue Active Substances): not greater than 0.5 mg/l to protect the aesthetic qualities of water supplies and to prevent foaming;

(d) Odor producing substances contained in sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes: only such amounts, whether alone or in combination with other substances or wastes, as shall not cause taste and odor difficulties in water supplies which cannot be corrected by treatment, impair the palatability of fish, or have a deleterious effect upon any best usage established for waters of this class;

(e) Chlorinated phenolic compounds: not greater than 1.0 ug/l to protect water supplies from taste and odor problems from chlorinated phenols;

(f) Total hardness: not greater than 100 mg/l as calcium ~~carbonate;~~carbonate ($CaCO_3$ or Ca + Mg);

(g) Total dissolved solids: not greater than 500 mg/l;

(h) Toxic and other deleterious substances:

(i) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for non-carcinogens in Class WS-III waters:

(A) Barium: 1.0 mg/l;

(B) Chloride: 250 mg/l;

~~(C) Manganese: 200 ug/l;~~

~~(D)~~(C) Nickel: 25 ug/l;

~~(E)~~(D) Nitrate nitrogen: 10 mg/l;

~~(F)~~(E) 2,4-D: ~~100 ug/l;~~70 ug/l;

~~(G)~~(F) 2,4,5-TP (Silvex): 10 ug/l;

~~(H)~~(G) Sulfates: 250 mg/l;

(ii) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for carcinogens in Class WS-III waters:

(A) Aldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(B) Arsenic: 10 ug/l;

(C) Benzene: 1.19 ug/l;

(D) Carbon tetrachloride: 0.254 ug/l;

(E) Chlordane: 0.8 ng/l;

(F) Chlorinated benzenes: 488 ug/l;

(G) DDT: 0.2 ng/l;

(H) Dieldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(I) Dioxin: 0.000005 ng/l;

(J) Heptachlor: 0.08 ng/l;

(K) Hexachlorobutadiene: 0.44 ug/l;

(L) Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (total of all PAHs): 2.8 ng/l;

(M) Tetrachloroethane (1,1,2,2): 0.17 ug/l;

(N) Tetrachloroethylene: 0.7 ug/l;

(O) Trichloroethylene: 2.5 ug/l;

(P) Vinyl Chloride: 0.025 ug/l.

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0216 FRESH SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR WS-IV WATERS

The following water quality standards apply to surface water supply waters that are classified WS-IV. Water quality standards applicable to Class C waters as described in Rule .0211 of this Section also apply to Class WS-IV waters.

(1) The best usage of WS-IV waters are as follows: a source of water supply for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes for those users where a more protective WS-I, WS-II or WS-III classification is not feasible and any other best usage specified for Class C waters;

(2) The conditions related to the best usage are as follows: waters of this class are protected as water supplies which are generally in

moderately to highly developed watersheds or protected areas and meet average watershed development density levels as specified in Sub-Items (3)(b)(i)(A), (3)(b)(i)(B), (3)(b)(ii)(A) and (3)(b)(ii)(B) of this Rule; discharges which qualify for a General Permit pursuant to 15A NCAC 02H .0127, trout farm discharges, recycle (closed loop) systems that only discharge in response to 10-year storm events, other stormwater discharges and domestic wastewater discharges shall be allowed in the protected and critical areas; treated industrial wastewater discharges are allowed in the protected and critical areas; however, new industrial wastewater discharges in the critical area shall be required to meet the provisions of 15A NCAC 02B .0224(1)(b)(iv), (v) and (vii), and 15A NCAC 02B .0203; new industrial connections and expansions to existing municipal discharges with a pretreatment program pursuant to 15A NCAC 02H .0904 are allowed; the waters, following treatment required by the ~~Division of Environmental Health,~~ Division, shall meet the Maximum Contaminant Level concentrations considered safe for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes which are specified in the national drinking water regulations and in the North Carolina Rules Governing Public Water Supplies, 15A NCAC 18C .1500. Sources of water pollution which preclude any of these uses on either a short-term or long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard. The Class WS-II or WS-III classifications may be used to protect portions of Class WS-IV water supplies. For reclassifications of these portions of WS-IV water supplies occurring after the July 1, 1992 statewide reclassification, the more protective classification requested by local governments shall be considered by the Commission when all local governments having jurisdiction in the affected area(s) have adopted a resolution and the appropriate ordinances to protect the watershed or the Commission acts to protect a watershed when one or more local governments has failed to adopt necessary protection measures;

(3) Quality standards applicable to Class WS-IV Waters are as follows:

(a) Sewage, industrial wastes, non-process industrial wastes, or other wastes: none shall be allowed except for those specified in Item (2) of this Rule and Rule .0104 of this Subchapter and none shall be allowed that shall have an adverse effect on human health or that are not effectively treated to the satisfaction of the Commission and in accordance with the requirements of the ~~Division of Environmental Health, North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources.~~ Division. Any discharges or industrial users subject to pretreatment standards may be required by the Commission to disclose all chemical constituents present or potentially present in their wastes and chemicals which could be spilled or be present in runoff from their facility which may have an adverse impact on downstream water supplies. These facilities may be required to have spill and treatment failure control plans as well as perform special monitoring for toxic substances;

(b) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution: none shall be allowed that would adversely impact the waters for use as water supply or any other designated use.

(i) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution Control Criteria For Entire Watershed or Protected Area:

(A) Low Density Option: development activities which require a Sedimentation/Erosion Control Plan in accordance with 15A NCAC 04 established by the North Carolina Sedimentation Control Commission or approved local government programs as delegated by the Sedimentation Control Commission shall be limited to no more than either: two dwelling units of single family detached development per acre (or 20,000 square foot lot excluding roadway right-of-way) or 24 percent built-upon on area for all other residential and non-residential development; or three dwelling units per acre or 36 percent

built-upon area for projects without curb and gutter street systems in the protected area outside of the critical area; stormwater runoff from the development shall be transported by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(B) High Density Option: if new development activities which require a Sedimentation/Erosion Control Plan exceed the low density requirements of Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) of this Rule then development shall control the runoff from the first inch of rainfall; new residential and non-residential development shall not exceed 70 percent built-upon area;

(C) Land within the critical and protected area shall be deemed compliant with the density requirements if the following condition is met: the density of all existing development at the time of reclassification does not exceed the density requirement when densities are averaged throughout the entire area;

(D) Cluster development shall be allowed on a project-by-project basis as follows:

(I) overall density of the project meets associated density or stormwater control requirements of this Rule;

(II) buffers meet the minimum statewide water supply watershed protection requirements;

(III) built-upon areas are designed and located to minimize stormwater runoff impact to the receiving waters, minimize concentrated stormwater flow, maximize the use of sheet flow through vegetated areas, and maximize the flow length through vegetated areas;

(IV) areas of concentrated development are located in upland areas and away, to the maximum extent practicable, from surface waters and drainageways;

(V) remainder of tract to remain in vegetated or natural state;

(VI) area in the vegetated or natural state may be conveyed to a property owners association, a local government for preservation as a park or greenway, a conservation organization, or placed in a permanent conservation or farmland preservation easement;

(VII) a maintenance agreement for the vegetated or natural area shall be filed with the Register of Deeds; and

(VIII) cluster development that meets the applicable low density option requirements shall

transport stormwater runoff from the development by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(E) If local governments choose the high density development option which requires engineered stormwater controls, then they shall assume ultimate responsibility for operation and maintenance of the required controls as outlined in Rule .0104 of this Subchapter;

(F) Minimum 100 foot vegetative buffer is required for all new development activities that exceed the low density option requirements as specified in Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) or Sub-Item (3)(b)(ii)(A) of this Rule, otherwise a minimum 30 foot vegetative buffer for development shall be required along all perennial waters indicated on the most recent versions of U.S.G.S. 1:24,000 (7.5 minute) scale topographic maps or as determined by local government studies;

(G) No new development shall be allowed in the buffer; water dependent structures, or other structures, such as flag poles, signs and security lights, which result in only de minimus increases in impervious area and public projects such as road crossings and greenways may be allowed where no practicable alternative exists. These activities shall minimize built-upon surface area, divert runoff away from surface waters and maximize the utilization of BMPs;

(H) For local governments that do not use the high density option, a maximum of 10 percent of each jurisdiction's portion of the watershed outside of the critical area as delineated on July 1, 1995 may be developed with new development projects and expansions to existing development of up to 70 percent built-upon surface area in addition to the new development approved in compliance with the appropriate requirements of Sub-Item (3)(b)(i)(A) of this Rule. For expansions to existing development, the existing built-upon surface area shall not be counted toward the allowed 70 percent built-upon surface area. A local government having jurisdiction within the watershed may transfer, in whole or in part, its right to the 10 percent/70 percent land area to another local government within the watershed upon submittal of a joint resolution for review by the Commission. When the designated water supply watershed area is composed of public land, such as National Forest land, local governments may count the public land acreage within the designated watershed area outside of the critical area in figuring the acreage allowed under this provision. Each project

shall, to the maximum extent practicable, minimize built-upon surface area, direct stormwater runoff away from surface waters and incorporate best management practices to minimize water quality impacts;

(ii) Critical Area Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution Control Criteria:

(A) Low Density Option: new development activities which require a Sedimentation/Erosion Control Plan in accordance with 15A NCAC 04 established by the North Carolina Sedimentation Control Commission or approved local government programs as delegated by the Sedimentation Control Commission shall be limited to no more than two dwelling units of single family detached development per acre (or 20,000 square foot lot excluding roadway right-of-way) or 24 percent built-upon area for all other residential and non-residential development; stormwater runoff from the development shall be transported by vegetated conveyances to the maximum extent practicable;

(B) High Density Option: if new development density exceeds the low density requirements specified in Sub-Item (3)(b)(ii)(A) of this Rule, engineered stormwater controls shall be used to control runoff from the first inch of rainfall; new residential and non-residential development shall not exceed 50 percent built-upon area;

(C) No new permitted sites for land application of residuals or petroleum contaminated soils shall be allowed;

(D) No new landfills shall be allowed;

(c) MBAS (Methylene-Blue Active Substances): not greater than 0.5 mg/l to protect the aesthetic qualities of water supplies and to prevent foaming;

(d) Odor producing substances contained in sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes: only such amounts, whether alone or in combination with other substances or waste, as will not cause taste and odor difficulties in water supplies which can not be corrected by treatment, impair the palatability of fish, or have a deleterious effect upon any best usage established for waters of this class;

(e) Chlorinated phenolic compounds: not greater than 1.0 ug/l to protect water supplies from taste and odor problems due to chlorinated phenols shall be allowed. Specific phenolic compounds may be given a different limit if it is demonstrated not to cause taste and odor problems and not to be detrimental to other best usage;

(f) Total hardness shall not exceed 100 mg/l as calcium ~~carbonate;~~carbonate ($CaCO_3$ or Ca + Mg);

(g) Total dissolved solids shall not exceed 500 mg/l;

(h) Toxic and other deleterious substances:

(i) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for non-carcinogens in Class WS-IV waters:

(A) Barium: 1.0 mg/l;

(B) Chloride: 250 mg/l;

~~(C) Manganese: 200 ug/l;~~

~~(D)~~(C) Nickel: 25 ug/l;

~~(E)~~(D) Nitrate nitrogen: 10.0 mg/l;

~~(F)~~(E) 2,4-D: ~~100 ug/l;~~ 70 ug/l;

~~(G)~~(F) 2,4,5-TP (Silvex): 10 ug/l;

~~(H)~~(G) Sulfates: 250 mg/l;

(ii) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue

consumption for carcinogens in Class WS-IV waters:

(A) Aldrin: 0.05 ng/l;
(B) Arsenic: 10 ug/l;
(C) Benzene: 1.19 ug/l;
(D) Carbon tetrachloride: 0.254 ug/l;
(E) Chlordane: 0.8 ng/l;
(F) Chlorinated benzenes: 488 ug/l;
(G) DDT: 0.2 ng/l;
(H) Dieldrin: 0.05 ng/l;
(I) Dioxin: 0.000005 ng/l;
(J) Heptachlor: 0.08 ng/l;
(K) Hexachlorobutadiene: 0.44 ug/l;
(L) Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (total of all PAHs): 2.8 ng/l;
(M) Tetrachloroethane (1,1,2,2): 0.17 ug/l;
(N) Tetrachloroethylene: 0.7 ug/l;
(O) Trichloroethylene: 2.5 ug/l;
(P) Vinyl Chloride: 0.025 ug/l.

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0218 FRESH SURFACE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS WS-V WATERS

The following water quality standards apply to surface water supply waters that are classified WS-V. Water quality standards applicable to Class C waters as described in Rule .0211 of this Section also apply to Class WS-V waters.

(1) The best usage of WS-V waters are as follows: waters that are protected as water supplies which are generally upstream and draining to Class WS-IV waters; or waters previously used for drinking water supply purposes; or waters used by industry to supply their employees, but not municipalities or counties, with a raw drinking water supply source, although this type of use is not restricted to WS-V classification; and all Class C uses. The Commission may consider a more protective classification for the water supply if a resolution requesting a more protective classification is submitted from all local governments having land use jurisdiction within the affected watershed;

(2) The conditions related to the best usage are as follows: waters of this class are protected water supplies; the waters, following treatment required by the ~~Division of Environmental Health,~~ Division, shall meet the Maximum Contaminant Level concentrations considered safe for drinking, culinary, or food-processing purposes which are specified in the national drinking water regulations and in the North Carolina Rules Governing Public Water Supplies, 15A NCAC 18C .1500; no categorical restrictions on watershed development or wastewater discharges are required, however, the Commission or its designee may apply management requirements for the protection of waters downstream of receiving waters (15A NCAC 02B .0203). Sources of water pollution which preclude any of these uses on either a short-term or long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard;

(3) Quality standards applicable to Class WS-V Waters are as follows:

(a) Sewage, industrial wastes, non-process industrial wastes, or other wastes: none shall be allowed that have an adverse effect on human health or that are not effectively treated to the satisfaction of the Commission and in accordance with the requirements of the ~~Division of Environmental Health, North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources.~~ Division. Any discharges or industrial users subject to pretreatment standards may be required by the Commission to disclose all chemical constituents present or potentially present in their wastes and chemicals which could be spilled or be present in runoff from their facility which may have an adverse impact on downstream water supplies. These facilities may be required to have spill and treatment failure control plans as well as perform special monitoring for toxic substances;

(b) MBAS (Methylene-Blue Active Substances): not greater than 0.5 mg/l to protect the aesthetic qualities of water supplies and to prevent foaming;

(c) Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution: none that would adversely impact the waters for use as water supply or any other designated use;

(d) Odor producing substances contained in sewage, industrial wastes, or other

wastes: only such amounts, whether alone or in combination with other substances or waste, as will not cause taste and odor difficulties in water supplies which can not be corrected by treatment, impair the palatability of fish, or have a deleterious effect upon any best usage established for waters of this class;

(e) Chlorinated phenolic compounds: not greater than 1.0 ug/l to protect water supplies from taste and odor problems due to chlorinated phenols; specific phenolic compounds may be given a different limit if it is demonstrated not to cause taste and odor problems and not to be detrimental to other best usage;

(f) Total hardness: not greater than 100 mg/l as calcium ~~carbonate;~~carbonate ($CaCO_3$ or Ca + Mg);

(g) Total dissolved solids: not greater than 500 mg/l;

(h) Toxic and other deleterious substances:

(i) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for non-carcinogens in Class WS-V waters:

(A) Barium: 1.0 mg/l;

(B) Chloride: 250 mg/l;

~~(C) Manganese: 200 ug/l;~~

~~(D)~~(C) Nickel: 25 ug/l;

~~(E)~~(D) Nitrate nitrogen: 10.0 mg/l;

~~(F)~~(E) 2,4-D: ~~100 ug/l;~~70 ug/l;

~~(G)~~(F) 2,4,5-TP (Silvex): 10 ug/l;

~~(H)~~(G) Sulfates: 250 mg/l.

(ii) Water quality standards (maximum permissible concentrations) to protect human health through water consumption and fish tissue consumption for carcinogens in Class WS-V waters:

(A) Aldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(B) Arsenic: 10 ug/l;

(C) Benzene: 1.19 ug/l;

(D) Carbon tetrachloride: 0.254 ug/l;

(E) Chlordane: 0.8 ng/l;

(F) Chlorinated benzenes: 488 ug/l;

(G) DDT: 0.2 ng/l;

(H) Dieldrin: 0.05 ng/l;

(I) Dioxin: 0.000005 ng/l;

(J) Heptachlor: 0.08 ng/l;

(K) Hexachlorobutadiene: 0.44 ug/l;

(L) Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (total of all PAHs): 2.8 ng/l;

(M) Tetrachloroethane (1,1,2,2): 0.17 ug/l;

(N) Tetrachloroethylene: 0.7 ug/l;

(O) Trichloroethylene: 2.5 ug/l;

(P) Vinyl Chloride: 0.025 ug/l.

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

15A NCAC 02B .0220 TIDAL SALT WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CLASS SC WATERS

General. The water quality standards for all tidal salt waters are the basic standards applicable to Class SC waters. Additional and more stringent standards applicable to other specific tidal salt water classifications are specified in Rules .0221 and .0222 of this Section. Action Levels, for purposes of NPDES permitting, are specified in Item (20) of this Rule.

(1) Best Usage of Waters: any usage except primary recreation or shellfishing for market purposes; usages include aquatic life propagation and maintenance of biological integrity (including fishing, fish and functioning PNAs), wildlife, and secondary recreation;

(2) Conditions Related to Best Usage: the waters shall be suitable for aquatic life propagation and maintenance of biological integrity, wildlife, and secondary recreation. Any source of water pollution which precludes any of these uses, including their functioning as PNAs, on either a short-term or a long-term basis shall be considered to be violating a water quality standard;

~~(3) Quality standards applicable to all tidal salt waters:~~

~~(a)~~(3) Chlorophyll a (corrected): not greater than 40 ug/l in sounds, estuaries, and other waters subject to growths of macroscopic or microscopic vegetation. The Commission or its designee may prohibit or limit any

discharge of waste into surface waters if, in the opinion of the Director, the surface waters experience or the discharge would result in growths of microscopic or macroscopic vegetation such that the standards established pursuant to this Rule would be violated or the intended best usage of the waters would be impaired;

(4) Cyanide: 1 ug/l;

~~(b)~~(5) Dissolved oxygen: not less than 5.0 mg/l, except that swamp waters, poorly flushed tidally influenced streams or embayments, or estuarine bottom waters may have lower values if caused by natural conditions;

(6) Enterococcus, including *Enterococcus faecalis*, *Enterococcus faecium*, *Enterococcus avium* and *Enterococcus gallinarium*: not to exceed a geometric mean of 35 enterococci per 100 ml based upon a minimum of five samples within any consecutive 30 days. In accordance with 33 U.S.C. 1313 (Federal Water Pollution Control Act) for purposes of beach monitoring and notification, "Coastal Recreational Waters Monitoring, Evaluation and Notification" regulations (15A NCAC 18A .3400) are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments;

~~(c)~~(7) Floating solids, settleable solids, or sludge deposits: only such amounts attributable to sewage, industrial wastes or other wastes, as shall not make the waters unsafe or unsuitable for aquatic life and wildlife, or impair the waters for any designated uses;

~~(d)~~(8) Gases, total dissolved: not greater than 110 percent of saturation;

~~(e) Enterococcus, including *Enterococcus faecalis*, *Enterococcus faecium*, *Enterococcus avium* and *Enterococcus gallinarium*: not to exceed a geometric mean of 35 enterococci per 100 ml based upon a minimum of five samples within any consecutive 30 days. In accordance with 33 U.S.C. 1313 (Federal Water Pollution Control Act) for purposes of beach monitoring and notification, "Coastal Recreational Waters Monitoring, Evaluation and Notification" regulations (15A NCAC 18A .3400) are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments;~~

(9) Metals:

(a) With the exception of mercury and selenium, tidal salt water quality standards for metals shall be based upon measurement of the dissolved fraction of the metals. Mercury and Selenium must be based upon measurement of the total recoverable metal. Alternative site-specific standards can be developed where studies are designed according to the "Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition" published by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) hereby incorporated by reference, including any subsequent amendments;

(b) Compliance with acute instream metals standards shall only be evaluated using an average of two or more samples collected within one hour. Compliance with chronic instream metals standards shall only be evaluated using averages of a minimum of four samples taken on consecutive days, or as a 96-hour average;

(c) With the exception of mercury and selenium, demonstrated attainment of the applicable aquatic life use in a waterbody will take precedence over the application of the aquatic life criteria established for metals associated with these uses. An instream exceedence of the numeric criterion for metals shall not be considered to have caused an adverse impact to the instream aquatic community if biological monitoring has demonstrated attainment of biological integrity;

(d) Acute and chronic tidal salt water quality metals standards are as follows:

(i) Arsenic, acute: 69 ug/l;
(ii) Arsenic, chronic: 36 ug/l;
(iii) Cadmium, acute: 40 ug/l;
(iv) Cadmium, chronic: 8.8 ug/l;
(v) Chromium VI, acute: 1100 ug/l;
(vi) Chromium VI, chronic: 50 ug/l;
(vii) Copper, acute: 4.8 ug/l;
(viii) Copper, chronic: 3.1 ug/l;
(ix) Lead, acute: 210 ug/l;
(x) Lead, chronic: 8.1 ug/l;
(xi) Mercury, total recoverable, chronic: 0.025 ug/l;
(xii) Nickel, acute: 74 ug/l;
(xiii) Nickel, chronic: 8.2 ug/l;
(xiv) Selenium, total recoverable, chronic: 71 ug/l;
(xv) Silver, acute: 1.9 ug/l;
(xvi) Silver, chronic: 0.1 ug/l;
(xvii) Zinc, acute: 90 ug/l;
(xviii) Zinc, chronic: 81 ug/l;

~~(f)~~(10) Oils, deleterious substances, colored or other wastes: only such amounts as shall not render the waters injurious to public health, secondary recreation or aquatic life and

wildlife or adversely affect the palatability of fish, aesthetic quality or impair the waters for any designated uses. For the purpose of implementing this Rule, oils, deleterious substances, colored or other wastes shall include but not be limited to substances that cause a film or sheen upon or discoloration of the surface of the water or adjoining shorelines pursuant to 40 CFR 110.3;

(11) Pesticides:

(a) Aldrin: 0.003 ug/l;

(b) Chlordane: 0.004 ug/l;

(c) DDT: 0.001 ug/l;

(d) Demeton: 0.1 ug/l;

(e) Dieldrin: 0.002 ug/l;

(f) Endosulfan: 0.009 ug/l;

(g) Endrin: 0.002 ug/l;

(h) Guthion: 0.01 ug/l;

(i) Heptachlor: 0.004 ug/l;

(j) Lindane: 0.004 ug/l;

(k) Methoxychlor: 0.03 ug/l;

(l) Mirex: 0.001 ug/l;

(m) Parathion: 0.178 ug/l;

(n) Toxaphene: 0.0002 ug/l;

~~(g)~~(12) pH: shall be normal for the waters in the area, which generally shall range between 6.8 and 8.5 except that swamp waters may have a pH as low as 4.3 if it is the result of natural conditions;

~~(h)~~(13) Phenolic compounds: only such levels as shall not result in fish-flesh tainting or impairment of other best usage;

(14) Polychlorinated biphenyls: (total of all PCBs and congeners identified) 0.001 ug/l;

~~(i)~~(15) Radioactive substances:

~~(i)~~(a) Combined radium-226 and radium-228: The maximum average annual activity level (based on at least four samples, collected quarterly) for combined radium-226, and radium-228 shall not exceed five picoCuries per liter;

~~(ii)~~(b) Alpha Emitters. The average annual gross alpha particle activity (including radium-226, but excluding radon and uranium) shall not exceed 15 picoCuries per liter;

~~(iii)~~(c) Beta Emitters. The maximum average annual activity level (based on at least four samples, collected quarterly) for strontium-90 shall not exceed eight picoCuries per liter; nor shall the average annual gross beta particle activity (excluding potassium-40 and other naturally occurring radio-nuclides) exceed 50 picoCuries per liter; nor shall the maximum average annual activity level for tritium exceed 20,000 picoCuries per liter;

~~(j)~~(16) Salinity: changes in salinity due to hydrological modifications shall not result in removal of the functions of a PNA. Projects that are determined by the Director to result in modifications of salinity such that functions of a PNA are impaired will be required to employ water management practices to mitigate salinity impacts;

~~(k)~~(17) Temperature: shall not be increased above the natural water temperature by more than 0.8 degrees C (1.44 degrees F) during the months of June, July, and August nor more than 2.2 degrees C (3.96 degrees F) during other months and in no cases to exceed 32 degrees C (89.6 degrees F) due to the discharge of heated liquids;

(18) Trialkyltin compounds: 0.007 ug/l expressed as tributyltin;

~~(l)~~(19) Turbidity: the turbidity in the receiving water shall not exceed 25 NTU; if turbidity exceeds this level due to natural background conditions, the existing turbidity level shall not be increased. Compliance with this turbidity standard can be met when land management activities employ Best Management Practices (BMPs) [as defined by Rule .0202 of this Section] recommended by the Designated Nonpoint Source Agency (as defined by Rule .0202 of this Section). BMPs must be in full compliance with all specifications governing the proper design, installation, operation and maintenance of such BMPs;

~~(m) Toxic substances: numerical water quality standards (maximum permissible levels) to protect aquatic life applicable to all tidal saltwaters:~~

~~(i) Arsenic, total recoverable: 50 ug/l;~~

~~(ii) Cadmium: 5.0 ug/l; attainment of these water quality standards in surface waters shall be based on measurement of total recoverable metals concentrations unless appropriate studies have been conducted to translate total recoverable metals to a toxic form. Studies used to determine the toxic form or translators must be designed according to the "Water Quality Standards Handbook Second Edition" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) or "The~~

~~Metals Translator: Guidance For Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit From a Dissolved Criterion" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-96-007) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. The Director shall consider conformance to EPA guidance as well as the presence of environmental conditions that limit the applicability of translators in approving the use of metal translators;~~

~~(iii) Chromium, total: 20 ug/l;~~

~~(iv) Cyanide: 1.0 ug/l;~~

~~(v) Mercury: 0.025 ug/l;~~

~~(vi) Lead, total recoverable: 25 ug/l; collection of data on sources, transport and fate of lead shall be required as part of the toxicity reduction evaluation for dischargers that are out of compliance with whole effluent toxicity testing requirements and the concentration of lead in the effluent is concomitantly determined to exceed an instream level of 3.1 ug/l from the discharge;~~

~~(vii) Nickel: 8.3 ug/l; attainment of these water quality standards in surface waters shall be based on measurement of total recoverable metals concentrations unless appropriate studies have been conducted to translate total recoverable metals to a toxic form. Studies used to determine the toxic form or translators must be designed according to the "Water Quality Standards Handbook Second Edition" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) or "The Metals Translator: Guidance For Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit From a Dissolved Criterion" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-96-007) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. The Director shall consider conformance to EPA guidance as well as the presence of environmental conditions that limit the applicability of translators in approving the use of metal translators;~~

~~(viii) Pesticides:~~

~~(A) Aldrin: 0.003 ug/l;~~

~~(B) Chlordane: 0.004 ug/l;~~

~~(C) DDT: 0.001 ug/l;~~

~~(D) Demeton: 0.1 ug/l;~~

~~(E) Dieldrin: 0.002 ug/l;~~

~~(F) Endosulfan: 0.009 ug/l;~~

~~(G) Endrin: 0.002 ug/l;~~

~~(H) Guthion: 0.01 ug/l;~~

~~(I) Heptachlor: 0.004 ug/l;~~

~~(J) Lindane: 0.004 ug/l;~~

~~(K) Methoxychlor: 0.03 ug/l;~~

~~(L) Mirex: 0.001 ug/l;~~

~~(M) Parathion: 0.178 ug/l;~~

~~(N) Toxaphene: 0.0002 ug/l;~~

~~(ix) Polychlorinated biphenyls: (total of all PCBs and congeners identified) 0.001 ug/l;~~

~~(x) Selenium: 71 ug/l;~~

~~(xi) Trialkyltin compounds: 0.007 ug/l expressed as tributyltin.~~

~~(4)~~(20) Action Levels for Toxic ~~Substances:~~Substances Applicable to NPDES Permits:

(a) ~~Copper:~~Copper, dissolved, chronic: ~~3 ug/l;~~3.1 ug/l;

(b) ~~Silver:~~Silver, dissolved, chronic: 0.1 ug/l;

(c) ~~Zinc:~~Zinc, dissolved, chronic: ~~86 ug/l;~~81 ug/l

If the chronic Action Levels for any of the substances listed in this ~~Subparagraph~~ Item (which are generally not bioaccumulative and have variable toxicity to aquatic life because of chemical form, solubility, stream characteristics or associated waste

characteristics) are determined by the waste load allocation to be exceeded in a receiving water by a discharge under the ~~specified low~~7Q10 flow criterion for toxic ~~substances (Rule .0206 in this Section),~~substances, the discharger shall be required to monitor the chemical or biological effects of the discharge; efforts shall be made by all dischargers to reduce or eliminate these substances from their effluents. Those substances for which Action Levels are listed in this ~~Subparagraph~~ Item ~~may~~shall be limited as appropriate in the NPDES permit if sufficient information (to be determined for metals by measurements of that portion of the dissolved instream concentration of the Action Level parameter attributable to a specific NPDES permitted discharge) exists to indicate that any of those substances may be a causative factor resulting in toxicity of the effluent. ~~NPDES permit limits may be based on translation of the toxic form to total recoverable metals. Studies used to determine the toxic form or translators must be designed according to: "Water Quality Standards Handbook Second Edition" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-94-005a) or "The Metals Translator: Guidance For Calculating a Total Recoverable Permit Limit From a Dissolved Criterion" published by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 823-B-96-007) which are hereby incorporated by reference including any subsequent amendments. The Director shall consider conformance to EPA guidance as well as the presence of environmental conditions that limit the applicability of translators in approving the use of metal translators.~~

Authority G.S. 143-214.1; 143-215.3(a)(1).

TITLE 21 – OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

CHAPTER 23 – IRRIGATION CONTRACTORS' LICENSING BOARD

***Notice** is hereby given in accordance with G.S. 150B-21.2 that the Irrigation Contractors' Licensing Board intends to adopt the rule cited as 21 NCAC 23 .0105; and amend the rules cited as 21 NCAC 23 .0206; .0207; and .0505.*

Agency obtained G.S. 150B-19.1 certification:

☐ **OSBM certified on:**
☐ **RRC certified on:**
☒ **Not Required**

Link to agency website pursuant to G.S. 150B-19.1(c): *www.nciclb.org*

Proposed Effective Date: *October 1, 2014*

Instructions on How to Demand a Public Hearing: *(must be requested in writing within 15 days of notice)*: *Please submit a written request for a public hearing to Barbara Geiger, P.O. Box 41421, Raleigh, NC 27629.*

Reason for Proposed Action:
21 NCAC 23 .0206(a) *– The Board proposes to amend this rule in order to allow the Board to elect to refer contested cases to OAH for disposition as allowed under N.C. Gen. Stat. 150B-40(e). The rule currently requires that all contested cases be heard only by a majority of the Board.*
21 NCAC 23 .0207 *– The intention is to allow the Board additional flexibility in the timely issuance of final agency decisions, insofar as they meet the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act. This additional flexibility is necessary as the Board continues to hold regular Board meetings on a monthly basis.*
21 NCAC 23 .0505 (l) and (m) *– These amendments are proposed in order to reflect the increasing diversity in accepted industry practice in the treatment of the specified components.*
21 NCAC 23 .0105 *– Like other self-regulating professional boards, the Board seeks to ensure the ethical integrity, transparency and accountability of its licensees in the course of their business conduct.*

Comments may be submitted to: *Barbara Geiger, P.O. Box 41421, Raleigh, NC 27629; fax (919) 872-1598; email info@nciclb.org*

Comment period ends: *August 15, 2014*

Procedure for Subjecting a Proposed Rule to Legislative Review: If an objection is not resolved prior to the adoption of the rule, a person may also submit written objections to the Rules Review Commission after the adoption of the Rule. If the Rules Review Commission receives written and signed objections after the adoption of the Rule in accordance with G.S. 150B-21.3(b2) from 10 or more persons clearly requesting review by the legislature and the Rules Review Commission approves the rule, the rule will become effective as provided in G.S. 150B-21.3(b1). The Commission will receive written objections until 5:00 p.m. on the day following the day the Commission approves the rule. The Commission will receive those objections by mail, delivery service, hand delivery, or facsimile transmission. If you have any further questions concerning the submission of objections to the Commission, please call a Commission staff attorney at 919-431-3000.

Fiscal impact (check all that apply).

☐ **State funds affected**
☐ **Environmental permitting of DOT affected**
Analysis submitted to Board of Transportation
☐ **Local funds affected**
☐ **Substantial economic impact (≥$1,000,000)**

CERTIFICATION OF THE AGENCY HEAD REGARDING COMPLETION OF A FISCAL NOTE AND RULE ANALYSIS

REFERENCE: 15A NCAC 02B .0206; 15A NCAC 02B .0211; 15A NCAC 02B .0212; 15A NCAC 02B .0214; 15A NCAC 02B .0215; 15A NCAC 02B .0216; 15A NCAC 02B .0218; 15A NCAC 02B .0220.

FINDINGS:

The Chair of the North Carolina Environmental Management Commission ("the Commission") is appointed by the Governor to guide and coordinate the activities of the Commission in fulfilling its duties. (G.S. § 143B-284)

The Commission is charged with adopting rules to be followed in the protection, preservation and enhancement of the water resources of the State. (G.S. § 143B-282(a))

The undersigned Chair of the Environmental Management Commission hereby certifies that the attached rule complies with the rulemaking principles set out in Executive Order No. 70 and G.S. § 150B-19.1. The Chair specifically certifies the following:

1. The attached rules are necessary because the rules are:
   - ☒ required by federal law, citation: Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 101(a) & 303(c)(2)(A) and 40 CFR 131.10. North Carolina has been delegated responsibility by the Environmental Protection Agency to implement the CWA through adoption and implementation of criteria and designated uses for the protection of surface water quality.
   - ☒ required by state law, citation: GS § 143-211, 143-214.1, 214.3, 214.5, 214.7, 215.1,215.3(a)(1), 215(3)(e), and GS §143B-279.2 & 282.
   - ☒ deemed necessary by the agency to serve the public interest . The proposed rulemaking provides protections for aquatic life propagation, maintenance and survival; procedures to implement those protections;; and provisions for the safety of human health .

2. The rules are based on sound, reasonably available scientific, technical, economic, and other relevant information. DENR has presented amendments using conventional chemical specific scientific language. The proposals are in accordance with CWA Section 303 (c) (1) and have been drafted to mimic the federal 304 (a) water quality criteria to implement the CWA. As the proposed scientifically derived mathematical formulas may not be clear to the general public unaccustomed to such language, the regulations also include numerical concentrations and tables for illustrative purposes. The rulemaking record and supporting documents are located in the March and May 2014 minutes of the Environmental Management Commission: http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/emc/agenda/2014/home or may be requested from the Clerk of the Environmental Management Commission at lois.thomas@ncdenr.gov.

