

In the Matter Of:

LONG ISLAND COMM for AQUIFER PROT.

HEARING

January 17, 2019



ESQUIRE
DEPOSITION SOLUTIONS

800.211.DEPO (3376)
EsquireSolutions.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SUFFOLK COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK

-----x
LONG ISLAND COMMISSION FOR AQUIFER PROTECTION
PUBLIC HEARING and
PRESENTATION

BY STEVEN COLABUFO,
WATER RESOURCES MANAGER

-----x
320 Center Drive
Riverhead, New York

January 17, 2019
6:01 p.m.

LONG ISLAND COMMISSION FOR AQUIFER
PROTECTION PUBLIC HEARING ON GROUNDWATER
RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN, held at the
above-noted time and place, before JEFFREY
W. SZABO, CEO, SCWA; JOHN C. MILAZZO,
SCWA; WALTER DAWYDIAK, SC Department of
Health; and JANICE L. ANTOS, a Stenotype
Reporter and Notary Public within and for
the State of New York.

1 MR. SZABO:

Good evening everybody.

2 Good evening and welcome to the
3 Long Island Commission for Aquifer
4 Protection Public Hearing regarding the
5 Groundwater Resource Management Plan. My
6 name is Jeff Szabo. I'm the Chief Executive
7 Officer of the Suffolk County Water
8 Authority and I serve as LICAP's Vice
9 Chairman. LICAP was created in 2013 via
10 resolutions approved both by the Nassau and
11 Suffolk County Legislatures and it's
12 comprised of representatives from the
13 Drinking Water Industry, Nassau and Suffolk
14 County Executives, both County Health
15 Departments and the presiding officers of
16 each respective Legislatures.

17 We have also had significant
18 contributions and input from numerous
19 entities like New York State DEC Region One
20 and USTS. We will begin tonight's hearing
21 with an introduction of those members
22 joining me and we will hear a presentation
23 summary from Steve Colabufo on the
24 Groundwater Resource Management Plan.

25 Upon completion of the

1 presentation, I will ask any speakers to
2 come up and to make their public comment.

3 With me this evening is LICAP's
4 general counsel, John Milazzo.

5 MR. MILAZZO: Hello.

6 MR. SZABO: And Walter, Walter Dawydiak.

7 MR. DAWYDIAK: Suffolk County Health Department.

8 MR. SZABO: Nice to see you. Thank you for
9 coming, Walt.

10 With that I will ask Mr. Colabufo
11 to begin his presentation.

12 MR. COLABUFO: Okay. Thank you. As Jeff
13 mentioned, by name is Steve Colabufo. I'm
14 the Water Resources Manager for the Suffolk
15 County Water Authority. We're here tonight
16 to talk about the LICAP Groundwater
17 Resources Management Plan. This is the
18 second major deliverable of LICAP. The
19 first one was last year where we met in
20 similar fashion to discuss the State of the
21 Aquifer Report, the inaugural State of the
22 Aquifer Report.

23 The Groundwater Resources
24 Management Plan is much more comprehensive
25 in scope and much more for forward looking

1 and we will discuss that tonight at this
2 Hearing.

3 LICAP for those who may not know
4 is the Long Island Commission for Aquifer
5 Protection. It's a partnership of water
6 resource professionals, both Nassau and
7 Suffolk Counties and it includes water
8 suppliers, regulatory agencies, government
9 officials, academics and citizen activist
10 groups.

11 And it was formed to address
12 water quality and water quantity issues
13 facing Long Island on an island wide basis.
14 So prior to LICAP, most problems were kind
15 of addressed on a local basis. But we
16 wanted to take a more holistic, Island wide
17 regional approach to these problems. So
18 LICAP was created for that purpose.

19 It was created through
20 legislation passed by both Nassau and
21 Suffolk Legislatures back in 2013. And the
22 LICAP website is shown here on the bottom of
23 the slide.

24 Okay, so LICAP members include
25 all water providers in Nassau and Suffolk

1 who collectively serve over three million
2 Long Island residents. Also representatives
3 from the Nassau and Suffolk Legislatures,
4 Nassau and Suffolk County executive branches
5 as well as employees of Nassau and Suffolk
6 County Health Departments, State DEC as well
7 as the US Geological Survey.

8 This is kind of a collage of all
9 participating agencies. There's actually a
10 lot more than that. It's a very, large
11 comprehensive, inclusive tent of all members
12 of the Long Island Groundwater Community.

13 There are nine voting members, two of which
14 are behind me tonight. There's also a bunch
15 of nonvoting members that represent other
16 members of County and State government.

17 Internally LICAP has two standing
18 subcommittees. One is known as the Water
19 Resources and Infrastructure, chaired by
20 myself. And our charge was to develop a
21 plan to identify long-term risks to the
22 water supply industry. The other
23 subcommittee known as the Water Resource
24 Opportunities Subcommittee chaired by Bill
25 Merklin of Dvirka and Bartilucci

1 Engineering.

2 Looking at potential short-term
3 risks facing water suppliers, treatment and
4 distribution of potable water. The two
5 subcommittees began meeting back in 2014.
6 The meetings were attended by the same wide
7 cross section of the Long Island Groundwater
8 community that I described before;
9 suppliers, environmental groups, regulators
10 and the like.

11 And the attendees at the initial
12 meetings following the adopted LICAP law
13 ultimately determined the subject matter
14 that was to be included in the Groundwater
15 Management Plan. The subcommittee chairs
16 divided those topics that were discussed
17 based on their mission, the Water Resources
18 and Infrastructure Subcommittee focused more
19 on long-term resource oriented topics. The
20 Water Resources Opportunities Subcommittee
21 focused more on shorter term facilities
22 oriented topics.

23 And the subcommittee chairs then
24 organized and oversaw report writing teams
25 to create and edit reports. Ultimately 15

1 reports were created over a three year span
2 and those reports were the raw material, the
3 nuts and bolts, that kind of comprised the
4 Groundwater Resources Management Plan.

5 The Plan is the culmination of a
6 three-year process that was started back
7 when LICAP was created and it was produced
8 as a result of cooperative efforts among
9 existing practitioners within all aspects of
10 the groundwater industry on Long Island.
11 That's the main difference between this plan
12 and others that have come before this.

13 Rather than give direction to a
14 consultant who kind of produced a plan on
15 his own, this was done as a result of
16 efforts among existing practitioners within
17 the groundwater industry on Long Island who
18 currently work in some aspect of
19 groundwater.

20 So the Management Plan does a
21 couple of things. It provides a clear
22 picture of specific threats to the aquifer
23 and the potential damage potentially caused
24 by those threats. It assesses the adequacy
25 of existing groundwater management

1 regulations, creates and action plan for
2 long-term sustainability of the aquifer as
3 well as an implementation program and
4 prioritization schedule for all of the
5 recommendations that came from the plan.

