

2783

FORM LETTER H  
RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

2009 DEC -3 AM 10:57

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY  
COMMISSION

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

Roy Boyle  
Roy Boyle  
RR2 Box 416A  
Hollidaysburg, PA 16848

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

2009 DEC -3 AM 12:57

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY  
COMMISSION

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

*Michael Jackson*  
Michael JACKSON  
8621 Black Valley Rd.  
Everett, PA 15537

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

2009 DEC -3 AM 10:57

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

*Laura Jackson*  
Laura Jackson  
8621 Black Valley Rd  
Everett, PA 15537

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

2009 050 -3 AM 10:57

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY  
COMMISSION

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

*Georgia Bottenfield*  
*Robert Bottenfield*  
2409 William Penn Hwy.  
Williamsburg, Pa. 16693

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

NOV 23 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

*Peggy Keating-Butler*  
Peggy Keating-Butler  
413 Nelson Rd  
Morrisdale PA  
16858

2783

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

2009 DEC -3 AM 12:57

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely, *Alice S. Fleischer*  
Alice S. Fleischer  
8615 Riverview Heights Dr.  
Huntingdon, PA 16652

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

NOV 23 11:58

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

*George Mahon*

George Mahon  
534 54th Street  
Altoona, PA 16602

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

2009 NOV 23 10 17 58

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY  
COMMISSION

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

*Helena Kotala*

Helena Kotala

259 McMullen

Altoona PA 16601



2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

2009 NOV -23 AM 12:58

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

*Stan Kotala*

STAN KOTALA

259 McMULLEN ROAD

ALTOONA, PA 16601

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

NOV 23 11 10 58

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,



DAVID J. BONTA

PO BOX 68

TRONE, PA 16686

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

2009 REG -3 11:17:58

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

*Charles A. Hoyer*  
CHARLES A. HOYER  
254 CHARMA DR.  
TYRONE PA 16686

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

2009 NOV -3 AM 10:58

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

LUIS + CINDY MOORE  
4307 3RD AVE.  
ALTOONA, PA 16602

2783

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

2009 NOV 23 10 58

INDUSTRIAL REGULATORY

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

Warren Baker  
1364 Homers Lane  
Tyrone Pa 16686

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

2009 DEC -3 AM 11:58

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

*Marcia Bonta*  
Marcia Bonta  
Plummers Hollow Rd.  
Tyrone, PA. 16686

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED  
2009 NOV 23 AM 10:58

NOV 23 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

*Judy Shunk*  
605 N. 8<sup>th</sup> St.  
Bellwood, PA 16617

2783

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

2009 DEC -3 AM 10:58

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

Melissa Hilandts  
Melissa  
713 Washington Ave  
Tyrone PA 16686



2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

2009 REC -3 IN 10 56

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY  
COMMISSION

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

James Russell  
576 Fair Valley Rd  
Martinsburg, PA 16662

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

700 DEC -3 AM 11:58

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

Kayci Russell  
576 Fair Valley Rd  
Martinsburg, PA 16662

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

NOV 23 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely,

MARIA F. KOTALA  
259 Mc Mullen Rd  
Altoona Pa. 16601  
Maria Kotala

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

NOV 23 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely, *Alexander Shields*

Alexander Shields

201 Vairo Blvd. Apt. 214

State College, PA 16803

2783

RECEIVED

Environmental Quality Board  
P.O. Box 8477  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477  
[regcomments@state.pa.us](mailto:regcomments@state.pa.us)

NOV 23 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

RE: PROPOSED RULEMAKING on 25 PA. CODE CH. 102: Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management

Pennsylvania has over 83,000 miles of streams. This is an important resource and we need to protect it! We need a mandatory stream buffers program, not a voluntary one. It is also why DEP should not eliminate technical review of stormwater plans. Without review by the state and without opportunities for public comment, stormwater management will get worse, not better. Pennsylvania's streams cannot afford more pollution and runoff, and we cannot afford increased flooding and drinking water treatment costs.

We applaud DEP for requiring forested buffers on exceptional value streams, but we need to require forested buffers of at least 100 feet on both sides of every stream in our state. We also need 150 foot buffers on small headwater streams and 300 foot buffers on Exceptional Value and High Quality streams. Forested Buffers are good for the environment and the economy. These buffers will reduce pollution of our streams, limit erosion of stream banks, improve habitat for fish and keep streams cooler. They will also increase property values for nearby properties, and cut stormwater management costs and drinking water treatment costs. And they will reduce damage from flooding, which costs taxpayers at least \$6 billion a year.

Many municipalities in Pennsylvania already require at least a 100 foot buffer, demonstrating that environmental improvements can be achieved without economic burdens.

DEP should also continue to actively review stormwater plans to insure that they meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and do not degrade the quality of the streams of the Commonwealth. An expedited permit review process, like the new "permit-by-rule" (PBR) program being proposed, puts rivers and streams at risk, is poor policy, and violates core requirements of the Clean Water Act. Of particular concern is the fact that the PBR would apply in High Quality and Impaired watersheds. These watersheds require special protections to ensure that water quality is protected and maintained. Those special protections cannot be ensured through an expedited permit review process.

Please ensure the safety and quality of our streams and drinking water in Pennsylvania by creating a 100 foot forested buffer for streams and eliminating the proposed PBR program.

Sincerely, *Morgan Pfeiffer* Morgan Pfeiffer  
622 W. Cherry Lane Apt. #2  
State College, PA 16803