3. The fiscal impacts of the rule have been analyzed and appropriate action taken as follows:
   - ☐ The Commission determined that no fiscal note was required under G.S. 150B-21.4; or
   - ☒ A fiscal note has been approved by the Environmental Management Commission in accordance with GS 150B-19.1 and certified by the Office of State Budget and Management in accordance with G.S. 150B-21.4. A copy of the fiscal note can be found in the rulemaking record at the location described in (2) above.

4. The rules meet all other requirements of Executive Order No. 70 and G.S. § 150B-19.

Based upon the foregoing Findings and pursuant to the requirements of the North Carolina Administrative Procedures Act and Executive Order No. 70 and G.S. § 150B-19.1, the undersigned makes the following:

CERTIFICATION

The proposed rules: 15A NCAC 02B .0206; 15A NCAC 02B .0211; 15A NCAC 02B .0212; 15A NCAC 02B .0214; 15A NCAC 02B .0215; 15A NCAC 02B .0216; 15A NCAC 02B .0218; 15A NCAC 02B .0220, are in compliance with Executive Order No. 70 and G.S. § 150B-19.1.

This, the 8th day of May, 2014 at Raleigh, North Carolina.

Benne C. Hutson, Chair
N. C. Environmental Management Commission

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

Benne C. Hutson
Chairman
Kevin Martin
Vice Chairman

NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Pat McCrory, Governor
John Skvarla, Secretary

David W. Anderson
Gerard P. Carroll
Charles Carter
Tommy Craven
Daniel E. Dawson
E. O. Ferrell
Manning Puette
Dr. Lawrence W. Raymond
Dr. Albert R. Rubin
Clyde E. Smith, Jr.
Steve W. Tedder
Julie A. Wilsey

May 15, 2014

MEMORANDUM

TO: Steve Tedder

FROM: Benne C. Hutson

SUBJECT: Hearing Officer Appointment,
Triennial Review of Water Quality Standards

I hereby designate you to serve as hearing officer for public hearings of the Triennial Review of Surface Water Quality Standards to be held in accordance with federal Clean Water Act requirements. The purpose of the hearing is to gather comments on proposed modifications to water quality standards in 15A NCAC 02B .0206; 15A NCAC 02B .0211; 15A NCAC 02B .0212; 15A NCAC 02B .0214; 15A NCAC 02B .0215; 15A NCAC 02B .0216; 15A NCAC 02B .0218; and 15A NCAC 02B .0220. The state will also accept comments on variances from surface water quality standards.

Public hearings are scheduled for Tuesday, July 15th, 2014, 2:00 PM in the Ground Floor Hearing Room, Archdale Building, 512 N Salisbury St., Raleigh, NC and Wednesday, July 16th, 2014, 3:00 PM in Room B of the Statesville Civic Center, 300 South Center Street, Statesville, NC. You are requested to preside over the hearings and receive all relevant comments. Following the close of the public comment period (August 22, 2014), staff will work with you to develop findings and recommendations to be presented to the EMC. Staff support will be provided by Connie Brower (919-807-6416).

Thank you for your assistance and service.

cc: Tom Reeder
Tom Fransen
Connie Brower
Jeff Manning
Janice Bownes
Lois Thomas

Public Hearing: July 15, 2014 2:00 PM
Triennial Review of Surface Water Quality Classifications and Standards
Ground Floor Hearing Room, Archdale Building
Raleigh, NC

Public Hearing: July 16, 2014 3:00 PM
Triennial Review of Surface Water Quality Classifications and Standards
Statesville Civic Center, 300 South Center Street
Statesville, NC

Hearing Officer: Mr. Steve Tedder, Chairman, Water Quality Committee, EMC

Good afternoon. This public hearing is now officially called to order.

My name is Steve Tedder, I have been appointed by the Environmental Management Commission of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources as the presiding officer for today's hearing.

This public hearing and comment period are being held in accordance with the federal Water Pollution Control Act (the Clean Water Act) which requires States, at least every three years, to review and revise water quality standards to protect aquatic life and human health.

This hearing is also being conducted under the authority of North Carolina General Statutes, Chapter 143-214.1 and 143-215.3(a). In accordance with General Statute 150B, a public notice, containing the proposed changes and the accompanying fiscal note, was published in the June 16, 2014 edition of the *North Carolina Register.*

Notices were sent to those who have requested to be placed on the Division of Water Resources' rule-making e-mail notification list. Notice to the public was also provided through the Department and Division's websites and a press release was issued by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources.

A written record of this hearing will be prepared for the Commission.

For this reason, the hearing is being tape-recorded.

Written comments received by August 22nd, 2014 will also be included in the hearing record.

Recognitions >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> EMC members identified

Now, Connie Brower, of the Classifications and Standards, Rule Review Branch, will present a brief overview of the proposed changes to the NC water quality standards.

Connie's presentation

If you have not already done so, and you would like to speak, please sign in at the registration table. Only those registered to speak will be provided this opportunity.

We will now accept comments from the audience. Based upon the number of persons requesting a chance to present; a limit on the amount of time available will be made. If you have written copies of your comments, please provide staff an electronic or written copy. When your name is called, please come up to the microphone and state your name and any business or group affiliation.

# People who wish to speak	***Time limit per speaker*
1-10	*7 -8 minutes*
10-30	*4 minutes*
31+	*3 minutes*

Because a large number of people have requested to speak, it will be necessary to impose a time limit of _____minutes per speaker. A member of the Division of Water Resources staff, _____, will be timing the comments and will hold up a sign indicating when you have one minute remaining to speak. We appreciate your cooperation with this time limit so that everyone who wishes to speak is able to do so.

Please remember that this hearing is being recorded. I will now call on the first registered speaker.

Speakers

Thank you for attending today's public hearing, the hearing record will remain open until August 22nd, 2014. Anytime between today and 5:00 PM- August 22nd, 2014, you may submit written comments on the proposed rules, water quality variances or the fiscal analysis. Written comments received by US Mail or by e-mail during this time period will be made a part of the public record.

In making any final decision, the EMC considers the written public comments record, the suggestions of the hearing officer and any concerns of the commission members. Based upon careful consideration by myself and the Water Resources staff, I will make recommendations for action to the Environmental Management Commission.

We thank everyone for being here today. Staff will be around for a few minutes to answer any additional questions you might have.

I now declare this public hearing closed.

Attachment E

Attendee List – Public Hearing - July 2014

ATTENDEE LIST - PUBLIC HEARING
JULY 15, 2014
GROUND FLOOR HEARING ROOM, ARCHDALE BUILDING
RALEIGH, NC

EMC APPOINTED HEARING OFFICER

Steve Tedder (Environmental Management Commission Member)

DWR -DIRECTOR

Tom Reeder

DWR LEAD STAFF ON TRIENNIAL REVIEW

Tom Fransen
Jeff Manning
Connie Brower

DWR STAFF

Susan Massengale	DWR- Public Information Officer
Carrie Ruhlman	
Cam McNutt	
Joanna Gmyr	
Julie Grzyb	
Ian McMillan	
Andy Painter	
Adugna Kebebe	
Jennifer Smith	
Tom Belnick	
Nora Deamer	
Tonya Godwin	
Jucilene Hoffman	
Elizabeth Kountis	
Gary Kreiser	
Steven Kroeger	
Sarah M. Bass	
Dianne Reid	
Adriene Weaver	

Attachment E

Attendee List – Public Hearing - July 2014

US EPA OFFICIALS

Annie Godfrey	Region IV – Atlanta, GA, Chief –Water Quality Standards Section
Lisa Perras Gordon	Region IV – Atlanta, GA
Lauren Petter	Region IV – Atlanta, GA

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

Peter Raabe	American Rivers
Martha Ginalami	Private Citizen
Lib Hutchby	Private Citizen
Harvey Richmond	Private Citizen
Mike Hanes	Private Citizen
Karen Brashear	City of Goldsboro
Brianna VanStekelenburg	Sierra Club
Kenneth Waldroup	City of Raleigh
Heather Deck	Pamlico-Tar Riverkeeper
Steve Brown	Town of Cary/ League of Municipalities
Chad Ham	Public Works Commission/ NC Water Quality Association
Mandy Hall	NC Rural Water Association
Mick Noland	City of Fayetteville, Public Works Commission
Matthew Starr	Neuse RiverKeeper Foundation
Julie Youngman	Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC)
Libby Malcolm	Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC)
Alina Boccella	Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC)
Cassie Gavin	NC Chapter – Sierra Club
Stephanie Schweickert	NC Conservation Network
Karen Rindge	WakeUp Wake County
Jennifer Dean	Private Citezen
Elaine Chiosso	Haw River Keeper

REGISTERED ATTENDEES

Kathleen Hopson	Private Citizen
Julie Cook	Private Citizen
John Shaw	Private Citizen
Robert Matthews	Crescero
Gray Jernigan	Waterkeeper Alliance
Nick McCracken	Evergreen Packaging
Sara Ludwig	Duke University
Adrianne Coombes	McKim & Creed
Jay Sauber	Sauber WQ Consulting
Brian Jacobson	URS Corporation
Sharon Owens	Flowserve
Keith Larick	NC Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
Zachary Keith	NC Sierra Club
Caroline Spence	Sierra Club

Attachment E

Attendee List – Public Hearing - July 2014

Gerald Tyrone Battle	City of Durham
Andy McDaniel	NC Dept of Transportation
Jay Stem	NC Aggregates Association
Will Hendrick	Southern Environmental Law Center
Erin Wynia	NC League of Municipalities
Sarah Collins	NC League of Municipalities
Frank Skee	City of Greensboro
Abby Bishop	NC Conservation Network
Erica Egenes	NC Conservation Network
Bethany Georgoulis	Division of Energy Mining and Land Resources

Attachment E

Attendee List – Public Hearing - July 2014

ATTENDEE LIST - PUBLIC HEARING
JULY 16, 2014
STATESVILLE CIVIC CENTER
STATESVILLE, NC

EMC APPOINTED HEARING OFFICER
Steve Tedder (Environmental Management Commission Member)

DWR LEAD STAFF ON TRIENNIAL REVIEW
Jeff Manning
Connie Brower

DWR STAFF
Joanna Gmyr
Julie Grzyb
Elizabeth Kountis
Gary Kreiser
Steven Kroeger
Corey Bassinger
Sherri Knight
Mike Parker
Wes Bell
Marcia Allocco

US EPA OFFICIALS

Annie Godfrey	Region IV – Atlanta, GA, Chief –Water Quality Standards Section
Lisa Perras Gordon	Region IV – Atlanta, GA
Lauren Petter	Region IV – Atlanta, GA

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

Kimberly Brewer	Private Citizen
Rich Daves	Pure Water Project
Will Hendrick	Southern Environmental Law Center
Monica Hayes	City of Winston Salem
Sara Behnke	Private Citizen
Allen Hubbard	Clean Water for NC
Katie Hicks	Clean Water for NC
Sarah Collins	NC League of Municipalities
Sam Perkins	Catawba Riverkeeper Foundation
Ben Benoit	Catawba Riverkeeper Foundation –Lincoln County Lakekeeper
Charles Miles	Private Citizen

Attachment E

Attendee List – Public Hearing - July 2014

REGISTERED ATTENDEES

Victoria Taylor	Catawba Water Relicensing Coalition
Elizabeth Burton	Yadkin Riverkeeper
Weston Johnson	City of Statesville
Greg Padgett	Town of Valdese
Jacob Reid	City of Hickory
Susan McNeely	City of Hickory
Dwight Bradshaw	Daimler Trucks North America
Eric Moser	Daimler Trucks North America
Forrest Westall	Upper Neuse River Basin Association
Lydia Wright	Pure H2O Project
Paul Martinez	Pure H2O Project
Steve Jadlocki	City of Charlotte
Bruce Henderson	The Charlotte Observer
Joe Hudson	City of Statesville
Jerry Byerly	City of Statesville
Rich Mogensen	Mogensen Mitigation Inc.
Frank Skee	City of Greensboro
Gerald Tyrone Battle	City of Durham/ NC Pretreatment Consortium
Kathy Wolfe	Private Citizen
Shannon Sypolt	Charlotte –Mecklenburg Utilities
Tom Duckwell	Friends of the Deep River
Nick McCracken	Evergreen Packaging
Matt Nunez	Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utilities Department
Danny Sigmon	City of Newton
Garrett Gilbert	City of Newton
Wilce Martin	City of Newton
??? Stambe	Private Citizen

ATTACHMENT F
Summary of Written Comments

The following is a brief synopsis of the ~925 comments received; the reader is directed to Attachment G

Metals (by topic):

- **Adoption of Dissolved/ Equation-based Criteria/National Recommended Water Quality Criteria (NRWQC) for Metals**

  All interested parties exhibited general support for the adoption of revised metals standards. Numerous private citizens expressed concern for the delays that have prolonged the adoption of the proposed revisions.

  Federal agencies, private citizens, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs): support NRWQC for metals in dissolved form.

  Local governments/representatives of local governments, and industries: Support adoption of instream dissolved metals with *implementation* of NPDES total recoverable permit limits using US EPA approved translators. {Note: the US EPA translators are part of an implementation policy and are not "water quality standards"}

- **Hardness Dependent Equation-Based Criteria**

  - Water "hardness" affects the toxicity of some metals to aquatic life by competing with the dissolved metal ions for binding sites on an aquatic organism. The higher the water hardness, the lower the toxicity of some metals. The extent of this hardness effect varies greatly by metal and by metal speciation. In aquatic toxicity tests used to derive the national criteria, the laboratory water hardness can be varied, to some degree, to characterize the effect. However, numerous water quality standards have not been tested at extremely low hardnesses, and, as recently as the NRWQC for Cadmium in 2001, the affect was tested infrequently below 30 mg/L. To reflect this "hardness dependent" influence, the proposals are represented as equations. Reflective of the NRWQC aquatic toxicity testing, the state proposed a range of instream hardness with a floor of 25 mg/L. Metals whose toxicity is not influenced by water hardness are expressed as a single numeric value in the proposal and do not have an associated equation provided. Water hardness has not been found to affect the toxicity of metals to saltwater organisms in saltwater environments.

  Adoption of equations is supported by federal agencies, private citizens and local governments as it replaces the current default hardness assumption and provides flexibility in assessments. The US EPA supports a "floor" of hardness at 20 mg/L, the current proposal is 25 mg/L. EPA notes that waters of the state are often below 25 mg/L.

Local governments/representatives of local governments/industries with pre-treatment agreements support the adoption of the median/mean instream hardness values for permitting purposes, they also supported implementation of NPDES total recoverable permit limits using US EPA approved translators and a mass balance approach for calculation of NPDES permit limits. {Note: the US EPA translators are part of an implementation policy and are not "water quality standards"}

- **Adoption of NRWQC for acute metals criteria (to accompany the chronic criterion)**

  All interested parties cited agreement that acute criterion would be helpful for proper decisions on the quality of NC waters. Numerous parties (local government, federal agencies, private citizens, NGOs) expressed concern about funding for adequate monitoring.

- **Numerous commenters requested the ability to apply the Water Effects ratio to the applicable water quality standards for metals. {Comments on this policy were specifically requested in the *NC Register* Notice of Text}**

  - As this provision is currently available under the 15A NCAC 02B .0226 regulation for "Exemptions to Water Quality Standards, the US EPA does not pose objections to this modification.

- **Adoption of NRWQC for Arsenic (Aquatic Life)**

  This proposal was not supported by private citizens and NGOs, citing a decreased protection of aquatic life and/or human health.
  - The reviewers were unaware that the applicable standard for human health remains and is therefore protective of human health (and aquatic life).

- **Adoption of Chromium VI Criteria and Chromium III criteria/Elimination of Total Chromium**

  Generally supported by federal agencies, private citizens, NGOs.
  Most cited importance of noting toxicity of Cr VI and regulating appropriately for protection of human health and aquatic life.

- **Maintenance of "Action Level" Regulations with respect to NPDES Permits**

  - No proposals were made to eliminate "Action Level" policies.

    It is important to note that the proposed regulations in 15A NCAC 02B .0211 and .0220 <u>modify</u> the numerical concentration (by equation), but <u>maintain</u> instream water quality standards for Copper, Silver and Zinc.

> In 1984, North Carolina adopted Action Level water quality policies for copper, zinc, iron, and silver with respect to NPDES permitting activities. This adoption did not alter the instream water quality standards for these parameters. These policies were developed to allow dischargers some flexibility in meeting the NPDES permit limits derived from the applicable instream water quality standards. The regulatory language was written to permit an examination of the bioavailability of the metal, using Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) testing. Under the Clean Water Act, the state has primacy for establishment of water quality standards and classifications; EPA must approve all state standards and reclassifications. In 1985, 1986 and 1990 when EPA reviewed the action level water quality policies, in conjunction with the applicable water quality standards, they only conditionally approved the policies and subsequently requested information on how the Action Level policies would be implemented. The implementation procedure presented to EPA involved establishing WET testing limits and monitoring for discharges with the metals in their effluent. No permit limits for the metals were to be given if the facility continued to pass their WET limits or if upon failure of the WET testing an action level parameter was not found to be a causative factor. The Division's implementation procedure was reviewed by EPA and reworked by the Division several times during 1999 and 2000 before EPA finally approved it in October 2000.

As noted above, the use of "Action Levels" is strictly for use with NPDES permitting and is widely supported by the regulated parties (local governments, industries, representatives of local governments).

Maintenance of the Action Level metals policies was not supported by the US EPA, nor the NGOs and most of the private citizens that commented on the topic. US EPA states that the policy is not in alignment with 40 CFR 122.44(1)(i), the Clean Water Act, and Section 304(a) national recommendations (NRWQC).

- **Removal of Iron and Manganese from Applicable Metal Standards**

  Support of these proposals was mixed, but, the US EPA recognized the natural content of the Iron and Manganese in NC waters. The two elements are not currently known to disrupt public water supplies, nor designated uses.

- **Cadmium Criteria Recalculation**

  - The recalculation of the NRWQC is an acceptable mechanism under Clean Water Act and is supported by federal agencies, local governments/representatives of local governments.

  Non-governmental Organizations cite that the calculation is inadequately protective of aquatic life because it is less protective than the federal.

- While the Cadmium proposal is numerically higher than the NRWQC, it is equally protective of the species known to inhabit the state's waters.

- **Adoption of Methyl Mercury Criteria (water column and fish tissue)**

  - No proposals were made to modify the current Mercury standard, nor were proposals made to add a criterion for Methyl Mercury.

Revised standards for either the water column or the addition of meHg fish tissue criterion are supported by federal agencies, private citizens and Non-governmental Organizations.

- **Biological Assessment Used for Water Body Assessments**

This provision was not supported by federal agencies, private citizens and NGOs, citing that biological indicators are more restorative in nature – as opposed the Clean Water Act mandate to protect water quality.

The regulated community supported the effort to more clearly assess the conditions of the waters before making decisions of the waters conditions.

- **Adoption of Site Specific Criterion**

  - No specific amendments were proposed for derivation of a "site-specific criterion".

Commenters supported amendments to more specifically allow for SSC derivation using the federally approved Water Effects Ratio (WER).

- **Nutrient/Nutrient Related Criteria/Nutrient Criteria Development Plan**

  - While no specific amendments were proposed with respect to nutrients, a significant number of comments were submitted in support of the state' s Nutrient Criteria Development Plan (NCDP)

Support from agricultural interests, local governments/representatives of local governments and some citizens. These commenters were varied in their support of the current chlorophyll a standard.

A number of private citizens and NGOs expressed concern that we lack speed in determining appropriate nutrient standards (TN, TP, chlorophyll a criteria for all water bodies).

- **Adoption of Revised NRWQ Ammonia Criteria**

  - Although no proposals were made to adopt ammonia criteria, the adoption of the recently published NRWQC criteria was supported by federal agencies, private citizens, Non-governmental Organizations.

  Not supported by local governments/representatives of local governments, noting that control was inherent in other programmatic efforts (notably the NPDES permits).

- **Adoption of Instream "Flow" as a Criterion**

  Protective standards for flow were suggested by private citizens, federal agencies and NGOs. Concern was expressed that adequate flow is warranted to protect aquatic life. Commenters expressed the desire to have standards established for flow (quantity).

  - Existing statutes provide regulatory authority to protect instream flows.

- **Reorganization of Current Standards**

  US EPA noted that a separate section for standards applicable to trout waters would be helpful.

- **Protection of Recreational Opportunities, Public Water Supplies, Sensitive Species**

  Business noted that standards that assure recreational opportunities are protected are a means to attract commercial and residential development to the state.

  One local government suggested we adopt criteria for bromides to protect water supplies.

  Federal agencies encouraged adoption of revised standards as a means to protect sensitive and vulnerable species.

- **Variances – Chloride**

  Agricultural Interests indicated support of current variances, specifically for chlorides at pickle plants as a mechanism to sustain agricultural efforts.

  Private citizens and NGOs cited concern for sufficient regulation to control discharges as reason for disapproval.

- **Triennial Review Process and Procedures**

  Some commented that there be more public hearings for the Triennial Review (requested more hearings throughout the state), and some requested more stakeholder meetings on the Triennial process.

- **Additional Comments and Concerns**

    - Dissolved oxygen criteria for varying water column depths. Comments cited concern with lack of protection for aquatic species throughout the water column;

    - Readjustment of the Fish Consumption Rate, used to calculate protective human health standards, to account for subsistence fishermen;

    - Examine fate and transport as it relates to adoption of any new or revised criteria;

    - Stronger control of “emerging contaminants” such as: flame retardants, endocrine disrupting compounds, pharmaceuticals;

    - Sediment criteria: concerns with possible re-suspension of heavy metals, nitrogen and phosphorus to the water column;

    - The general state of North Carolina’s surface water and ground waters was noted and the specific need for more ambient monitoring and oversight of NPDES dischargers;

    - Lack of progress in implementing rulemaking efforts in both Falls and Jordan Lakes;

    - Concerns with the effects of HB 74 and Rules Review Commission reviews that could hamper water quality improvements and regulations;

    - Concerns related to climate change;

    - Concerns related to storm water controls.

From: Patricia Adams
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: !
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:30:21 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patricia Adams

283 Inman Branch Rd
Waynesville, NC 28786

From: Kevin Furr
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: 2.5%
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:54:16 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Furr

306 N. E. Connector
Albemarle, NC 28001

From: Hazel Poolos
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: 8 years late in reviewing NC water quality standards is unacceptable
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 11:35:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Extremely important is to ADOPT A STANDARD THAT PROHIBITS, PROHIBITS, PROHIBITS THE DISCHARGE OF FRACKING WASTEWATER CONTAMINANTS.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Hazel Poolos

42717 Caudle Rd
Richfield, NC 28137

From: Sam Perkins
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: 2014 NC Surface Water Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 3:34:14 PM
Attachments: 2014 NC Surface Water Triennial Review.pdf

Please find attached our comments to supplement those we made orally in Statesville at the public hearing on July 16th, 2014.

Sincerely,
--

Sam Perkins
Catawba **RIVERKEEPER®**
Catawba Riverkeeper Foundation, Inc.
421 Minuet Lane, Suite 205
Charlotte, NC 28217-2784
Office: (704) 679-9494
Cell: (704) 651-5974
www.CatawbaRiverkeeper.org

Sign up for our e-newsletter!

Become a Member or Donate!

Find the Riverkeeper and the Foundation on Facebook!

From: Helen Williams
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Against Fracking
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:57:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Helen Williams

17 Birchcrest Court
Durhan, NC 27713

From: hehowms
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Against Fracking
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:12:38 PM

I am in every way a conservative, and am strongly opposed to the State opening the door to the potential damage to our amazing water resources in North Carolina through, most lately, fracking.

I love being near water. I love the North Carolina landscape. I am GRATEFUL for our abundant water resources, both above and below the ground in this beautiful state. As a former California resident with family still in that state, I am more than aware of the value of clean water to sustain our health and our agriculture and how dollar-considerations can undermine both.

This is not a financial issue, though that appears to be controlling the dialog. Ultimately, our financial welfare rests with productive land and people, not arid land and people with mounting health needs.

Please do not disregard the voters. The stock prices should not be the momentum behind the approval of fracking, or other water-endangering decisions.

Ask the farmers.

….and please pass on my comments to the governor's office. I support Mr. McCrory, but hope he will consider the opposition's concerns.

Helen Williams
17 Birchcrest Court
Durham, NC 27713

From: Julie Koenig
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: An ounce of prevention > a pound of cure. Do the right thing, for the love of all things natural!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:31:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Julie Koenig

785 Jackeys creek lane
Leland, NC 28451

From: Betty Heater
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Be viligent with our water!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:16:25 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Betty Heater

475 ROMANA DRIVE
Salisbury, NC 28146

From: Tish Wilson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Because it is common sense.
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:46:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tish Wilson

1020 Kirby Branch Road
Zionville, NC 28698

From: Tammy Barr
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: bringing our standard up to date
Date: Sunday, August 17, 2014 2:50:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tammy Barr

4222 Garden Street
Winston Salem, NC 27105

From: Madeleine Watt
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Changing water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:28:29 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of STRENGTHENING our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D.

However, I was very DISSAPOINTED that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Madeleine Watt

Po box 3289
Cashiers, NC 28717

From:	Groome, Martie
To:	DWR_Classifications_Standards; stevewtedder@gmail.com; Brower, Connie
Cc:	Drew, Steve; McDowell, Kenney; Williams, Elijah; Cooper, Lori W.; Osborne, Ed; Goots, Alicia; Skee, Joseph; "chad.ham@faypwc.com"; Glenn McGirt; Scott Pickard; Joellen Gay(jgay@wilsonnc.org)
Subject:	City of Greensboro Triennial Review Comments
Date:	Friday, August 22, 2014 7:29:21 PM
Attachments:	meg-August 2014 Triennial CommentsFINAL.doc

Attached please find the City of Greensboro comments on the Triennial Review. If you have questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Martie Groome, Laboratory and Industrial Waste Section Supervisor
Water Resources Department
City of Greensboro
Phone: 336-433-7229 Fax: 336-373-7720
Box 3136, Greensboro NC 27402-3136
www.greensboro-nc.gov

==========
Please note that email sent to and from this address is subject
to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From:	Groome, Martie
To:	DWR_Classifications_Standards; stevewtedder@gmail.com; Brower, Connie
Cc:	Drew, Steve; McDowell, Kenney; Williams, Elijah; Cooper, Lori W.; Osborne, Ed; Goots, Alicia; Skee, Joseph; "chad.ham@faypwc.com"; Glenn McGirt; Scott Pickard; Joellen Gay(jgay@wilsonnc.org)
Subject:	City of Greensboro Triennial Review Comments
Date:	Friday, August 22, 2014 7:29:22 PM
Attachments:	meg-August 2014 Triennial CommentsFINAL.doc

Attached please find the City of Greensboro comments on the Triennial Review. If you have questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Martie Groome, Laboratory and Industrial Waste Section Supervisor
Water Resources Department
City of Greensboro
Phone: 336-433-7229 Fax: 336-373-7720
Box 3136, Greensboro NC 27402-3136
www.greensboro-nc.gov

==========
Please note that email sent to and from this address is subject
to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: Waldroup, Kenneth
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Cc: McLawhorn, Dan; Lynch, TJ
Subject: City of Raleigh verbal comments at the triennial review public hearing 7-15-14
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 9:35:41 AM
Attachments: COR Speakers Comments on WQS Rules w TJL edits.pdf
ATT00001.c
ATT00002.htm

Connie,

Here is a copy of the comments we shared at the public hearing yesterday. We will also be providing written comments before the August deadline. Thank you for your good work on this issue.

-Kenny

Kenneth R. Waldroup, PE
Assistant Public Utilities Director
City of Raleigh Public Utilities
Post Office Box 590
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602
Direct Phone (919) 996-3489
Cell Phone (919) 369-3240
Direct Fax (919) 996-7967
Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.
"The first responsibility of a leader is to define reality. The last is to say thank you. In between, the leader is a servant." — Max DePree

From: Monica Stamm
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: CLEAN AIR/WATER STANDARDS
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:32:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Monica Stamm

1212 Crescent Ave
Roselle, FL 07203

From: George Olson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean and Pure Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:20:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

George Olson

433 Toecane Road
Bakersville, NC 28705

From: Judge Stuart & Nancy Namm (Ret)
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Drinking Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:34:19 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Judge Stuart & Nancy Namm (Ret)

101 Marshview Road
Hampstead, NC 28443

From: Kitsie Bean
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean our water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:40:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kitsie Bean

PO Box 158
Yadkinville, NC 27055

From: Muhammed Ekkandy
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean our water
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 2:13:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Muhammed Ekkandy

730 CANDLER LN APT 414
CHARLOTTE, NC 28217

From: Kristen Childress
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean our waters
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 11:16:22 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kristen Childress

549 merrimon ave
Asheville, NC 28804

From: Sam Brouse
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean up our rivers!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:22:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sam Brouse

15 allesarn rd
Asheville, NC 28804

From: Yvonne Moody
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean up our water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:54:33 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

I'm also very concerned about water contamination by fracking chemicals. We need clean water for people and agriculture, and to provide a positive environment for shellfish and sea life.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Moody

609 Marsh Grass Ct
southport, NC 28461

From: Gilda Friedman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean up our water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:19:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gilda Friedman

4315 dogwood drive
Greensboro, NC 27410

From: Laurie Shafer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean up our water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:52:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Laurie Shafer

2110 Arrowcreek Drive
Apt 102
Charlotte, NC 28273

From: Robert Pleasants
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean up
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:26:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert Pleasants

Po box 861
carolina beach, NC 28428

From: P. Manuel
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water - NC
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 5:49:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

P. Manuel

128 S. Cherry St
kernersville, NC 27284

From: Chris Cameron
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water & Healthy Enviroment
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:04:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Chris Cameron

108 Clancey Court
durham, NC 27712

From: Roxy Darling
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: CLEAN WATER ACT
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:28:30 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Roxy Darling

936 Waterlily Rd
Coinjock, NC 27923

From: Jerome Goodwin
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:20:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jerome Goodwin

3106 Shopton Dr
Apex, 27502

From: Justin Johnson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water for all North Carolinians
Date: Monday, August 18, 2014 8:20:12 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Justin Johnson

2370 Bethel Road
Jonesville, NC 28642

From: Alisa Keegan
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water for LIFE
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 4:31:23 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alisa Keegan

1260 West Fourth St
Winston Salme, NC 27101

From: William Lamm
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water for N. C.
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:14:21 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

William Lamm

105 Appenzell la
New abern, NC 28562

From: Deborah Ash
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water for NC please!
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 3:52:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deborah Ash

115 Goose Creek Drive
Washington, NC 27889

From: Josep Colomer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water for NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:45:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities. I must say I drink tap water daily, and failure to strengthen the water quality will directly affect my health.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Josep Colomer

5022 Gable Ridge Dr
Durham, NC 27713

From: Jerry Ayers
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water for NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:51:22 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

As one who lives on a lake, I am very concerned with keeping our public waters clean. So, I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality until dead organisms are evident. That is stupid, and it violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jerry Ayers

8341 Long Island Rd
Catawba, NC 28609

From: Carol Swing
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water for NC
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:28 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Swing

223 Dula Springs Road
Weaverville, NC 28787

From: Anne White
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water for NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:53:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anne White

533 Greenwood Drive
Cary, NC 27511

From: Barry Silverstein
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water for North Carolina
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:14:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Barry Silverstein

5 Blue Damsel Court
Candler, NC 28715

From: John White
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water for North Carolina
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:01:31 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

John White

199 Four Seasons Lane
Murphy, NC 28906

From: Thomas Lillard
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water for our children, our future
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:35:58 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

We need honesty and future-based protection of our national aquifer...less the sad Orwellian predictions come to past...our water=our health. Why is the US lagging behind other countries in the sensitivity to Global Warming, carbon emissions foot-printing, health, good sense? Come on, its time to use our good judgement for the future, not create more awful toxic super sites....We don't need natural gas...we need fair implementation and federal support for alternative technologies. Technologies that are being stymied by the petroleum giants. God help us. Are their no honest leaders to aid our national skid?
Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thomas Lillard

PO box 1107
Marshall, NC 28753

From: ELIZABETH MANGRUM
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: CLEAN WATER IN NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:31:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

If citizens of North Carolina do not like to pay $4.00 / gallon for gas, I wonder what they will be paying for a gallon of clean water? If the NC General Assembly continues to gut environmental regulations protecting our water, we could all end up paying for water!