6 In addition we have some
7 recommended regulatory amendments and
8 legislative actions that came out of the
9 plan as well. There's two slides here that
10 focus on who the authors were. The Plan
11 would not be possible without their
12 volunteer efforts like they did. These two
13 slides are kind of a shout out to my fellow
14 authors without whom the Plan would not even
15 be possible.

16 We ended up with 15 individual
17 reports, organized along a couple of
18 different guidelines. For start, we had the
19 Regulatory Framework for Long Island
20 Groundwater Management, basically a summary
21 of all of the laws and rules that regulate
22 groundwater use on Long Island.

23 And we divided some topics into
24 both natural and cultural issues affecting
25 Long Island groundwater. On the natural

1 issue side, we talk about climate change and
2 the potential impact to water resources. We
3 also talked about the Pine Barrens and other
4 land preservation initiatives that are
5 designed to preserve water quality and water
6 quantity in both Nassau and Suffolk
7 Counties.

8 Moving onto cultural issues, one
9 of the bigger ones is wastewater management
10 practices in Nassau and Suffolk. Obviously
11 there's two different methodologies going
12 on. Nassau mostly sewer, regional sewerage.
13 Suffolk, mostly relying on individual septic
14 systems or small package sewage treatment
15 plants.

16 So that was discussed. That was
17 the report done by Dorian Dale. We also
18 discussed geothermal heating and cooling.
19 That is an up and coming technology, a green
20 technology, that uses groundwater for its
21 functionality and so we decided to do a
22 report on that because it is an important
23 groundwater issue.

24 Additionally, water supply
25 alternatives such as desalination, potable

1 water reuse, and aquifer storage and
2 recovery. We discussed a lot of these types
3 of technology, kind of glanced over
4 frequently. But we decided to have a
5 chapter of the report devoted to that.

6 On the water quality side we
7 talked extensively about regional
8 groundwater contamination events, the
9 Grumman plume being the one in Bethpage and
10 other events that have effected larger
11 sections of the aquifer system. We talked
12 about chloride contamination of potable
13 wells from both salt water intrusion,
14 lateral intrusion, vertical upconing as well
15 as road salting.

16 And we talked about some
17 additional water quality issues as reported
18 on by the Suffolk County Department of
19 Health considering mostly emerging
20 contaminants, things like one 1,4 dioxane
21 and stuff like that.

22 Then on the quantity side, we
23 have an extensive discussion of competing
24 uses, potable suppliers are not The only
25 people using groundwater out there.

1 Agriculture uses its fair share as well as
2 golf courses, industry and there are other
3 users out there. So a full discussion of
4 all the people who utilize groundwater on
5 Long Island, certainly warranted its own
6 report. And similarly the Lloyd Aquifer.
7 The Lloyd Aquifer is used extensively for
8 water supply in Nassau but minimally in
9 Suffolk so we have a report on that.

10 Also conservation and water use
11 efficiency. Paul Granger of the Port
12 Washington Water District did a report on
13 that. We also have a small section of that
14 report dedicated to wastewater reuse, in
15 particular the Indian Island Golf Course
16 down the road as was employing wastewater
17 reuse this past summer. There's a section
18 in the report dedicated to that.

19 And also Cross County Water
20 Transmission. Usually that's to supply
21 Nassau from either Suffolk on the or the
22 City on the west, so a report was done on
23 that. And finally, one of the more hotter
24 topics going on these days, the potential
25 reactivation of the public supply well

1 system in Queens, the former Jamaica Water
2 Supply System. Brian Schneider of the
3 Nassau County DPW did a report on that.

4 And in addition to those 15
5 reports, we had two other reports dedicated
6 to initiatives that have either started or
7 been finished while LICAP was in session.
8 One of which was known as WaterTraQ, a water
9 quality and mapping database. That is
10 contained within a Long Island Aquifer
11 Commission's website.

12 That's a good example of
13 something that was started and up and
14 running during LICAP's -- from when LICAP
15 was started. Another important study Long
16 Island Sustainability Study, undertaken by
17 USGS, has begun in the last six months or a
18 year or so. Again, while LICAP was
19 in session. Should be done in a couple of
20 years.

21 All right. So the Plan is
22 organized in 10 basic sections. The first
23 section is the Executive Summary and
24 Introduction. It's available out in the
25 lobby for anybody who cares to read it. It

1 also contains the top 15 major
2 recommendations. We didn't want to make
3 people wade through a 200 page report just
4 to find the most important recommendations,
5 so it's mentioned right up front.

6 The next couple of sections are
7 Summary of Existing Conditions, existing
8 groundwater conditions, regulatory and
9 management issues, as well as existing
10 threats and assessment of the existing
11 programs that deal with those threats.

12 The next couple of sections are
13 more future oriented; management and
14 implementation opportunities going forward
15 as well as recommendations and
16 implementation schedule for those
17 recommendations.

18 Then the last two sections are an
19 acknowledge on the report authors and of our
20 references that the authors used to make
21 those reports. The 15 reports that I
22 mentioned earlier yielded a total 143
23 recommendations. Many of those
24 recommendations were highly specific to one
25 report. So the recommendations were

1 summarized and assembled and given to the
2 LICAP voting board members to rank.

3 And they were ranked in this A,
4 B, C fashion shown here on the slide. A
5 being immediate. B being short term. C
6 being long term. And some recommendations
7 were even given another letter E for
8 elimination because while they may have been
9 very important to one specific report, the
10 overall scheme of things they were not
11 deemed as necessary as others and were
12 just eliminated from consideration.

13 And also similar recommendations
14 that were from different reports were
15 combined in the recommendation section. So
16 we ended up with 15 what we're calling A
17 list recommendations that are listed here on
18 the next two slides in no particular order.
19 But these were the ones that the LICAP
20 voting members decided were the most
21 immediate and most important and recommended
22 for immediate implementation.

23 And again they are contained in
24 the handouts that we showed in the lobby
25 earlier. So the full reports will be

1 available as part of appendix so if you do
2 find something in the Management Plan that
3 does strike your fancy, you can read more
4 about it in one of the full reports.

5 They are also available on the
6 LICAP website. This interim plan as we're
7 calling it was adopted on December 13 by
8 LICAP. And public comments will be accepted
9 through the close of business on Friday,
10 February 2.

11 You can submit comments on the
12 web by e-mail, via old fashion regular snail
13 mail, and via the phone to the Water
14 Authority or just by calling in.

