

From: jecapbrid@sbcglobal.net [mailto:jecapbrid@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2009 3:23 PM
To: Hust, Robert
Subject: DEP Water Quality Standards

Hello, I am forwarding some comments in regard to the above. We are currently intervenors in an application right now on Echo Lake Road in Watertown, CT where they are trying to bring in 212,000 cubic yards of polluted soil and claiming it as redevelopment. I would like to see landfills be much more stringently monitored. Your standards say "The anti-degradation policy requires that the state not permit activities that will lower w.q. or limit designated uses." This property has a stream which they want to bury for 660 feet in a 3 foot pipe and bury it under up to 60 feet of polluted soil. I guess right now under DEP's definitions, certain polluted soils can be called "clean".

In regard to number 8 I would like to add a friend's comment which says: **Rewrite these passages to avoid making the definition of "natural" dependent on economic and institutional considerations. Once an environmental goal is set. Then the feasibility of attaining that goal can be considered separately.**

Also, "Standards for limiting contamination of waters by endocrine disrupters, neurotoxins, and the like, need to be reviewed. The goals should be limits that are ecologically protective not just limits presumed to be protective of human health."

Thank you for your time in this matter.

Judith Brideau

jecapbrid@sbcglobal.net