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH MANGRUM

355 RED FOX RIDGE ROAD
CAMERON, NC 28326

From: Kathleen Hundley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water in North Carolina Waterways
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 7:27:28 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Since the late 1990's, The Friends of the Rock y River and the Rocky River Heritage Foundation have been working diligently to improve the water quality of that small river in Chatham County. We worked closely with our Legislature to build awareness of their responsibilities to protect rivers in NC in general and the Rocky River in particular. We have raised over $750,000 for research in water quality and citizen awareness and education such that the Rocky River has a higher level of data on not only water quality, but the status of aquatic life of any comparable river in the State of NC. As citizens, we have gone as far as we can to protect our river; now, it's up to government, both State and Federal, to return NC rivers to clean, usable waterways for citizen use and enjoyment.
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Hundley

P.O. box 1177
Pittsboro, NC 27312

From: Mirinda Kossoff
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water is a Basic Right
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:26:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mirinda Kossoff

137 Edgewood Dr
Durham, NC 27713

From: Jerod Kratzer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water is a fundamental right, not an option
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:38:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jerod Kratzer

131 Shirley Drive
Cary, NC 25711

From: Carol Keister
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water is a must
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:52:19 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Keister

139 Bridelpath Lane
Mooresville, NC 28117

From: Linda Alfredson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water is a right!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:44:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda Alfredson

21 Red Oak Road
Asheville, NC 28804

From: Jeffrey DeLuca
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water is Basic Right in a Modern Society
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:26:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey DeLuca

400 Sharon Rd
Chapel Hill, NC 27517

From: Judith Stafford
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water is critical
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:35:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Judith Stafford

2204 Anthony Drive
Durham, NC 27705

From: Larissa Bowman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water is Essential to NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:16:20 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

As our population grows, weather patterns change, and the preciousness of clean water becomes ever more important and better understood, it is imperative that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

I ask you to please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me, my family, and ALL North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Larissa Bowman

677 Brevard Rd
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Elizabeth Dunnagan
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water is essential
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 12:05:25 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Dunnagan

8629 reindeer moss dr
Wake forest, NC 27587

From: Rebecca Carina
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water is Essential
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:44:35 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Carina

2815 Bedford Ave
Raleigh, NC 27607

From: Dave McLintock
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water is important to me!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:49:19 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dave McLintock

920 Tumbling Fork Rd
Waynesville, NC 28785

From: Christie Driscoll
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water is Important to Me
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:48:28 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Christie Driscoll

5308 Lansing Dr
Charlotte, NC 28270

From: John van Arnold
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water is key to citizen well being
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:02:27 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

As a former employee of Northrup Environmental Services who did contract work for EPA,NIEHS & NATIONAL TOXICOLOGY PROGRAM, I have seen 1st hand the damage heavy metals and toxins do to animal life. DO NOT TAKE CHANCES WITH NORTH CAROLINA'S citizen HEALTH

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

John van Arnold

100 Adam's Way
Chapel Hill, 27516

From: Becky Cleland
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water is Life: Protect North Carolina"s!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:34 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Becky Cleland

2142 Coxe Rd
Tryon, NC 28782

From: Christine Arvidson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water is not OPTIONAL!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:26:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Christine Arvidson

401 College Ave
West Jefferson, NC 28694

From: Daria Drake
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water is out lifeline!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:34:22 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Daria Drake

3504 Mossdale Ave
Durham, NC 27707

From: Lynn B. Spees
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water is very important to health
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 11:00:36 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lynn B. Spees

280 28th Avenue Place, NE
Hickory, NC 28601

From: Deborah Osborne
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Is Vital For All Living Things
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:00:51 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deborah Osborne

116 McNaron Ln
Mooresville, NC 28117

From: Lynn Gregory
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water is Vital
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:26:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lynn Gregory

555 Smith Creek Rd
Mars Hill, NC 28754

From: Amy Bartley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water now
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:34:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amy Bartley

937 Homestead Park Dr
Apex, NC 27502

From: Katherine Matthews
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Petition
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 12:27:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Katherine Matthews

380 Luzelle Drive
Winston Salem, NC 27103

From: Dawn Mcginty
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water please!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:06:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dawn Mcginty

206 W Avondale Drive
Greensboro, NC 27403

From: Logan Paul
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water please!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:37 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Logan Paul

4449 Murphy school road
Durham, NC 32129

From: Sue Cole
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Please
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:16:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sue Cole

4808 Starmount Dr
Greensboro, NC 27410

From: carla caccia
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water please
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:19:40 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

carla caccia

581 greenland dr
fayetteville, NC 28305

From: Mr. James F. Moore, Sr.
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water regulation updates.
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:59:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mr. James F. Moore, Sr.

215 Craig Street
Greensboro, 27406

From: lawrence adrian
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water regulations
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:21:45 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

lawrence adrian

101 kaitlin drive
durham, NC 27713

From: Inta Blomquist
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Resources
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 1:57:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Inta Blomquist

605 Drexel Road
Rocky Mount, NC 27803

From: Fred Stanback
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water rules
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:47:29 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Fred Stanback

507 W Innes St. #270
Salisbury, NC 28144

From: Barbara Barron
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water standard
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:49:45 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Barbara Barron

8902 Charlottes Mountain Road
Rougemont, NC 27572

From: Alyssa Belcher
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 9:16:05 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alyssa Belcher

536 Appeldoorn Circle
Asheville, NC 28803

From: Brenda Hayes
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:56:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brenda Hayes

403 St. Mary's Rd
Hillsborough, NC 27278

From: SR. Jeanne Marie Kienast
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:45:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

SR. Jeanne Marie Kienast

500 Sacred Heart Circle
Belmont, NC 28012

From: Robert Howland
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:27:25 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities. Don't allow fracking byproducts to be discharged into our waterways.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert Howland

176 Mountain Bluff Trl
Hendersonville, NC 28792

From: Allison Garwood
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:37:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Allison Garwood

436 Landsbury Drive
Waxhaw, NC 28173

From: Michele Skeele
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:54:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michele Skeele

519 3rd Ave West
Hendersonville, NC 28739

From: robert stratton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:28:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

robert stratton

2436 gold cup ct
matthews, NC 28105

From: L Simon
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:50:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

L Simon

11 spring hollow circle
Asheville, NC 28805

From: Linnea Angermuller
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 5:51:25 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linnea Angermuller

400 Lamp Post Drive
Zirconia, NC 28790

From: Jeffery White
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:40:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeffery White

25 Pisgah View Rd
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Deidre Duffy
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:35:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Development standards also need to stricter in order to protect our waterways.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deidre Duffy

67 Craggy
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Gracie Woody
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 4:40:16 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gracie Woody

7804 Craig Road
Belews Creek, NC 27009

From: casie Sampson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:41:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

casie Sampson

8611 Keller rd
summerfield, NC 27358

From: G.W. Cheney
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

G.W. Cheney

315 Hickory Lane
Boone, NC 28607

From: Carol Hay
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:52:06 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Hay

3929-A Red Hawk Rd
Hillsborough, NC 27278

From: Kathryn Pezzi
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:37 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Pezzi

96 Pine Lake Drive
Whispering Pines, NC 28327

From: Carl Gipson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:42:16 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carl Gipson

728 Spartacus Ct
Cary, NC 27518

From: Susan Kraus
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Susan Kraus

2712 Towhee Court
Charlotte, NC 28269

From: Rebecca Carter
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:33:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Carter

155 Jim's trail
Westfield, NC 27053

From: Larry Cooper
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Larry Cooper

1009 Goodworth Drive Suite 104
Apex, NC 27539

From: Maggie McKinney
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:26:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Maggie McKinney

234 N. Anderson Street
MORGANTON, NC 28655

From: Ruth Noble
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 11:27:05 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ruth Noble

26 Rylee Ridge
Asheville, NC 28805

From: Corey Cavalier
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:02:27 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Corey Cavalier

7033 Sandringham Court
Raleigh, NC 27613

From: Margie Stewart
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:38:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Margie Stewart

2606 Francis St
Durham, NC 27707

From: Marcia Sobel
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:04:15 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Marcia Sobel

110 Kimberly Dr
Greenville, NC 27858

From: James Smiley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:03:17 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James Smiley

684 Deadmon Road
Mocksville, NC 27028

From: Annette Haynes
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:59:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Annette Haynes

9002 Scotch Heather Way
Charlotte, NC 28277

From: Julia Rogers
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:29:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Julia Rogers

328 Colony Rd
Statesville, NC 28677

From: Richard Herring
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:03:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Richard Herring

1813 Cherokee Drive
Fayetteville, NC 28303

From: Carol Kemmler
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:58:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxins in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Why would you even propose that our water be allowed to get to the point of no return before we start to try to return? This state does enough pandering to special interests at the expense of its citizens. It's time to pay attention to the people's needs. We need strong standards, NOW.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Kemmler

5737 Chrismon Rd
Browns Summit, NC 27214

From: David Mayfield
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:53:17 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clearly with irresponsible companies like Duke Energy (our Governor's former sweetheart company), our water quality laws must be strengthened to prevent such self-serving, damaging corporate behavior.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Mayfield

5736 Burck Drive NW
Concord, NC 28027

From: Harbans Sahni
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:44:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Harbans Sahni

3703 Sipes Lane
charlotte, NC 28269

From: Ryan Scarborough
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2014 5:25:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ryan Scarborough

203 Polks Landing Rd
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: Elinor Metzger
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water standards.
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:54:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Elinor Metzger

24 Clubhouse Trail apt 1313
Highlands, NC 28741

From: Donna Kersey
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 11:56:58 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donna Kersey

631 Union Road
Rutherfordton, NC 28139

From: Elizabeth Hay
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:53:21 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Hay

690 Junaluska Road
Andrews, NC 28901

From: Elisabeth Jezierski
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:55:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Elisabeth Jezierski

1101 Norwood
9194894205
Durham, NC 27707

From: THOMAS CADWALLADER
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: CLEAN WATER STANDARDS
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:20:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards TO FURTHER REDUCE IN SITU metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of DETERIORATING our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

THOMAS CADWALLADER

404 DIMOCK WAY
Wake Forest, NC 27587

From: Diane Affonso
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 18, 2014 8:27:02 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Diane Affonso

108 Wintergreen Ct
Rocky Mount, NC 27801

From: shaun murphy
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standards:
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:29:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

shaun murphy

6020 bartlett court
fayetteville, NC 28314

From: Cecil Clark
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water Standars
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:17:28 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cecil Clark

27 Sandon Dr
Asheville, NC 28804

From: Pauline Valestin
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water!!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:31:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Hello & thank you for your time.

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Pauline Valestin

113 Wood Hollow Dr
Cary, NC 27513

From: Beth Collom
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:04:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Beth Collom

18202 Old Arbor Court
Davidson, NC 28036

From: Edward Dale
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:19:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Edward Dale

17C Bear Creek Ln
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Ilona Csapo
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:24:25 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ilona Csapo

85 great oak ln
Fairview, NC 28730

From: gerhard moh
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:00:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

gerhard moh

1103 jamestown rd
morganton, NC 28655

From: Elizabeh McClure
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:47:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Elizabeh McClure

145 Wesley Branch Road
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Joan Parker
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: CLEAN WATER
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:26:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joan Parker

5011 Harness Lane
Colfax, NC 27235

From: Rebecca Malone
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Sunday, August 17, 2014 12:35:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Malone

415 Chunns Cove Rd
Asheville, NC 28805

From: alyce salvo
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 8:00:25 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

alyce salvo

4216 whispering oaks dr
charlotte, NC 28215

From: Pam Nelligan
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:39:51 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Pam Nelligan

102 dron place
Wilmington, NC 28409

From: susan Howell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Saturday, August 16, 2014 5:14:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

susan Howell

1920 #K Quail Ridge Rd
Greenville, NC 27858

From: Jane Forbes
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: CLEAN WATER
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:09:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

OK, IT IS TIME TO REALIZE THAT WITHOUT CLEAN, SAFE WATER WE CANNOT LIVE. FOR WHATEVER REASONS, POLITICAL, "WHINNING BY CITIES AND COMMUNITIES" THAT THEY CANNOT AFFORD CLEAN WATER, THE SPINELESS LEGISLATURE, WHATEVER, ACTION MUST BE TAKEN NOW TO CLEAN UP OUR WATER.

JORDAN LAKE THAT SUPPLIES WATER TO MANY TOWNS AND COMMUNITIES IS SO FILTHY THAT FISH AND OTHER WILDLIFE CANNOT LIVE IN IT. THE WATER SMELLS, HAS ENORMOUS LEVELS OF AGRICULTURE RUNOFFS, CHEMICALS, AND BACTERIA. IT IS TIME TO ACT DECISEVILY AND GET IT CLEAN.

THERE ARE RULES AND REGULATIONS THAT ARE IGNORED. THE SIMPLE SOLUTION WOULD BE TO MAKE THE UPSTEAM TOWNS AND COMMUNITIES DRINK WATER FROM JORDAN LAKE. ALSO, PROVIDE WATER FROM JORDAN LAKE TO THE LEGISLATURE AND GOVENOR. WOULD THEY DRINK IT- NOT A CHANCE, BUT THEY WANT US TO.

DEVELOP A VOLUNTEER WORKFORCE TO CLEAN UP WHAT THE COMMUNITIES WILL NOT. BETTER YET PUT THE UNEMPLOYED TO WORK. THE CCC DID A GREAT JOB DURING THE DEPRESSION. WHEN PEOPLE HAVE A GOAL AND DREAM TO WORK FOR, A LOT OF DISSATISFACTION GOES AWAY.

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

HAVE YOU LOOKED AT THE DATA FROM DUKE AND OTHER UNIVERSITIES AND RESEACH ABOUT FRACKING? AND YOU WANT US TO HAVE TO LIVE WITH IT. GIRT UP YOUR POWERS AND ACT.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jane Forbes

635 Bear Tree Creek
Chapel Hill, NC 27517

From: patti whipple
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:37 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

patti whipple

105 north court
atlantic beach, NC 28512

From: Cheryl Kennedy
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:27:48 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Kennedy

500 Water Wheel Cove
Clyde, NC 28721

From: Maura Berry
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 6:13:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Maura Berry

5631 Lakeside Dr
Pfafftown, NC 27040

From: AnneMarie Williams-Ransmeier
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: CLEAN WATER
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:22:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

AnneMarie Williams-Ransmeier

7228 Quail Meadow Lane
Charlottw, NC 28210

From: Melanie Wilson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:26:09 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Melanie Wilson

547 Woodsong dr
old fort, NC 28762

From: Joanne Barber
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:23:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joanne Barber

1896 Bell Road
Otto, NC 28763

From: NANCY Forrest
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 5:28:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

PEOPLE CAN NOT LIVE WITHOUT CLEAN WATER.
Thank you.

Sincerely,

NANCY Forrest

2234 F Basil Holt RoAD
Burlington, NC 27258

From: Eric Siebert
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:11:25 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Eric Siebert

489 brewington dr
burgaw, NC 28425

From: Walter Edwards
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:43:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Walter Edwards

104 Shorelake Dr
Apt C
Greensboro, NC 27455

From: Jacob Smith
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 9:44:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jacob Smith

818 S Dogwood LN
Swansboro, NC 28584

From: Kathy Dick
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:04:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kathy Dick

192 mylands rd e
Louisburg, NC 27549

From: Terry Foskett
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:28:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Terry Foskett

9104 Spotter Drive
Apex, NC 27502

From: Richard Monson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 8:00:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Richard Monson

1805 Hampton Forest Dr
Concord, NC 28027

From: NANCY O"DELL
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:11:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

NANCY O'DELL

PO BOX 1407
MURPHY, NC 28906

From: Karen Willis
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 8:33:59 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Karen Willis

2223 W Club Blvd
Durham, NC 27705

From: Christopher Charland
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:59:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Christopher Charland

1693 Colonist Square SW
Ocean Isle Beach, NC 28469

From: Michele Hickman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:09:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michele Hickman

341 Lafayette Street
Wilmington, NC 28411

From: Regina Epley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:27:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Regina Epley

445 Ned Marsh Rd
Salisbury, NC 28146

From: Nicole Campbell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:54:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nicole Campbell

1617 Lyndale Place
Charlotte, NC 28210

From: Jock Simmons
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:19:15 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jock Simmons

1903 Todd St
Newton, NC 28658

From: Mary Jackson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 7:23:48 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary Jackson

1373 LEES CHAPEL RD
GREENSBORO, NC 27455

From: Bertram Montgomery
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:51:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bertram Montgomery

1623 Alice Ave
Greensboro, NC 27401

From: Brenda Russell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:17:17 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brenda Russell

4824 N. Tryon St
Lot 16
Charlotte, NC 28213

From: claudia mikulaninec
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:08:51 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

claudia mikulaninec

148 park blvd
ws, NC 27127

From: Maria zytnik
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:16:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Maria zytnik

1114 China Drive
Morrisville, NC 27560

From: Edith M. Conrad
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 4:06:17 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Edith M. Conrad

89 Dorchester Ave
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Z. Vijay Director
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:56:51 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Z. Vijay Director

po box 970
Black Mountain, NC 28711

From: Kathryn Casey
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:30:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Casey

3725 Cattail Ln
Greenville, NC 27858

From: Jennifer Brandon
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:46:46 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Brandon

174 Brody Ln
Lexington, NC 27295

From: gigi grill
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:12:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

gigi grill

110 Holly Hills Ln
Manteo, NC 27954

From: sylvie delaunay
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:38:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

sylvie delaunay

10 forest lake drive
asheville, NC 28803

From: lisa Morice
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:18:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

lisa Morice

35 Turtle Wallow
Weaverville, NC 28787

From: Jim McGlinn
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:15:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Dear Ms. Brower,
What carcinogens are in the air we breathe and the water we drink? Cancer has attacked too many of my friends and family--it's like the plague from the middle ages.
Are you someone who can help solve the problem by fighting for strict standards of water and air purity?
Please communicate to the EMC the importance of prohibiting the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jim McGlinn

1032 Windsor Drive
Asheville, NC 28803

From: Jamie Abeln
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:12:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jamie Abeln

313 Ivywood Lane
Raeford, NC 28376

From: Andrea Poole
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:49:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Andrea Poole

2174 skyview dr
Fayetteville, NC 28304

From: Jessica Luscombe
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:56:32 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jessica Luscombe

6028 mcdaniel ln lot 167
charlotte, NC 28213

From: Catherine Mitchell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Clean water is essential for life.

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Catherine Mitchell

PO Box 596
Ocracoke, NC 27960

From: Raimundas Sidabras
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:46:22 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Raimundas Sidabras

1155 Rama rd
Sandy Ridge, NC 27046

From: Pam Dix
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:48:31 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Pam Dix

11127 Aprilia Lane
Cornelius, NC 28031

From: Paige Pinder
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:39 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paige Pinder

2329 Albright Dr
Greensboro, NC 27408

From: Jonathan sires
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:44:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jonathan sires

7448 valleybrook rd
Charlotte, NC 28270

From: Beth Alexander
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:39:06 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Beth Alexander

1400 recapture ct
Wake Forest, NC 27587

From: David Paynter
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:35:32 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Paynter

6242 Head Rd
Wilmington, NC 28409

From: William Warfel
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:32 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

William Warfel

1673 Banbury Dr
Fayetteville, NC 28304

From: Kurt & Margaret Storck
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:23:27 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kurt & Margaret Storck

8713 karibuni Drive, Apt. B
Waxhaw, NC 28173

From: Ken Heverly
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:27:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ken Heverly

2029 Eastwood Rd., #124
Wilmington, NC 28403

From: Laura Maddy
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 11:12:31 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Laura Maddy

4644 Bournewood Lane
Charlotte, NC 28226

From: Anthony Flores
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:52:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anthony Flores

917 Shelby Dr
Apt. B
Greensboro, NC 27409

From: Gary Gore
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:32:07 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gary Gore

140 Stoney Creek Lane
Union Grove, NC 28689

From: dave currall
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:11:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

dave currall

4300 lyman ave
None
Raleigh, NC 27616

From: Ed Mezynski
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:33:15 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ed Mezynski

338 W Salisbury St
Pittsboro, NC 27312

From: Sharon Swaney
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:27:07 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sharon Swaney

7206 White Tail Drive
Julian, NC 27283

From: Patricia Stark
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:48:15 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patricia Stark

250 Stone Creek Trail
Brevard, NC 28712

From: Melinda Scott
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:32:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Melinda Scott

2010-F Quail Ridge Road
Greenville, NC 27858

From: Deborah Minshew
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:18:08 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deborah Minshew

879 Herman Lane Rd
Stantonsburg, NC 27883

From: Rhonda Ferotti
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:43:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Ferotti

2715 Greenville Hwy
Flat Rock, NC 28731

From: Ronald Godfrey
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:28:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ronald Godfrey

13061 Debra Dr
Laurinburg, NC 28352

From: Michele Harvey
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 11:37:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michele Harvey

15 Ocaso Dr
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Mike Tuziw
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:30:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mike Tuziw

4625 Meadow Fork Rd
Hot Springs, NC 28743

From: Deborah Hankins
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:21:06 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deborah Hankins

349 Scottsdale Drive
Wilmington, NC 28411

From: Gerald Collins
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:23:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gerald Collins

212 N Walker St
Burgaw, NC 28425

From: Donna Krug
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 11:34:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donna Krug

16 Denise Circle
Concord, NC 28025

From: Sarah Charles
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2014 7:56:58 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sarah Charles

1701 gentry ct
High Point, NC 27265

From: Mary Manuel-miller
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 11:08:16 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary Manuel-miller

4275 Lynnridge Ct
Walkertown, NC 27051

From: Jean Wheelock
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:18:45 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jean Wheelock

22 Hibriten Drive
Asheville, NC 28801

From: natalie granberry
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Monday, August 25, 2014 3:40:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

natalie granberry

2978 heritage commons ln
gastonia, NC 28054

From: Kay Doost
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:26:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kay Doost

1618 Marion Street
Greensboro, NC 27403

From: ROBERT Durivage
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Monday, August 18, 2014 10:00:07 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT Durivage

38 hurst dr
candler, NC 28715

From: Renee McCann
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:16:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Renee McCann

118 Eastgreen Dr
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: april crisp
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2014 12:40:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

april crisp

376 cricket ridge rd
mount olive, NC 28365

From: Cynthia Campbell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:50:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Campbell

6407 Dunham Drive
Fayetteville, NC 28304

From: Jessica Kellam
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:39:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jessica Kellam

202 Ashland Drive
Apartment A
Greensboro, NC 27403

From: Sally Woodard
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:00:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sally Woodard

801 Azalea Avenue
Black Mountain, NC 28711

From: Sandy Forrest
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:30:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.
It is your job (or should be) to make sure all of us have clean water.
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sandy Forrest

612 Bethany Church Rd
Moravian Falls, NC 28654

From: Julia Howe
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:17:28 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.
Water should be drinkable for all of us, you and your families, too. No contamination of any kind should be permitted.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Julia Howe

989 Brasstown Road
Cullowhee, NC 28723

From: Linda Peterson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:42:49 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda Peterson

404 Woodlark Ct
Indian Trail, NC 28079

From: Sandee Smith
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:00:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sandee Smith

40014 Matt Neal Rd #12
Norwood, NC 28128

From: Patricia Kingsbury
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:33:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patricia Kingsbury

920 Acorn Drive
Purlear, NC 28665

From: Ann Lane
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:26:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ann Lane

932 Logan Cr
Cary, NC 27511

From: Renee Hayes
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:59:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Renee Hayes

6903 Fairview Church Rd
Trinity, NC 27370

From: LURIE FISHR
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:54:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

LURIE FISHR

28 TT
Swannanoa, NC 28778

From: Cris Shewchuk
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:39:16 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cris Shewchuk

2933 Alpine Forest Ct
Charlotte, NC 28270

From: Lynne Carmichael
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:36:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lynne Carmichael

1200 turnstone
Rocky mount
Rocky Mount, NC 27803

From: Neil Infante
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:24:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Neil Infante

314 Churton Grove Blvd
Hillsborough, NC 27278

From: Phyllis Swank
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:18:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Swank

750 Weaver Dairy Rd
1212
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: William St. George
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:15:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

William St. George

2217 Camellia Dr
Wilmington, NC 28403

From: Carol & Mike Birkett
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:58:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol & Mike Birkett

5500 Fortunes Ridge Dr., #78D
Durham, NC 27713

From: jeff hopkins
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:55:31 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

jeff hopkins

69 amber court
Lindenhurst, IL 60046

From: Girish Bose
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:53:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Girish Bose

9141 Linden Tree Lane
Charlotte, NC 28277

From: Kayla Johnston
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:42:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kayla Johnston

202 Yorktown rd
Kernersville, 27284

From: Dennis Raines
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:38:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dennis Raines

3319 Caratoke hwy
Elizabeth City, NC 27906

From: Diane Young
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:16:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Diane Young

PO Box 1803
Kernersville, NC 27285

From: Olivia Baregrounds
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 18, 2014 11:13:17 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Olivia Baregrounds

1250 L T Hardee Rd
Greenville, NC 27858

From: Sara Gritsavage
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2014 2:09:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sara Gritsavage

PO Box 276
Edneyville, NC 28727

From: Frank Stroupe
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2014 12:15:00 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Frank Stroupe

329 Raintree Dr
matthew, NC 28104

From: Amber White
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water, please!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:18:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amber White

39 Cider Mill Dr. Apt. 208
Hendersonville, NC 28792

From: Michelle Wells
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 3:09:26 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michelle Wells

113 Modena Dr
Cary, NC 27513

From: RICK RESTA
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: CLEAN WATER
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:36:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

RICK RESTA

344 AMARYLLIS WA
WAKE FOREST, NC 27587

From: Martha Brimm
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Water
Date: Sunday, August 17, 2014 3:13:22 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Martha Brimm

7 Surrey Lane
Durham, NC 27707

From: randy marrs
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: clean water
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 8:54:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

randy marrs

15 woodvale avenue
asheville, NC 28804

From: Edith Simpson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean water: Depending on you
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:46:06 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Edith Simpson

15 Springdale Rd
Asheville, NC 28805

From: Andrew L. Lilley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean Wter
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:33 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Andrew L. Lilley

14 Glenview Dr
Lake Junaluska, NC 28745

From: Matthew Voos
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean(er) Water
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 2:25:57 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Matthew Voos

4709-1202
Bayridge Xing
Raleigh, NC 27604

From: Matt Miller
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Clean, Sustainable Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:03:35 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Matt Miller

1629 Wellington Ave
Newton, NC 28658

From: Carol Greenwood
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Cleaner water for North Carolina
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:46:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Greenwood

10710 Nickleby Way
Apt 106
Raleigh, NC 27614

From: Christopher Lowry
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Cleaner Water requirements :
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2014 5:19:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Christopher Lowry

37 Montford Ave
Asheville, NC 28801

From: Brian OHara
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Cleaner Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:31:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brian OHara

2061 Mares Way
Greenville, NC 27858

From: John Woodell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: cleaner water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:58:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

John Woodell

3066 Speedway rd
North Wilkeboro, NC 28659

From: Sonia McLamb
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Cleanwater
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:11:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sonia McLamb

111 rose lane
Stony Point, NC 28678

From: David Cook
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Comment on Water Quality Regulations
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:36:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Cook

411 East Cannon Avenue
Albemarle, NC 28001

From: Brianna Van Stekelenburg
To: Brower, Connie
Cc: Cassie Gavin
Subject: Comments - Triennial Review of water quality standards
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 9:20:39 AM

Dear Ms. Brower,

I am a Policy Analyst Intern with the NC Chapter of the Sierra Club. The NC Chapter has over 61,000 members and supporters in North Carolina, who are concerned about water quality.
We are appreciative that North Carolina will be upgrading our water quality standards for toxic metals to the nationally recommended criteria. This is a step in the right direction but we ask that the Division go further.

While North Carolina has a mercury standard, it currently does not regulate methylmercury. When Mercury is deposited into water or onto land, microorganisms found in soils and sediments convert it to methylmercury, which is a highly toxic form. In this form, it is consumed by aquatic plants and animals. Fish that eat these plants and animals build up methylmercury in their bodies.

People in North Carolina are typically exposed to methylmercury by eating fish and shellfish like trout, catfish and carp. In 2011, 1.5 million people 16 years and older spent a combined total of 23.5 million days fishing and 1.5 billion dollars on fishing in North Carolina. The highest concentrations of methylmercury are usually found in large fish that eat other fish. In North Carolina, the highest concentrations are found in largemouth bass and bowfin.

Mercury, especially in the form of methylmercury, is highly toxic to humans. It can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood brain development, and cause health problems for adults as well. North Carolina does not currently regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and therefore directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. We recommend that DENR adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligrams per kilogram of fish tissue to better protect human health.

Again, it is good that the state is moving forward with adopting metals standards, but the public is counting on the state to appropriately regulate a wide range of toxic substances in our waters - such as methylmercury - in order to protect public health.

Thank you,

Brianna Van Stekelenburg

From: Cassie Gavin
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Comments - Triennial Review of water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2014 5:23:15 PM

Dear Ms. Brower,

The North Carolina chapter of the Sierra Club has more than 61,000 members and supporters across the state who care about water quality. Our members are concerned that the legislature and the McCrory administration may not be prioritizing our Clean Water Act obligations. This is especially true with respect to the clean-up of Jordan Lake.

We are appreciative that North Carolina will be adopting nationally recommended criteria for toxic metals. High concentrations of toxic metals in our waters can poison people and wildlife. This is a positive step forward.

The North Carolina Sierra Club asks the Division fill in remaining significant gaps in our water protection standards. North Carolina's lack of statewide nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards and the lack of protection for in-stream flow are two big concerns.

A big gap in our water quality programs is the lack of statewide nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. As you know, in 2001, the EPA required states to set water quality standards sufficient to protect waters from nitrogen and phosphorous pollution. Now, its 13 years later - and North Carolina still has not adopted these standards. We know that when too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish. Over a third of North Carolina drains to waters classified as nutrient sensitive. This problem is a threat to all uses of our waters - such as swimming, fishing and drinking. Despite the overwhelming evidence that nitrogen and phosphorus standards are needed, the Division is not proposing adoption of these as part of the Triennial Review. We urge the Division to stop delaying this important step forward and adopt numeric nutrient criteria this year.

In addition to protecting of our water quality - the Division should also ensure protection of water quantity. Having sufficient water quantity - or flow - is important to protect traditional uses of our rivers, including providing drinking water, swimming, fishing and boating. Our rivers support a strong tourism industry, including whitewater rafting and fishing, that depend on sufficient flow. Unfortunately, the Division is not proposing protections for instream flow as part of this Triennial Review. We urge the Division to adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Thank you again for proposing some significant and needed updates to water quality standards. As you know, since the February Dan River coal ash spill, the public has been especially focused on water quality issues and we are interested in seeing the state show leadership to proactively protecting our waters. We urge the Division to take the opportunity presented by this Triennial Review process to step up and address remaining gaps in our water programs - like for nutrients and flow.

Thank you,

--
Cassie Gavin, Director of Government Relations
Sierra Club - NC Chapter
cassie.gavin@sierraclub.org
19 W. Hargett Street, Suite 210
Raleigh, NC 27601
919.833.8467 x 104

From: Heidi Zehnal
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Comments from MEC Meeting that may be under EMC jurisdiction
Date: Monday, August 25, 2014 11:43:26 AM

I understand that some of the comments below may relate to the EMC's jurisdiction, not the MEC - related to wastewater, etc., so I wanted to be sure you also received these comments. Thank you, Heidi Zehnal, Chatham Country resident.

Public Comments – MEC Meeting 8/20/14

There is someone associated with my family out West who works in the oil and gas and fracking industries. Even he feels that it is risky to do fracking in North Carolina, due to the geology – with the fractured shale and the shale being so close to the water table, compared to places like Pennsylvania and Colorado. Even with better geology, there were 209 water well contamination cases confirmed in Pennsylvania since 2007.

I am bringing this up because allowing fracking wells and wastewater storage pits to be 100 feet from rivers, streams, and lakes and 300 feet from wetlands and trout streams seems like a recipe for disaster. If those wells start leaking into waterways feeding our water supplies in the Triangle and other parts of the state, they could cause harm, forever. Also, flood maps aren't always up to date and flooding events occur out of the norm, so the 100 foot setback from the 100 year flood plain allowance could likely not be sufficient, especially with open waste pits. The Marcellus Shale Safe Drilling Initiative Study recommends larger setbacks than the MEC proposes. There is also no allowance for runoff from sloped land. Spills could be a problem with fracking operations so close to rivers and streams. In Colorado alone, there were 495 spills reported in 2013 and 22% resulted in water contamination of groundwater and surface water.

Related to open waste pits, 25% of problems in Marcellus wells were from pit and storage problems, such as leaks overtopping pits, wildlife drinking the water, and air pollution. In 2012, Pennsylvania's DEP recommended eliminating pit storage due to the unacceptable risks and other states are only allowing watertight tanks inside a secondary containment station.

A study done last year by Downstream Strategies, an environmental consulting firm in Pennsylvania, showed that up to 4.3 million gallons of clean water are used to frack a single well and more than half of the wastewater was treated and discharged into rivers and streams. The EPA came out with an internal document this spring making it clear that fracking wastewater discharges into rivers and streams are covered under the Clean Water Act. The document lists almost two dozen individual substances such as benzene, radium, and arsenic that have been found at high enough levels in shale wastewater to pose hazards to drinking water safety, human health and the environment and other potential pollutants have to be removed for the water to be considered fully treated. In typical fracking wastewater, drinking water contaminant levels (MCLs) were exceeded for 8 parameters, water quality criteria for human health protection were exceeded for 9 parameters, and criteria for aquatic

protection were exceeded by 16 parameters. 100% of fracking wastewater needs to be tested before it is recycled and/or disposed of and new toxicants, carcinogens, or endocrine disruptor chemicals known to cause health damage at very low concentrations (less than 1 ppm) need to be characterized.

A study in *Environmental Science and Technology* showed that plants can't handle fracking water's high levels of contaminants and water flowing out of treatment plants showed elevated levels of fracking chemicals. David Carpenter, Director of the University of Albany's Institute for Health and the Environment noted at a New York State General Assembly hearing that wastewater treatment facilities are not fully capable of fully treating fracking wastewater. North Carolina lacks water quality standards or effluent limit guidelines for many fracking contaminants and facilities can treat and discharge fracking wastes into rivers and lakes without removing contaminants of concern. With 750 to 1000 chemicals in fracking wastewater and 80 to 330 tons of chemicals used per well, many unknown, something else must be done other than putting it into rivers and streams. NC also lacks the necessary regulatory framework to ensure safe surface disposal and treatment facilities designed to remove fracking contaminants from wastewater, so the state needs to ban the disposal of fracking wastewater at facilities that discharge effluent to surface waters. Contaminants that are suspected carcinogens, teratogens, toxicants, or endocrine disruptors should not be allowed to be discharged. Companies need to identify a safe disposal facility before drilling begins and there needs to be more emphasis on recycling and reuse of fracking wastewater and significant penalties for illegal dumping of fracking wastes. There also needs to be a rule on fracking wastewater being applied to crops or sprayfields, which runs off into rivers and streams and can contaminate aquifers.

Heidi Zehnal
Chatham County, NC resident

Additional Comments:

There are some missing safety rules for regulating fracking in North Carolina that are very important that I wanted draw attention to.

Several people have mentioned the Shearon Harris Nuclear plant, but I wanted to reiterate why there needs to be a rule about fracking near that plant. It is located on three fault lines, including the Jonesboro fault. There have been recent proven incidents in Canada, Ohio, and the UK showing that fracking itself has caused earthquakes and I also read some information from Texas saying that fracking itself has caused earthquakes there, not just the wastewater injection wells from fracking. One of the largest concentrations of radioactive nuclear waste in the country from several nuclear plants is located in three waste pools at Shearon Harris

and if there was a crack in the pools from an earthquake and water leaked out and a fire ensued, it would be dangerous for the entire East Coast. There could also be core damage to the nuclear plant itself from an earthquake. It is a very serious issue and rules must be in place to keep fracking away from those fault lines.

Also, there needs to be a rule against fracking wastewater being sprayed on land, since it runs off into rivers and streams and can contaminate aquifers and harm crops. To illustrate how dangerous fracking fluids can be that are part of the wastewater, in a published news story, Cathy Behr, an emergency room nurse in Durango, Colorado almost died after treating a wildcatter who had been splashed in a fracking fluid spill at a BP natural gas rig. Behr stripped the man and stuffed his clothes into plastic bags while the hospital sounded alarms and locked down the ER. The worker was released, but a few days later, the nurse Behr lay in critical condition facing multiple organ failure. These fracking fluids are not benign, as the industry tries to make them out to be. That is one reason why fracking wastewater is so difficult to treat and we can't allow fracking wastewater to go into rivers and streams or be sprayed onto land. In addition, a rule related to methane leakage is important, since NOAA determined that there is a 9% leakage rate from fracking wells nationwide, which makes fracking worse than coal fired plants for greenhouse gases going into the environment, since methane is so much more potent that CO2.