15 Now in conclusion going forward
16 LICAP will complete and publish its yearly
17 State of the Aquifer Report in next upcoming
18 months. And we will continue to budget
19 based on the funding we receive from New
20 York State, part of which should go and may
21 go to continue to expand the data for use by
22 WaterTraq and for use by USGS Sustainability
23 and Groundwater Study.

24 With that I'll conclude my
25 presentation and we can open it up to public

1 comment if anybody wants to comment.

2 MR. SZABO: Thank you, Steve, much
3 appreciated. I would ask if anyone has
4 comments to make for the Commission that
5 they come up the podium. (No response).

6 Okay. We see no hands being
7 raised. Nobody is rushing toward the podium
8 to make a comment. It is 6:16. Why don't
9 we recess for 15 minutes and we'll see if
10 anyone comes, from the public decides to
11 come and speak before the Commission. If
12 they do, we'll go back into session and
13 accept comments at that time. Let's recess
14 for 15 minutes, thank you.

15 (A recess was taken.)

16 MR. SZABO: It's 6:32. We can go back into
17 session. This is a reminder, a friendly
18 reminder, this is a Public Hearing. It's
19 not necessarily a Q and A but Walter and I
20 will do our best to answer questions you
21 have.

22 MS. BERRY: I apologize because I'm not
23 prepared with comments. I have only skimmed
24 little pieces so I don't have a full
25 understanding of the reports so...

1 My name is Glynis Berry. I'm
2 with Peconic Green Growth and have worked on
3 the water issues. And I'm starting to look
4 at water quantity issues for the Town of
5 Southold so I have been analyzing the data.
6 So I'm very concerned about this.

7 MR. SZABO: Excuse me. I can't hear you.
8 I'm not sure if your microphone is on.

9 MS. BERRY: Is that better?

10 MR. SZABO: Much better, thank you.

11 MS. BERRY: Okay. My name is Glynis Berry,
12 Peconic Green Growth. I have been working
13 on water quality and I am now working on
14 quantity issues as well on the North Fork
15 right now. A couple of things, you talk
16 about having the conservation pricing but
17 I'm wondering how that money will be used
18 and if it could really go to conservation
19 efforts and not just be a penalty so I hope
20 that's part of the idea, that we can
21 incentivize real water conservation.

22 And one of the things that always
23 gets missed is, at least on the East End,
24 roughly over 50 percent are still on onsite
25 wells and the shallow aquifers. And I never

1 quite see anything that helps those people.
2 And I think how do we get the incentive to
3 also benefit people on wells because it will
4 effect the salt water intrusion to have a
5 program that's more comprehensive. And so
6 that is a question I guess.

7 And when you're talking about
8 working and reviewing municipal planning
9 board applications, it might also be helpful
10 to have the reverse happen. Where you
11 can -- since you are doing the master plan
12 and mapping issues, the areas that are going
13 to be very vulnerable to salt water
14 intrusion, if pumping is over X. And
15 usually pumping over X happens with certain
16 parameters. So that we can -- then planners
17 can really plan and start matching zoning to
18 some of these critical things instead of
19 going on an individual by individual and not
20 having the data to support that.

21 And we actually had an example in
22 Southold where somebody wanted an livestock
23 farm literally in wetlands going into an
24 area that is impaired. And, you know, there
25 was no sense of how much water pumping would

1 be appropriate there or what that parcel
2 could actually support. So maybe some
3 guidelines for planning could be developed
4 on these critical -- whether it's quantity
5 or salt water intrusion or some other issue
6 that might come up.

7 And I've looked at some of the
8 western programs and they actually have
9 water budgets and some of them are very
10 specific where they actually sort of give
11 guidance on how much water you should use
12 per crop. So, if, you know, one locale can
13 only support X amount of water usage in a
14 sustainable way and of course we want things
15 that do have a high water use like farming
16 is always there, how do you compensate for
17 that and also how do you control it within
18 the industry as well?

19 So I think that kind of water
20 budget and understanding in the planning
21 work could help. And mapping is always
22 great. So I guess those are just some
23 reactions to reading the top 15. And I
24 really think there should be a great
25 emphasis on conservation and really lowering

1 the numbers.

2 Communities like have really
3 lowered tremendously their water use in the
4 west. It's harder here because it's not as
5 visceral but we have the same tools and we
6 have a lot of good examples. So, hopefully
7 real conservation can be part of this. And
8 hopefully that money can go back to doing
9 that. Because we need funding sources.
10 Because there is no funding right now for
11 water conservation.

12 MR. SZABO:

13 Thank you very much for you
14 comments. I'll speak to a couple of the
15 items and try to answer them. When you talk
16 about conservation and conservation
17 initiatives, I believe it was in the Spring
18 Summer of 2015 that the Water Authority
19 launched a conservation initiative focused
20 on the East End of Long Island, the North
21 Fork and the South Fork, bringing awareness
22 to residents that they need to conserve and
23 offering incentives to them if they
24 purchased low flow devices, shower heads and
25 other things like that.

So it -- the point that we have

1 tried to stress since that initiative was
2 kicked off is that it's not just a one of
3 one month campaign or a two month campaign.
4 Conservation, having that dialogue with the
5 public and having that discussion
6 continuously over months and years, that is
7 really the only way that you will get into,
8 you know, the resident's heads so they
9 understand the importance of water and how
10 much water is wasted and the importance of
11 conservation when they have a sole source
12 aquifer and we have enough water to last a
13 long, long time but it doesn't mean that you
14 can't use it wisely.

15 So our initiatives, we have given
16 a couple of thousand dollars in total over
17 the last couple of years as a rebate to
18 residents who purchased these types of
19 devices. But we have also started a series
20 of discussions in various communities. We
21 have been in Sag Harbor and West Islip,
22 Southold, Northport, West Islip where we're
23 sort of crisscrossing the Island every other
24 month in nighttime community meetings.
25 We're calling them Water Talk and inviting

1 the public, residents, to come in to learn
2 about Suffolk County Water Authority, the
3 water quality and conservation, a whole 20
4 minute segment just dedicated to
5 conservation.

6 And it's not just us. It's not
7 just the Water Authority. It's us along
8 with other entities, whether it be the
9 County or the State and Villages and other
10 water providers. So I think it's a combined
11 joint effort with all interested parties
12 over a long period of time that really can
13 move that conservation initiative forward.
14 These are just sort of the beginning steps.

15 When it comes to conservation
16 pricing or tiered rate pricing, we did a
17 rate study two years ago. We have a very
18 flat structure, rate structure right now.
19 And the consultant had recommended that we
20 adopt a tiered structure. And the board at
21 the Water Authority after reviewing the
22 report and hearing from the consultants and
23 the experts and also the staff decided to
24 hold off at least initially on implementing
25 that type of plan.

