

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.


Sincerely yours,

Don NEILSON

Box #17 RD #1

SIGEL PA

15860



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.


Sincerely yours,

Don NEILSON

Box #17 RD #1

SIGEL PA

15860



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Conrad J. Egan
R.D. #5 Box 281
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA
15767



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth W. Yates
21 Long Avenue
Brookville, Pa. 15825



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

David Shick
Rd # 4 Box 114
Brookville, Pa 15825



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.


I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Ken Reitz

KEN REITZ
18 FEDERAL ST.
BROOKVILLE, PA
15825



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Larry Simpson
Rt #1 Box 194B
Cresaca, Pa
15829



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Robert Sherman
RD#4 BX145H
Brookville Pa. 15825



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Kathy L. Stiles
R.D.#1 Box 290
Brookville, PA 15825



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?


The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Jeffery E Shields

P.O. Box 222

Brookville PA 15825



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Jean Schill



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:



This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwestern part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed---until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" designation for HQ or EV streams are based on the proposed regulation?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend it and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:



This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwestern part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed---until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" designation for HQ or EV streams are based on the proposed regulation?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend it and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:



This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.



I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Shane A Janosky



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Jeanie McCleary



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas E. Nfon



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Cindy L. Van Dyke



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Marylenn Schuster



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHI)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Wanda McKinney



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely, yours,

Richard McKinney



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Gary Snyder



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:



This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwestern part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed---until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" designation for HQ or EV streams are based on the proposed regulation?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend it and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Liz Morris



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Travis Haney



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:



This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Ann Heffelford
P.O. Box 287B
Steel, PA 15860



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Raymond A. Enig



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Jim Haney



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Donna Stacey



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Wm Gray Grant



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Donna Grant



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Keith T. Hedeman
PO BOX 135
Fisher, Pa. 16225-0135
(814) 764-5215



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Emma Hollenbaugh



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

John E. Elzer



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Shirley Spangler
Fisher, PA 16225



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?


The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Steven R Shaffer

RD #2 Box 140

Clarion PA 16214



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Dennis Gitzel



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Shannon Casey



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Earl Meyer



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Germanie Schill



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Clifford M. Keith



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?


The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Marilyn Shaup

P.S.

My son is an avid fisherman and wants to keep his fishing streams clean.



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Howell Riley Jr.



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:



This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:



This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Stephanie A. Hannon



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:



This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Angela R. Maxwell



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:



This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Mike Schell



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Salma M. Bohrer



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Marv Skitzu



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Dana Deitz



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Gwen Dolby



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Laura R. Keasler



Susan Wills
RD #2 Box 300
Summerville Pa
15864

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Susan Wills



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Michelle Kaputa
34 S 5TH
CLARION PA 16214



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

David Alt



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Baion Heasley



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHD)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.


I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



J.A. Dolby



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Marlene Austin



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.


I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Karen Hetrick

ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwestern part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed---until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" designation for HQ or EV streams are based on the proposed regulation?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend it and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "John H. Haugh".



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Hope Meyers".



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Neva Brothers



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Raymond E. Brothers



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Barry Gustin".



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas E. Gery



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ronald L. Bert".

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Alex Grant



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:



This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Honna Wheland



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Joseph M Prusakowski
J. M. PRUSAKOWSKI
24 WALNUT ST
BROOKVILLE PA 15825
5/6/97

ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Si red Brothers



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas W. Raybuck



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Helene McKenney



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Ann M. Butler



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:



This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Julian Draydo



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Mary E. Olson
RD # 1 Box 220
Brookville Pa. 15825



5/8/97

ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Mr. James Seif
Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
16th Floor, Rachel Carson Building
P.O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Re: Proposed Antidegradation Regulations (Revisions to PA Code Chapters 92, 93, and 95 published on January 21, 1997)


Dear Mr. Seif:

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed new antidegradation regulations for Pennsylvania. The proposal weakens the protections that exist under the current regulations promulgated for Pennsylvania by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and does not ensure that this state's highest quality waters will not be degraded.

As a member of Trout Unlimited, I am acutely aware of the ecological damage that can be done by any degradation of water quality. Pennsylvania is home to many outstanding trout streams that attract anglers from all over the world. These waters and their fisheries are threatened from a variety of sources, including coal mining and its after effects, increased development, polluted run-off, and industrial pollution. These sources are so pervasive and diverse that unless we make protecting high water quality a top priority, we will lose it.

I understand that Pennsylvania Trout is submitting comments on the regulations pointing out their specific shortcomings. The regulations should not be adopted unless all of the problems pointed out in those comments are fixed. The existing regulation is vastly preferable to the new proposal as it is now written.

Sincerely,
Sergei Basilev



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?


The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Edward C. Malle

*RR 2 Box 527
Summerville, Pa.*

15864



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Martha Blaine



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

RANDELL S. PALMER

110 Pine St
Brookville PA 15925



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Matthew H. Keth



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Amy J. Keth



BUD WILLS
RD #2, BOX 300
SUMMERVILLE, PA.
15864

ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Bud Wills



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Gay W. Mosen



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Len Ferraro
Len Ferraro



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?


The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Stephen F Schill

HCK Box 7

LEEPER PA 16233



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Francis C. ...



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwestern part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed---until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" designation for HQ or EV streams are based on the proposed regulation?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend it and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Andrew D. Gerbman
Box 104
Harrisburg Pa. 17134

might be a different
name than Patrick

ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Kevin Schill



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Richard A. Judge



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Penda Hoover



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:



This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwestern part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed---until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" designation for HQ or EV streams are based on the proposed regulation?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend it and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Richard L. Schell
RR #1 Box 414
Lucas, Pa 16235



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Benedict J. Sander



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:


This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?


The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

John J. Smail



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed—until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.


I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Len Ferraro

ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.


I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Jacky Smart
107 Central Ave
Brookville PA 15825

ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)



Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.


I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Theresa Humelbrink".



ORIGINAL: #1799
COPIES: NONE
(PER JHJ)

Chairman
Environmental Quality Board
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to the antidegradation regulation proposal in the March 22, 1997, *Pennsylvania Bulletin*.

I am opposed to the allowance of general NPDES permits in our High Quality streams. Oil and gas discharges have already done plenty of damage in the northwest part of the state, and now you want to allow their discharges in HQ streams. General permits are not tracked by DEP, so they would have no way of knowing how much degradation is taking place in any one watershed--until it was too late. The proposed rules will significantly weaken existing protection for both High Quality and Exceptional Value streams.

I am also very disappointed that DEP did not mention wetlands in their antidegradation proposal. The current regulation, put into place by EPA, gives this protection to wetlands. How can wetlands be given HQ or EV protection if the criteria to make a "surface water" HQ or EV are based on streams?

The proposed regulation has little good to recommend them and much bad. The proposed regulation should be rejected by the Board.

Sincerely yours,

Andrew Grant