The Society of Professional Engineers Journal has published research on high failure rates of fracking wells related to well integrity and the University of Texas has come with standards related to well integrity. Duke University scientists found higher levels of methane near fracking sites, University of Texas scientists found higher levels of arsenic, and University of Missouri researchers found endocrine disruptors that interfere with hormones, so keeping up the focus on strengthening rules related to well integrity is important. There have been proven well integrity issues in places like West Virginia, Northeast Pennsylvania, and Ohio, as well as other places around the country, where methane and other chemicals leaked into shallow water aquifers.

Heidi Zehnal
Chatham County Resident

From: Battle, Gerald
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Cc: Brower, Connie; Hicks, Reginald; Westbrook, Vicki
Subject: Comments from the City of Durham
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 2:51:45 PM
Attachments: CofDurhamAug2014TriennialScan.pdf

Thank you.

Gerald Tyrone Battle
Industrial Pretreatment Coordinator
Water Management, City of Durham
101 City Hall Plaza
Durham, NC 27701

(O) (919) 560-4386 x. 35556
(C) (919) 475-2520
(F) (919) 560-4418

gerald.battle@durhamnc.gov
http://www.durhamnc.gov/

From: Battle, Gerald
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Cc: Brower, Connie; Hicks, Reginald; Westbrook, Vicki
Subject: Comments from the City of Durham
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 2:51:45 PM
Attachments: CofDurhamAug2014TriennialScan.pdf

Thank you.

Gerald Tyrone Battle
Industrial Pretreatment Coordinator
Water Management, City of Durham
101 City Hall Plaza
Durham, NC 27701

(O) (919) 560-4386 x. 35556
(C) (919) 475-2520
(F) (919) 560-4418

gerald.battle@durhamnc.gov
http://www.durhamnc.gov/

From:	Katie Hicks
To:	DWR_Classifications_Standards
Cc:	Hope Taylor
Subject:	Comments of Clean Water for NC - 2014 Triennial Review
Date:	Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:48:18 AM
Attachments:	NC Triennial Review 2014 - written comments of CWFNC.pdf

---

Ms. Brower,

Please find attached the written comments of Clean Water for North Carolina regarding the April 2014 proposed draft amendments to NC's water quality standards.

Respectfully,

Katie Hicks
Assistant Director
Clean Water for North Carolina
828-251-1291 / 1-800-929-4480
katie@cwfnc.org
www.cwfnc.org
Connect on Twitter - Follow on Facebook - Join CWFNC

From: Anne Coan
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Cc: Mitchell Peele
Subject: Comments of NC Farm Bureau Federation on Triennial Review Rules - 8-22-14
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 4:43:45 PM
Attachments: Water Quality - Triennial Review Comments of NCFB - 8-22-14.pdf

---

Attached please find the comments of the NC Farm Bureau Federation on the proposed Triennial Review rule changes and the variances. If you have questions, please let me know. Anne Coan

From: Gordon, Lisa Perras
To: Brower, Connie; Manning, Jeff
Cc: Wetherington, Michele; Petter, Lauren
Subject: Comments on NC"s Proposed Triennial Review
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 1:21:56 PM
Attachments: 2014 Feb 4 EPA Rec Crit and Ammonia Letter to NC.pdf
2014 Jan 3 EPA to NC Triennial Review Comments with Attachments.pdf
2010 Aug NC Triennial Cmts Chart.pdf
2010 Aug NC Triennial Cmts Letter.pdf

Connie,

Please accept these comments from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on the current North Carolina Triennial Review.

The EPA has provided earlier comments dated January 3, 2014 and August 20th, 2010, for this triennial review. We resubmit those comments in their entirety for your consideration for this triennial review as many of the revisions and comments remain the same. In particular, please note the comments in these letters that specifically address the proposed changes to the metals criteria, the low end hardness cap, the biological 'trump' and the action levels, as well as the request to ensure that the State submit the methods and analyses conducted to support the revised WQS as required by 40 CFR 131.6. This is important for all revisions but especially important for those areas that are not adopting federally recommended criteria (40 CFR 131.11(b)). We are also including as part of our comments EPA's February 4th, 2014, letter encouraging the State to consider adoption of the EPA's most recent ammonia and bacteria criteria. For those changes in our letters that NC does not intend to address in this triennial, we urge NC to fully evaluate in the next triennial.

In addition to those previous comments, we add the following:

1. Since the date of our January 3rd, 2014 letter, the EPA and NC Division of Water Resources have entered into a mutually agreed plan to develop numeric nutrient criteria. The work in that plan has already begun and the EPA looks forward to continuing to work with the State on that process so that numeric nutrient criteria can be adopted into the State WQS in a future triennial review as outlined in the milestone section of that plan.
2. The EPA attended the public hearings in both Raleigh and Statesville, NC on July 15th and 16th. During those hearings, numerous suggestions were made to modify the proposed metals criteria by including a multiplier of "x 1 WER" to allow for the use of a Water Effects Ratio. The EPA supports the use of this multiplier. Appendix L of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Water Quality Standards Handbook, entitled, *Interim Guidance on Determination and Use of Water-Effect Ratios for Metals,* (EPA-823-B-94-001, February 1994) and *Streamlined Water-Effect Ratio Procedure for Discharge of Copper* (EPA-822-R-01-

005, March 2001) provide detailed information on how to properly conduct a WER and those sections may be directly referenced in the state WQS. The EPA welcomes the opportunity to assist North Carolina with any questions regarding the use or applicability of WERs.

3. Since the date of the original proposal reviewed for the January 3, 2014 comments, the section regarding the derivation of the hardness for the use with the hardness based metals (Section 15 NCAC 02B .0211 (11)(c)(i)) was revised. EPA notes that the actual instream hardness will be used when calculating the metals criteria and supports that revision. For permitting purposes, the updated revision (Section 15 NCAC 02B .0211 (11)(c)(ii))states that the hardness shall be established using the "median of instream hardness data collected within the local US Geological Survey (USGS) and Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) 8-digit Hydrologic Unit." EPA notes that 8 digit HUCs can be hundreds of miles in size and include multiple eco-regions with varying physical conditions. The use of so large of an area may result in hardness that are either over-protective (hardness lower than in the receiving water) or under-protective (hardness higher than in the actual receiving water.) The EPA recommends that NC consider using hardness values that more closely reflect the hardness in the actual receiving stream for the NPDES permittee. The EPA welcomes the opportunity to continue to evaluate this section with NC DWR in the coming weeks.

The EPA wants to be able to quickly review and respond to these changes once they are submitted to us. Therefore, please let us know at your earliest convenience of any changes that will be made to these proposed revisions so that we can begin our evaluation. Your incredible persistence and diligence in moving this triennial ahead is greatly appreciated.

Thank you,

Lisa Perras Gordon
Water Quality Standards
NC Coordinator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Atlanta, Georgia
(404) 562-9317

From: Buchan, Edward
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: comments on triennial review
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 3:25:20 PM
Attachments: 201408221521.pdf
ATT00001.c

Please find attached the City of Raleigh's comments on the proposed rule changes as described in the triennial review.

Best regards,

Ed Buchan
Environmental Coordinator
City of Raleigh - Public Utilities Department
(919) 996-3471

PUBLIC UTILITIES DEPARTMENT

SERVING

Garner • Knightdale • Raleigh • Rolesville
Wake Forest • Wendell • Zebulon

From: Mike Hanes
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Comments to NC Environmental Management Commission Regarding Water Quality Standards July 21, 2014
Date: Monday, July 21, 2014 10:50:37 AM

Comments to NC Environmental Management Commission
Regarding Water Quality Standards
July 21, 2014

My name is Mike Hanes, I was born and raised in Winston-Salem, NC. I moved to Raleigh in 1966 to attend NCSU and later received my MPH from UNC-CH…. Before my retirement I worked in Health and Human services at the Federal, State and Local Levels of government for nearly 40 years.

I love NC, but I'm deeply concerned about its future. Below are my comments regarding NCs Water Quality and your responsibility to make sure NCs water is clean and safe.

Although it is worthy that you are proceeding with a review of NCs WQ Standards, I have two major concerns.

- Your proposal for allowing polluting industries and municipalities to violate your own standards up to the point that stream life begins to die seems a loophole for major polluters to bypass the very standards that you are setting forth.

- With all the news of expected fracking in NC, it is difficult to understand why **you are not proposing any standards** for fracking contaminants and their safe discharge. How will you deal with these waste waters, where will they go and how will you regulate them?

As you proceed, I would ask for your best professional judgement and to do your utmost to protect NC, its people, its children and its future.

Thank you…. Mike Hanes, MPH

From: Juliana Baxley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Concerned resident for water quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 7:00:28 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Please consider the following:
Upgrade our standards for toxic heavy metals, something our neighboring states did years ago;
Reject an EMC proposal to let toxic metals exceed standards until aquatic life dies;
Tighten the standard for a type of herbicide that causes blood cancers and reproductive problems and has been found in rising amounts in surface drinking water sources;
Adopt criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus, which can cause algal blooms and fish kills, and can threaten the safety of drinking water;
Adopt a standard for methylmercury in fish, a form of mercury that is closely tied to many serious health problems, including learning disabilities, birth defects, and heart disease;
Adopt a standard for ammonia pollution, which is discharged by some wastewater treatment plants and can kill fish and shellfish downstream;
Adopt a standard that prohibits the discharge of fracking wastewater contaminants.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Juliana Baxley

415 pecan dr
Selma, NC 27576

From: Shannon Grimes
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: concerns about fracking
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:25 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Shannon Grimes

4533 Birmingham Way
Raleigh, NC 27604

From: christina logan
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Connie Brower DWR water planning section
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2014 12:05:32 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

christina logan

249 Scottsdale drive
advance, 27006

From: Cheryl Chabot
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Connie Brower
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:58:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Chabot

319 Juanita Lane
New Bern, NC 28560

From: Velimir Visnjic
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Connie Brower, DWR Water Planning Section
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:05:48 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Velimir Visnjic

3216 Edsel pl
Charlotte, NC 28205

From: Harry Arnold
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Connie Brower, DWR Water Planning Section
Date: Saturday, August 16, 2014 7:00:53 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Harry Arnold

4952 Morrowick Rd
Charlotte, NC 28226

From: Dan Johnson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Connie Brower
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:46:41 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dan Johnson

3416 Amber Drive
Wilmington, NC 28409

From: Emily Auman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Current Water Quality Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:20:21 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Emily Auman

7 Provincetown Ct
Greensboro, NC 27408

From: Mercedes Hyman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Dear Connie,
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:30:32 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mercedes Hyman

6832 Main Street # 324
Wilmington, NC 28405

From: Elizabeth Adams
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Demanding clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:35:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Adams

3066 Imperial Oaks Drive
Raleigh, NC 27614

From: Garret Meyer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Dirty water in NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:28:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Garret Meyer

4901 Mashpee Lane
Apex, NC 27539

From: Robert Richardson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Do the right thing for North Carolina
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:49:06 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert Richardson

3100 Pearces rd
Zebulon, NC 27597

From: Jeshua Stahler
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Do your job.
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:03:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeshua Stahler

113 hensdale rd
Raeford, NC 28376

From: Caitlin Burke
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Don"t let polluters compromise our water quality
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2014 8:23:19 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D.

However, I oppose the proposal allowing polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Caitlin Burke

103 Ashtree Ct
Cary, NC 27519

From: Joanne McGrath
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Drinking water quality affects human health!
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 4:02:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joanne McGrath

924 Chestnut Cove Rd
Sylva, NC 28779

From: Robert Sauer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Enforce clean water standards
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2014 4:13:17 PM

With the failure of the governor and state legislature to lead the way to protecting clean water in North Carolina, it falls to those in state government to enforce the existing standards to the best of their abilities. Please do what you can to keep coal ash, chemical waste and water reclaimed from fracking operations out of our all-too-precious clean water sources.

From: Allison Delavan
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: enviornment
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:47:17 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Allison Delavan

192 Crystal Falls
Fairview, NC 28730

From: Dick Canty
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Environment - Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:45:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dick Canty

23 Red Maple Drive
Weaverville, NC 28787

From: Gina DeBreto
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Environment
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 2:43:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gina DeBreto

37 Skyview Pl Apt. 6
Asheville, NC 28804

From: David Sachter
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: environment
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:04:28 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Sachter

580 Panther Branch Road
Alexander, NC 28701

From: June Linhart
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Environment
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 2:28:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

June Linhart

4501 rivershyre way
Raleigh, NC 27616

From: Christine Conley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Environment
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:37 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Christine Conley

4800B Walden Ct
Raleigh, NC 27604

From: margaret Peeples
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Environment
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:33:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

margaret Peeples

838 Heather Lane
Charlotte, NC 28209

From: Jo Ann Mount
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Environment
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:22:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jo Ann Mount

1238 West 4th St
Winston-Salem, NC 27101

From: Leigh Hart
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Environment
Date: Saturday, August 16, 2014 1:35:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Leigh Hart

910 Arrowhead Rd
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: Adrienne Ferriss
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: environment
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:59:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Adrienne Ferriss

27 Pheasant Dr
asheville, NC 28803

From: Ryan Tuchler
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Environmental sustainability
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 7:45:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ryan Tuchler

5450 gallion Ridge Rd
Blacksburg, VA 24060

From: TJ Fox
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: forgrt the fracking keep our water supply clean& chemical free
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:19:17 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

TJ Fox

7607 nc hwy 210
Smithfield, 27577

From: J.A. Perry
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Fracking & water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:20:36 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

J.A. Perry

24 Ridge Ave
Asheville, NC 28803

From: Thomas Boyd
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Fracking is Dangerous
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 1:25:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thomas Boyd

105 Colora Court
Cary, NC 27513

From: balex06
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Fracking
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2014 2:38:20 PM

Please prevent fracking. It destroys drinking water, a life giving substance. Without water, you die in 3 days. Also fracking lowers property values. Please protect the people you represent.

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy Note 3 phablet!

From: Debra Wilfong
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: fracking
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:12:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Debra Wilfong

1921 Kingston Dr
Gastonia, NC 28052

From:	Mick Noland
To:	"Steve Tedder"; DWR_Classifications_Standards
Cc:	Chad Ham
Subject:	FW: Letter to Connie Brower - Comments on Proposed Amendments - Triennial Review of Water Quality Standards
Date:	Tuesday, July 29, 2014 3:06:18 PM
Attachments:	Comments on Proposed Amendments Triennial Review of Water Quality Standards.pdf

---

Fayetteville Public Works Commission comments on Proposed Amendments Triennial Review of Water Quality Standards.

Mick Noland, PE
Chief Operations Officer
Water Resources Division
Public Works Commission of the
City of Fayetteville
955 Old Wilmington Road
P O Box 1089
Fayetteville, NC 28302
(W) 910-223-4733
(F) 910-829-0207
mick.noland@faypwc.com

The information contained in this communication (including any attachment) is privileged and confidential information that is intended for the sole use of the addressee. Access to this communication by anyone else is unauthorized. If the reader is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this communication to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this transmission in error, please reply and notify us of this error and delete this message. Finally, the recipient should check this communication and any attachments for the presence of viruses. The Public Works Commission of the City of Fayetteville, NC, accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this communication.

From: Reeder, Tom
To: Manning, Jeff; Brower, Connie
Subject: FW: NC Surface Water Triennial Review
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 3:33:42 PM
Attachments: 08-22-14 Comments to Connie Brower re triennial review.pdf
ncflagsmall[24].png

See below.

Tom Reeder
Director, NC Division of Water Resources
Phone: 919-707-9027
email: tom.reeder@ncdenr.gov

E-mail correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: Lou Ann Phelps <lphelps@selcnc.org>
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 3:25 PM
To: Tom Reeder <tom.reeder@ncdenr.gov>, "giattina.jim@epa.gov" <giattina.jim@epa.gov>, "'Gordon.Lisa-Perras@epamail.epa.gov'" <Gordon.Lisa-Perras@epamail.epa.gov>, Peter Raabe <praabe@americanrivers.org>, "'amy@appvoices.org' (amy@appvoices.org)" <amy@appvoices.org>, "kemp@cfrw.us" <kemp@cfrw.us>, "'carrie@nclcv.org' (carrie@nclcv.org)" <carrie@nclcv.org>, "'Robin@enoriver.org'" <Robin@enoriver.org>, "gmatthis@bellsouth.net" <gmatthis@bellsouth.net>, "'matthew@neuseriver.org' (matthew@neuseriver.org)" <matthew@neuseriver.org>, "'gjernigan@waterkeeper.org'" <gjernigan@waterkeeper.org>, "'tgravesriverkeeper@gmail.com'" <tgravesriverkeeper@gmail.com>, "'Riverkeeper@winyahrivers.org'" <Riverkeeper@winyahrivers.org>
Cc: Julie Youngman <jyoungman@selcnc.org>, Will Hendrick <whendrick@selcnc.org>
Subject: NC Surface Water Triennial Review

Hello, all,

Attached are comments that have been submitted today by Julie Youngman, Senior Attorney, and Will Hendrick, Associate Attorney, Southern Environmental Law Center, to the Water Quality Planning Section of NC DENR on behalf of the North Carolina League of Conservation Voters, Cape Fear River Watch, River Guardian Foundation, Appalachian Voices, Winyah Rivers Foundation, American Rivers, Neuse Riverkeeper Foundation, Eno River Association, and Waterkeeper Alliance. To avoid crashing your email inbox, we have not attached the six letters from EPA referenced in the

comments. However, if you would like to have a copy of those letters, please let me know. Together they are approximately 7 MB.

Best regards,

Lou Ann Phelps
Administrative and Legal Assistant
North Carolina Certified Paralegal
Southern Environmental Law Center
601 W. Rosemary St., Suite 220
Chapel Hill, NC 27516-2356
Tel: (919) 967-1450
Fax: (919) 929-9421
www.southernenvironment.org

From: Reeder, Tom
To: Brower, Connie
Cc: Manning, Jeff
Subject: FW: NCLM comments - Water Quality Standards (Triennial Review)
Date: Monday, August 25, 2014 8:12:28 AM
Attachments: image003.png
image004.png
image005.png
image006.png
NCLM Comments - Triennial Review.pdf
ncflagsmall[2].png

Tom Reeder
Director, NC Division of Water Resources
Phone: 919-707-9027
email: tom.reeder@ncdenr.gov

E-mail correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: Sarah Collins <scollins@NCLM.ORG>
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 5:18 PM
To: Tom Reeder <tom.reeder@ncdenr.gov>
Cc: "Gillespie, Mitch" <Mitch.Gillespie@ncdenr.gov>, "Poupart, Jeff" <jeff.poupart@ncdenr.gov>
Subject: FW: NCLM comments - Water Quality Standards (Triennial Review)

Director Reeder,

Forwarded are comments the N.C. League of Municipalities' submitted regarding the proposed changes to water quality standards regulations pursuant to the Triennial Review.

Best,
Sarah

Sarah W. Collins
Regulatory Affairs Associate
NC League of Municipalities
215 North Dawson Street
Raleigh, NC 27603
919.715.2919 office

919.368.1269 cell
scollins@nclm.org

From: Sarah Collins
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 5:11 PM
To: 'benne.hutson@gmail.com'; 'Steve W Tedder (stevewtedder@gmail.com)'; 'Kevin Martin (Kmartin@sandEC.com)'; 'tcravenncemc@gmail.com'; 'dandersonemc@gmail.com'; 'gpcemc@gmail.com'; 'carterdenr@gmail.com'; 'tcravenncemc@gmail.com'; 'ddawson.emc@bellsouth.net'; 'eoferrell3@gmail.com'; 'billpuette@hughes.net'; 'lraymond@carolina.rr.com'; 'rubin@ncsu.edu'; 'manager@ccsdwater.com'; 'Jwilsey28@hotmail.com'
Cc: Brower, Connie (connie.brower@ncdenr.gov); Erin Wynia
Subject: FW: NCLM comments - Water Quality Standards (Triennial Review)

Commissioners,

Forwarded are comments the N.C. League of Municipalities' submitted regarding the proposed changes to water quality standards regulations pursuant to the Triennial Review.

The comments do not reiterate all of our previous comments but rather highlight what we believe are key issues that the EMC needs to consider in their deliberations. Our comments include discussion of:

- **Change from Total Recoverable to Dissolved Metals**: The proposed changes reflect the latest guidance from the USEPA and with the associated rules/approaches guiding implementation represent a reasonable approach to protecting water quality in North Carolina.
- **Retention of Action Levels:** The proposed rules update the action levels to dissolved chronic criteria and propose to retain the language that allows compliance with whole effluent toxicity (WET) requirements to negate the need for permit limitations for copper, silver, and zinc in all waters plus chloride in freshwater. Elimination of the action level concept and requiring dischargers to do additional testing to adjust these criteria through development of a WER or other site specific approach is a waste of resources when the WET testing is already demonstrating that water quality is being protected.
- **Addition of Water Effect Ratio:** The proposed rules do not include a provision for using a water effect ratio (WER). Therefore, any special studies requiring consideration of site-specific requirements in development of effluent limitation will require modification of the applicable criteria through rule-making by the EMC. We believe it is a better use of resources by the staff, EMC and the regulated community to define a water quality criterion for a metal as the applicable criterion times a water effect ratio (WER), with the default WER value being 1.
- **Other Issues:**
  - Recalculation of the national acute criterion for Cadmium to reflect different protection needs in trout and non-trout waters is strongly supported.
  - Retention of the current chlorophyll *a* standard is supported since it seems appropriate to consider any changes to the standard in conjunction with the development of nutrient management requirements in conjunction with the

recently approved Nutrient Criteria Development Plan (June 2014).

- We support continuation of previously approved variances until new information is developed and reviewed with the EMC.
- We do not support the inclusion of any flow requirement in the water quality standards for protection of ecological integrity as suggested by some commenters at the public hearings. Ecological flow requirements are being investigated as part of requirements for development of Basinwide hydrological models pursuant to Session Law 2010-143 and should continue being investigated in that context.

The League commends DWR and the EMC in their development of a reasonable rule package and associated implementation procedures to complete this delayed Triennial Review. The proposals, with the suggested changes, reflect a reasonable balance to water quality protection and environmental regulation.

Best,
Sarah

Sarah W. Collins
Regulatory Affairs Associate
NC League of Municipalities
215 North Dawson Street
Raleigh, NC 27603
919.715.2919 office
919.368.1269 cell
scollins@nclm.org

From: Sarah Collins
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 4:55 PM
To: 'DWR-Classifications-Standards@ncdenr.gov'
Cc: Erin Wynia
Subject: NCLM comments - Water Quality Standards (Triennial Review)

Attached are the North Carolina League of Municipalities' comments regarding the proposed changes to water quality standards regulations pursuant to the Triennial Review.

Best,

Sarah Collins

Sarah W. Collins
Regulatory Affairs Associate
NC League of Municipalities

215 North Dawson Street
Raleigh, NC 27603
919.715.2919 office
919.368.1269 cell
scollins@nclm.org

From: Sarah Collins
To: "benne.hutson@gmail.com"; "Steve W Tedder (stevewtedder@gmail.com)"; "Kevin Martin (Kmartin@sandEC.com)"; "tcravenncemc@gmail.com"; "dandersonemc@gmail.com"; "gpcemc@gmail.com"; "carterdenr@gmail.com"; "tcravenncemc@gmail.com"; "ddawson.emc@bellsouth.net"; "eoferrell3@gmail.com"; "billpuette@hughes.net"; "lraymond@carolina.rr.com"; "rubin@ncsu.edu"; "manager@ccsdwater.com"; "Jwilsey28@hotmail.com"
Cc: Brower, Connie; Erin Wynia
Subject: FW: NCLM comments - Water Quality Standards (Triennial Review)
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 5:10:52 PM
Attachments: image003.png
image004.png
image005.png
image006.png
NCLM Comments - Triennial Review.pdf

Commissioners,

Forwarded are comments the N.C. League of Municipalities' submitted regarding the proposed changes to water quality standards regulations pursuant to the Triennial Review.

The comments do not reiterate all of our previous comments but rather highlight what we believe are key issues that the EMC needs to consider in their deliberations. Our comments include discussion of:

- **Change from Total Recoverable to Dissolved Metals**: The proposed changes reflect the latest guidance from the USEPA and with the associated rules/approaches guiding implementation represent a reasonable approach to protecting water quality in North Carolina.
- **Retention of Action Levels:** The proposed rules update the action levels to dissolved chronic criteria and propose to retain the language that allows compliance with whole effluent toxicity (WET) requirements to negate the need for permit limitations for copper, silver, and zinc in all waters plus chloride in freshwater. Elimination of the action level concept and requiring dischargers to do additional testing to adjust these criteria through development of a WER or other site specific approach is a waste of resources when the WET testing is already demonstrating that water quality is being protected.
- **Addition of Water Effect Ratio:** The proposed rules do not include a provision for using a water effect ratio (WER). Therefore, any special studies requiring consideration of site-specific requirements in development of effluent limitation will require modification of the applicable criteria through rule-making by the EMC. We believe it is a better use of resources by the staff, EMC and the regulated community to define a water quality criterion for a metal as the applicable criterion times a water effect ratio (WER), with the default WER value being 1.
- **Other Issues:**
    - Recalculation of the national acute criterion for Cadmium to reflect different protection needs in trout and non-trout waters is strongly supported.
    - Retention of the current chlorophyll *a* standard is supported since it seems appropriate to consider any changes to the standard in conjunction with the development of nutrient management requirements in conjunction with the recently approved Nutrient Criteria Development Plan (June 2014).
    - We support continuation of previously approved variances until new information is developed and reviewed with the EMC.
    - We do not support the inclusion of any flow requirement in the water quality standards for protection of ecological integrity as suggested by some commenters at the public hearings. Ecological flow requirements are being investigated as part of requirements for development of Basinwide hydrological models pursuant to

Session Law 2010-143 and should continue being investigated in that context.

The League commends DWR and the EMC in their development of a reasonable rule package and associated implementation procedures to complete this delayed Triennial Review. The proposals, with the suggested changes, reflect a reasonable balance to water quality protection and environmental regulation.

Best,
Sarah

Sarah W. Collins
Regulatory Affairs Associate
NC League of Municipalities
215 North Dawson Street
Raleigh, NC 27603
919.715.2919 office
919.368.1269 cell
scollins@nclm.org

From: Sarah Collins
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 4:55 PM
To: 'DWR-Classifications-Standards@ncdenr.gov'
Cc: Erin Wynia
Subject: NCLM comments - Water Quality Standards (Triennial Review)

Attached are the North Carolina League of Municipalities' comments regarding the proposed changes to water quality standards regulations pursuant to the Triennial Review.

Best,

Sarah Collins

Sarah W. Collins
Regulatory Affairs Associate
NC League of Municipalities
215 North Dawson Street
Raleigh, NC 27603
919.715.2919 office
919.368.1269 cell
scollins@nclm.org

CITYVISION 2014
Charting
Our Tomorrow
NC LEAGUE
OF MUNICIPALITIES
Good government. Great hometowns.
You
Tube
LINC

From: Gondek, John
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Cc: Joseph Gorsuch (joseph.gorsuch@copperalliance.us); Gensemer, Bob; Canton, Steven; DavidD@windwardenv.com; evangenderen@zinc.org
Subject: GEI Comments on NC Triennial Review -- Copper BLM
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2014 2:04:49 PM
Attachments: image001.png
GEI_BLMProposal_NC.pdf

Ms. Brower,

Attached is a comment letter from Robert Gensemer on behalf of the Copper Development Association discussing an issue we would like your staff to consider in North Carolina's triennial review of standards.

Please let us know if you need any additional information – we are here to help if you have any questions. We look forward to speaking with you soon.

Thank you,
John

John Gondek
Ecotoxicologist
GEI Consultants
Consulting Engineers & Scientists
GEI Consultants, Inc.
455 Winding Brook Drive, Suite 201 | Glastonbury, CT 06033
T: 860.368.5382 | **M:** 845.323.6424
www.geiconsultants.com | vCard | map | LinkedIn | Twitter | Facebook

From: Forrest Westall
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Cc: Steve Tedder
Subject: General Comments on WQ Standards Relative to Triennial
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 12:25:05 PM

To: DWR Triennial Review Staff and Hearing Officer Steve Tedder:

I have followed this process for the last what seems like many years. I'm sure the Division and the Hearing Officer have had sufficient comments on the actual changes proposed and I think the staff has done a good job of providing opportunity to interested parties to interact with the Division. This has been a multi-year process and I know agency folks are glad to see it come to this point. What I mainly want to provide is comments on some eutrophication-targeted standards that are not proposed for change at this point. I will share one reiteration point on the issue of biological evaluation of potential toxicity relative to action levels and really all aquatic related toxicity standards (excludes human health issues related to Hg, Se and other human health parameters that typically are targets for bioaccumulation).

Biological Confirmation of potential toxicity impacts: NC has an excellent aquatic toxicity program that has been around for several decades. While aimed primarily at WWTPs and other point sources, it is sometimes used for in-stream evaluations. The ongoing issues related to EPA's concern for action levels is at the core of this comment. DWR has a solid program for evaluating effluent toxicity for facilities with toxic limits. In the cases of action levels the parameters included have very variable toxicity depending on the composition of the effluent involved or the receiving waters, beyond just hardness. The whole effluent aquatic toxicity program is an effective "safety net" to make sure that effluents are not causing toxicity issues and if toxicity results show issues there is a required toxicity minimization program. In many ways this provision of toxicity management is superior to parameter limits. The confusion related to elevation of some parameters that may be "false positives" or the result of elevated levels of variable toxicity parameters that do not have real impacts on natural waters affected. The standards need to continue to provide the provision of action levels and to emphasize in discussions with EPA the tremendous effort NC makes to protect waters using direct biological monitoring. If the standards need to note this provision to help deal with EPA, then a modification to do that should be considered for inclusion.

The future of Ecological-based Standards: This area of the WQ Standards has received many comments from interest groups and others advocating the addition of Statewide TN and TP levels. This is not appropriate for many reasons the primary one is that there is no justification or solid science for the numbers being offered. The NC Nutrient Forum and the vast majority of technical literature on eutrophication, particularly for manmade reservoirs, but would apply to all water body type, clearly concludes that only site-specific evaluation can be used to establish realistic and effective nutrient criteria. Additionally, in-stream TN and TP levels are not always appropriate or helpful in managing nutrient loading to address documented eutrophication problems. The process for setting nutrient criteria has to site-specific and directed at situations where management of loading will result in significant

improvement of water quality.

NC has what can be considered numeric criteria for chlorophyll *a*, dissolved gasses (including reference to super-saturation of DO) and pH (values >9 SU). Values higher than the levels specified may reflect the effects of excessive growth of aquatic vegetation. These are strongly linked to the Nutrient Sensitive Waters (NSW) Classification and the wording of the chlorophyll *a* mirrors several of the phrases contained in the text of the NSW Classification. I realize that the chlorophyll a standard has come under intense scrutiny and that there are many opinions about its value in improving water quality. However, it cannot be reasonably disputed that this standard in conjunction with the NSW Classification has served NC well and has resulted in site-specific evaluations and the establishment of nutrient management programs. However, the application of the chlorophyll *a* standard as currently applied as a "not to exceed" level is not appropriate and is entirely contrary to the reason for establishing the standard. Because algae blooms are transient in nature and variable in the water column (particularly for blue-greens), a measurement at any point in time is likely to change within a very short timeframe. Many other parameters that are often dissolved or at a molecular level in waters have a much greater likelihood of being relatively evenly distributed. For metals and other toxics it makes much more sense to use a "not to exceed" approach. Chlorophyll is not such a parameter. This can be considered a time-sensitive consideration. The ecological and physical condition of waters, particularly in lakes and estuaries can vary from location to location, even within relatively short distances. The application of a chlorophyll standard should be allowed to be adjusted within a water body. The State should look at making the chlorophyll standard more variable, considering the same factors that would allow sections of water bodies to have different standard levels. Ideally this should relate to the hydrologic factors, soils and regional conditions that affect what level of chlorophyll *a* is most appropriate. The chlorophyll standard also should be adjusted to apply to seasonal changes. There are many characteristics of algae growth that is greatly affected by the variation of seasons in NC. The bottom line here is that a lot of work needs to be done to provide much more flexibility in both the level of and application of the chlorophyll. This needs to be done both in the next triennial review and the NCDP process.

Because others have advocated the addition of several other parameters for inclusion as numeric criteria, I wanted to provide an alternate view of the need for statewide TN and TP levels. I believe that consideration of a more flexible chlorophyll standard can help to address some difficult issues with how it is applied currently. I want to continue to advocate the use of site-specific evaluations and the use of the NSW process to initiate evaluation of the true need for eutrophication control. We have limited resources as a state and people, those need to be used wisely to work on problems that truly rise to the level of needing action.

I am providing these comments as an interested citizen and not as a representative of any group or organization.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Forrest Westall
396 Locust Creek Road
Burnsville, NC 28714

-

From: wade Harrison
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: greeting
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:51:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

wade Harrison

po box 814
wake forest, NC 27588

From: Burt Aycock
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: H2O Quality
Date: Friday, July 11, 2014 7:00:00 AM

Please create and maintain the highest possible standards for water quality.
(Well, if it's just about you and me and this year - don't worry about it.)

IT'S ABOUT THE GRANDCHILDREN !

Thank you,
Burt Aycock

From: Thomas Leonard
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: H2O
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:50 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thomas Leonard

228 N. Front St
Wilmington, NC 28405

From: Margaret Sowerwine
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Heavy metals
Date: Monday, July 14, 2014 11:43:23 AM

As a physician and mother, I think it is time for North Carolina to comply with decades-old EPA standards. People in eastern NC catch and eat fish out of economic necessity, and these toxic metals can affect children and fetuses.

If we wait till streams are biologically affected, it is too late. There is no simple way to get those toxins back out of the water. We need to think in terms of PREVENTION.

Margaret Sowerwine, M.D., Chair
Medoc Group NC Sierra Club
lalamusic130@aol.com
18 East Elm St., Rocky Mt. NC 27804
(252) 985-1804

From: James Clampet
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Hello
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:31:33 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James Clampet

1165 quiet Creek lane
williamston, NC 27892

From: Deborah OBrien
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Higher Standards for Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:35:40 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deborah OBrien

1783 Dunmore Place
Chapel Hill, NC 27517

From: Carrie Goodykoontz
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: higher standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:17:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carrie Goodykoontz

2206 Jackson St
Belmont, NC 28012

From: Anna Stubblefield
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Homeowners support CLEAN WATER over industrial "job creators"...
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:20:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anna Stubblefield

831 Scholastic Drive
Winston-Salem, NC 27106

From: pamela woods
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Honor basic rights and use common sense
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:46:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

pamela woods

9 remembrance rideg
flat rock, NC 28731

From: Mike Ruck
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: I am very concerned about NC"s water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:46:33 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

We can no longer just sit by while our water quality is under attack from many directions.
I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mike Ruck

4012 White Pine Drive
Raleigh, 27612

From: P Dean Addison
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: I care about clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:34:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

P Dean Addison

8 Town Square Blvd
306
Asheville, NC 28803

From: Robert Hyman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: I Demand Good Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 11:07:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert Hyman

4029 Bamburgh Lane
Apex, NC 27539

From: Barbara SMith
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: I support clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:29:42 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Barbara SMith

3140 Sussex Road
Raleigh, NC 27607

From: Diane Clark
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: I support strengthening our water quality standards!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:46:20 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

I hope all standards will reflect protection from chemicals used in hydrolic fracturing ("fracking"), and from issues resulting from fracking as well (such as natural gas getting into wells).