1 That discussion will come up
2 again over the next couple of months with
3 the Board of the Water Authority. We have
4 put together many different proposals and
5 concepts of how we think it could
6 potentially work. It would be a tiered rate
7 structure where if you receive certain
8 threshold based on meter size, you would
9 move into that higher tier. But the
10 revenue, the additional revenue that you
11 would get from crossing that tier would be
12 used primarily to go back into paid for the
13 cost of bringing the service.

14 Does that make sense? I'm not
15 sure if I'm being clear.

16 MS. BERRY: Yes. So it's going back to
17 providing a service area rather than
18 conservation.

19 MR. MILAZZO: It pays for the incremental cost
20 for that extra --

21 MS. BERRY: But that doesn't deal with the
22 issue then.

23 MR. MILAZZO: No, it does. It addresses the
24 issue in that it had provides a financial
25 incentive to use less water because you're

1 not paying as much if you go over that
2 threshold, that ceiling. But the funds, the
3 revenue, would be used by the provider to
4 pay for additional wells to meet the demand
5 that it creates.

6 MS. BERRY: But that's kind of the opposite
7 of how it should be because you're using
8 that money to actually meet that high demand
9 in some ways instead of trying to reduce the
10 demand.

11 MR. SZABO: The higher cost would be the
12 disincentive.

13 MR. MILAZZO: What would you propose?

14 MS. BERRY: I think the tiered approach is
15 really great, and if there's anything I can
16 do to help with that, I would love to
17 because I think it is an important way of
18 getting people to at least become aware of
19 it. But I think that extra money should be
20 going to reducing demand. Because that's
21 the more sustainable future. It's not
22 continuing to meet any demand that's out
23 there.

24 So I would think -- you know, and
25 there have been examples of where using

1 conservation was the cheapest way of
2 actually handling the issue. Because you're
3 saving on all that cost of extra
4 infrastructure. So, I would hope that a
5 good portion of any extra funds, and maybe
6 even some of it gets, you know, back to some
7 of the Towns. And I don't know how we deal
8 with the people on wells.

9 MR. SZABO: Why would it go back to the
10 Towns?

11 MS. BERRY: Well, I was thinking of -- like
12 in Southold, you know, over 50 percent are
13 on wells. So how can you protect the whole
14 aquifer and get everybody --

15 MR. SZABO: Right. But revenue, any revenue
16 from the Water Authority, right, those funds
17 would not go back to the Town or State or
18 County for --

19 MS. BERRY: For water conservation.

20 MR. SZABO: -- for conservation.

21 MS. BERRY: I mean, whether it's done through
22 you or programs you make wider, but I think
23 that there's a real need to look at the
24 bigger picture. I'm from the East End so
25 our issues are different from what you are

1 dealing with on the western end. You know,
2 we're -- everybody is on public water and so
3 therefore you're -- but, we have a different
4 situation on the East End. So I'm wondering
5 if that can somehow enter into the
6 conversation on how to handle that.

7 MR. MILAZZO: My advice would be, because we
8 are at a Public Hearing, if you have a
9 suggestion, you should write it down and
10 submit it so that LICAP as a group can
11 consider it and incorporate it into the
12 Plan. Because it seems like this is an
13 issue that kind of you are passionate about
14 and you have some ideas. So that would give
15 you -- I know Jeff is going to say in about
16 three minutes that public comments are going
17 to be open until February 2.

18 MS. BERRY: Okay.

19 MR. MILAZZO: So I think that this is an
20 opportunity for you, rather than have a
21 dialogue on how it could work, give a
22 proposal to LICAP to consider.

23 MS. BERRY: Okay.

24 MR. SZABO: I just want to point out, the
25 incentive that the Water Authority provides

1 for residents on private wells to connect,
2 right, to come off the private wells and
3 connect to the Water Authority is something
4 we called a 75 Foot Rule. Which we
5 basically, we absorb the first 75 feet of
6 water main, that cost.

7 So we reduce the cost so that
8 people can connect to try to make it more
9 financially feasible. The other thing I
10 just wanted to mention and I wasn't sure if
11 I got this, I got your comments correct.
12 But it seemed to be related to planning and
13 guidelines related to --

14 MS. BERRY: Land use.

15 MR. SZABO: Land use.

16 MS. BERRY: And the approval of the projects.
17 Because it related to one of the suggestions
18 about having some review of some of the
19 projects. But I think what happens when
20 it's a case by case basis is you don't have
21 the structure to make an informed decision
22 against. So, understanding pumping rates in
23 certain critical areas that may have a
24 negative impact on water quality like
25 saltwater intrusion or where ledges are too

1 small -- where quantity is an issue in some
2 of these isolated aquifers, you know, where
3 we're using the upper glacier.

4 So I think thinking from a real
5 planning perspective could help the Towns
6 when they are doing their land use and when
7 they are reviewing projects to know if it's
8 too intense.

9 MR. SZABO:

10 I know we supply, during the
11 SEQRA process, we supply and review
12 applications and provide those comments to
13 the Town Planning Department. We have not
14 only our Water Resource Department but we
15 have our Production Control and our
16 Construction Department. All three
17 divisions review the applications, provide
18 comments and then under my signature we sort
19 submit the summary.

20 What's frustrating -- and we
21 indicate and we always stress that
22 conservation, right, conservation practices
23 should be used and we outline exactly how
24 they can handle landscaping that would not
25 be detrimental and irrigation if they are on
a private well. There's a whole series of

1 recommendations that it's almost standard
2 language, especially in Towns like Southold
3 and other towns on the south fork.

4 What is frustrating for the Water
5 Authority is often when these applications
6 come through, they are not complete. They
7 don't have the required information or it's
8 a best guess from the consultant who is
9 working --

10 MS. BERRY: Sure.

11 MR. SZABO: -- developer to put X project
12 in. So we are -- in fact, we question and
13 often question some of the figures that they
14 present saying this is the estimated use.
15 And we often will kick it back to them
16 saying, this is -- you know, this may not be
17 our particular field of expertise, but we
18 know that this is not accurate. You need to
19 come back to us with something more
20 realistic.

21 So we have been very aggressive.
22 And historically we have not been. But I
23 would say the last five to seven years, we
24 have been extremely aggressive in trying to
25 have the Towns and different developers

1 submit the appropriate information for the
2 application because it does impact the
3 aquifer.

4 MS. BERRY: But couldn't it also work -- I
5 think it's great what you just said and it's
6 very important. But also taking your
7 criteria and maybe having a summary document
8 like typical uses and, you know, when
9 quantity kicks in, certain criteria. If
10 there's some kind of general guidance so
11 that at least the Towns can look at that so
12 they know it's a red flag.

