

2734.

417 Walnut Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1902  
717 255-3252 / 800 225-7224  
FAX 717 255-3298  
<http://www.pachamber.org>

RECEIVED

2008 DEC 23 AM 11: 28

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY  
REVIEW COMMISSION

December 23, 2008

The Honorable John Hanger  
Acting Secretary  
Department of Environmental Protection &  
Acting Chairperson, Environmental Quality Board  
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
400 Market Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2301

Subject: Comments on Proposed Rulemaking, Safe Drinking Water (Groundwater Rule)

Ref: 38 PA Bulletin 6483, November 29, 2008

Dear Secretary Hanger:

On behalf of its 24,000 members and customers, representing the spectrum of Pennsylvania industry, business, and commercial enterprises, the Pennsylvania Chamber of Business and Industry appreciates the opportunity to provide comments concerning the Safe Drinking Water Act proposed rulemaking as published in the November 29, 2008 PA Bulletin.

The U.S. EPA groundwater rule (GWR) was promulgated on November 8, 2006. The proposed PA GWR is, for the most part, consistent with the requirements of the U.S. EPA GWR. The PA GWR is more stringent than the EPA GWR with triggered monitoring requirements (section 109.1303), however. Triggered monitoring requires monitoring of source water for *E. coli* whenever a public water system that cannot or has not demonstrated 4-log treatment of viruses receives a distribution system total coliform detection. The EPA GWR states that source monitoring for *E. coli* is not required if the total coliform detection is related to a distribution system deficiency (40 CFR 141.402(a)(5)). The PA GWR does not allow for this exception. In preamble language for section 109.1303, DEP states, "the Department does not believe it is possible to eliminate source water quality as a potential source contributor to the distribution contamination without additional sample results." The PA Chamber does not agree. This statement from the preamble, and DEP's direction with triggered monitoring, not only conflicts with existing regulation in Chapter 109 (109.301(3)(ii)), but also conflicts with bacterial science, and with the operational engineering of a drinking water supply system.

Total coliform is the primary indicator organism for evaluating the bacterial safety of drinking water. The test is relatively inexpensive and easy to perform. Total coliform is a collective group of other possible indicator organisms of drinking water bacterial testing. Two others include fecal coliform which is a type of total coliform and mostly exists in feces, and *E. coli*, which is a type of fecal coliform bacteria. Total coliform bacteria are commonly found in the environment and are generally harmless. In bacterial testing of drinking water, if total coliform is detected and no other bacterial organisms, then a fecal contamination source is highly unlikely. Intestinal pathogens cannot survive outside of the body and are not commonly found in groundwater, unless the well is too shallow, or improperly constructed or damaged.<sup>1</sup> In addition, the most likely sources of coliform bacteria in a drinking water system are from the points of use (spigot, sink), from improper backflow protection from a contaminated source, and from reduced pressure in

<sup>1</sup> B. Daniels, N. Mesner. Drinking Water Facts: Coliform bacteria. Utah State University, Water Quality Extension. June 2005.



underground water lines resulting in drawing in soil water at joints.<sup>2</sup> Existing chapter 109 regulations support the information presented in this paragraph.

Section 109.301(3) provides the monitoring requirements for coliform. This section mandates the number of samples that must be taken based on population served. Populations greater than 1,000 people require multiple samples (more than one) per monitoring frequency. In addition, section 109.301(3) specifies the requirements in response to a total coliform positive sample. A total coliform positive sample requires repeat monitoring for either fecal coliform or *E. coli*, and check samples at, upstream, and downstream of the total coliform positive sample location. These existing regulations clearly paint a picture of: (a) recognition that a single total coliform positive sample does not necessarily translate into a system-wide or source level fecal contamination issue, and (b) the source is likely distribution system based, but must first be confirmed through additional distribution system sampling. The existing regulations provide a systematic methodology of locating the source of the total coliform positive result, or in fact obtaining data that will invalidate the total coliform positive result. In addition to the section 109.301(3) regulations, DEP's Tier 2 public notice requirements under section 109.409 state that for a total coliform MCL exceedence when fecal coliform or *E. coli* is not present, the water system is allowed up to thirty (30) days to issue a public notice. This lengthy amount of time for public notification provides clear indication of DEP's recognition that when only total coliform is present in the distribution system, there is a low immediacy of health risk to the population served.