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational, and business opportunities. Our water is one of our most treasured resources and it requires strong protections to keep it clean and pure.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Diane Clark

4115 Castleford Dr
Colfax, NC 27235

From: Deja Lizer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: I Support Strong Clean Water Standards
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 3:48:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deja Lizer

2 melody ln
Asheville, NC 28803

From: Carol Hoke
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: I support strong clean-water standards for North Carolina!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:29:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Hoke

1541 Joshua Road
Rosman, NC 28772

From: Tim Leighton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: I Support Stronger Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:48:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tim Leighton

17019 Ashton Oaks Dr
Charlotte, NC 28278

From: Jamie Cheshire
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: I urge you to think
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 11:03:59 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It shouldn't require much thought, but we've gone so much further than we ever should have gone; now we must think.
Think about those parts of the world where water is scarce or unsafe. What is there? Poverty. Disease. Death. Where are the valiant corporations dedicated to "the greater good?" Somewhere else. Not there.
WATER IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN GROWTH.
WATER IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN MONEY.
WATER IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN CORPORATE ENTITLEMENT TO PROFIT FOR THE FEW AT THE EXPENSE OF THE MANY.
Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Please look at yourself in the mirror. Do you love yourself? Tell yourself so. Out loud so you can hear your own voice say it. And the commit to being one of the strong, far sighted, courageous ones who stood up for the restoration of our planet.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jamie Cheshire

796 Ransom Rd
winston-salem, NC 27106

From: Todd Yennior
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: I want clean water!!!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:20:22 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Todd Yennior

1456 Joyceland Road
Kernersville, NC 27284

From: Colleen Gilgenbach
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: I want clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:56:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Colleen Gilgenbach

29 Monroe Place
Asheville, NC 28801

From: Ron Sutherland
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: I want cleaner water & stronger water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:58:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It is well past time we adopted strong standards for water quality in North Carolina, including those for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ron Sutherland

5801 Mountain Island Dr
Durham, NC 27713

From: Paul Kim
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Importance of clean water for all life
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:48:51 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paul Kim

4009 City of Oaks Wynd
Raleigh, NC 27612

From: Ann Koppelman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Improve NC Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:16:49 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ann Koppelman

2308 Wabash Rd
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: Lisa Yarger
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: improve water quality standards in NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:25:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

North Carolina is a beautiful state; I want to keep it that way!

I am extremely concerned about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that are generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

I call upon the NC Environmental Management Commission to strengthen our water quality standards now and to prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lisa Yarger

1025 Alabama Avenue
Durham, NC 27705

From: Eanna Heyliger
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Improve Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:32:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Eanna Heyliger

4239 Patriots Hill Rd
Mint Hill, NC 28227

From: Chris McGratty
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Improve water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:33:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Chris McGratty

3700 Commonwealth Ave
Charlotte, NC 28205

From: Stephen Beets
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Improve Water Quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:08:45 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

As a concerned North Carolinian, I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Stephen Beets

327 Caudle Road
Pinnacle, NC 27043

From: Sonny Keisler
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Improving Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:06:50 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

North Carolina must strengthen its water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sonny Keisler

3006 River Forks Rd
Sanford, NC 27330

From: Daisy Buitrago
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Improving Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:47:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Daisy Buitrago

2218 Gran Lake Dr
Apt F
Morrisville, NC 27560

From: Brandon Whitesell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: In support of strengthening our current water quality standards.
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:53:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brandon Whitesell

408 Culpepper Ln
Raleigh, NC 27610

From: Terry LaRiviere
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Is North Carolina Concerned About Prevention of Disease
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:29:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

All the fuss about healthcare costs and no ability to consider the long term health effects of tainted water. This is NOT how I want other States to see us (we are already considered to be a bunch of ignorant, uneducated hillbillies!) Placing corporate interests ahead of the public interest will further this perception and create even more health care costs for people who are already burdened with paying for the exorbitant costs of medical care.

Do you care?

If so, please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Terry LaRiviere

99 Glasgow Trail
Black Mountain, NC 28711

From: William Koester
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: It's way past time...
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:23:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

William Koester

40 Otis Campbell Road
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Nicole Haynes
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: It"s important
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 9:48:54 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nicole Haynes

749 Galloway drive
Fayetteville, NC 28303

From: Paula Stober
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Keep NC"s water standards strong
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:24:16 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paula Stober

3607 Timberoak Dr
Greensboro, NC 27410

From: Emma Segasture
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Keep North Carolina a Healthy Place for Future Generations
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:36:25 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Emma Segasture

1418 Orange Street
Wilmington, NC 28401

From: William Heath
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Keep Our NC Water Clean!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:57:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

William Heath

7533 NC Hwy 55 West
Seven Springs, NC 28578

From: Virginia Leslie
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Keep our water safe and clean - NO Fracking
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:16:30 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Virginia Leslie

9206 Bracken Lane
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: Joseph McCourt
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Keep water clean
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:20:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joseph McCourt

7807 Greylock Ridge Road
Matthews, NC 28105

From: Jeffrey Deal
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Keeping NC Citizen Taxpayers" Water CLEAN
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:24:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Deal

220 Tall Timber
Boone, NC 28607

From: Amber Chesley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: lacking water standards
Date: Saturday, August 16, 2014 6:34:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amber Chesley

2605 Arendell St
Morehead City, NC 28557

From: Matt Parris
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Let"s clean it up
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:52:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Matt Parris

34 Candler School Rd
Candler, NC 28715

From: Colleen Watson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Let"s Have Some Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:41:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Colleen Watson

6907 Bickham Lane
Ehringhaus, Room #252
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: Anne Williams
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Lets Set High Standards
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 7:55:29 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anne Williams

418 Shandon Street
columbia, SC 29205

From: Donna Savage
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Let"s stay current!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:28:22 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donna Savage

P.O.Bx 493
Cullowhee, NC 28723

From: Alan Stacey
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Life essential clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:40:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alan Stacey

512 Stokes Rd
Graham, NC 27253

From: William Sharfman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Life without water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:45:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

William Sharfman

50 Riverside Drive
New York, NY 10024

From: Justin Hilton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Limiting
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2014 11:37:41 AM

Please limit phosphorus and nitrogen discharging by large companies and large polluters, especially. Clean water and air means so much to living in NC.

Best,
Lifetime NC resident
Justin Hilton

From: Wilfred Robin
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Long Overdue Update of NC CWA WQSs
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:22:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow dischargers to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the most essential tenet of the Clean Water Act, which is to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Wilfred Robin

549 11th Ave., Cir., NW
Hickory, NC 28601

From: Amy Adams
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Ms. Brewer
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2014 1:16:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amy Adams

498 Hodges Gap Rd
Boone, NC 28607

From: Mary Bennett
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: My thoughts on water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:22:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary Bennett

2013 McCarthy Street
Raleigh, NC 27608

From: Sarah Moore
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Cannot Jeopardize Our "Clean" Drinking Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:47:13 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sarah Moore

311 S. Lasalle Street
Apt 14 K
Durham, NC 27705

From: art kiser
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:37:16 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

art kiser

377 vanderbilt rd
asheville, NC 28803

From: Monica and Donnie Brown
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC clean water
Date: Saturday, August 16, 2014 1:36:58 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Monica and Donnie Brown

7845 Dusty Trail
Germanton, NC 27019

From: Calvin Woodland
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Environment
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:20:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Calvin Woodland

4512-306 Tesla Park Dr
Wilmington, NC 28412

From: Susan Davis
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Environmental Management Commission strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:09:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Susan Davis

216 Adams St
Burlington, NC 27217

From: Ryan Bondurant
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Environmental Management Commission to strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:07:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ryan Bondurant

603 thomas st
Reidsville, NC 27320

From: Joy Pickett
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Environmental Management Commission
Date: Sunday, August 17, 2014 8:48:04 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joy Pickett

1108 Pender street
Raleigh, NC 27610

From: RALEIGH STOUT
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Must Strengthen Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:20:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

RALEIGH STOUT

1001 YANCEYVILLE ST APT A
GREENSBORO, NC 27405

From: Virginia Browning
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC native requests strong water standards
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 6:29:27 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Virginia Browning

510 Marshburn Rd
Wendell, NC 27591

From: Beth Stanberry
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC needs clean water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:26:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Beth Stanberry

PO Box 468
Asheville, NC 28802

From: David Phillips
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC protecting the air, water, and quality of life.
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:34:15 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Phillips

PO Box 811
Zebulon, NC 27597

From: Liz Cullington
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Triennal Review of WQ Standards
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:30:07 PM

I am writing to oppose the use of "biological confirmation" as a substitute for water quality measurements of toxic metals, or other water quality measurements. Not only would this fail to address metals in sediment, it could mean a dangerous build up in the aquatic food chain. The state must maintain the current metal standards.

I support a new tighter standard for 2,4D herbicide and would urge DWQ to add standards for all commonly used herbicides and pesticides for which our state's waters are not currently tested.

I am extremely concerned that, even without spills or illegal discharges to our state's waters, our rivers could be contaminated with the salty, radioactive, and mineral-laced "produced waters" from fracking, via wastewater treatment plants, which is currently proposed as permissible under Mining and Energy Commission Rules (15A NCAC 05H .2003). Similarly chemically contaminated fracking wastewater, which can also contain "biocides" and a number of substances harmful to aquatic life and human health could be sent to sewage treatment plants (or treatment plants).

Unfortunately, the salts and biocides in these wastes can also damage the biological processes of sewage plants leading to additional threats to our water supplies downstream, as well as the health of our rivers.

I urge DWQ to explore such chemicals and ingredients as are revealed to the public from drilling operations elsewhere in order to plan for additional testing parameters where necessary. For starters, there is a list that the hydraulic fracturing industry will admit to, and it is here, but too long to paste into my comments. However, it's a list of things that you would definitely not want in your water, and which downstream drinking water intakes are not currently required to test for.

http://fracfocus.org/chemical-use/what-chemicals-are-used

There are multiple ammonia compounds on the list, just another reason for NC to not wait, and to adopt a water quality standard for ammonia compounds, as EPA recommends, since our state allows land application of both WWTP sludge and waste from confined animal operations (CAFOs).

As a resident of a county that depends on Jordan Lake for drinking water, I am opposed to the delay of the Jordan Lake rules, and the use of a few little useless Solarbees. Our state needs nitrogen and phosphorus limits, not just upstream of Jordan Lake, but statewide.

I understand that NC has yet to adopt the national standard for methylmercury in fish, this is absolutely necessary, and testing and notification should be expanded, including notifications in both English and Spanish for every affected water body or reach.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these important issues.

Liz Cullington
390 Rocky Hills Road, Pittsboro NC 27312-6377

From:	Heather Deck
To:	Brower, Connie
Cc:	Giattina.jim@Epa.gov; Gordon.lisaperras@Epa.gov
Subject:	NC Triennial Review Comments
Date:	Friday, August 22, 2014 4:28:34 PM
Attachments:	PTRF Triennial Review Comments_08_22_14.pdf appendix A_mussel distribution in Tar River basin.pdf

---

Ms. Brower,

Please find the attached comments from the Pamlico-Tar River Foundation re: NC Triennial Review.

Thank you,

Heather Jacobs Deck
Pamlico-Tar RIVERKEEPER
Pamlico-Tar River Foundation
P.O. Box 1854
Washington, NC 27889
(252) 946-7211 (office)
(252) 946-9492 (fax)
(252) 402-5644 (cell)
www.ptrf.org

Follow us on Facebook: http://www.facebook.com/pamlicotar
Follow us at Twitter: www.twitter.com/ptrfriverkeeper"
Like us at Tar-Pamlico Water Trail: www.facebook.com/TarPamRiverCamping

From: Cindy Phipps
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Water quality is vital
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:36:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cindy Phipps

326 Berry Hill Dr
Sylva, NC 28779

From: Brandon Tweed
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:34:22 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brandon Tweed

6700 Sandwell Ln
Apt 208
Raleigh, NC 27607

From: Lydia Degn-Sutton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:43:50 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lydia Degn-Sutton

801 E Woodcroft Pkwy
Apt 1904
Durham, NC 27713

From: Johnny Dillard
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:43:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Johnny Dillard

1147 Laurelwood Place
Lenoir, NC 28645

From: Karen Bethune
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 4:42:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important and long overdue that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Karen Bethune

28 Stone River Dr
asheville, NC 28804

From: A. Gardner
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:21:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

A. Gardner

154 Ridgeview Drive
Mount Airy, NC 27030

From: Melanie Lech
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:37:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Melanie Lech

12512 Pickford Ct
Huntersville, NC 28078

From: David Monroe
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Water Quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:27:40 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Monroe

206 Narcissus Mews
Caswell Beach, NC 28465

From: Suzanne Ward
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC water standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:53:40 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Ward

7624 Decatur Dr
Fayetteville, NC 28303

From: Carrie Kluiter
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 5:41:05 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carrie Kluiter

273 Parrish Farm Ln
Benson, NC 27504

From: Sarah Collins
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Cc: Erin Wynia
Subject: NCLM comments - Water Quality Standards (Triennial Review)
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 4:54:55 PM
Attachments: image003.png
image004.png
image005.png
image006.png
NCLM Comments - Triennial Review.pdf

Attached are the North Carolina League of Municipalities' comments regarding the proposed changes to water quality standards regulations pursuant to the Triennial Review.

Best,

Sarah Collins

Sarah W. Collins
Regulatory Affairs Associate
NC League of Municipalities
215 North Dawson Street
Raleigh, NC 27603
919.715.2919 office
919.368.1269 cell
scollins@nclm.org

From: Botic, Katie
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NC-PC Response to Triennial Review of Standards
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2014 4:36:59 PM
Attachments: Triennial Review of Standards Response.pdf

Please see the attached response. Thank you.

Katie Botic
Environmental Compliance Specialist
Charlotte Mecklenburg Utilities
4222 Westmont Drive
Charlotte, NC 28217
704-336-4582

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

From: Maria parrino
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: New Water Standards Need Immediately
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:23:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Maria parrino

p o box 1480
Black Mountain, NC 28711

From: judy katz
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: NO FRACKING!!! SAVE OUR WATER!!!!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:55:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

judy katz

1419 manns chapel
pittsboro, NC 27312

From: Kent Lupton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: No One Should Have to Worry About Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:17:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kent Lupton

613 May Court
Gastonia, NC 28054

From: David Shelton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: No toxins in our water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:38:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Industry and development put a burden on clean water supplies, and we have to be careful not to let the interests of polluters get out of hand, and spoil our water.

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children, and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and is the right of all North Carolinians and Americans.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Shelton

329 Grady McNeilly Rd
Casar, NC 28020

From: Carl Barnes
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: North Carolina Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:18:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carl Barnes

2611 Woodberry Dr
Winston Salem, NC 27106

From: Benjamin Wheeler
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: North Carolina deserves CLEAN water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:16:29 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Wheeler

4703 Heritage Drive
Durham, NC 27712

From: Lou Ann Phelps
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: North Carolina Surface Water Triennial Review
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 2:56:12 PM
Attachments: 08-22-14 Comments to Connie Brower re triennial review.pdf
EPA letters re WQS - NC, AL, GA.pdf

Dear Ms. Brower,

Attached are comments submitted by Julia Youngman of the Southern Environmental Law Center, on behalf of the North Carolina League of Conservation Voters, Cape Fear River Watch, River Guardian Foundation, Appalachian Voices, Winyah Rivers Foundation, American Rivers, Neuse Riverkeeper Foundation, Eno River Association, and Waterkeeper Alliance. Also attached are enclosures referenced in the comments. A hard copy will follow by regular mail.

Thank you in advance for your thoughtful consideration of these comments.

Best regards,

Lou Ann Phelps
North Carolina Certified Paralegal
Assistant to Julia F. Youngman
Southern Environmental Law Center
601 W. Rosemary St., Suite 220
Chapel Hill, NC 27516-2356
Tel: (919) 967-1450
Fax: (919) 929-9421
www.southernenvironment.org

From: Wendy King
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: North Carolina Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:55:33 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Wendy King

914 East Washington Street
Nashville, NC 27856

From: Velvet Key
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: North Carolina"s Water Needs Improvements
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:01:17 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Velvet Key

11818 Elizabeth Madison Court
Charlotte, NC 28277

From: Bill Staton, MBA, CFA
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: North Carolina"s Water Quality Is in Serious Jeopardy
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:18:19 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bill Staton, MBA, CFA

2431 Hartmill Court
Charlotte, NC 28226

From: Ulla Reeves
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Nothing is more precious than clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:16:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ulla Reeves

221 FAIRFAX AVENUE
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Yelena Porzio
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Only way to know its clean is to test it!
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 4:00:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Yelena Porzio

5119 Goshawk Dr
Hope Mills, NC 28348

From: Renee Giddens
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Our taxes pay for clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:24:25 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Renee Giddens

23 Chop Nut Circle
Smithfield, NC 27577

From: Teresa Baker
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Our Water Quality matters to Me
Date: Monday, August 18, 2014 3:11:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Teresa Baker

2652 NC Hwy 56
Creedmoor, NC 27522

From: Lauren Cotter
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Our water quality stamdards must be improved!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:31:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lauren Cotter

6608 Lynndale Dr
Raleigh, NC 27612

From: Anne Kepplinger
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Our water
Date: Saturday, August 16, 2014 5:49:56 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anne Kepplinger

2844 Wycliff
Raleigh, NC 27607

From: bill clark
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: our water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:29:51 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

bill clark

4246 east little horse creek rd
lansing, NC 28643

From: Jeanne Fertig
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please adopt the proposed metals standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:51:21 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fertig

P.O. Box 2865
Cashiers, NC 28717

From: David Fregeau
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please be patient; unknowingly we will pay more later.
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2014 11:44:34 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Fregeau

12723 Winget Rd
charlotte, NC 28278

From: Bob Drake
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please clean water.. no more
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:13:34 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bob Drake

109 Wllow Drive
Garner, NC 27529

From: Pierre Chartier
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please do something about it!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:40:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Pierre Chartier

107 Ashley Glen Dr
Cary, NC 27513

From: mark Gilbert
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: please do the right thing
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:01:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

mark Gilbert

492 mill creek rd lot 4
Newport, NC 28570

From: rocky reuter
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: please ensure that our water is clean and healthy for us
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:20:52 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

rocky reuter

3941 D hahns lane
greensboro, NC 27401

From: Carlos Espinosa
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please establish very good water quality standards for North Carolina!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:49:34 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carlos Espinosa

212 Central Avenue
Black Mountain, NC 28711

From: Gary Marshall
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please help protect our water resources!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:48:06 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gary Marshall

16825 knoxwood dr
Huntersville, NC 28078

From: Mark Skinner
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please help
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 6:42:26 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mark Skinner

Rainbow Forest Drive
Charlotte, NC 28277

From: Erik Rosengren
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please improve and protect our clean WATER!
Date: Sunday, August 17, 2014 9:37:21 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

This is simple. Without clean water, we die. Or only the very wealthy will have access to clean water, which seems to be fast approaching. Water is given to us by the earth and clean water is every beings birthright. There is no amount of money or industrial progress that should be allowed to pollute the gorgeous water systems in North Carolina. Act now to preserve the gift of life for our children and descendants. PLEASE. We have the ability to make decisions now that will effect our immediate future.

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Erik Rosengren

75 Lakewood Drive #3
Asheville, NC 28803

From: David Greenwald
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please improve the quality of our water in NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:40:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my thoughts on strengthening our current water quality standards. I think we should tighten standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.
David Greenwald
610 Madam Moores Lane
New Bern NC 28562

Sincerely,

David Greenwald

610 Madam Moores Lane
New Bern, NC 28562

From: Jessica Janecki
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please improve water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:34:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jessica Janecki

920 Exum St
Durham, NC 27701

From: Anthony Jones
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please keep NC clean & green
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:57:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anthony Jones

213 Perry Street
Henderson, NC 27536

From: David Owens
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please keep our precious water clean
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:41:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Owens

914 Monmouth Ave. #1
Durham, NC 27701

From: Laurie Rieman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please Keep our Water Clean
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:29:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Laurie Rieman

287 Tuskeegee Acres Road
Robbinsviile, NC 28771

From: Crystal Cabot
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please Prevent a Cancer Epidemic, and Environmental Destruction
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:42:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Crystal Cabot

2342 Oxford Road
Henderson, NC 27536

From: Daniel Morris
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please Prohibit Discharge of Fracking Contaminants in NC Waters
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:43:25 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Daniel Morris

3610 Alamosa Drive
High Point, NC 27265

From: Donna Haskins
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please Protect North Carolina"s Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:27:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donna Haskins

170 Cedar Elm Rd
Durham, NC 27713

From: Randy Knotts
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please Protect Our Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:55:41 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Randy Knotts

105 auburn cove
mount holly, NC 28120

From: Joan Walker
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please protect our drinking water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:49:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joan Walker

63 WASHINGTON AVE
ASHEVILLE, NC 28804

From: Colby Hall
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please protect our water supply!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:34:09 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Colby Hall

3731 Yorktown Place
Raleigh, NC 27609

From: Brenda Thompson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please Protect Our Water!!!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:13:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brenda Thompson

65 Monticello Rd
Weaverville, NC 28787

From: Teresa Howachyn
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please Protect Our Water!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:55:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Teresa Howachyn

315 Lookout Terrace
Black Mountain, NC 28711

From: Larry Hannon
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please Protect Our Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:26:16 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers.
Please work with other state agencies to protect our water from the threat of un-named chemicals use in fracking. There is no substitute for clean water!
Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Larry Hannon

6823 Needham Dr
Charlotte, NC 28270

From: David Stover
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please Raise the Water Quality Standards in NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:17:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Stover

101 east sprague st
Winston-Salem, NC 27127

From: Stephanie Crawford
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please stand UP FOR NC WATER NOW & always
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:46:32 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Crawford

25 bear creek road
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Alison Smitley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen and update our water quality standards in NC!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:28 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alison Smitley

1403 Sycamore Street
Raleigh, NC 27604

From: Betty Lawrence
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please Strengthen Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:48:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Betty Lawrence

142 Hillside St
Asheville, NC 28801

From: Steve Dean
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen NC Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:56:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Steve Dean

114 Swain Lane
Topton, NC 28781

From: Ruth Steenwyk
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen NC"s water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:46:26 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ruth Steenwyk

1625 Ben Jones Drive
Mebane, NC 27302

From: Linda Vickery
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen our NC watersheseds" standards as least to equal our neighboring stat
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 2:28:06 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda Vickery

2407 Legacy Oaks Pl
Asheville, NC 28803

From: Brittany Iery
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen our water quality standards!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:07:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brittany Iery

1116 Holburn Pl
Raleigh, NC 27610

From: Chris Clarke
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen our water quality standards!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:32:25 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Chris Clarke

795 Elizabeth Lane
Matthews, NC 28105

From: Robert Blackwell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:15:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert Blackwell

4311 Cove Loop Road
Hendersonville, NC 28739

From: Pat Blackwell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:14:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Pat Blackwell

4311 Cove Loop Road
Hendersonville, NC 28739

From: Heidi Burke
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2014 11:02:05 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Heidi Burke

1009 Meadowlands Trl
Calabash, NC 28467

From: Krista Stearns
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen our water quality standards.
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:17:34 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Krista Stearns

165 Brevard Rd
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Ryan Cannon
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:25:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ryan Cannon

220 Barksdale Avenue
Hendersonville, NC 28792

From: Mary Wagner
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: please strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:34:31 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary Wagner

294 Trillium Way
Clayton, NC 27527

From: Julia Jessop
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen our Water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:28:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards especially for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Julia Jessop

2713 McDowell Road
Durham, NC 27705

From: Dr. Diane Nelson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen vital clean water regulations
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:31:19 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dr. Diane Nelson

244 sweet bay pl
x
Carrboro, NC 27510

From: Laura Bouchard
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please Strengthen Water Quality Standards in NC!!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:17:15 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Laura Bouchard

P. O. Box 609
Tryon, NC 28782

From: Caroline Dyar
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: please strengthen water quality standards in NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:42:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Caroline Dyar

101 Thomas Ln
Carrboro, NC 27510

From: Tracy Feldman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen water quality standards in the US
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:07:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tracy Feldman

2117 Strebor Street
Durham, NC 27705

From: Amy Kellum
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please Strengthen Water Quality Standards!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:06:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amy Kellum

4615 Willa Way
Durham, NC 27703

From: Heather Norton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen water quality standards!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:00:20 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Heather Norton

15310 Superior Street
Charlotte, NC 28273

From: Robert Belknap
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:02:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert Belknap

900 Hillsborough Street
Raleigh, NC 27603

From: Kelly Brookshire
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:50:15 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kelly Brookshire

419 Incinerator Road
Clyde, NC 28721

From: Martha Spencer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please Strengthen Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:15:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Martha Spencer

988 Henry Mountain Road
Brevard, NC 28712

From: James Schall
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 11:19:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James Schall

31 Elizabeth St
Asheville, NC 28801

From: Theresa McAskill
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please strengthen water standards & protect our health & the beauty of NC
Date: Saturday, August 16, 2014 8:00:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.
Everyone in my neighborhood is concerned about the quality of our drinking wtarer & also of our lakes & streams, & our recreation water.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Theresa McAskill

3112 lassiter st
Durham, NC 27707

From: Carol shaffer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please take this serious!!!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:23:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams. If you care about the water quality for your children and grandchildren please take a closer look at this. Testing of our waters should be done yearly. Last time done was in 2006? Seriously? NC is too beautiful to let this slide.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol shaffer

700 Zelda court
Hendersonville, NC 28792

From: MARTIN HAZELTINE
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please think of your Grandchildren.
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:49:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

MARTIN HAZELTINE

7614 DUNBAR DRIVE SW
Sunset Beach, NC 28468

From: Michele Clark
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please update NC"s clean water standards! Protect our environment!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 11:04:36 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michele Clark

109 Shadowood Dr. Apt. V
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: Mike Hamer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please update water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:58:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mike Hamer

100 Park Drive
Greenville, 27858

From: Joyce Atkinson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Please work to strengthen our clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:52:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joyce Atkinson

7125 Trumble Woods
CONNELLY SPRINGS, NC 28612

From: Esther Murphy
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Poisoned Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:13:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Esther Murphy

7235 Darden Rd
Apt. #127
WILMINGTON, 28411

From: James Stone
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Precious Water
Date: Monday, August 18, 2014 3:34:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James Stone

647 Town Mountain Road
Apt. 201
Asheville, NC 28804

From: Chelsea Barnes
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Prevent water pollution
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:14:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Chelsea Barnes

2505 Tryon Pines Drive
Raleigh, NC 27603

From: Joanna Willard
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:02:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joanna Willard

208 Applecross Dr
Cary, NC 27511

From: Debora Ellis
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect NC Water - Strengthen our Regulations (and enforce them)
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:26:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Debora Ellis

3936 2nd St. Dr. NW
HIckory, NC 28601

From: Linda Covington
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: PROTECT NC WATER
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:41:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda Covington

62 Beverly Road W
Ashevile, NC 28806

From: James Embrey
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect NC"s Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:58:06 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James Embrey

509 South Front Street
Wilmington, NC 28401

From: Tiffany K
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: PROTECT NORTH CAROLINA"S PEOPLE!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:22:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tiffany K

Protect North Carolina Lane
Fayetteville, NC 28311

From: Jake Anderson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect our drinking water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:18:29 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jake Anderson

420 High St
Winston-Salem, NC 27106

From: linda eiserloh
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect our precious water while we still can!
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 7:59:55 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

linda eiserloh

168 doubleday rd
tryon, NC 28782

From: sam retsch-bogart
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect Our Water & AIR!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:24:22 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

sam retsch-bogart

100 Cardiff Place
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: Jayne Boyer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect our water quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:13:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jayne Boyer

4316 Thetford Rd
Durham, NC 27707

From: Barbara Sloss
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: protect our water resources
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:26:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Barbara Sloss

5 Wagon Road
Asheville, NC 28805

From: Laura Graziano
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect our water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:30:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Laura Graziano

25 Stone Cottage Rd
Mars Hill, NC 28754

From: Jory Froggatt
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect our water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:08:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jory Froggatt

5411 Ashbey lane
Summerfield, NC 27358

From: Dan Faris
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect Our Water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:41:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dan Faris

6000 Rose Valley Dr
Charlotte, NC 28210

From: Bobbi Hapgood
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect our Water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:57:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bobbi Hapgood

13 Friday Lane
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: Laura Graziano
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect our water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 11:04:19 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Laura Graziano

25 Stone Cottage Rd
Mars Hill, NC 28754

From: fw hester
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect Our Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:18:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

fw hester

201 duncan street
raleigh, NC 27608

From: Katherine Williams
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: protect our water, please!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:42:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. As a resident of Rockingham County, living in a zone scheduled for fracking, I am extremely concerned about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina.

Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into the Dan River and its tributaries since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants. Radiation is also a concern. The Dan River is where our water comes from here.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Katherine Williams

2102 bryant street
Madison, NC 27025

From: Ellen Osborne
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect Our Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:29:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ellen Osborne

6731
Hunt Rd
Pleasant Garden, NC 27313

From: Molly Murphy
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protect our water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:22:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Molly Murphy

2116 Brandon Road
Wilmington, NC 28405

From: Carol Lynn Anderson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protecting NC air, water, and quality of life
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:19:38 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Lynn Anderson

2402-M Lake Brandt Pl
Greensboro, NC 27455

From: James Kelleher
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protecting NC"s Natural Resources
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:23:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James Kelleher

3700 Cotswold Terr Unit 3D
Greensboro, 27410

From: jennifer smith
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: protecting the environment
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 2:46:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

jennifer smith

7816 calibre crossing drive
charlotte, NC 28227

From: Cassandra Beach
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Protecting water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:15:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

As a former administrator at DNER (then NER & NRCD), I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cassandra Beach

672 Spindlewood
672 Fearrington Post
Pittsboro, NC 27312

From: Cynthia Gallion
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Public Health
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:46:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Gallion

745 Hanska Way
Raleigh, NC 27610

From: Juanita Klostermeyer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Re: Strengthen and update our clean water standards.
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:33:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Juanita Klostermeyer

139 Camden Ct
Shelby, NC 28152

From: Aimee Siluk
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Re: Clean Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:43:19 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Aimee Siluk

13721 Pytchley Lane
Charlotte, NC 28273

From: Gordon, Lisa Perras
To: Brower, Connie; Manning, Jeff
Cc: Godfrey, Annie; Petter, Lauren; Wetherington, Michele
Subject: RE: Comments on NC"s Proposed Triennial Review
Date: Monday, August 25, 2014 9:11:55 AM

Connie,

With apologies, I realized that I inadvertently left off the following comment, which I've included now under No. 4 below. While we have discussed this in earlier communications and on the phone, I would like it to be included with our official comments.

Hope you fared well last Friday!

Thanks so much,

Lisa Gordon

From: Gordon, Lisa Perras
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 1:21 PM
To: Connie Brower; 'Manning, Jeff'
Cc: Wetherington, Michele; Petter, Lauren
Subject: Comments on NC's Proposed Triennial Review

Connie,

Please accept these comments from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on the current North Carolina Triennial Review.

The EPA has provided earlier comments dated January 3, 2014 and August 20th, 2010, for this triennial review. We resubmit those comments in their entirety for your consideration for this triennial review as many of the revisions and comments remain the same. In particular, please note the comments in these letters that specifically address the proposed changes to the metals criteria, the low end hardness cap, the biological 'trump' and the action levels, as well as the request to ensure that the State submit the methods and analyses conducted to support the revised WQS as required by 40 CFR 131.6. This is important for all revisions but especially important for those areas that are not adopting federally recommended criteria (40 CFR 131.11(b)). We are also including as part of our comments EPA's February 4th, 2014, letter encouraging the State to consider adoption of the EPA's most recent ammonia and bacteria criteria. For those changes in our letters that NC does not intend to address in this triennial, we urge NC to fully evaluate in the next triennial.

In addition to those previous comments, we add the following:

1. Since the date of our January 3rd, 2014 letter, the EPA and NC Division of Water Resources have entered into a mutually agreed plan to develop numeric nutrient criteria. The work in that plan has already begun and the EPA looks forward to continuing to work with the State on that process so that numeric nutrient criteria can be adopted into the State WQS in a future triennial review as outlined in the milestone section of that plan.
2. The EPA attended the public hearings in both Raleigh and Statesville, NC on July 15th and 16th. During those hearings, numerous suggestions were made to modify the proposed metals criteria by including a multiplier of "x 1 WER" to allow for the use of a Water Effects Ratio. The EPA supports the use of this multiplier. Appendix L of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Water Quality Standards Handbook, entitled, *Interim Guidance on Determination and Use of Water-Effect Ratios for Metals,* (EPA-823-B-94-001, February 1994) and *Streamlined Water-Effect Ratio Procedure for Discharge of Copper* (EPA-822-R-01-005, March 2001) provide detailed information on how to properly conduct a WER and those sections may be directly referenced in the state WQS. The EPA welcomes the opportunity to assist North Carolina with any questions regarding the use or applicability of WERs.
3. Since the date of the original proposal reviewed for the January 3, 2014 comments, the section regarding the derivation of the hardness for the use with the hardness based metals (Section 15 NCAC 02B .0211 (11)(c)(i)) was revised. EPA notes that the actual instream hardness will be used when calculating the metals criteria and supports that revision. For permitting purposes, the updated revision (Section 15 NCAC 02B .0211 (11)(c)(ii))states that the hardness shall be established using the "median of instream hardness data collected within the local US Geological Survey (USGS) and Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) 8-digit Hydrologic Unit." EPA notes that 8 digit HUCs can be hundreds of miles in size and include multiple eco-regions with varying physical conditions. The use of so large of an area may result in hardness that are either over-protective (hardness lower than in the receiving water) or under-protective (hardness higher than in the actual receiving water.) The EPA recommends that NC consider using hardness values that more closely reflect the hardness in the actual receiving stream for the NPDES permittee. The EPA welcomes the opportunity to continue to evaluate this section with NC DWR in the coming weeks.
4. As noted, NC DWR has proposed metals criteria to include updated chronic criteria for arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, chromium III, chromium VI, copper, lead, nickel, silver and zinc. NC has also proposed to add in a section at 15A NCAC 02B .0211 (11)(d) which states that, "Compliance with chronic instream metals standards shall only be evaluated using averages of a minimum of four samples taken on consecutive days, or as a 96-hour average." It is EPA's understanding that NC's monitoring program does not currently monitor over four consecutive days. Please provide information on how monitoring will be done to assess

against these new criteria once adopted.