13 Because I know I have seen
14 applications where nobody quite realizes it
15 and then suddenly, oh, it has a negative
16 impact here and there. That wasn't fully
17 thought out by the application.

18 MR. SZABO: It's my understanding that we
19 supply that information, or at least a
20 description in our submissions back to the
21 Town.

22 MS. BERRY: Okay. And then one last comment,
23 I'm looking at one year's worth of data for
24 Southold. And what I'm finding -- I thought
25 there would be like jumps. Like this person

1 irrigates, you know, this person -- but, it
2 wasn't. It was continuous. And the average
3 was very much different from the mean in
4 water use.

5 And basically 40 percent were
6 using over 150 percent of the national
7 average. And then it went up and up and up
8 and the curve just went, shoop, like this.
9 And it was continuous. And I did a
10 correlation with -- because I didn't have
11 size of buildings, I did a correlation with
12 value, and there was a pretty close
13 relationship to value and water use.

14 So there might be a sense of
15 entitlement that is another issue that has
16 to be incorporated in rated how you
17 introduce conservation.

18 MR. MILAZZO: Could be irrigation systems.

19 MS. BERRY: It could be.

20 MR. MILAZZO: It is --

21 MS. BERRY: But I didn't get the jumps I
22 expected with irrigation.

23 MR. MILAZZO: So you're not saying a fall off.
24 But you only have a year's data.

25 MS. BERRY: I only have a year's date.

1 MR. MILAZZO: Did you have a winter cycle to a
2 winter cycle?

3 MS. BERRY: Yes, I do.

4 MR. MILAZZO: So you didn't see a sine curve --

5 MS. BERRY: Actually, summer, extremely high
6 and fall is extremely high. Because we have
7 a big tourist community as well.

8 MR. MILAZZO: Yes.

9 MS. BERRY: So the way if data came, it
10 didn't -- clear categories didn't come out
11 the way I thought it would.

12 MR. MILAZZO: I think the irrigation season is
13 extended now, right? We're seeing that
14 traditional irrigation cycle is longer in
15 the year and you're probably catching that.
16 You're not seeing that dead of winter drop
17 off, because you'll see that. Especially on
18 the North Fork where it's seasonal. People
19 that aren't there in the winter aren't using
20 water like in the summer.

21 So you'll see that curve. The
22 bigger question is, is that baseline trend.
23 If you take out the curve for irrigation, is
24 that going up? I don't know. I think
25 that's held flat or decreases because of the

1 slow flow fixtures. So you're actually
2 seeing a decline in base rate and an
3 increase in irrigation rate, if you will.

4 But I really recommend you submit
5 your comments in writing, especially with
6 respect to that incentive pricing,
7 conservation pricing. And how you would
8 like to see the funds allocated.

9 MS. BERRY: Okay.

10 MR. MILAZZO: And that would be good for LICAP
11 to have, you know, as a legal matter, we
12 would have to look at it whether we can
13 distribute funds. But it would be better if
14 you thought about it some more and gave it
15 to us in writing so the whole group can
16 consider it.

17 MS. BERRY: Okay. Thank you very much.

18 MR. MILAZZO: Thank you.

19 MS. BERRY: I appreciate everything you are
20 doing because it's so, so important.

21 MR. SZABO: We are glad you came. Thank you
22 so much. At 6:50, approximately. We will
23 close the Hearing for this evening and just
24 make mention that public comments will be
25 accepted until Friday, February 2.

<hr/>	<hr/>	address	approach	Authority
1	6	4:11	4:17	2:8 3:15
			24:14	15:14
1,4	6:16	addressed		20:17
10:20	16:8	4:15	approval	22:2,7,21
			27:16	23:3
10	6:32	addresses	approved	25:16
12:22	16:16	23:23	2:10	26:25
13	<hr/>	adequacy	aquifer	27:3
15:7	7	7:24	2:3 3:21,	authors
143	<hr/>	adopt	22 4:4	8:10,14
13:22	75	22:20	7:22 8:2	13:19,20
	27:4,5	adopted	10:1,11	aware
15	<hr/>	6:12 15:7	11:6,7	24:18
6:25 8:16	A	advice	12:10	awareness
12:4	<hr/>	26:7	15:17	20:20
13:1,21	absorb	affecting	21:12	
14:16	27:5	8:24	25:14	<hr/>
16:9,14	academics	agencies	aquifers	B
19:23	4:9	4:8 5:9	17:25	
<hr/>	accept	Agriculture	28:2	back
2	16:13	11:1	area	4:21 6:5
	accepted	alternative	18:24	7:6
2	15:8	s	23:17	16:12,16
15:10	acknowledge	9:25	areas	20:8
26:17	13:19	amendments	18:12	23:12,16
20	action	8:7	27:23	25:6,9,17
22:3	8:1	amount	aspect	Barrens
200	actions	19:13	7:18	9:3
13:3	8:8	analyzing	aspects	Bartilucci
2013	activist	17:5	7:9	5:25
2:9 4:21	4:9	apologize	assembled	based
2014	addition	16:22	14:1	6:17
6:5	8:6 12:4	appendix	assesses	15:19
2015	additional	15:1	7:24	23:8
20:17	10:17	application	assessment	basic
<hr/>	23:10	s	13:10	12:22
5	24:4	18:9	attended	basically
	Additionall	28:11,16	6:6	8:20 27:5
50	y	appreciated	attendeess	basis
17:24	9:24	16:3	6:11	4:13,15
25:12				27:20

began 6:5	budget 15:18 19:20	5:20	Commission 2:3 4:4 16:4,11	conservatio n 11:10 17:16,18, 21 19:25 20:7,11, 15,18
begin 2:20 3:11	budgets 19:9	cheapest 25:1	Commission' s 12:11	
beginning 22:14	bunch 5:14	Chief 2:6	communities 20:2 21:20	
begun 12:17	business 15:9	chloride 10:12	community 5:12 6:8 21:24	
benefit 18:3		citizen 4:9		
Berry 16:22 17:1,9,11 23:16,21 24:6,14 25:11,19, 21 26:18, 23 27:14, 16	<hr/> C <hr/>	City 11:22		
Bethpage 10:9	called 27:4	clear 7:21 23:15	compensate 19:16	conserve 20:21
bigger 9:9 25:24	calling 14:16 15:7,14 21:25	climate 9:1	competing 10:23	considerati on 14:12
Bill 5:24	campaign 21:3	close 15:9	complete 15:16	Constructio n 28:15
board 14:2 18:9 22:20 23:3	cares 12:25	Colabufo 2:23 3:10,12, 13	completion 2:25	consultant 7:14 22:19
bolts 7:3	case 27:20	collage 5:8	comprehensi ve 3:24 5:11 18:5	consultants 22:22
bottom 4:22	caused 7:23	collectivel y 5:1	comprised 2:12 7:3	contained 12:10 14:23
branches 5:4	ceiling 24:2	combined 14:15 22:10	concepts 23:5	contaminant s 10:20
Brian 12:2	chaired 5:19,24	comment 3:2 16:1, 8	concerned 17:6	contaminati on 10:8,12
bringing 20:20 23:13	Chairman 2:9	comments 15:8,11 16:4,13, 23 20:13 26:16 27:11 28:11,17	conclude 15:24	continue 15:18,21
	chairs 6:15,23		conclusion 15:15	continuing 24:22
	change 9:1		conditions 13:7,8	continuousl y 21:6
	chapter 10:5		connect 27:1,3,8	
	charge			