These discussions lead to the point that the proposal in section 109.1303 requiring *E. coli* sampling of all water sources as a result of a single total coliform positive sample in the distribution system is an unsubstantiated and overly conservative leap.

We will provide an example to highlight our point. Assume a PA manufacturing facility with 4,500 employees whose water supply needs are served by a well-network owned and operated by the company. The facility is designated a non-community water supplier, and is required to collect and analyze five (5) total coliform samples per month. Assume during one particular month one of the total coliform samples yielded a positive result and the other four were negative. The facility re-tests for *E. coli* and all results are negative. The initial conclusion of these sample results is that this is an isolated total coliform-only event, there are no fecal coliform contamination concerns, and sampling of the water sources for *E. coli* is not necessary. Under section 109.301(3)(ii), the facility is also required to analyze three (3) check samples for total coliform. The results of these check samples will be used to determine compliance with the coliform MCL, help determine a source, and possibly be used to invalidate the original total coliform positive sample.

This is not a stretch example, but is the standard scenario for a water supplier with groundwater sources. As was previously stated, intestinal pathogens are not common in groundwater (Daniels 2005), and the most common sources of coliform in a water supply is the distribution system itself (National Ground Water Association, 2008). In addition, a coliform contaminated groundwater source would result in system-wide total coliform positive results and not a single positive sample result.

The above example also points out another disparity in the proposed PA GWR. Section 109.1303(a) states, "Groundwater systems not required to conduct compliance monitoring under 109.1302..... shall collect a source water sample for *E. coli* within 24 hours of notification of a total coliform-positive sample collected under 109.301(3)." As has been previously presented, 109.301(3) has a number of its own requirements following notification of a total coliform positive sample, including repeat sampling for fecal coliform or *E. coli* and analysis of multiple check samples. 109.301(3) also provides for the evaluation of sample results for possible invalidation of the original total coliform positive sample. The proposed rule preamble language for section 109.1303 recognizes the total coliform positive sample invalidation process. The disparity, therefore, exists in the timing requirements of the proposed rule (24 hour response) and the

---

<sup>2</sup> Wellowner.org. Bacteria: What Do You Want to Know? National Ground Water Association, 2008.

December 23, 2008


Page 3

amount of time required to complete the requirements in the existing 109.301(3). The proposed PA GWR does not change any of the existing requirements in 109.301(3). Therefore, when a water supplier receives a total coliform positive sample result, per regulation they are still required to meet the requirements of section 109.301(3) which must be performed within 24 hours of notification. But according to the proposed 109.1303(a), sampling of water sources must be completed within 24 hours of a valid total coliform positive sample. Therefore, it appears that section 301(3) requirements must first be performed, with section 1303(a) requirements being initiated within 24 hours of data validation. But this is not clear and extremely confusing as currently presented in the proposed PA GWR.

In conclusion, the PA Chamber of Business and Industry requests that:

1. Section 109.1303 be modified to be consistent with the EPA GWR. Specifically, modify section 109.1303(a) to state that sampling of water sources is required for a valid total coliform positive result within 24 hours of determining that the total coliform-positive sample is not conclusively related to a distribution system source in accordance with technical guidance developed by DEP.
2. PA DEP develop a technical guidance document for evaluating total coliform-positive results for public water suppliers with groundwater sources to determine or refute direct relationship to the distribution system, and establishing and communicating decision criteria for source sampling under section 109.1303(a). A workgroup of technical representatives from PA water suppliers with groundwater sources could be utilized to help identify key criteria for the document.

Sincerely,



Gene Barr

Vice President, Government and Public Affairs