The EPA wants to be able to quickly review and respond to these changes once they are submitted to us. Therefore, please let us know at your earliest convenience of any changes that will be made to these proposed revisions so that we can begin our evaluation. Your incredible persistence and diligence in moving this triennial ahead is greatly appreciated.

Thank you,

Lisa Perras Gordon
Water Quality Standards
NC Coordinator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Atlanta, Georgia
(404) 562-9317

From: Augspurger, Tom
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Re: Triennial Review Hearings
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 4:18:22 PM
Attachments: 20140822_Letter_Benjamin to Brower_Proposed water quality standards amendments.pdf

---

Good afternoon Connie,

The attached letter conveys the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's comments on the July 1, 2014 Notice of Rule-making Action related to water quality standards amendments. Thanks for your diligence over the last couple years in getting the dissolved metals criteria changes proposed. Please give me a call if you have any questions about our input.

Regards,

Tom

Tom Augspurger
Ecologist / Environmental Contaminants Specialist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
551-F Pylon Drive
Raleigh NC 27606
919-856-4520 x21
tom_augspurger@fws.gov

On Tue, Jul 1, 2014 at 11:34 AM, Brower, Connie <connie.brower@ncdenr.gov> wrote:

> Good afternoon, everyone,
>
> Public Notice of our Surface Water Triennial Review Public Hearings was made through the NC Register on June 16th. An announcement was also sent through our DENR/DWR Rulemaking List Serve and appears on both the DENR and DWR web pages/calendar of events in accordance with G.S. 150B. A DENR press release is scheduled for ~ 7 days prior to the scheduled hearings.
>
> While these efforts have been effective, we may not be reaching all audiences. So, in an additional effort to assure that the interested parties are notified, we would like to ask the favor of your assistance. Would you please share the following information on your respective list serves and/or mail outs from your respective organizations or areas of expertise? As it is DWR's strong desire to provide the Environmental Management Commission with feedback from all interested parties, your efforts will aid us greatly in that purpose.

Thank you, again,

Fondest regards,

Connie Brower

Notice of Rule-making Action:

Notice is hereby given in accordance with G.S. 150B-21.2 that the Department of Environment and Natural Resources intends to amend the rules cited as 15A NCAC 02B .0206; .0211; .0212; .0214-.0216; .0218; .0220. The Environmental Management Commission (EMC) will conduct public hearings to consider proposed amendments to these rules that establish the surface water quality standards for North Carolina. These proposed amendments comprise the State's Triennial Review of Surface Water Quality Standards, which is mandated by the federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act). Additionally, the Division will accept comments on the Fiscal Note prepared for this proposal. The Agency obtained G.S. 150B-19.1 certification of the Fiscal Note from Office of State Budget Management on April 23, 2014.

The complete text of the proposed rule revisions is available on the Division of Water Resources' Proposed Rules Website, *pursuant to G.S. 150B-19.1(c):* *http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/guest/rules*

Proposed Effective Date: *January 1, 2015*

Public Hearings:

Date: *Tuesday, July 15, 2014*

Time: *2:00 p.m.*

Location: *Ground Floor Hearing Room, Archdale Building, 512 North Salisbury St.,*

Raleigh, NC

Date: *Wednesday, July 16, 2014*

Time: *3:00 p.m.*

Location: *Statesville Civic Center, 300 South Center Street, Statesville, NC*

In case of inclement weather on either of the two published hearing dates, a continuance date for the public hearing has been established as July 29th , 1:30 p.m., Ground Floor Hearing Room, Archdale Building, 512 North Salisbury Street, Raleigh, NC. A recorded message regarding any continuance to the hearing record will be available at the below noted telephone number.

It is important that all interested and potentially affected persons or parties make their views known to the EMC whether in favor of, or opposed to, any and all of the proposed amendments and current regulations. The public hearing will be recorded. It will consist of a presentation by DWR staff, followed by an open comment period. The EMC appointed hearing officer may limit the length of time that you may speak, if necessary, so that all those who wish to speak will have an opportunity. You may attend the public hearing to make oral comments and/or submit written comments. You may present conceptual ideas, technical justifications, or specific language you believe is necessary and relevant to 15A NCAC 02B surface water quality classifications and standards regulations. No items will be voted on and no decisions will be made at this hearing.

How to Submit Comments:

As the state and US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) have a strong interest in assuring that the decisions are legally defensible, are based on the best scientific information available, and are subject to full and meaningful public comment and participation, clear records are critical to the administrative review by the EMC and the US EPA. All persons interested in and potentially affected by the proposal are strongly encouraged to submit written comments, data or other relevant information by ***5:00 p.m., Friday, August 22, 2014*** to Connie Brower at the postal address or e-mail address listed below.

Connie Brower,

DWR Water Planning Section,

1611 Mail Service Center,

Raleigh, NC 27699-1611

e-mail: DWR-Classifications-Standards@ncdenr.gov

Questions can be directed to Connie Brower at (919) 807-6416, main line (919) 707-9000; or fax (919) 807-6497.

www.portal.ncdenr.org/web/wq

Note: E-mail correspondence to and from this address is subject to NC Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties unless the content is exempt.

From: Tim Wadkins
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Re: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:31:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tim Wadkins

65 Pine Tree Lane
Pisgah Forest, NC 28768

From: Rob Stott
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: RE:
Date: Sunday, August 17, 2014 2:36:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rob Stott

1609 Tippah Ave
Charlotte, NC 28205

From: lester coonse
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Regulation of North Carolin Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:54:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am dismayed at the inaction of DENR water quality division with regards to water quality. Coal ash is just a reservoir for mercury and the extremely dangerous non priority pollutant 2,3,7,8 tetrachlorodibenzodioxin. Because of what I perceive as NC DENR becoming a polluter protection agency with priorities set by politicians connected to Duke Energies, I have asked and will continue to ask the national EPA director to remove NC DENR as the regulatory agency for North Carolina's water quality. . .

Thank you.

Sincerely,

lester coonse

71
Pinewood Rd
granite falls, NC 28630

From: Valerie Baksa
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Renew and Strengthen Water Quality Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 5:10:50 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Valerie Baksa

130 Oak Grove Ave
Mt Holly, NC 28120

From: Julie Tuttle
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Request: Strengthen and updated our clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:21:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Julie Tuttle

311 Boothe Hill Rd
Chapel Hill, NC 27517

From: Rosalba Arroyo
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Rosalba Arroyo
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:56:27 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rosalba Arroyo

1716 furman ct
Kannapolis, NC 28083

From: Thomas Flick
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Safe Oil revenue only with Safe Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:07:15 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thomas Flick

5002 Golden Acres Road
Oak Ridge, NC 27310

From: Donna Keziah
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Safe water to drink
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:50:30 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donna Keziah

3516 Keithcastle Ct
Charlotte, NC 28210

From: Dawn Tucker
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: safe water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:41:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dawn Tucker

320 glendare drive apt m
Winston Salem, NC 27104

From: AMANDA LANGHEINRICH
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Sea, Rivers, lakes and Beer! Water is everything to NC
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:26:28 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

AMANDA LANGHEINRICH

57 JONESTOWN RD
Asheville, NC 28804

From: Thomas Lehman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Standards for water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:09:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thomas Lehman

Orange County
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: John Breckenridge
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: State Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:21:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

John Breckenridge

954 White-Smith Road
Pittsboro, NC 27312

From: John Freeze
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Stop fracking & Have Cleaner Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:45:22 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

As a resident of NC, please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

John Freeze

648 Chaney Road
Asheboro, NC 27205

From: Jeanne gibbs
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Stop the fracking
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:58:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeanne gibbs

78 brant lane
Coats, NC 27521

From: R.Stephen Karvwatt
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Nort Carolina"s water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:22:06 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

R.Stephen Karvwatt

803 Brooks Ave
Raleigh, NC 27607

From: Michael Navascues
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: STRENGTHEN WATER QUALITY STANDARDS
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:57:28 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.
PLEASE SUPPORT A HEALTHIER NC ENVIRONMENT!
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael Navascues

6508 Falconbridge Rd
Chapel Hill, NC 27517

From: Barry Anderson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen and Update NC"s Clean Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 5:09:39 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus plus a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

In review:

• Upgrade our standards for toxic heavy metals, something our neighboring states did years ago;
• Reject an EMC proposal to let toxic metals exceed standards until aquatic life dies;
• Tighten the standard for a type of herbicide that causes blood cancers and reproductive problems which has been found in rising amounts in surface drinking water sources;
• Adopt criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus, which can cause algal blooms and fish kills, plus threaten the safety of drinking water;
• Adopt a standard for methylmercury in fish, a form of mercury that is closely tied to many serious health problems, including learning disabilities, birth defects, and heart disease;
• Adopt a standard for ammonia pollution, which is discharged by some wastewater treatment plants, killing fish and shellfish downstream;
• Adopt a standard that prohibits the discharge of fracking wastewater contaminants.
• DO IT NOW!

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities. Federal law requires states to review water quality standards every three years— North Carolina last did this in 2006. These laws do no good if you ignore or deny their urgency ... PLUS IT'S THE LAW! Do you job NOW and do not forget, YOU work for US ... We The People ... NOT for selfish, greedy corporate monopolies and the planet's worst fossil fuel polluters.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Barry Anderson

111 W Oregon Ave
Kill Devil Hills, NC 27948

From: Melissa Griffin
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen and update NC"s water quality standards
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 3:28:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Melissa Griffin

7001 Orchard Knoll Dr
Apex, NC 27539

From: Eric Luling
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen and update North Caolina"s clean water standards
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2014 10:21:17 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Eric Luling

23 Warwick Rd
Asheville, NC 22803

From: William Beam
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen and update our clean water standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:49:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

William Beam

1104 Millcreek Ct
East Bend, NC 27018

From: Michael Gellar
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: strengthen and update our clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:50:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael Gellar

1613 Grace Street
Yellow House
Charlotte, NC 28205

From: Stephen Boletchek
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen and update our clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:29:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Stephen Boletchek

1106 Elbury Drive
Apex, NC 27502

From: Grover McCoury
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen and update our clean water standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 6:02:34 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Grover McCoury

148 Wintergreen Lane
Boone, NC 28607

From: D & G Altman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen and Update our Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:58:15 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

D & G Altman

PO Box 643
Murphy, NC 28906

From: phyllis koerv
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: strengthen and update our clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:50:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

phyllis koerv

701 copperline dr
unit 204
chapel hill, NC 27516

From: Lois Heintz
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: strengthen Cater Quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:44:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lois Heintz

8B Bent Grass Crt
Black Mountain, NC 28711

From: Peter Jackson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen clean water protection
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:37:23 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Peter Jackson

157 shadowrun road
hendersonville, NC 28792

From: linda santell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Clean Water Standards
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 8:05:03 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

linda santell

310 maple avenue
reidsville, NC 27320

From: Angela Pack
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:36:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Angela Pack

2218 Kensington station PKWY
Charlotte, NC 28210

From: Todd Patton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Clean Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:21:59 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Here are a few ways we can improve our water quality standards1:

- Upgrade our standards for toxic heavy metals, something our neighboring states did years ago;
- Reject an EMC proposal to let toxic metals exceed standards until aquatic life dies;
- Tighten the standard for a type of herbicide that causes blood cancers and reproductive problems and has been found in rising amounts in surface drinking water sources;
- Adopt criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus, which can cause algal blooms and fish kills, and can threaten the safety of drinking water;
- Adopt a standard for methylmercury in fish, a form of mercury that is closely tied to many serious health problems, including learning disabilities, birth defects, and heart disease;
- Adopt a standard for ammonia pollution, which is discharged by some wastewater treatment plants and can kill fish and shellfish downstream;
- Adopt a standard that prohibits the discharge of fracking wastewater contaminants.

It’s way past time for North Carolina to strengthen and update our clean water standards.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Todd Patton

4512 Bracada Dr
Durham, NC 27705

From: Mary Ellen Griffin
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:35:26 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary Ellen Griffin

228 Kilowatt Lane
Sylva, NC 28779

From: Marty Gooch
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen clean water standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:54:45 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Marty Gooch

1529 Jenkins Road
Wake Forest, NC 27587

From: may moore
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: strengthen clean water standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:19:32 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

may moore

27 yaupon way
oak island
oak island, NC 28465

From: danna mclintock
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Clean Water Standards
Date: Saturday, August 16, 2014 3:55:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

danna mclintock

920 tumbling fork road
Waynesville, NC 28785

From: Michela Rebuli
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen NC clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:26:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michela Rebuli

605 Donald Ross Dr
Pinehurst, NC 28374

From: Donald Harland
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen NC Water Quality Standards
Date: Sunday, August 24, 2014 7:46:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donald Harland

PO Box 2080
Candler, NC 28715

From: Mark Norton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen NC Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:16:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mark Norton

15310 Superior St
Charlotte, NC 28273

From: Jody Ford
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen NC water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:33:36 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jody Ford

101 Belles Way
New Bern, NC 28562

From: Chris Weeks
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen NC water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:37:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Chris Weeks

608 Timothy Drive
ElizabethCity, NC 27909

From: Robert Schwartz
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen NC Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:16:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert Schwartz

748 Oaklawn Avenue
Winston-Salem, NC 27104

From: Tony McCarson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen NC"s clean water!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 12:16:21 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tony McCarson

3608 Long Ridge Rd
Durham, NC 27703

From: joe zinich
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:20:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

joe zinich

306 mountain laurel
Asheville, NC 28805

From: Siddharth Sharma
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our current water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:26:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Siddharth Sharma

9031 JMKEYNES DRIVE
Charlotte, NC 28262

From: Willard Fullam
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our current water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:47:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Willard Fullam

5912 Haddington Drive
Charlotte, NC 28215

From: cheryl flournoy hustvedt
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our water quality standards in NC
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 5:37:24 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

cheryl flournoy hustvedt

2710 stuart drive
durham, NC 27797

From: Janet Tice
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our water quality standards in NC
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:47:45 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Janet Tice

310 Umstead
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: Karen Greenhalge
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Our Water Quality Standards!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:30:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Karen Greenhalge

246 Calhoun Ridge Drive
Waynesville, NC 28786

From: Charles Stopford
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our water quality standards!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:54:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Charles Stopford

3321 New Sharon Church Rd
Hillsborough, NC 27278

From: Leigh Clodfelter
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Our Water Quality Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:47:22 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Leigh Clodfelter

3923 Fountain Village Lane
High Point, NC 27265

From: Donna Bullock
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:54:49 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donna Bullock

6112 Sabine Dr
Fayetteville, NC 28303

From: Daniel Konzelman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:53:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Daniel Konzelman

34 Tappan Street
Spruce Pine, NC 28777

From: deborah hines
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:59:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

deborah hines

6714 Roberta Road
Ocean Isle Beach, NC 28469

From: Claiborne Smisson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Our Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:00:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Claiborne Smisson

P. O. Box 12253
Raleigh, NC 27605

From: tonia crumpton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:43:35 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

tonia crumpton

123 Flora McDonald Lane
cary, NC 27511

From: Ernest Roberts
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Our Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:42:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ernest Roberts

3541 Springsweet Lane
Apt 33
Raleigh, NC 27612

From: Al Jones
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:34 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Al Jones

4716 Ludwell Branch Court
Raleigh, NC 27612

From: Gavin Dillard
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:16:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gavin Dillard

528 Padgettown road
Black mountain, NC 28711

From: Cody Jones
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 12:07:52 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cody Jones

262 Hicks Chapel Loop
Marion, NC 28752

From: Janice Siebert
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Our Water Quality Standards
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2014 6:27:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Janice Siebert

10 Indigo Lake Ter
GREENSBORO, NC 27455

From: Marc Pendergast
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:53:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Marc Pendergast

203 Glenview Pl
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: Renee McGuire
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our water quality standards.
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 5:31:51 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Renee McGuire

2001 G Fall Dr
Wilmington, NC 28401

From: Anne Lanzi
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 10:59:02 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anne Lanzi

155 Michigan Ave
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Carol Bentley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Our Water Quality Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:52:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Bentley

2232 Shade Valley Road
Apt A
Charolotte, NC 28205

From: James Walsh
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:24:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James Walsh

P. O. Box 246
Morganton, NC 28680

From: Bill Groves
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: strengthen our water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:19:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bill Groves

738 Middle Skeenah Rd
Franklin, NC 28734

From: JW Vogel
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Our Water Quality Standars
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:29:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JW Vogel

103 B White St
Charlotte, NC 28205

From: arneeta scott
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: strengthen our water quality
Date: Saturday, August 16, 2014 2:30:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

arneeta scott

11cypress dr
asheville, NC 28803

From: Colleen Payne
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen our water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:18:28 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Colleen Payne

131 Skipwyth Court
Cary, NC 27513

From: Jana Murray
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Standards, Disallow Fracking
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:16:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jana Murray

P.O. Box 261
Rodanthe, NC 27968

From: C. Warren Pope
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Water Purity Standards in NC
Date: Monday, August 18, 2014 5:33:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

C. Warren Pope

12 Mountain Site Ln. Ext
Asheville, NC 28803

From: Anne Markey Jones
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Water Quality Standards!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:49:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anne Markey Jones

158 Buckingham Road
Winston Salem, NC 27104

From: Thomas Higgins
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Water Quality Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:49:56 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thomas Higgins

1909 E. Chapman Ct
Hillsborough, NC 27278

From: Clay Denman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:17:28 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Clay Denman

7829 Timber Glow Trl
Knoxville, TN 37938

From: David Fouche
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:28:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Fouche

155 Euclid Street
Winston Salem, NC 27106

From: brittney bergstrom
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Water Quality Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:58:33 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

brittney bergstrom

6312 Oakbrook Cir
Raleigh, NC 27609

From: Peter Crow
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:19:19 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Peter Crow

1401 Kershaw Dr
Raleigh, NC 27609

From: Julia Martin
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:12:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

No single substance is more vital to our survival than water, yet we aren't doing enough to protect this precious resource.North Carolina must strengthen its water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

We have seen what can happen. We have seen people waiting in line for bottled water as they would in a Third World country. We have heard the warnings that although fish is theoretically good for you, be careful what kind you eat, and how often.

The time is past to ask you to protect our future. There is no future. There is only now.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Julia Martin

295 Hazel Mill Road
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Abby Bishop
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:08:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Abby Bishop

2123 Fairview Rd
Raleigh, NC 27608

From: Art Smoker
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:26:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Art Smoker

284 Arrowood Corner Rd
0
Mars Hill, NC 28754

From: Pat Vescio
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:38:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Pat Vescio

Arvo lane
Cary, NC 27513

From: Katie Baird
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:21:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to express my support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are essential to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Katie Baird

45 S. French Broad Ave
Asheville, NC 28801

From: Nancy Gonzalez
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:30:17 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nancy Gonzalez

119 Dawnwood Ln
Statesville, NC 28677

From: Carol Soroos
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:21:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Soroos

2876 Wycliff Road
Raleigh, NC 27607

From: Lysandra Joseph
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:15:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lysandra Joseph

109 Smokemont Drive
Cary, NC 27513

From: George Phillips
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:49:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

George Phillips

124 Fidelity St, Apt 36
Carrboro, NC 27510

From: Shari Stratton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen water quality standards.
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:40:49 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Shari Stratton

11526 Dartington Ridge Ln
Charlotte, NC 28262

From: Frank Lorch
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: strengthen water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:55:16 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Frank Lorch

1522 Lynway Dr
Charlotte, NC 28203

From: Regina Krzesicki
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 6:49:09 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Regina Krzesicki

10111 buggy horse road
Charlotte, NC 28277

From: Wendy Kobylarz-Chouvarda
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Water Quality Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 4:23:39 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

This is going to be especially critical in light of NC's recent decision to allow fracking.

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Wendy Kobylarz-Chouvarda

1 Hurst Drive
Candler, NC 28715

From: Adam Versenyi
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:36:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Adam Versenyi

205 Oleander Road
Carrboro, NC 27510

From: Miriam Youngquist-Thurow
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen water quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:54:34 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Miriam Youngquist-Thurow

6209 Thurlow Court
Holly Springs, NC 27540

From: Donna Bowman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:38:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donna Bowman

68 Cedar Forest Loop
Hickory, NC 28601

From: Traci Hamilton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: strengthen water squality tandards
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 9:28:21 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Traci Hamilton

6138 Candlewood Drive
Charlotte, NC 28210

From: Anne White
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen Water Standards!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:36:43 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anne White

45 Libbey Lane
Mills River, NC 28759

From: Willis Strickland
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: strengthen water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:23:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Willis Strickland

120 Riding Lane
Southern Pines, NC 28387

From: Sally and Chris MacMillan
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthen WaterQuality Standards
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 12:51:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sally and Chris MacMillan

414 Pocono Court
Arden, NC 28704

From: Kevin Wilson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthening Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:17:37 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Wilson

3767 Howard Ave
Tarboro, NC 27886

From: Keith Cutler
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthening Our Water quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:29:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Keith Cutler

524 Tryst Lane
Wake Forest, NC 27587

From: Lesia Mills
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthening Our Water Quallity Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:17:08 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. The current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.
Here are more ways we can improve our water quality standards:

1. Reject an EMC proposal to let toxic metals exceed standards until aquatic life dies;
2. Tighten the standard for a type of herbicide that causes blood cancers and reproductive problems and has been found in rising amounts in surface drinking water sources;
3. Adopt criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus, which can cause algal blooms and fish kills, and can threaten the safety of drinking water;
4. Adopt a standard for methyl mercury in fish, a form of mercury that is closely tied to many serious health problems, including learning disabilities, birth defects, and heart disease;
5. Adopt a standard for ammonia pollution, which is discharged by some wastewater treatment plants and can kill fish and shellfish downstream;
6. Adopt a standard that prohibits the discharge of fracking waste-water contaminants.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities. With out clean safe water and a healthy environment we will not be able to survive, nor will our NC wildlife.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lesia Mills

PO Box 1183
Clayton, NC 27528

From: Kimberly Wiley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthening the Water Quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:04:16 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Wiley

72 Chimney Hill Rd
Rochester, NY 14612

From: Jude Casseday
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthening Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:08:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Even though this effort is a bit like rearranging the deck chairs while the Titanic sinks, I would like to see our state leaders demonstrate some concern regarding this most necessary resource: clean water. Please strengthen our current water quality standards. If fracking comes to North Carolina, many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants. How appalling it is that businesses and individuals will dump whatever they feel like into the water unless there is a regulation forbidding it. Even then, they probably will go ahead and do it until they get caught. So, while this is a gesture at best, we need to go on record that we tried to provide clean wayer for our own and for future generations.
Please prohibit fracking contaminants from our drinking water. Thank you!

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jude Casseday

6 Bair Circle
Durham, NC 27804

From: Melanie Porter
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthening Water Quality Standards
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 11:15:21 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Melanie Porter

17020 Northstar Drive
Huntersville, NC 28078

From: Leigh & Pamela Dunston
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthing Clean Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:59:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Leigh & Pamela Dunston

1922 Main St
Blowing Rock, NC 28605

From: Jules Fraytet
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strengthne clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:15:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jules Fraytet

401 Hawthorne Lane STE 110
Charlotte, NC 28204

From: Allen Spalt
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strenthem Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:52:31 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

With water quality and quantity two of the biggest issues for our future, it is imperative that NC have the strongest possible clean water standards.

Thank you. I will be following this action closely

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Allen Spalt

300 James St
Carrboro, NC 27510

From: Debbie Bromfield
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strenthen Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:23:32 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Debbie Bromfield

6835 Squirrels Foot Ct
Charlotte, NC 28217

From: Herman Lankford
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: strong clean water safeguards
Date: Monday, August 18, 2014 2:22:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Herman Lankford

175 Britten Cove Rd
Weaverville, NC 28787

From: Michelle Lee
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strong Clean Water Standards for North Carolina
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:26:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michelle Lee

6746 Vlosi Dr
Charlotte, NC 28226

From: Betsey Granda
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strong Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:08:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Betsey Granda

112 Circadian Way
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: Brett Dillingham
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: STRONG CLEAN WATER STANDARDS
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 5:16:00 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brett Dillingham

707 Village Creek Drive
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Johnny Dillard
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strong Standards for Clean Water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:45:47 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Johnny Dillard

1147 Laurelwood Place
Lenoir, NC 28645

From: Karen Nehlsen
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Strong Water Quality Standards for NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:37:30 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Karen Nehlsen

1804 Ashton Drive
Greensboro, NC 27410

From: kurt irmiter
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: stronger clean water rules
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:42:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

kurt irmiter

19 salm rd
Weaverville, NC 28787

From: Madeleine Pabis
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Stronger Clean Water Standards Needed ASAP
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:14:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Madeleine Pabis

100 E. Ellerbee Street
Durham, NC 27704

From: Martha Kennedy
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Stronger water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:56:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Martha Kennedy

174 Crepe Myrtle Cir
Winston-Salem, NC 27106

From: Cama Merritt
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Stronger water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:43:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. We are having too many fish kills and algal blooms.

I urge you to adopt: (1) the proposed metals standards, (2) adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus, (3) adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children, (4) and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. I want clean water for me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cama Merritt

1244 Arbor Road #224
Winston-Salem, NC 27104

From: Gary Simpson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Stronger water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:07:15 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am concerned about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

I also suggest that as a state we:

- Upgrade our standards for toxic heavy metals, something our neighboring states did years ago;
- Reject an EMC proposal to let toxic metals exceed standards until aquatic life dies;
- Tighten the standard for a type of herbicide that causes blood cancers and reproductive problems and has been found in rising amounts in surface drinking water sources;
- Adopt criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus, which can cause algal blooms and fish kills, and can threaten the safety of drinking water;
- Adopt a standard for methylmercury in fish, a form of mercury that is closely tied to many serious health problems, including learning disabilities, birth defects, and heart disease;
- Adopt a standard for ammonia pollution, which is discharged by some wastewater treatment plants and can kill fish and shellfish downstream;

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gary Simpson

82 Cynthia Lane
Pittsboro, NC 27312

From: Peter Stein
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: stronger water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:58:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Peter Stein

302 Columbia Place East
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: Celeste Irizarry
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Stuff That Is Important
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 5:43:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Celeste Irizarry

4306 Hepatica Court
Greensboro, NC 27358

From: Lewise Busch
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Support clean water standards for NC
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:54:27 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue. It is also very important to ban fracking wastewater contaminants.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lewise Busch

750 Weaver Dairy Rd. 1223
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: keith levene
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Support Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:14:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

keith levene

405 carolina circle
Durham, NC 27707

From: Erik Minges
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Support Clean Water
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 3:53:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Erik Minges

1620 Crest rd
Raleigh, NC 27606

From: Valerie Anderson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: SUPPORT STRONG CLEAN WATER STANDARDS FOR NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:37:26 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Valerie Anderson

3 Billy Cove Rd
Candler, NC 28715

From: Mary Gallagher
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Support Strong Clean Water Standards for NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:04:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary Gallagher

308 Bahama Loop
Fayetteville, NC 28314

From: Kenna Sommer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Support strong clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:41:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kenna Sommer

74 Crestmont Ave
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Lori Campbell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Supporting clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:58:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

I am also interested in making sure my voice is heard related to supporting strong water pollution standards upstream of Jordan Lake (which is where Cary gets its water). I think the sooner we apply water pollution mitigation strategies, the better, even with the devices that have been recently installed in the lake. Mitigation strategies must be implemented alongside the devices to maximize water quality for those of us downstream of Greensboro and Burlingame politicians (who get their water from another source).

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lori Campbell

P.O. Box 5307
Cary, NC 27512

From: Joseph Shea
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Take a Stand for Public Health in NC!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:41:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joseph Shea

1 buttons rd
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: dave schwartz
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Thanks for your time
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:08:35 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

dave schwartz

126 oxford rd
greenville, NC 27858

From: myra dotson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: The Pollution our waters contain is illegal under the Clean Water Act!!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:08:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

myra dotson

8418 orange grove road
chapel hill, NC 27516

From: Ann Houston
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: This is OUR water too!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:55:19 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I do not understand how anyone thinks it is advisable to inject chemicals - with vast amounts of water - into our unseen & uncharted aquifers, not to mention into our above-ground waterways. I am baffled & horrified by what corporations will do, simply for profit.

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ann Houston

107 N. Hillsborough Ave
Hillsborough, NC 27278

From: Tom Gingrich
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: This Tarheel is for Clean NC Water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:28:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tom Gingrich

9 Spinet St
Asheville, NC 28806

From: sarah faulkner
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Tighten Standards to protect our water
Date: Saturday, August 23, 2014 8:05:15 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

sarah faulkner

banks creek
Burnsville, NC 28714

From: Jim Smith
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Time to update our water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:09:16 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jim Smith

4620 Mial Plantation Rd
Raleigh, NC 27610

From: Nancy Yarosis
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Tired of letting dirty fuel company"s getting away with poisoning people
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:20:22 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nancy Yarosis

2375 Godwin Lake Rd
Benson, NC 27504

From: Timothy Plonk
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: To work it and to keep it.
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:49:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Timothy Plonk

301 Morrison avenue
Raleigh, NC 27608

From: Ben Conley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Tougher Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:32:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ben Conley

309 Garrou Avenue
Apt/Suite
Valdese, NC 28690

From: Rachael Wooten
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Toxic fracking wastewater will wreak havoc on our water supply
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:30:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rachael Wooten

2721 Kittrell Dr
Raleigh, NC 27608

From: Harvey Mitchell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: toxic verses clean water
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:49:50 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.
Upgrade our standards for toxic heavy metals, something our neighboring states did years ago; The coal ash spill in the Dan River was preventable an therefore inexcusable. The same issue exists with the two coal ash ponds at the Asheville Power Plant. Please help prevent a repeat of this inexcusable accident.
Reject an EMC proposal to let toxic metals exceed standards until aquatic life dies;
Tighten the standard for a type of herbicide that causes blood cancers and reproductive problems and has been found in rising amounts in surface drinking water sources;
Adopt criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus, which can cause algal blooms and fish kills, and can threaten the safety of drinking water;
Adopt a standard for methylmercury in fish, a form of mercury that is closely tied to many serious health problems, including learning disabilities, birth defects, and heart disease;
Adopt a standard for ammonia pollution, which is discharged by some wastewater treatment plants and can kill fish and shellfish downstream;

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Harvey Mitchell

200 Patton Mountain Road
Asheville, NC 28804

From: MARTHA W GIROLAMI
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Reveiw.
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2014 1:06:07 PM
Attachments: Triennial Reveiw..pdf

Sent from my iPad

From: John Calhoun
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comment
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:06:31 PM

Aug 21, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

It is far past time for N.C. to update it's regulation of toxic metals and chemicals in our water sources. We count on your agency to protect Water Quality and to comply with the Clean Water Act, yet NC DENR has lagged behind other states in adopting standards protecting our water. Especially, methylmercury levels need to be monitored and regulated to the national standard or better. Obviously nitrogen and phosphorus numerical levels need to be monitored and standards set. Our state depends on tourism and recreational uses for our rivers and streams. It is absolutely imperative that there be standards to maintain minimum water quantity and flow in rivers and streams. We will face water shortages again, especially as our population grows, so maintaining minimum stream flows is crucial.

It is time for NC DENR to work cooperatively with updating standards for water quality, not delaying or trying to thwart good-faith efforts to update standards and protect our water sources!

Sincerely,

Mr. John Calhoun
1416 Brookstown Ave
Winston Salem, NC 27101-1127
(336) 777-8315

From: Tony Misner
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comment
Date: Monday, July 14, 2014 4:22:03 AM

Jul 14, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please consider this statement

Sincerely,

Mr. Tony Misner
PO Box 553
Andover, NJ 07821-0553

From: Peter Raabe
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Cc: Grady McCallie (grady@ncconservationnetwork.org)
Subject: Triennial Review Comments from NC Conservation Network and American Rivers
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 11:25:06 AM
Attachments: image001.png
AR - NCCN triennial review comments.docx

Please find attached the comments submitted on behalf of NC Conservation Network and American Rivers.

Thank you for your time and efforts on this package of protections for water quality.

Peter

Peter Raabe | NC Conservation Director
331 West Main Street |Suite 304 | Durham, NC 27701
Office: 919-682-3500 |Cell: 202-441-6174 | praabe@americanrivers.org

American Rivers | Rivers Connect Us
Facebook.com/AmericanRivers | Twitter.com/AmericanRivers
www.americanrivers.org

Keep up on the latest river news and info: www.americanrivers.org/updates

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

From: Celia Forno
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 12:26:26 PM

Jul 17, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Celia Forno
3308 Auckland Ct
Fayetteville, NC 28306-7505
(520) 240-2514

From: Marilyn Constine
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 11:55:48 AM

Jul 17, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Constine
337 Lake Knoll Ct
Lewisville, NC 27023-9814
(336) 946-0200

From: Kathryn Pezzi
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 10:55:35 AM

Jul 17, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Pezzi
96 Pine Lake Dr
Whispering Pines, NC 28327-9373
(910) 688-7017

From: Sandra Core
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 10:54:58 AM

Jul 17, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Sandra Core
945 S Shore Dr
Southport, NC 28461-8815
(910) 279-3381

From: Amy Hartzog
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 10:25:39 AM

Jul 17, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Amy Hartzog
429 E Hemlock St
Yadkinville, NC 27055-7766
(336) 679-4750

From: Jewell Spataro
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 9:55:29 AM

Jul 17, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Jewell Spataro
162 Water Tower Dr
Forest City, NC 28043-7064

From: Melissa Ayers
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 9:54:51 AM

Jul 17, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Melissa Ayers
345 Johns Rd
Lexington, NC 27295-7037

From: Kimberly Hurtt
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 9:54:29 AM

Jul 17, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thank you.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Hurtt
1325 Harvard Park Way Apt 101
Garner, NC 27529-5222
(919) 763-2596

From: Joe Bearden
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 9:25:29 AM

Jul 17, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Joe Bearden
1809 Lakepark Dr
Raleigh, NC 27612-6516
(919) 844-9050

From: Deb Killinger
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 9:24:48 AM

Jul 17, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Deb Killinger
706 Bryan Ave
Hendersonville, NC 28739-5128

From: Nancee Neel
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 7:54:40 AM

Jul 17, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Nancee Neel
3 Raven Rock Dr
Asheville, NC 28806
(205) 616-8751

From: Joan Dulberg
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 12:24:30 AM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Joan Dulberg
555 Pine Ridge Pl
Raleigh, NC 27609-4644
(919) 781-8944

From: Toni Sorter
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 11:25:30 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Toni Sorter
PO Box 2
Denver, NC 28037-0002

From: Adrian Smith
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 10:55:48 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Adrian Smith
PO Box 265
Moncure, NC 27559-0265
(919) 542-3807

From: Jane Jewell
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 9:53:22 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Jane Jewell
3953 Westridge Meadow Cir
Clemmons, NC 27012-8609

From: Diane Blanks
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 9:26:24 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I strongly encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Diane Blanks
357 Green St
Boone, NC 28607-3490
(828) 386-4002

From: Robin Kersey
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 9:26:15 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Robin Kersey
2280 McGill Dr
Fayetteville, NC 28305-5144
(910) 860-1612

From: Mary Lou & George Buck
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 9:24:42 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou & George Buck
3406 Mar Vista Cir
Charlotte, NC 28209-1513
(704) 525-2293

From: Jerry Nelon
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 9:24:17 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Jerry Nelon
409 Fairway Dr
Lake Lure, NC 28746-9857

From: Chris Berg
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 8:54:41 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to fouled water inhospitable to oxygen sensitive biota. Fish, larval insects of indicator types such as caddis-fly, stone-fly and mayfly familes, gestating amphibians and many other forms of wildlife are threatened, and water quality is adversely affected by these nutrients when present at over-concentrated levels compared to natural background.