contributions 2:18	courses 11:2	Dawydiak 3:6,7	9:25	distributio n 6:4
control 19:17 28:14	create 6:25	days 11:24	designed 9:5	District 11:12
conversatio n 26:6	created 2:9 4:18, 19 7:1,7	deal 13:11 23:21 25:7	determined 6:13	divided 6:16 8:23
cooling 9:18	creates 8:1 24:5	dealing 26:1	detrimental 28:24	divisions 28:16
cooperative 7:8	crisscrossi ng 21:23	DEC 2:19 5:6	develop 5:20	dollars 21:16
correct 27:11	critical 18:18 19:4 27:23	December 15:7	developed 19:3	Dorian 9:17
cost 23:13,19 24:11 25:3 27:6,7	crop 19:12	decided 9:21 10:4 14:20 22:23	devices 20:23 21:19	DPW 12:3
counsel 3:4	cross 6:7 11:19	decides 16:10	devoted 10:5	Drinking 2:13
Counties 4:7 9:7	crossing 23:11	decision 27:21	dialogue 21:4 26:21	Dvirka 5:25
County 2:7,11,14 3:7,15 5:4,6,16 10:18 11:19 12:3 22:2,9 25:18	culmination 7:5	dedicated 11:14,18 12:5 22:4	difference 7:11	<hr/> E <hr/>
	cultural 8:24 9:8	deemed 14:11	dioxane 10:20	e-mail 15:12
	<hr/> D <hr/>	deliverable 3:18	direction 7:13	earlier 13:22 14:25
couple 7:21 8:17 12:19 13:6,12 17:15 20:13 21:16,17 23:2	Dale 9:17	demand 24:4,8, 10,20,22	discuss 3:20 4:1	East 17:23 20:19 25:24 26:4
	damage 7:23	Department 3:7 10:18 28:12,13, 15	discussed 6:16 9:16,18 10:2	edit 6:25
	data 15:21 17:5 18:20	Departments 2:15 5:6	discussion 10:23 11:3 21:5 23:1	effect 18:4
	database 12:9	desalinatio n	discussions 21:20	effected 10:10
			disincentiv e 24:12	efficiency 11:11

effort 22:11	examples 20:6 24:25	fashion 3:20 14:4 15:12	3:25 13:14 15:15 22:13	geothermal 9:18
efforts 7:8,16 8:12 17:19	Excuse 17:7	feasible 27:9	Framework 8:19	give 7:13 19:10 26:14,21
eliminated 14:12	executive 2:6 5:4 12:23	February 15:10 26:17	frequently 10:4	glacier 28:3
elimination 14:8	Executives 2:14	feet 27:5	Friday 15:9	glanced 10:3
emerging 10:19	existing 7:9,16,25 13:7,9,10	fellow 8:13	friendly 16:17	Glynis 17:1,11
emphasis 19:25	expand 15:21	finally 11:23	front 13:5	golf 11:2,15
employees 5:5	experts 22:23	financial 23:24	frustrating 28:19	good 2:1,2 12:12 20:6 25:5
employing 11:16	extensive 10:23	financially 27:9	full 11:3 14:25 15:4 16:24	government 4:8 5:16
end 17:23 20:19 25:24 26:1,4	extensively 10:7 11:7	find 13:4 15:2	functional 9:21	Granger 11:11
ended 8:16 14:16	extra 23:20 24:19 25:3,5	finished 12:7	ty 9:21	great 19:22,24 24:15
Engineering 6:1	<hr/> F <hr/>	flat 22:18	funding 15:19 20:9,10	green 9:19 17:2,12
enter 26:5	facilities 6:21	flow 20:23	funds 24:2 25:5,16	groundwater 2:5,24 3:16,23 5:12 6:7, 14 7:4, 10,17,19, 25 8:20, 22,25 9:20,23
entities 2:19 22:8	facing 4:13 6:3	focused 6:18,21 20:18	future 13:13 24:21	general 10:8,25 11:4 13:8 15:23
environmental 6:9	fair 11:1	Foot 27:4	<hr/> G <hr/>	Geological 5:7
evening 2:1,2 3:3	fancy 15:3	Fork 17:14 20:20	group	
events 10:8,10	farm 18:23	formed 4:11		
	farming 19:15	forward		

26:10	hear	impact	incremental	introductio
groups	2:22 17:7	9:2 27:24	23:19	n
4:10 6:9	hearing	impaired	Indian	2:21
Growth	2:4,20	18:24	11:15	12:24
17:2,12	4:2 16:18	implementat	individual	intrusion
Grumman	22:22	ion	8:16 9:13	10:13,14
10:9	26:8	8:3	18:19	18:4,14
guess	heating	13:14,16	industry	19:5
18:6	9:18	14:22	2:13 5:22	27:25
19:22	helpful	implementin	7:10,17	inviting
guidance	18:9	g	11:2	21:25
19:11	helps	22:24	19:18	irrigation
guidelines	18:1	importance	informed	28:24
8:18 19:3	high	21:9,10	27:21	island
27:13	19:15	important	infrastruct	2:3 4:4,
	24:8	9:22	ure	13,16
	higher	12:15	5:19 6:18	5:2,12
H	23:9	13:4	25:4	6:7 7:10,
	24:11	14:9,21	initial	17 8:19,
handle	highly	24:17	6:11	22,25
26:6	13:24	inaugural	initially	11:5,15
28:23	hold	3:21	22:24	12:10,16
handling	22:24	incentive	initiative	20:19
25:2	holistic	18:2	20:18	21:23
handouts	4:16	23:25	21:1	Islip
14:24	hope	26:25	22:13	21:21,22
hands	17:19	incentives	initiatives	isolated
16:6	25:4	20:22	9:4 12:6	28:2
happen	hotter	incentivize	20:16	issue
18:10	11:23	17:21	21:15	9:1,23
Harbor		include	input	19:5
21:21	I	4:24	2:18	23:22,24
harder		included	intense	25:2
20:4	idea	6:14	28:8	26:13
heads	17:20	includes	interested	28:1
20:23	ideas	4:7	22:11	issues
21:8	26:14	inclusive	interim	4:12 8:24
Health	identify	5:11	15:6	9:8 10:17
2:14 3:7	5:21	incorporate	Internally	13:9
5:6 10:19		26:11	5:17	17:3,4,14