Secondly, please adopt protections for in-stream flow, governing rates of intentional withdrawal, this year: so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes .

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methyl mercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methyl mercury can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and poses risks to human adults. North Carolina does not directly regulate methyl mercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methyl mercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Chris Berg
6 Rosemary Trl
Flat Rock, NC 28731-9532
(864) 414-4113

From: Shoshana Serxner-Merchant
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 8:26:39 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Shoshana Serxner-Merchant
705 Dixie Trl
Raleigh, NC 27607-4154
(919) 834-9406

From: Julia Hartman
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 8:24:28 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Julia Hartman
70 Dalmatian Trl
Alexander, NC 28701-9210
(828) 658-9444

From: Lynne C
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 8:23:44 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Lynne C
5012 Lipscomb Dr
Garner, NC 27529-9641
(919) 553-8612

From: Fred Stanbeck
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 7:56:02 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Fred Stanbeck
220 Stonewall Rd
Salisbury, NC 28144-2860
(704) 633-3022

From: Fred Stanbeck
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 7:55:51 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Fred Stanbeck
220 Stonewall Rd
Salisbury, NC 28144-2860
(704) 633-3022

From: Patricia Fleming
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 7:53:30 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Patricia Fleming
4203 W South Ridge Rd
Nags Head, NC 27959-9156
(252) 441-7652

From: Dean Brodhag
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 7:23:45 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Dean Brodhag
1025 Regency Dr
Charlotte, NC 28211-4778
(704) 661-7547

From: Martha Spencer
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 6:57:48 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Martha Spencer
988 Henry Mountain Rd
Brevard, NC 28712-6762
(828) 885-2680

From: Patricia Carstensen
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 6:56:14 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Patricia Carstensen
58 Newton Dr
Durham, NC 27707-9744
(919) 490-1566

From: Morgan Crawford
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 6:24:52 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Morgan Crawford
3101 Sun Dr
Raleigh, NC 27614-9225
(919) 463-0601

From: David Shelton
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 6:23:34 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal. Not to do so would be to ignore the devastating toxic effects of pollutants in our waterways and the associated effects on our citizens' health and well being. This must not be tolerated, and those who want to pollute must accept responsibility and pay the price.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

David Shelton
329 Grady McNeilly Rd
Casar, NC 28020-8749
(704) 538-9133

From: James Coffey
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:57:50 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

James Coffey
17 Hickory Court Ln
Hendersonville, NC 28792-1229
(828) 692-3375

From: Susan & Larry Powell
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:56:56 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Susan & Larry Powell
701 W Trinity Ave Apt 108
Durham, NC 27701-1869
(919) 960-4425

From: Doris Whitfield
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:56:14 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards so our lakes and streams are clean for communities to use and drink and the fish are preserved, not killed.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Doris Whitfield
109 Renwick Ct
Raleigh, NC 27615-2946
(919) 518-0426

From: Adam Versenyi
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:54:47 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Adam Versenyi
205 Oleander Rd
Carrboro, NC 27510-1939
(919) 968-3493

From: Christi Dillon
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:53:27 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Christi Dillon
175 Forest Ridge Rd
Mooresville, NC 28117-6519
(704) 230-1152

From: Tiffany Erichsen
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:53:27 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Erichsen
2236 Lynnwood Dr
Wilmington, NC 28403-8044
(910) 251-8744

From: Elissa Engelbourg
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:29:22 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Elissa Engelbourg
307 Mosley Ct # 202
Rocky Mount, NC 27804-6520

From: Dorothy Campbell
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:26:44 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Campbell
1115 Scaleybark Rd Apt B
Charlotte, NC 28209-4588
(802) 345-2531

From: Steven Linden
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:26:04 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Steven Linden
501 Burge Mountain Rd
Hendersonville, NC 28792-8225
(828) 698-3234

From: Lois Heintz
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:25:08 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Lois Heintz
8b Bent Grass Ct
Black Mountain, NC 28711-7400

From: Elena Carleo
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:23:28 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Elena Carleo
393 Crestview Church Rd
Asheboro, NC 27205-0714
(336) 736-8339

From: Phyllis Swank
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 4:56:55 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Swank
750 Weaver Dairy Rd Apt 1212
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-1434
(919) 918-3405

From: David Galloway
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 4:56:46 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

David Galloway
3705 Highgate Dr Apt G
Durham, NC 27713-9126
(919) 495-1107

From: Devon Seltzer
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 4:56:02 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Devon Seltzer
5856 Old Oak Ridge Rd
Apt 917
Greensboro, NC 27410-8424
(336) 543-4766

From: Roger Chellew
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 4:55:15 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Roger Chellew
104 Elmwood Ln
Clayton, NC 27520-4302
(919) 359-2960

From: Vic Cabaroc
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 4:53:48 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Vic Cabaroc
504 Tilden St
Raleigh, NC 27605-1524

From: Danna & Dave Mclintock
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 4:53:36 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Danna & Dave Mclintock
920 Tumbling Fork Rd
Waynesville, NC 28785-6010
(904) 388-3188

From: Michael Gellar
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 4:52:49 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Michael Gellar
1613 Grace St
Charlotte, NC 28205-2329
(704) 421-5390

From: Alison Woomert
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 4:25:04 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Alison Woomert
2604 Jefferson Choice
Chapel Hill, NC 27516-9748
(919) 966-8301

From: Barbara Harvey
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 4:23:48 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Barbara Harvey
102 Ayr Ct
Cary, NC 27511-6402
(919) 388-7618

From: Ann Lane
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 3:57:03 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Ann Lane
932 Logan Cir
Cary, NC 27511-5146
(919) 460-7799

From: Jan Ochs
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 3:56:48 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Jan Ochs
90 Forest Ln
Pinehurst, NC 28374-9729

From: Kim Fanelly
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 3:55:49 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Kim Fanelly
9928 Blackbird Hill Ln
Mint Hill, NC 28227-5582
(704) 545-6506

From: Wendy Stevens
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 3:54:52 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Wendy Stevens
7024 Hidden Creek Dr
Charlotte, NC 28214-8842
(704) 479-1855

From: David Williams
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 3:54:26 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

David Williams
12 Willoughby Run Dr
Asheville, NC 28803-2168
(828) 687-2835

From: Robert Obeid
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 3:53:58 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Robert Obeid
477 George McKinney Rd
Bakersville, NC 28705-8035

From: Rhonda Ferotti
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 3:53:35 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Ferotti
PO Box 706
Flat Rock, NC 28731-0706
(910) 578-8215

From: Laura Glover
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 3:53:17 PM

Jul 16, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Laura Glover
Foxwood Ln
Wilmington, NC 28409-3979
(910) 616-6718

From: Marijean Dornback
To: Brower, Connie
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 1:30:23 PM

Jul 17, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Marijean Dornback
408 Horatio Ct
Cary, NC 27519-9383
(919) 913-5126

From: Debbie Burroughs
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2014 2:01:24 PM

Jul 17, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Debbie Burroughs
111 Hobbs Acre Dr
Edenton, NC 27932-9203
(252) 482-7769

From: Susan Lindenberger
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 10:49:53 PM

Jul 22, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Fourth, I urge you to strengthen the requirements to remove coal ash before it can enter ground or standing water. Coal ash contains toxic heavy metals and is injurious to humans and wildlife.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Susan Lindenberger
222 Grandfather Ave
Blowing Rock, NC 28605-6114

From: Gary Lavinder
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 10:20:36 PM

Jul 22, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Gary Lavinder
348 S Greenbriar Rd
Statesville, NC 28625-4720
(704) 872-3492

From: Doug Wingeier
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Monday, July 21, 2014 5:47:12 PM

Jul 21, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Doug Wingeier
266 Merrimon Ave
Asheville, NC 28801-1218

From: John Robins
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Monday, July 21, 2014 1:41:40 PM

Jul 21, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

John Robins
124 Concord St
Greensboro, NC 27406-3615
(336) 274-0214

From: Cashin Hunt
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Monday, July 21, 2014 9:11:43 AM

Jul 21, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Cashin Hunt
2333 Rosewood Ave
Winston Salem, NC 27103-3638

From: Sam Leeper
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Sunday, July 20, 2014 5:09:37 PM

Jul 20, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Sam Leeper
409 Carlyle Way
Asheville, NC 28803-1239
(828) 337-3935

From: Darlene Hamilton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Sunday, July 20, 2014 5:09:24 PM

Jul 20, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Darlene Hamilton
1605 Beacon Valley Dr
Raleigh, NC 27604-8488
(919) 463-1942

From: howard Cohen
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Sunday, July 20, 2014 2:38:55 PM

Jul 20, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

howard Cohen
1116 Charter Pl
Charlotte, NC 28211-5620
(704) 365-5245

From: Bill Gupton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Sunday, July 20, 2014 10:09:10 AM

Jul 20, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Bill Gupton
6725 Morganford Rd
Charlotte, NC 28211-5406
(704) 367-0068

From: Cathy Holt
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Saturday, July 19, 2014 10:37:18 PM

Jul 19, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Cathy Holt
386 Kenilworth Rd
Asheville, NC 28805-1754
(828) 545-9681

From: Tom Clarke
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Saturday, July 19, 2014 12:37:36 PM

Jul 19, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Tom Clarke
2706 Stratford Dr
Greensboro, NC 27408-3326
(336) 288-1329

From: Holly Adkisson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Saturday, July 19, 2014 10:38:38 AM

Jul 19, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flow into our lakes and streams, algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water, and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for in-stream flow this year so that future generations will also be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercury can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and can cause adults risk as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and people who eat the fish. To help protect human health, North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit to meet or exceed the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Holly Adkisson
1511 Lansdale Dr
Apt A
Charlotte, NC 28205-5788
(704) 532-0108

From: Betty Lawrence
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Saturday, July 19, 2014 10:09:02 AM

Jul 19, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Betty Lawrence
142 Hillside St
Asheville, NC 28801-1206
(828) 254-9672

From: Dieter Graumann
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Saturday, July 19, 2014 8:35:54 AM

Jul 19, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Dieter Graumann
4015 Black Locust Ter
Greensboro, NC 27405-8230

From: Frances Huffman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 18, 2014 10:04:56 PM

Jul 18, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Frances Huffman
2400 Hoyt St
Winston Salem, NC 27103-4314
(336) 725-3432

From: Jin Adams Parker
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 18, 2014 3:34:42 PM

Jul 18, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Jin Adams Parker
1924 Old Kanuga Rd
Hendersonville, NC 28739-6765

From: June Linhart
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 18, 2014 8:33:46 AM

Jul 18, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

June Linhart
4501 Rivershyre Way
Raleigh, NC 27616-7412
(561) 945-4309

From: Michael Pennell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 18, 2014 1:45:47 AM

Jul 18, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Michael Pennell
3355 Rocky Rd
Lenoir, NC 28645-8550

From: Jennifer Harris
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 18, 2014 1:45:02 AM

Jul 18, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Harris
3829 Westridge Farm Ln
Clemmons, NC 27012-8688
(336) 766-7932

From: Beth Collom
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 18, 2014 1:38:47 AM

Jul 18, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Beth Collom
18202 Old Arbor Ct
Davidson, NC 28036-7872
(704) 237-3950

From: Martha Brimm
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 18, 2014 1:37:09 AM

Jul 18, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Martha Brimm
7 Surrey Ln
Durham, NC 27707-5172
(919) 493-1775

From: Andrea Crook
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 18, 2014 1:33:19 AM

Jul 18, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Andrea Crook
5579 Nix Rd
Fayetteville, NC 28314-1416
(910) 478-5092

From: Kenneth Schammel
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 18, 2014 1:31:33 AM

Jul 18, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Schammel
8911 Rosalyn Glen Rd
Cornelius, NC 28031-8075
(704) 895-5972

From: Andrea Poole
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 18, 2014 1:29:39 AM

Jul 18, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Andrea Poole
2174 Skyview Dr
Fayetteville, NC 28304-5124
(910) 000-0000

From: Lucy Kaplan
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 25, 2014 8:00:23 AM

Jul 25, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Lucy Kaplan
660 Chester Rd
Winston Salem, NC 27104-1704

From: Donald Harland
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 24, 2014 10:29:54 PM

Jul 24, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Donald Harland
PO Box 2080
Candler, NC 28715-2080
(828) 665-9247

From: Patrick Brown
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 24, 2014 5:59:11 PM

Jul 24, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

In light of the Dan River Coal Ash spill fiasco, these standards are really just the bare minimum that can be done to keep our water clear and clean. The people of North Carolina deserve nothing less than this.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Patrick Brown
2901 Saint Claire Rd
Winston Salem, NC 27106-5025
(336) 774-3978

From: Keely Jordan
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 24, 2014 4:59:35 PM

Jul 24, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Keely Jordan
420 Park Ridge Ln Apt G
Winston Salem, NC 27104-3561
(336) 283-9063

From: Gus Preschle
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, July 24, 2014 4:59:19 PM

Jul 24, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Gus Preschle
7711 Lasater Rd
Clemmons, NC 27012-8477

From: Christopher Ammon
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 25, 2014 9:30:25 AM

Jul 25, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Christopher Ammon
815 Woodside Park Ln
Durham, NC 27704-6046

From: Mary Goodkind
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Sunday, July 27, 2014 7:06:11 PM

Jul 27, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Mary Goodkind
23 Ridgefield Pl
Biltmore Forest, NC 28803-3019
(828) 772-8089

From: Tammy Hopman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 25, 2014 6:31:50 PM

Jul 25, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Tammy Hopman
120 Martin Ridge Rd
State Road, NC 28676-9225

From: Juliana Baxley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, July 25, 2014 12:01:02 PM

Jul 25, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Juliana Baxley
415 Pecan Dr
Selma, NC 27576-2366

From: Audrey Tillinghast
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Monday, July 28, 2014 10:38:40 AM

Jul 28, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Audrey Tillinghast
5337 Cucumber Branch Rd
Snow Camp, NC 27349-9565

From: D Provance
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Monday, July 28, 2014 6:38:11 PM

Jul 28, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

D Provance
2624 Sweetgum Dr
Apex, NC 27539-8851
(919) 303-4323

From: Jill Gooch
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, August 01, 2014 2:14:53 PM

Aug 1, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Jill Gooch
1208 Oakview Dr
Greenville, NC 27858-5229
(252) 756-7987

From: Adrienne Gardner
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 3:06:23 PM

Aug 15, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercuru can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Adrienne Gardner
154 Ridgeview Dr
Mount Airy, NC 27030-9297
(000) 000-0000

From: Joe Bearden
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:06:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joe Bearden

1809 Lakepark Drive
Raleigh, NC 27612

From: Heather Payne
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:36:08 PM

Aug 21, 2014

Connie Brower

Dear Brower,

Please accept the following comments on the proposed set of water standards that the state is currently considering as part of the state's "Triennial Review" required by the Clean Water Act.

I encourage you to make three additions to the current proposal.

First, I urge you to adopt nitrogen and phosphorus nutrient standards. When too much nitrogen and phosphorus flows into our lakes and streams - algal blooms result that can lead to stinky, bad-tasting water and can suffocate and kill fish.

Secondly, please adopt protections for instream flow this year so that future generations will be able to enjoy fishing, rafting and swimming in our state's rivers and lakes like we do today.

Third, I urge you to propose a limit for methylmercury, which is highly toxic to humans. Methylmercury can interfere with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and cause adults risk, as well. North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form that mercury takes in fish and most directly threatens the wildlife and the people who eat the fish. North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 milligram per kilogram of fish tissue to help protect human health.

Fourth, North Carolina should upgrade our standards for toxic heavy metals, which our sister states did long ago.

Fifth, I request you adopt a standard for ammonia pollution. This pollution can kill fish and shellfish downstream from the point of discharge.

Sixth, a standard should be adopted which prohibits the discharge of any fracking produced water, saltwater, or other fracking contaminants.

Additionally, I strongly reject any proposal that toxic metal should be allowed to exceed standards until aquatic life dies.

Thanks you and I hope you will make the additional changes listed above to ensure that North Carolinians get the protections they deserve.

Sincerely,

Heather Payne
1300 Mason Farm Rd
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-4604
(919) 933-0229

From: george
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:26:23 PM
Attachments: Triennial Review Water Quality Standards Revision Comments 2014.doc

---

Ms. Brower:
Please find attached recommendations related to the draft triennial review water quality standards.
We appreciate the opportunity to comment and look forward to the EMC's action on this important issue that is vital to protecting North Carolina's citizens and the environment.
Best regards,
George
George Matthis, President
River Guardian Foundation
http://www.riverguardfdn.org
https://www.facebook.com/RiverGuardianFoundation/
https://twitter.com/RiverGuardianFd

From: Brianna Van Stekelenburg
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Comments
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2014 4:16:30 PM
Attachments: TriennialReviewComments-Methylmercury-2.pdf

Hi Connie Brower,

My name is Brianna Van Stekelenburg. I am a Policy Analyst Intern with the NC Chapter of the Sierra Club. I gave comments at the Triennial Review public hearing in Raleigh, but I wanted to submit a written copy of them. I have attached them to this email.

Thank you,
Brianna Van Stekelenburg

From: Thomas F Duckwall
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review comments
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2014 9:00:18 PM

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments on the proposed changes to water quality standards.

I support the tighter rules for toxic metals by use of the hardness equations for Cu, Zn, Cd, Ni, Cr III, Ag and Pb and the use of standards for acute impacts (average of samples collected within an hour), but am disappointed that NH3 is omitted (rec. in 1999 for fresh water).

I am concerned about disposal of "produced" water from hydraulic fracturing operationsand strongly urge that allowable contaminant levels be zero or very low unless and until "safe levels" can be determined.

As a general principle I hold that cost considerations should be secondary to health concerns, and human health issues should be seen as dependent on aquatic health. Costs and other burdens of contamination (e.g. medical treatment) are often borne by families, and for those affected will far exceed the costs of regulation and prevention that would have been pro-rated among community members. We cannot afford to miss the chance to provide every citizen a fair opportunity for good health and a productive life.

I hope for a review of variances (color, temp.) in the near future, and that in the coming years "Triennial" Reviews will be truly that.

Tom Duckwall, 5 Holly Crest Ct., Greensboro NC 27410

From: Fred Jamison
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review of North Carolina Water Quality Standards
Date: Friday, July 18, 2014 8:17:47 PM

Dear Ms. Brown:

As a citizen, I am deeply concerned about the continuing contamination and degradation of water quality in North Carolina's lakes, rivers, and streams. It appears agricultural and industrial lobbying, state politics engineering regulatory delay and environmental neglect have worked to compromise the effectiveness of needed robust state efforts to protect and improve North Carolina water quality standards. I am speaking up for clean water, healthy rivers, and drinking water sources. My specific concerns are as follows:

- T**Toxic heavy metals**. North Carolina is the only state in the southeast that has not adopted toxic metals criteria recommended by EPA two decades ago. The current proposal would upgrade our water quality standards for metals – cadmium, chromium III, copper, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc - to match EPA's national recommendations and protect wildlife and human health. The proposed upgrade is a step in the right direction, but could do better. The toxicity of metals depends on the 'hardness' of water. In the mountains particularly, water hardness can be low, making metals more toxic, but the proposal does not address these conditions. I recommend: the state should tighten the metals standards as proposed, but should also tighten them further than proposed in vulnerable mountain streams with an especially low hardness.

- **Biological trump**. While the state has proposed to tighten and improve the standards for toxic metals, it has also proposed to let polluting industries routinely violate the standards as long as stream life appears to survive. This violates the Clean Water Act, as it only identifies damage *after* pollution has gone too far. I recommend: the state must abandon the 'biological trump.' Polluters should be held accountable when they violate water quality standards.

- **2,4-D (chlorophenoxy herbicide).** This herbicide is already widely applied, and genetic engineering of crops is predicted to significantly expand its use. When consumed by humans, 2,4-D can damage the liver, kidney, and adrenal glands. I recommend: the state has proposed to tighten its standard for 2,4-D in waters used as sources for drinking water and food-processing purposes; that change should be adopted into the final set of water quality standards.

Other Issues Needing To Be Addressed By The Triennial Review:

- **Fracking chemicals**. As a result of recent legislation, the state is on track to begin issuing permits for extraction of natural gas via fracking in 2015. The fracking process generates massive volumes of contaminated wastewater. North Carolina lacks water quality standards for hundreds of contaminants that can be in fracking wastewater; without such standards, the state has no effective way to limit pollutants in fracking wastewater discharged to rivers, lakes, and streams. The proper vehicle for adopting such standards is the triennial review, but the state has not proposed any standards for fracking contaminants. I recommend: the Environmental Management Commission should prohibit discharges of fracking

contaminants for which safe levels have not yet been scientifically determined.

- **Nutrients**. Excess nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorous) cause algal blooms (thick green muck that fouls clear water) and fish kills. EPA recently approved a multi-year state plan to study whether to adopt limits on nitrogen and phosphorus, but this process will not yield a limit for most of the state's water bodies for more than a decade, if at all. I recommend: North Carolina needs to address nutrient pollution, now, at the source, by adopting statewide nitrogen and phosphorus limits, if not in this triennial review then in the next.

- **Ammonia**. Released by wastewater treatment plants and other polluters, ammonia is sharply toxic to aquatic life, especially mussels. North Carolina has no water quality standard for ammonia, and the current package does not propose one. I recommend: the state should adopt EPA's nationally recommended standards for ammonia – formulas that take account of local temperature and water acidity (pH) – to protect life in North Carolina's streams and rivers.

- **Mercury**. Especially in the form of methylmercury, mercury is highly toxic to humans, interfering with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and placing adults at risk, too. However, North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form in which mercury accumulates in fish and most directly threatens wildlife and people who eat the fish. I recommend: North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 mg/kg of fish tissue to protect human health, while retaining its standard for inorganic mercury.

- **Flow**. If withdrawals leave too little water in a river or lake, that waterbody will not sustain healthy fish and wildlife. Worse, pollution discharged into a depleted river remains more concentrated, increasing the risks to people who use it downstream. Currently, North Carolina lacks explicit protections for flow in its water quality standards, and the state uses a weak method to set permit limits. I recommend: North Carolina should add adopt strong protections for water flow.

- **Variances**. When the state reviews its water quality standards, it must also review variances –permissions given to specific facilities to violate the standards. These include two chloride variances for pickle companies, Mt. Olive Pickle Company in Wayne County and Bay Valley Foods in Duplin County; a color variance for Evergreen Paper Products in Haywood County; and thermal variances for the cooling systems at a long list of electric power generating plants. I recommend: DENR should insist on all possible progress being made toward meeting water quality standards as a condition to granting continued variances for these permits.

Overall, **it is past time for North Carolina to upgrade our water quality standards**. It is good that the state is moving forward with metals standards, but the package is painfully limited. The state should go further now, and failing that, should prepare now for a much broader upgrade of state water quality standards next year.

Sincerely yours,

Fred C. Jamison

125 W. Pine Avenue

Wake Forest, NC 27587

From: Wrenne Kapornyai
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review of Stds Response
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2014 2:27:10 PM
Attachments: Triennial Review 2014 Response 08212014.docx

Good morning Ms. Brower:

Attached please find my response.

Thank you for all you do.

Wrenne

Mrs. Wrenne Kapornyai
Lab Supervisor
Pretreatment Coordinator
Franklin County
North Carolina
Member NC-PC
(919) 494-5850
wkapornyai@franklincountync.us

From: Bob Boulden
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Triennial Review Proposed Changes and Deletions
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 4:49:19 PM

To Whom It May Concern:

Please let me start by asking a rhetorical question. Are we, as NC legislators and regulatory experts, that much smarter than the equivalent at the Federal level, in particular the folks at the EPA? If we are, perhaps we should help the folks at the federal level and save everyone a lot of work, wasted time and money! But seriously, we are not. So why do we continuously waste time and taxpayers money "arguing" with the recommendations of the EPA? I have my opinion, but that is not important for this letter.

Do not delete existing water quality standards for total chromium, manganese and iron. As stated, they are naturally occurring, but when discharged to a receiving body of water they can and will upset the natural balance of the river or creek if discharged in a large enough volume.

Do not allow for "aquatic life biological integrity" - it only helps those who wish to pollute! Once a stream shows signs of stress, it may be too late to reverse the trend.

Do away with "Action Level" regulations pertaining to copper, silver, zinc and chloride. "Hard numeric values" are readily available and must be enforced.

Hydraulic fracturing has not been addressed at all in the Triennial Review. We all know that it is extremely water use intensive technology and we should be addressing the disposal of the millions and millions of gallons of waste water that will be contaminated with many chemicals that we currently do not address in the statutes already on the books in NC. Let's get "ahead of the ball" for a change and not suggest claiming "trade secret" information to allow companies to discharge without regulation.

In summary, I suggest you re-read the first paragraph! If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 252-402-5564. Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Respectfully,

Bob Boulden

From: TJ Cawley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards; a tjcawley
Subject: Triennial Review Public Hearing Comment
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2014 2:44:24 PM

As a husband, father, and homeowner here in Morrisville, Wake County, North Carolina I respectfully submit the following recommendations for inclusion in your upcoming Triennial Review and I hope that you do everything within your authority to preserve and protect our water quality for this and future generations.

• Toxic heavy metals. North Carolina is the only state in the southeast that has not adopted toxic metals criteria recommended by EPA two decades ago. The current proposal would upgrade our water quality standards for metals – cadmium, chromium III, copper, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc - to match EPA's national recommendations and protect wildlife and human health. The proposed upgrade is a step in the right direction, but could do better. The toxicity of metals depends on the 'hardness' of water. In the mountains particularly, water hardness can be low, making metals more toxic, but the proposal does not address these conditions.
I recommend: the state should tighten the metals standards as proposed, but should also tighten them further than proposed in vulnerable mountain streams with an especially low hardness.

• Biological trump. While the state has proposed to tighten and improve the standards for toxic metals, it has also proposed to let polluting industries routinely violate the standards as long as stream life appears to survive. This violates the Clean Water Act, as it only identifies damage after pollution has gone too far.
I recommend: the state must abandon the 'biological trump.' Polluters should be held accountable when they violate water quality standards.

• 2,4-D (chlorophenoxy herbicide). This herbicide is already widely applied, and genetic engineering of crops is predicted to significantly expand its use. When consumed by humans, 2,4-D can damage the liver, kidney, and adrenal glands.
I recommend: the state has proposed to tighten its standard for 2,4-D in waters used as sources for drinking water and food-processing purposes; that change should be adopted into the final set of water quality standards.

What is missing from the triennial review proposal?

• Fracking chemicals. As a result of recent legislation, the state is on track to begin issuing permits for extraction of natural gas via fracking in 2015. The fracking process generates massive volumes of contaminated wastewater. North Carolina lacks water quality standards

for hundreds of contaminants that can be in fracking wastewater; without such standards, the state has no effective way to limit pollutants in fracking wastewater discharged to rivers, lakes, and streams. The proper vehicle for adopting such standards is the triennial review, but the state has not proposed any standards for fracking contaminants.
I recommend: the Environmental Management Commission should prohibit discharges of fracking contaminants for which safe levels have not yet been scientifically determined.

• Nutrients. Excess nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorous) cause algal blooms (thick green muck that fouls clear water) and fish kills. EPA recently approved a multi-year state plan to study whether to adopt limits on nitrogen and phosphorus, but this process will not yield a limit for most of the state's water bodies for more than a decade, if at all.
I recommend: North Carolina needs to address nutrient pollution, now, at the source, by adopting statewide nitrogen and phosphorus limits, if not in this triennial review then in the next.

• Ammonia. Released by wastewater treatment plants and other polluters, ammonia is sharply toxic to aquatic life, especially mussels. North Carolina has no water quality standard for ammonia, and the current package does not propose one.
I recommend: the state should adopt EPA's nationally recommended standards for ammonia – formulas that take account of local temperature and water acidity (pH) – to protect life in North Carolina's streams and rivers.

• Mercury. Especially in the form of methylmercury, mercury is highly toxic to humans, interfering with fetal, infant, and childhood development, and placing adults at risk, too. However, North Carolina does not directly regulate methylmercury, although that is the form in which mercury accumulates in fish and most directly threatens wildlife and people who eat the fish.
I recommend: North Carolina should adopt a methylmercury limit that meets or exceeds the national recommendation of 0.3 mg/kg of fish tissue to protect human health, while retaining its standard for inorganic mercury.

• Flow. If withdrawals leave too little water in a river or lake, that waterbody will not sustain healthy fish and wildlife. Worse, pollution discharged into a depleted river remains more concentrated, increasing the risks to people who use it downstream. Currently, North Carolina lacks explicit protections for flow in its water quality standards, and the state uses a weak method to set permit limits.
I recommend: North Carolina should add adopt strong protections for water flow.

• Variances. When the state reviews its water quality standards, it must also review variances –permissions given to specific facilities to violate the standards. These include two chloride variances for pickle companies, Mt. Olive Pickle Company in Wayne County and Bay Valley

Foods in Duplin County; a color variance for Evergreen Paper Products in Haywood County; and thermal variances for the cooling systems at a long list of electric power generating plants.

I recommend: DENR should insist on all possible progress being made toward meeting water quality standards as a condition to granting continued variances for these permits.

Thank you for your time and your efforts,

TJ Cawley
Morrisville, North Carolina, 27560

From: Daniel Ferguson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Unacceptable Water Quality Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 4:40:41 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Daniel Ferguson

1602 Thore Road
Pinnacle, 27106

From: M W
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Unity Is What You Seek. Universal Love!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:18:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

M W

607 Rose Ave
Wilmington, NC 28403

From: Stephen Blake
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Update clean water standards now!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:08:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

We must strengthen our current water quality standards now. Ultimately this is the water that we drink, the water that grows the food that we eat, the water that we bathe in.

The goal must be pollution prevention. It will cost taxpayers and ratepayers more to clean up behind polluters than to prevent the damage in the first place.

The Duke Energy mess has made it clear that corporate polluters will take profits at the expense of the environment while they stick the public with the clean up costs.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Stephen Blake

506 Merrybrook Ct
Address Line 2
Clemmons, NC 27012

From: Lawrence East
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Update Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:33:15 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lawrence East

316 Richlands Ave
Apt. 5
Jacksonville, NC 28540

From: Terry Brookins
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Update NC Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:00:33 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Terry Brookins

8805 Nellie Lane
Waxhaw, NC 28173

From: Karen Pearsall
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Update NC clean water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:44:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Karen Pearsall

331 Ashland Dr
Goldston, NC 27252

From: Deborah Griffith
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Update NC water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:59:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deborah Griffith

7054 Meeting Street
Charlotte, NC 28210

From: Sarah Pruteanu
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Update our Clean Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:16:28 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sarah Pruteanu

100 Rivers Edge Drive
Apartment 124
Medford, MA 02155

From: Edith Coleman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Update our water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:09:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Edith Coleman

2600 Frederick Avenue
Wilmington, DE 19805

From: Mary Stone
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Update our water to make it cleaner
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:26:40 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary Stone

500 Audubon Dr
Oriental, NC 28571

From: Richard Hamilton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: update water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:49:48 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Richard Hamilton

1024 Washington St
Raleigh, NC 27605

From: charles pettee
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Update water standards -- no loopholes
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:38:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

charles pettee

318 Burris Pl
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: Terri Garretson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Updating Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:26:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Terri Garretson

7424 Dunsany Court
Wake a Forest, NC 27587

From: Lynne Royall
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Uphold the Clean Water Act
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:08:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in earnest support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities. Don't allow industry to pollute our water supply.

Thank you for your attention.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lynne Royall

6016 Bramblewood Drive
Raleigh, NC 27612

From: Antoinette De Luca
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: URGENT!!!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:36 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Antoinette De Luca

4307 Saquache Drive
Charlotte, NC 28269

From: Susan Leete
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Urgent: stronger water quality standards needed
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:36 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Susan Leete

3100 Silas Lane
Hillsborough, NC 27278

From: Meghan Prior
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Urging NC Environmental Management Commission to Strenthen Our Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 11:20:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Meghan Prior

4210 Sunnydell Drive
Winston Salem, NC 27106

From: nathalie worthington
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Vital Resource -- WATER
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:42:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

nathalie worthington

1434 farrington rd
apex, NC 27523

From: Laura Tweed
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Vote for stronger water quality regulations
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:53:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Laura Tweed

6700 Sandwell ln
Apt208
Raleigh, NC 27607

From: Lissa Caldwell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water conservation
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:10:00 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lissa Caldwell

157 Deer Glade Lane
Waynesville, NC 28786

From: Libby Cook-Carlton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water In NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:07:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Dear Ms. Brower;
Please strengthen our current water quality standards here in North Carolina. I am very concerned about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina especially after my Govenor allowed Duke Energy to dump their coal ash in people's water sources in my state with only a slap on the wrist. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into more rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants and not many people who care who have clout or position to do something.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams. You are all we have,Ms. Brower please help us!

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Libby Cook-Carlton

707 Stillwater Road
Boomer, NC 28606

From: David Vohwinkel
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water is critical to life
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:03:32 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Vohwinkel

212 Allie Bell Ln
Rolesville, NC 27571

From: Antonio Aversano
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Is Life!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:18:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Antonio Aversano

165 Newfound Road
Leicester, NC 28748

From: Melissa Deal
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water is our greatest resource
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:49:29 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Melissa Deal

PO Box 1458
Burgaw, NC 28425

From: Ben Bridgers
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water is our most precious asset
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:47:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ben Bridgers

PO Box 248
Sylva, NC 28779

From: Nina Broadway
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water pollution prevention
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:28:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nina Broadway

518 Buttonwood Dr
Hillsborough, NC 27278

From: Rachael Rocamora
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water protection
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 11:07:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rachael Rocamora

3019 Branderwood Drive
Greensboro, NC 27406

From: mary rand
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Protection
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:20:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

mary rand

1205 old coats rd
Lillington, NC 27546

From: Suzanne Everette
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water protection
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:18:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Everette

3315 Winston dr
Burlington, NC 27215

From: Betsy Malpass
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality & Protection - Prohibit Extraction for Fracking
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 12:28:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

In addition we have no water to sacrifice to Fracking activity, a practice I'll suited to North Carolina's resources. It is vitally important NC pass a law to limit extraction of water from our rivers, lakes, ponds and acquifers, and to control who, when, how, and how much can be withdrawn, as well as regulate handling of waste and contaminated water.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Betsy Malpass

908 Woodbine Drive
Please do not call
Chapel hill, NC 27517

From: Chandra Metheny
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Affects Everyone
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:42:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Chandra Metheny

3105 Beaconwood Drive
Greensboro, NC 27455

From: Rachel Roper
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality and health
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:29:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Water quality is essential for our health.
I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rachel Roper

754 Gatewood Dr
Winterville, NC 28590

From: Jan Evans
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality at Atlantic Beach, NC
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 5:56:31 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

I would also like for the water quality at Atlantic Beach which is called "The Pond" to be checked for bacteria. I see people all the time dumping dog feces into the water and at times some people who empty their boat heads in the water rather than going offshore to release it. My grandchildren and many others swim in those waters and I would like for there to be stricter requirements of residents on "The Pond" in the areas described. A simple rule would be to enforce "No Dumping" in The Pond.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jan Evans

1301 Par Drive
Kinston, NC 28504

From: Elizabeth Woodruff
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality commenting
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 9:16:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please do not frack in our state because it puts the water is serious jeopardy and anything that is detrimental to the water is DUMB to do. Please allocate money to clean up the coal ash rentention ponds in the state of N.C. We need to work on the sewage system infrastructure to prevent leakages, install plants and animals (oysters) that will slow down run off and filter the water, allow and educate about rain barrels and gray water systems, stop spraying such a heavy amount of pesticides, and the list goes on and on. We need to do whatever we can to protect our water. We need to start being smart!

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Woodruff

724A Bonham Ave
Wilmington, NC 28403

From: Lisa Almaraz
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Creates Quality of Life
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:22:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards which are weak and in danger of exploitive industries that area threat to us all. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lisa Almaraz

568 Fortescue Road
Zirconia, NC 28790

From: HBankirer@aol.com
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Cc: cbankirer@aol.com; hbankirer@aol.com
Subject: Water Quality Hearing Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 2:25:35 PM

I want to say that I fully expect the state to close some of the loopholes in the proposed standards, which are woefully overdue, to ensure they include dissolved heavy metals such as arsenic, cadmium, lead, chromium-6, as well as including limits on nitrogen and phosphorus and ammonia into our lakes, streams and rivers.

These toxic pollutants have no place in NC waters in amounts that would imperil the health and safety of our citizens and wildlife.

Harold Bankirer
17206 Linksview Lane
Huntersville, NC 28078
704 274-9680

From: Mary McDaniel
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality in NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:17:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

I am concerned that my grandchildren will not have clean water to enjoy unless you act NOW.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary McDaniel

13106 Allison Ferry Road
Huntersville, NC 28078

From: Heidi Rozner
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality in NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:48:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Heidi Rozner

15460 Stone Hollow Dr
Huntersville, NC 28078

From: Eric Zimdars
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality in NC
Date: Sunday, August 17, 2014 1:41:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Eric Zimdars

167 Edgewood Rd
Asheville, NC 28770

From: Herbert House
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality is IMPORTANT!
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 12:48:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Herbert House

1921 W Front
Burlington, NC 27215

From: Tripp Carter
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality is important
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:17:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tripp Carter

751 Blowing Rock Road
Boone, NC 28607

From: matt szymanski
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: WATER QUALITY IS PARAMOUNT
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:49:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

matt szymanski

103 pinetree dr
matthews, NC 28104

From: Mark Hooper
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality protection in North Carolina
Date: Monday, August 18, 2014 4:11:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mark Hooper

273 East City Rd. Box 186
Smyrna, NC 28579

From: Steve Stallings
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Protection
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 12:31:17 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Steve Stallings

317 King George Lp
Cary, NC 27511

From: Kenneth Crews
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standard
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:21:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Crews

P.O. Box 1062
Stem, NC 27702

From: Robyn Barnes
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards for NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:17:50 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robyn Barnes

1211K Trillium Circle
Raleigh, NC 27606

From: Weldine Dossett
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards for triennial review
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:46:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Weldine Dossett

415 Aberdeen Terrace
Greensboro, NC 27403

From: John Davis
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards Must Be Strengthened
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:31 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

In addition, the energy companies have been given immunity from revealing the chemicals they will use in this process. It is bad enough that millions of gallons of fresh water will be diverted and made unusable for humans. The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Sincerely,

John Davis

220 S Elm St
Greensboro, NC 27401

From: Deborah McGuinn
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards need reviewing
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 3:08:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deborah McGuinn

1304 white memorial church rd
willow spring, NC 27592

From: Karen Piplani
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards Upgrade
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:53:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Karen Piplani

1502 Halifax Rd
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: Kathy Rayle
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Sunday, August 17, 2014 9:08:53 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kathy Rayle

15 Borden Avenue
Wilmington, NC 28403

From: Patrick Jean
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:54:03 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review.

North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as the EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Patrick Jean

3910 Herman Sipe Road
Conover, NC 28613

From: Kim Murphy
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 4:15:06 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

At a time when the healthcare system is clearly broken, I am amazed that political pressure has the high probablility of overriding common sense. All cancers are environmental diseases, and we are exposed to the cancer threat by the air we breathe, the food we eat, and the water we drink. Protecting the environment is clearly the best way to protect public health, yet politicians appear to be more concerned about protecting campaign contributions.

I am particularly concerned about the EMC proposal suggesting that toxic metal levels should be allowed to increase until there are actual aquatic life kills. I assume that you have at least one ecotoxicologist on staff. Please ask that person about the difference between an LC50 and an LD50. Simply put, you don't have to outright kill something to cause lasting detriment to that organism. As an example, let us consider radiation poisoning. When we bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki, not everyone died immediately. The immediate die-off is an example of an LD50. Others developed cancers that killed them after the event and/or destroyed their ability to reproduce in the future. That's an example of an LC50. Both are devastating in their own rights.

When it comes down to protecting our health, it is clearly better to observe LC50 levels, rather then LD50 levels.

Please do the right thing here by protecting the health of the state rather than protecting large scale polluters.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kim Murphy

34 Princeton Dr
Asheville, NC 28806

From: David Campbell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 4:29:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I support the strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. The proposal to allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump') is not acceptable, however. Unacceptable harm to wildlife and risk to humans occurs well before everything starts dying. The proposed standard violates the Clean Water Act.

North Carolina also needs to improve regulations of several harmful substances including heavy metals, excess nitrogen and phosphorus, methylmercury (in fish and other aquatic life), ammonia (especially hazardous to aquatic life, including many endangered or otherwise imperiled species), and fracking wastewater (often very salty, in addition to the various possible toxic components).

Clean water and a healthy environment are essential to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Campbell

College Manor Dr
Shelby, NC 28152

From: Ben Sorensen
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 12:09:54 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ben Sorensen

201 Wellington St
Asheville, NC 28806

From: george love
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

george love

516 princeton st
raleigh, NC 27609

From: Nancy Mueller
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Friday, August 15, 2014 12:13:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nancy Mueller

409 Moonridge Road
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: Julia Myers
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 11:03:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Julia Myers

10108 Whitestone Rd
Raleigh, NC 27615

From: Oscar Revilla
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:47:52 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Oscar Revilla

Juan de Herrera
San Sebastian de los Reyes

From: Michael Tillman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 11:24:56 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael Tillman

205 Hudson St. Apt. D
Raleigh, NC 27608

From: Laura Cotterman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:07:16 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Laura Cotterman

2707 Shadetree Rd
Hillsborough, NC 27278

From: Bradley Pearce
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:52:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bradley Pearce

160 exline williams dr
pittsboro, NC 27312

From: Ash B
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 5:08:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ash B

NC
Raleigh, NC 27557

From: Janette Moser
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:58:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Janette Moser

Wilson cove rd
Swannanoa, NC 28778

From: Susan Casar
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:18:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Susan Casar

32 Poplar Creek Drive
Asheville, NC 28805

From: Samantha Cornell
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 12:53:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Samantha Cornell

148 Anderby Dr
Clayton, NC 27527

From: Marlene Pratto
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:35:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am glad that you are reviewing our clean water standards. I cannot believe this has been neglected for so long. Water is our most important and precious asset, yet governments and people do not take keeping it clean and useful seriously enough.

I support strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. (Toxic metals are hard, if not impossible to remove.) However, I was disappointed and shocked that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). I am sorry, but this is just not good enough. Once life starts to die, what will it take to restore the water quality. It is better to not allow the water quality to deteriorate. Also this violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities. Please strengthen our standards, not weaken. them.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Marlene Pratto

105 Ridgeway Drive
Greensboro, NC 27403

From: Robert White
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:22:19 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert White

9820 White Cascade Dr
Charlotte, NC 28269

From: Linda Smith
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:59:16 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda Smith

983 W. Durness Ct
Wake Forest, NC 27587

From: Josh Storm
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 9:07:33 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Josh Storm

2708 Campus Box
Elon, NC 27215

From: Aaron Allen
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:35:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Aaron Allen

3601 Dogwood Dr
Greensboro, NC 27403

From: Claudia Nix
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:20:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Claudia Nix

72 Sherwood Road
Asheville, NC 28803

From: Amanda Tufts
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:46:36 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amanda Tufts

103 Troy Dr
Elizabeth City, NC 27909

From: Aglaia OQuinn
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:23:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Aglaia OQuinn

5106 Murphy School Re
Durham, NC 27705

From: Wynne Queen
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:55:51 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Wynne Queen

340 Davis Rd
Forest City, NC 28043

From: Iris Carman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:00:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Clean water is vital for a healthy and productive population. Our ability to filter contaminants from our water is so very limited. Even those with great financial resources and power will be effected at some point in time by contaminated water. Our governmental representatives should be examples of good stewards for all of our precious and limited natural resources.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Iris Carman

327 Lakewood Drive
Wilkesboro, NC 28697

From: Jordan & Beth Holtam
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:02:28 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jordan & Beth Holtam

21 Mooney Lane
Weaverville, NC 28787

From: Karen Jones
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:14:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Karen Jones

217 Ewbank Drive
Hendersonville, NC 28791

From: Scott Kelly
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:12:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to violate water quality standards routinely as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Scott Kelly

5242 Auburndale Road
Charlotte, NC 28205

From: Shel Anderson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:58:47 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Shel Anderson

1706 Rosetta Dr
Durham, NC 27701

From: marian dodd
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:39:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

marian dodd

215 Pinecroft dr
raleigh, NC 27609

From: Sanae Moorehead
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:48:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sanae Moorehead

300 Beaufort Manor Drive
Beaufort, NC 28516

From: Nancy Sanderson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:14:51 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nancy Sanderson

8454 Coulwood Oak Lane
Charlotte, NC 28214

From: Ann Floyd
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:21:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ann Floyd

8545 Chickenfoot Rd
Saint Pauls, NC 28384

From: Jay Newhard
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:32:25 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jay Newhard

306 Treybrooke Circle #33
Greenville, NC 27834

From: James Pugh
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:04:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James Pugh

2154 Norton Rd
Charlotte, NC 28207

From: Theresa Lauro
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:20:42 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Theresa Lauro

3014 Butter churn Lane
Matthews, NC 28105

From: Brenda Backer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:42:09 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brenda Backer

145 Vista Drive
Davidson, NC 28036

From: Chris Sheldon
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:16:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Chris Sheldon

5903 Arcadia Dr
Greensboro, NC 27410

From: Bristol Bowman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:16:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bristol Bowman

7 Birchcrest Court
Durham, NC 27713

From: Sandra Smith
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:12:26 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sandra Smith

5032 Dresden Court
Monroe, NC 28110

From: Jane Lynch
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:05:33 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jane Lynch

1408 Rosedale Ave
Durham, NC 27707

From: JASON HARPSTER
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:03:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JASON HARPSTER

105 MAGNOLIA AVE
PINEHURST, NC 28374

From: Sally Howard
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:20:21 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sally Howard

4030 Lattimore Drive
Hillsborough, NC 27278

From: Susan Morance
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:40:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Susan Morance

1513 East Franklin Street
Unit D-134
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: Randy Bernard
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:07:03 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Randy Bernard

18 Plateau Rd
Asheville, NC 28805

From: Christine Brown
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:29:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Christine Brown

1229 Newfound Hollow Dr
Charlotte, NC 28214

From: Thomas Blanton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:42:27 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thomas Blanton

2228 Russell Drive
Granite Falls, NC 28630

From: Elaine Jones
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:27:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Elaine Jones

3706 Cotswold Terrace, Unit 1-B
Greensboro, NC 27410

From: Clayton Denman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:16:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Clayton Denman

547 Rustic Road
West Jefferson, NC 28694

From: George Rector
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:26:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

George Rector

947 Bo Cove Road
Cullowhee, NC 28723

From: Elena Carleo
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:41:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Elena Carleo

393 Crestview Church Rd
Asheboro, NC 27205

From: Sandra Maddox
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:50:40 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sandra Maddox

6304 Carl Cox Rd
Bennett, NC 27208

From: Darryl Wally
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:47:20 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Darryl Wally

240 Silene
Pittsboro, NC 27312

From: Justin Mebane
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:45:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Justin Mebane

Covey Ln
Wilmington, NC 28411

From: Frederick Mayer
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:43:33 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Frederick Mayer

214 Hickory Lane
Hampstead, NC 28443

From: Suzanne Schenkel
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:37:37 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Schenkel

106 Belmont Ct
Southern Pines, NC 28387

From: Ashley Lewis
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:22:06 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ashley Lewis

4052 Obra Rd
Graham, NC 27253

From: Eric McManus
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:18:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Eric McManus

8019 Gera Emma Drive
Charlotte, NC 28215

From: Julie Newberry
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:17:46 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Julie Newberry

400 Mayfield Circle Apt E
Durham, NC 27705

From: Frank Gottbrath
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:15:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Frank Gottbrath

1082 Cornell Ct
Leland, NC 28451

From: Sharon Whitmore
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:59:35 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sharon Whitmore

7500 New Sharon Church Rd
Rougemont, NC 27572

From: C. Warren Pope
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality Standards
Date: Friday, July 11, 2014 3:44:22 PM

Put an end to this mad rush to get rid of protections for NC's water. Strengthen, or at least keep your hands off and do not further weaken NC's clean water protections. Get rid of the coal ash bill and start anew, this time protecting water quality, not Duke Energy.

Very truly yours,
C. Warren Pope
cwpope@charter.net

From: bette-burr fenley
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality standards
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 4:31:32 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

bette-burr fenley

211 carolina meadows villa
chapel hill, NC 27517

From: Kat Gejg
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 4:18:35 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kat Gejg

Raleigh
Raleigh, 27603

From: Denise Garland
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 8:24:53 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Denise Garland

10502 Sycamore Club Drive
Mint Hill, NC 28227

From: Gretchen Simpson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:11:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Clean water is a very valuable thing, and should be treated as such.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gretchen Simpson

494 Frank Rector Rd
Marshall, NC 28753

From: sharon weeks
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:55:35 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

sharon weeks

545 copperhead bend
Burnsville, NC 28714

From: Richard Loeppert
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 12:01:17 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Richard Loeppert

1317 Rand Drive
Raleigh, NC 27608

From: Raymond Occhipinti
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:34:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Raymond Occhipinti

265 Brooklyn
Asheville, NC 28803

From: Mark Weisser
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:09:50 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mark Weisser

6445 Mounting Rock Rd
Charlotte, NC 28217

From: Riley Maness
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:57:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Riley Maness

111 Walnut Creek Drive
Goldsboro, NC 27534

From: Jan Ross
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:51:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jan Ross

251 Jim's Branch
Swannanoa, NC 28778

From: Thomas Johnson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:34:26 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thomas Johnson

2455 Holloway Mtn Rd
BR, NC 28605

From: becky armstrong
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:54:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

becky armstrong

165 Finlay Brook Way
hendersonville, NC 28739

From: Debora Horning
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:06:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Debora Horning

3619 Marlowe Ave
Winston Salem, NC 27106

From: Darielle Whitelaw
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:03:43 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Darielle Whitelaw

4706 BLUEBIRD CT
UNIT#F
Raleigh, NC 27606

From: Dwayne Dvoracek
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:36:25 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dwayne Dvoracek

110 Grayson Dr
Salisbury, NC 28147

From: Gustavo Sandoval
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:35:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gustavo Sandoval

505 Los Gatos Way
San Mateo, CA 94403

From: Ellen Fallon
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:28:23 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ellen Fallon

604 Copperline Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: Amy Mull
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:50:26 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amy Mull

905 Deerfield Rd
Raleigh, NC 27609

From: Kelly Gay
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:48:42 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kelly Gay

5409 stuarts ridge rd
wake forest, NC 27587

From: James Poe
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:59:36 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James Poe

737 Florida Ave
Hendersonville, NC 28739

From: William Woody
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:31:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

As you are already seeing with the coal ash problems and the possible start of fracking - water quality guidelines need to be strengthen. - I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

William Woody

PO box 503
Manteo, NC 27954

From: Carol Moldoveanu
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:48:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Moldoveanu

650 Woodbriar Ct
Winston-Salem, NC 27106

From: Rachel Young
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:28:40 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rachel Young

325 Alberto St
Charlotte, NC 28207

From: Lynn Fowler
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:19:48 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lynn Fowler

135 S. Mills River Road
Mills River, 28759

From: Christine Robinson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:24:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Christine Robinson

4710 Long Leaf Hills Drive
Wilmington, NC 28409

From: Sheila Barnes
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:20:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sheila Barnes

PO box 5114
7028 Archers
Emerald Isle, NC 28594

From: Melissa Hastings
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:08:56 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Melissa Hastings

515 Tom Mann RD
Newport, NC 28570

From: Richard Strowd
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:08:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Richard Strowd

4845 Manns Chapel Road
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: Karen hodges
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality
Date: Monday, August 25, 2014 11:33:18 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Health is one of the most important values for me and my family, and water quality is essential to health. I have been alarmed at the laxity with which NC government is failing to protect water quality in our state from such threats as coal ash contamination.

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Karen hodges

2641 Palm Avenue
Charlotte, NC 28205

From: Gerri Morringello
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:31:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gerri Morringello

8310 Compass Pointe East Wynd
Leland, NC 28451

From: Philip Davenport
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:16:00 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Philip Davenport

10905 Fitzwilliam Street
Raleigh, NC 27614

From: Paul Williams
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:43:31 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paul Williams

933 Hawk Ridge Circle
Winston-Salem, NC 27103

From: Ruth Miller
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:45:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ruth Miller

1819 Billabong Lane
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: Sara Loeppert
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:42:22 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sara Loeppert

1317 Rand Drive
Raleigh, NC 27608

From: Rebecca Giordano
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:22:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Giordano

33 Little Dove Court
Hendersonville, NC 28739

From: Arden Kirkman
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:21:46 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Arden Kirkman

5859 Thacker Dairy Rd
Whitsett, NC 27377

From: Alicia Hood
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:41:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alicia Hood

118 Long Pond Drive
Sneads Ferry, NC 28460

From: Marie Ashworth
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:40:19 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Marie Ashworth

1236 Columbus Cir
Wilmington, MT 28403

From: Rivette Marchand-Hill
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:26:12 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rivette Marchand-Hill

122 Hardin Rd
Topton, NC 28781

From: Dennis George
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:56:39 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dennis George

108 Shadow Mountain Lane
Morrisville, NC 27560

From: Matthew Amick
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:05:27 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Matthew Amick

512 Arrowhead Dr
Greensboro, NC 27410

From: Greg Raschke
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:47:26 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Greg Raschke

2412 Wentworth Street
Raleigh, NC 27612

From: Jennifer Angyal
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:43:31 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Angyal

7149 Ludgate Road
Gibsonville, NC 27249

From: Melissa Bishop
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:25:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Melissa Bishop

2167B Deep Ford Rd
Lansing, nc 28643

From: Jude Maglione
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:20:32 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jude Maglione

10 Moreview Dr
Asheville, NC 28803

From: Nancy Montgomery
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 4:57:32 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nancy Montgomery

269 Pleasant Hill Loop Rd
Rutherford, NC 28139

From: Susan Periano
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water quality
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 1:56:08 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Susan Periano

125 Bald Cypress Lane
Mooresville, NC 28115

From: SC McCormick
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Quality
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 5:54:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

SC McCormick

95 Mills Gap
22b
Asheville, NC 28803

From: cynthia bringle
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water safety
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:19:15 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

cynthia bringle

160 lucy morgan lane
bakersville, NC 28705

From: John Banks
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water safety
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:50:37 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

John Banks

1612 Riverview Rd
Raleigh, NC 27610

From: Lewise Busch
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water standards in NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:04:02 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians. Please note also that coal ash releases radioactive isotopes into the water when it reaches water supplies.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lewise Busch

750 Weaver Dairy Rd. 1223
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

From: Robert Trullinger
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Standards Review
Date: Sunday, July 13, 2014 9:00:57 AM

Dr. Robert Trullinger

107 Chatburn Circle

Cary, NC 27513

July 13, 2014

Connie Brower

DWR Water Planning Section

1611 Mail Service Center

Raleigh, NC 27699-1611

Dear Ms. Brower:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the review of North Carolina's water quality standards.

I am very glad that the Commission has decided to review the water quality standards. Such a review is long overdue. Over the past decade in the absence of strong regulations, we have seen our water quality has been seriously compromised. Large quantities of industrial chemicals, fertilizer run-off, and herbicides have been introduced into our streams and rivers, and, by extension, into our drinking water. This increase in chemical pollution in our water sources has created serious public health issues, particularly for children, due to the impact of chemical pollution in the drinking water on their physical and mental development.

The long term consequences of the lack of appropriate regulations to protect the safety of our

drinking water will have serious economic and social costs. Our society will need to take care of those people. Taxpayers will need to provide the financial means to take care of those individuals whose development was impaired because of the commitment to short term financial gains at the expense of future generations.

I urge the Commission to undertake a full review of North Carolina's water quality standards and to adopt measures that are at least as strong as those of the federal Environment Protection Agency. Our children deserve no less.

Thank you.

Robert Trullinger

914-924-0563

Rstrullinger@gmail.com

From: Katherine Gonzalez
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:26:40 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Katherine Gonzalez

3878 Longwood Drive SW
Concord
Concord, NC 28027

From: joyce robinson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:21:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

joyce robinson

8010 covington ave
glen burnie, MD 21061

From: Claire Brothers
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:18:18 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.
THIS ALL GOES HAND IN HAND WITH OUR BEING WISE IN ALLOWING FRACKING AND ANY OTHER INDUSTRY WHICH HAS THE POTENTIAL TO ALTER OUR WATER QUALITY. STANDARDS MUST BE HIGH. STANDARDS MUST BE HIGH.
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Claire Brothers

1709 Calico Dr
Morehead City, NC 28557

From: JAMES & Leslea Kunz
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:40:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JAMES & Leslea Kunz

1218 Coral Reef Ct
New Bern, NC 28560

From: Brenda Barry
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 9:20:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brenda Barry

17860 NC Hwy 53 E
Kelly, NC 28448

From: Daniel McCaslin
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:22:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Daniel McCaslin

13718 Gatestone Lane
Pineville, NC 28134

From: Angelica Regueiro
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:58:56 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Angelica Regueiro

11124 Northwoods Forest Drive
Charlotte, NC 28214

From: william walls
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:08:06 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

william walls

po box 21
jamestown, NC 27282

From: John George
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:29:13 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.
As a 59 year old life long resident, voter, business owner and property owner I've seen our waters at their worst and now approaching usability again. Please, let's not go backward. Have we not learned from the past? Let's leave a legacy of opportunity in the outdoors. Not fear of poisoning.
Thank you.

Sincerely,

John George

6348 Sharon Hills Road
Charlotte, NC 28210

From: Jon McVety
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:49:31 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jon McVety

1413 Lindenberg Sq
Wake Forest, NC 27587

From: Evan Auld
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water standards
Date: Monday, July 14, 2014 3:02:03 PM

To whom it may concern,

I am writing as a lifetime concerned citizen of the state of North Carolina. Please limit and appropriately regulate the release of phosphorous, nitrogen, heavy metals, and toxic contaminants to our waterways and aquatic resources by NPDES polluters. This includes but is not limited to toxicity to humans. I am sure you are doing your best to ensure future generations will enjoy a state in better shape than we have enjoyed it.

Thank you,
Evan Auld

From: Max Mattison
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:05:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Max Mattison

234 Alta Vista Dr
Candler, NC 28715

From: bonnie vuolo
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water standars/quality
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:30:21 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

bonnie vuolo

6338 westview dr
newland, NC 28657

From: Rachel Lominac
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:57:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rachel Lominac

1010 7th st ne
Hickory, NC 28601

From: betty sparrow
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:22:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

betty sparrow

817 reems ck
reems ck
weaverville n.c., NC 28787

From: Kent Swenson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:21:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kent Swenson

225 dennis ln
Franklin, NC 28734

From: David Andes
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:17:37 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Andes

4005 Stoney Creek Church Road
Elon, NC 27244

From: Scott Sheppard
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water
Date: Thursday, August 21, 2014 2:08:17 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Scott Sheppard

PO Box 276
Edneyville, NC 28727

From: Jack Dula
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:48:19 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jack Dula

173 Eastview St
None
Hudson, NC 28638

From: Margie Zalesak
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water
Date: Monday, August 25, 2014 1:48:22 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Margie Zalesak

205 McCleary Ct
Raleigh, NC 27607

From: james devine
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:35:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

james devine

320 westridge dr
raleigh, NC 27609

From: TINA HOROWITZ
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:16:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

TINA HOROWITZ

4701 pine street m8
philadelphia, PA 19143

From: Janice Valder
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: WATer
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:30:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I grew up hearing" a penny saved is a penny earned. Saving our water quality will not only save the pennies, it will save lives. Please,
I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Janice Valder

1418 Euclid Ave`
Charlotte, NC 28203

From: Amber Watson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:20:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amber Watson

702 N Carolina Ave
Carolina beach, NC 28428

From: William Tripp
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: water
Date: Saturday, August 16, 2014 1:28:59 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

William Tripp

416 Withershinn Dr
Charlotte, NC 28262

From: Toni Johse
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Water=Life
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 11:00:56 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Toni Johse

3123 Reunion Plaza Td
Apex, NC 27539

From: Erica Gunnison
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We All Need Clean Water!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:57:54 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Erica Gunnison

100 Kentucky Dr
Asheville, NC 28806

From: Grayson Patton
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We All Need Clean Water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:50:04 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Grayson Patton

3482 NC Hwy 268
Siloam, NC 27047

From: Emily Soza
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We all need clean water
Date: Thursday, August 14, 2014 3:02:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Emily Soza

360 sawtooth dr
Fayetteville, NC 28314

From: Juli Smith
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We Are What We Drink
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:53:55 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Juli Smith

400 US Highway 70 E
Hillsborough, NC 27278

From: Shawna Schnorr
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We ask for safer water standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:39:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Shawna Schnorr

2701 Alder Ridge Lane
Raleigh, NC 27603

From: Shereen Gillette
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We Deserve Clean Water!
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:18:51 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Shereen Gillette

222 East Bland Street
Unit 3
Charlotte, NC 28203

From: Lorelei Nemcik
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We need better protection
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 5:40:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lorelei Nemcik

215 Calla Lilly Lane
Kernersville, NC 27284

From: Constance Engle
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: WE NEED CLEAN WATER!
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 9:31:26 AM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Constance Engle

244 Englewood Drive
Hendersonville, NC 28739

From: elza behrens
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: we need clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:34:57 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

elza behrens

2286 fork creek road
saluda, NC 28773

From: Carol Pelosi
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We need cleaner water in NC
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:41:11 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Pelosi

1255 South Main Street
Wake Forest, NC 27587

From: Marilyn Cosnstine
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: we need cleaner water to survive and grow
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:46:53 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Cosnstine

337 Lake Knoll Ct
Lewisville, NC 27023

From: Diego Medina
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We need our clean water
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:15:07 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Diego Medina

48 Evergreen Hill Dr
Etowah, NC 28729

From: Sam Hay
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We need stronger clean water standards in NC
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 2:41:31 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sam Hay

118 Fox
Mooresville, NC 28117

From: Gary Andrew
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We Need Stronger Water Standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:20:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies (think Toledo). This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians. Water is a precious resource and as climate change continues, water will likely become scarcer. We must act now to keep our water clean and safe to drink.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gary Andrew

319 N Downing St
Davidson, NC 28036

From: Charles Butzgy
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We need to make our clean water standards improved.
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:01:39 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Charles Butzgy

5728 Crenshaw Drive
Hope Mills, NC 28348

From: Michael Evon
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We need to strengthen NC water quality standards
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:14:14 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

It's important that North Carolina strengthen our water quality standards for metals, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), mercury and ammonia pollution. Without strong standards we'll continue to see fish kills and algal blooms, and we'll run the risk of algal toxics in our drinking water supplies. This is unacceptable.

Please adopt the proposed metals standards; adopt numeric standards for nitrogen and phosphorus; adopt a fish tissue standard for mercury to protect our children' and adopt the standard recommended by EPA for ammonia. Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to me and all North Carolinians.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael Evon

606 Brook Street
Morehead City, NC 28557

From: Edward Stavish
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We need to strengthen water quality protections
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 8:38:52 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Edward Stavish

1285 Duckett Top Tower Road
Hot Springs, NC 28743

From: Shirley Baker
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We The People
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:39:05 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Shirley Baker

900 Shellbrook Court
Apartment 2
Raleigh, NC 27609

From: Amanda Dillard
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We want better water quality standards!
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:32:10 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amanda Dillard

4241 Fox Street
Randleman, NC 27317

From: Claire Brothers
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: We want CLEAN WATER.
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 6:37:01 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am submitting my comments in support of strengthening our current water quality standards, including tightening standards for toxic metals and for the herbicide 2,4-D. However, I was very disappointed that the proposed standards would allow polluting industries to routinely violate water quality standards as long as stream life appears to survive (the 'biological trump'). This violates the Clean Water Act, which is supposed to prevent pollution, not merely respond after the fact.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Claire Brothers

1709 Calico Dr
Morehead City, NC 28557

From: Ann Mundy
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: WHAT IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN GOOD WATER QUALITY?
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:05:21 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ann Mundy

47 Logan Circle
asheville, NC 28806

From: Michael Keenan
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Who are you looking out for, certainly not the people of NC?
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 3:37:58 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael Keenan

48 CHEROKEE TRL
Fletcher, NC 28732

From: Tish Yarborough
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: why are you killing our water supplies?
Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 1:24:25 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

Please strengthen our current water quality standards. I am very worried about the possibility of fracking coming to North Carolina. Many of the toxic chemicals that would be generated in fracking wastewater could be legally discharged from treatment plants into our rivers since we don't have water quality standards for those contaminants.

The EMC should prohibit the discharge of fracking contaminants into our rivers, lakes and streams.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tish Yarborough

7517 Mason Landing Rd
Wilmington, NC 28411

From: Andrew San Juan
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Why weaken regulation of our water resources?
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 5:32:35 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Andrew San Juan

136 Sunny Acres Drive
Elizabeth City, NC 27909

From: jo ellen gay
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Cc: Reeder, Tom; Skvarla, John
Subject: Wilson"s Comment on Revised Water Quality Standards
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2014 8:20:35 AM
Attachments: EMC Triennial Review Comment 8-12-14.pdf

Please find attached our comments on the Revised Water Quality Standards. We appreciate the opportunity to submit comments on this very important proposal.

JoEllen Gay
Water Reclamation Compliance Coordinator
City of Wilson
PO Box 10 Wilson, NC 27894-0010
(p) 252-399-2499 (c) 252-230-8318
jgay@wilsonnc.org
Mon.- Fri. 7:30 am -4 pm

Pursuant to North Carolina General Statutes, Chapter 132,et.seq., this electronic mail message and any attachment hereto, as well as any electronic mail message(s) that may be sent in response to it may be considered public record and as such are subject to requests for review.

From: Starr Watson
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Without clean water there is no life
Date: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:56:24 PM

Dear DWR Water Planning Section Connie Brower,

I am writing to you today to submit my comments in support of strengthening our water quality standards for the triennial review. North Carolina should update our standards for heavy metals as EPA has requested and as neighboring states did years ago. The state should also adopt numeric nutrient criteria for nitrogen and phosphorus and a standard for ammonia to prevent the further degradation of our rivers. Finally, the current standard for total mercury is not adequate to protect human health; we also need a standard for the levels of methylmercury appearing in fish tissue.

Clean water and a healthy environment are vitally important to all North Carolinians – for our health, property values, recreational and business opportunities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Starr Watson

3720 Merestone Dr
Wilmington, NC 28412

From: Jeannie
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Written comments for water quality standards Triennial Review
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 2:37:55 PM
Attachments: JA-2014 Surface Water Quality Triennial Review of Standards.pdf

---

Connie Brower:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written comments.

Also, many thanks to you and others for safeguarding our precious water resource so vital to the quality of life we all enjoy in NC.

Jeannie Ambrose
Chatham County

From: Blodgett, Terry L.
To: DWR_Classifications_Standards
Subject: Written Comments: Triennial Review
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 2:34:19 PM
Attachments: Alcoa_Inc_Comments_on_Proposed_Amendment_to_NC_Surface_Water_Quality_Standards_of_April2014.pdf
Importance: High

PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT

Attn: Connie Brower
DENR/Division of Water Resources/Water Planning Section
1611 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1611

RE: Written Comments: Triennial Review

Dear Ms. Brower,

Alcoa Inc. (Alcoa) respectfully submits the attached comments addressing proposed amendments to Title 15A North Carolina Administrative Code 02B. Alcoa opposes changes which would regulate cyanide on a "total cyanide" basis only. It is widely accepted and well documented that most forms of cyanide, all of which are detected in a totals analysis, do not possess the potential to cause harm to people or the environment. Conversely, it is widely accepted that it is the free forms of cyanide in toxicity studies that that have the potential to cause harm if not properly regulated. To adopt a cyanide water quality criteria based on a totals analysis for comparison to a chronic criteria based on free cyanide toxicity testing is in our opinion overly simplistic and conservative. Companies should be afforded the opportunity to develop site-specific criteria based on free cyanide limits in receiving waters.

Sincerely,

Terry L. Blodgett
Alcoa Inc., International Project Development and Asset Management
Location EHS Manager
P.O. Box 472 | 4069 Charles Martin Hall Road | Rockdale, TX 76567
W: +1 512.446.8379 M: +1 512.760.8800 F: +1 512.446.8441
terry.blodgett@alcoa.com