items 20:14	10:10	14:17	lowering 19:25	meeting 6:5
<hr/>	lateral 10:14	literally 18:23	<hr/>	meetings 6:6,12 21:24
J <hr/>	launched 20:18	livestock 18:22	M <hr/>	
Jamaica 12:1	law 6:12	Lloyd 11:6,7	mail 15:13	members 2:21 4:24 5:11,13, 15,16 14:2,20
Jeff 2:6 3:12 26:15	laws 8:21	lobby 12:25 14:24	main 7:11 27:6	
John 3:4	learn 22:1	local 4:15	major 3:18 13:1	mention 27:10
joining 2:22	ledges 27:25	locale 19:12	make 3:2 13:2, 20 16:4,8 23:14 25:22 27:8,21	mentioned 3:13 13:5,22
joint 22:11	legislation 4:20	long 2:3 4:4, 13 5:2,12 6:7 7:10, 17 8:19, 22,25 11:5 12:10,15 14:6 20:19 21:13 22:12		Merklin 5:25
<hr/>	legislative 8:8		management 2:5,24 3:17,24 6:15 7:4, 20,25 8:20 9:9 13:9,13 15:2	met 3:19
K <hr/>	Legislature s 2:11,16 4:21 5:3			meter 23:8
kicked 21:2				methodologi es 9:11
kind 4:14 5:8 7:3,14 8:13 10:3 19:19 24:6 26:13	letter 14:7	long-term 5:21 6:19 8:2	Manager 3:14	microphone 17:8
<hr/>	LICAP 2:9 3:16, 18 4:3, 14,18,22, 24 5:17 6:12 7:7 12:7,14, 18 14:2, 19 15:6, 8,16 26:10,22	looked 19:7	mapping 12:9 18:12 19:21	Milazzo 3:4,5 23:19,23 24:13 26:7,19
L <hr/>		lot 5:10 10:2 20:6	master 18:11	million 5:1
land 9:4 27:14,15 28:6	LICAP's 2:8 3:3 12:14	love 24:16	matching 18:17	minimally 11:8
landscaping 28:23		low 20:23	material 7:2	minute 22:4
large 5:10	list 14:17	lowered 20:3	matter 6:13	minutes 16:9,14 26:16
larger	listed		meet 24:4,8,22	

missed 17:23	21:24	14:18	Paul 11:11	8:1,5,9, 10,14
mission 6:17	nonvoting 5:15	organized 6:24 8:17 12:22	pay 24:4	12:21 15:2,6 18:11,17
money 17:17 20:8 24:8,19	North 17:14 20:19	oriented 6:19,22 13:13	paying 24:1	22:25 26:12
month 21:3,24	Northport 21:22	outline 28:22	pays 23:19	planners 18:16
months 12:17 15:18 21:6 23:2	numbers 20:1	oversaw 6:24	Peconic 17:2,12	planning 18:8 19:3,20 27:12 28:5,12
move 22:13 23:9	numerous 2:18	<hr/> P <hr/>	penalty 17:19	
Moving 9:8	nuts 7:3	package 9:14	people 10:25 11:4 13:3 18:1,3 24:18 25:8 27:8	plants 9:15
municipal 18:8	<hr/> O <hr/>	paid 23:12	percent 17:24 25:12	plume 10:9
<hr/> N <hr/>	offering 20:22	parameters 18:16	period 22:12	podium 16:5,7
Nassau 2:10,13 4:6,20,25 5:3,4,5 9:6,10,12 11:8,21 12:3	Officer 2:7	parcel 19:1	perspective 28:5	point 20:25 26:24
natural 8:24,25	officers 2:15	part 15:1,20 17:20 20:7	phone 15:13	Port 11:11
necessarily 16:19	officials 4:9	participati ng 5:9	picture 7:22 25:24	portion 25:5
negative 27:24	onsite 17:24	parties 22:11	pieces 16:24	potable 6:4 9:25 10:12,24
Nice 3:8	open 15:25 26:17	partnership 4:5	Pine 9:3	potential 6:2 7:23 9:2 11:24
nighttime	opportuniti es 5:24 6:20 13:14	passed 4:20	plan 2:5,24 3:17,24 5:21 6:15 7:4,5,11, 14,20	potentially 7:23 23:6
	opportunity 26:20	passionate 26:13		practices 9:10 28:21
	opposite 24:6	past 11:17		practitione rs 7:9,16
	order			

prepared 16:23	programs 13:11 19:8 25:22	21:18	raw 7:2	24:9 27:7
presentatio n 2:22 3:1, 11 15:25	projects 27:16,19 28:7	purpose 4:18	reactions 19:23	reducing 24:20
preservatio n 9:4	proposal 26:22	put 23:4	reactivatio n 11:25	references 13:20
preserve 9:5	proposals 23:4	<hr/> Q <hr/>	read 12:25 15:3	Region 2:19
presiding 2:15	propose 24:13	quality 4:12 9:5 10:6,17	reading 19:23	regional 4:17 9:12 10:7
pricing 17:16 22:16	protect 25:13	12:9 17:13 22:3 27:24	real 17:21 20:7	regular 15:12
primarily 23:12	Protection 2:4 4:5	quantity 4:12 9:6 10:22	read 25:23 28:4	regulate 8:21
prior 4:14	provide 28:11,16	17:4,14 19:4 28:1	rebate 21:17	regulations 8:1
prioritizat ion 8:4	provider 24:3	Queens 12:1	receive 15:19 23:7	regulators 6:9
private 27:1,2 28:25	providers 4:25 22:10	question 18:6	recess 16:9,13, 15	regulatory 4:8 8:7, 19 13:8
problems 4:14,17	providing 23:17	questions 16:20	recommenda tion 14:15	related 27:12,13, 17
process 7:6 28:10	public 2:4 3:2 11:25 15:8,25 16:10,18	<hr/> R <hr/>	recommenda tion 14:15	relying 9:13
produced 7:7,14	21:5 22:1 26:2,8,16	raised 16:7	recommenda tions 8:5 13:2, 4,15,17, 23,24,25 14:6,13, 17	reminder 16:17,18
Production 28:14	publish 15:16	rank 14:2	recommended 8:7 14:21 22:19	report 3:21,22 6:24 9:17,22 10:5 11:6,9, 12,14,18, 22 12:3 13:3,19, 25 14:9
professiona ls 4:6	pumping 18:14,15, 25 27:22	ranked 14:3	recovery 10:2	15:17 22:22
program 8:3 18:5	purchased 20:23	rate 22:16,17, 18 23:6	reduce	
		rates 27:22		

reported 10:17	11:14,17	saltwater 27:25	16:12,17	size 23:8
reports 6:25 7:1, 2 8:17 12:5 13:21 14:14,25 15:4 16:25	revenue 23:10 24:3 25:15	saving 25:3	sewage 9:14	skimmed 16:23
represent 5:15	reverse 18:10	schedule 8:4 13:16	sewer 9:12	slide 4:23 14:4
representat ives 2:12 5:2	review 27:18 28:10,16	scheme 14:10	sewering 9:12	slides 8:9,13 14:18
resident's 21:8	reviewing 18:8 22:21 28:7	Schneider 12:2	share 11:1	small 9:14 11:13 28:1
residents 5:2 20:21 21:18 22:1 27:1	risks 5:21 6:3	scope 3:25	short 14:5	snail 15:12
resolutions 2:10	road 10:15 11:16	section 6:7 11:13,17 12:23 14:15	short-term 6:2	sole 21:11
resource 2:5,24 4:6 5:23 6:19 28:13	roughly 17:24	sections 10:11 12:22 13:6,12, 18	shorter 6:21	sort 19:10 21:23 22:14 28:17
resources 3:14,17, 23 5:19 6:17,20 7:4 9:2	Rule 27:4	segment 22:4	shout 8:13	source 21:11
respective 2:16	rules 8:21	sense 18:25 23:14	showed 14:24	sources 20:9
response 16:5	running 12:14	septic 9:13	shower 20:23	South 20:20
result 7:8,15	rushing 16:7	SEQRA 28:10	shown 4:22 14:4	Southold 17:5 18:22 21:22 25:12
reuse 10:1	S	series 21:19 28:25	side 9:1 10:6, 22	signature 28:17
	Sag 21:21	serve 2:8 5:1	significant 2:17	similar 3:20 14:13
	salt 10:13 18:4,13 19:5	service 23:13,17	similarly 11:6	span 7:1
	salting 10:15	session 12:7,19	situation 26:4	speak 16:11 20:13
				speakers 3:1

specific	23:7	summer	_____	three-year
7:22	27:21	11:17	T	7:6
13:24		20:17	_____	threshold
14:9	study			23:8 24:2
19:10	12:15,16	suppliers	talk	
Spring	15:23	4:8 6:3,9	3:16 9:1	tier
20:16	22:17	10:24	17:15	23:9,11
staff	stuff	supply	20:14	tiered
22:23	10:21	5:22 9:24	21:25	22:16,20
standing	subcommitte	11:8,20,	talked	23:6
5:17	e	25 12:2	9:3 10:7,	24:14
start	5:23,24	28:9,10	11,16	time
8:18	6:15,18,	support	talking	16:13
18:17	20,23	18:20	18:7	21:13
started	subcommitte	19:2,13	teams	22:12
7:6 12:6,	es	Survey	6:24	tonight
13,15	5:18 6:5	5:7	technology	3:15 4:1
21:19	subject	sustainabil	9:19,20	5:14
starting	6:13	ity	10:3	tonight's
17:3	submit	8:2 12:16	tent	2:20
State	15:11	15:22	5:11	tools
2:19	26:10	sustainable	term	20:5
3:20,21	28:18	19:14	6:21	top
5:6,16	Suffolk	24:21	14:5,6	13:1
15:17,20	2:7,11,13	system	thing	19:23
22:9	3:7,14	10:11	27:9	topics
25:17	4:7,21,25	12:1,2	things	6:16,19,
steps	5:3,4,5	systems	7:21	22 8:23
22:14	9:6,10,13	9:14	10:20	11:24
Steve	10:18	Szabo	14:10	total
2:23 3:13	11:9,21	2:1,6	17:15,22	13:22
16:2	22:2	3:6,8	18:18	21:16
storage	suggestion	16:2,16	19:14	Town
10:1	26:9	17:7,10	20:24	17:4
stress	suggestions	20:12	thinking	25:17
21:1	27:17	24:11	25:11	28:12
28:20	summarized	25:9,15,	28:4	Towns
strike	14:1	20 26:24	thousand	25:7,10
15:3	summary	27:15	21:16	28:5
structure	2:23 8:20	28:9	threats	Transmissio
22:18,20	12:23		7:22,24	n
	13:7		13:10,11	11:20
	28:18			

treatment 6:3 9:14	utilize 11:4	wastewater 9:9 11:14,16	wells 10:13 17:25 18:3 24:4 25:8,13 27:1,2	<hr/> y <hr/>
tremendousl y 20:3	<hr/> v <hr/>	water 2:7,13 3:14,15 4:5,7,12, 25 5:18, 22,23 6:3,4,17, 20 9:2,5, 24 10:1, 6,13,17 11:8,10, 12,19 12:1,8 15:13 17:3,4, 13,21 18:4,13, 25 19:5, 9,11,13, 15,19 20:3,11, 17 21:9, 10,12,25 22:2,3,7, 10,21 23:3,25 25:16,19 26:2,25 27:3,6,24 28:13	west 11:22 20:4 21:21,22	year 3:19 7:1 12:18
type 22:25	vertical 10:14		western 19:8 26:1	yearly 15:16
types 10:2 21:18	Vice 2:8		wetlands 18:23	years 12:20 21:6,17 22:17
<hr/> U <hr/>	Villages 22:9		wide 4:13,16 6:6	yielded 13:22
ultimately 6:13,25	visceral 20:5		wider 25:22	York 2:19 15:20
understand 21:9	volunteer 8:12		wisely 21:14	<hr/> z <hr/>
understandi ng 16:25 19:20 27:22	voting 5:13 14:2,20		wondering 17:17 26:4	zoning 18:17
undertaken 12:16	vulnerable 18:13		work 7:18 19:21 23:6 26:21	
upcoming 15:17	<hr/> W <hr/>	Watertraq 12:8 15:22	worked 17:2	
upconing 10:14	wade 13:3	ways 24:9	working 17:12,13 18:8	
upper 28:3	Walt 3:9	web 15:12	write 26:9	
usage 19:13	Walter 3:6 16:19	website 4:22 12:11 15:6	writing 6:24	
users 11:3	wanted 4:16 18:22 27:10			
USGS 12:17 15:22	warranted 11:5			
USTS 2:20	Washington 11:12			
	wasted 21:10			