



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

BOSTON REGION

In the Matter of:

PUBLIC HEARING:

RE: CITY OF PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLICLY OWNED TREATMENT WORKS, APPLICATION FOR SECTION 301(H) VARIANCE FROM THE SECONDARY TREATMENT REQUIREMENTS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT

City Hall Portsmouth, New Hampshire

Monday May 9. 2005

The above entitled matter came on for hearing,

pursuant to Notice at 7:00 p.m.

BEFORE:

DAVID M. WEBSTER DAMIEN HOULIHAN New Hampshire NPDES Permit Section Environmental Protection Agency One Congress Street Boston, MA 02114

GEORGE BERLANDI NH Department of Environmental Services

APEX Reporting (617) 426-3077

1

1 - 65

national goal would be that wherever obtainable an interim
goal of water quality which provides for the protection and
propagation of fish, shellfish and wildlife, and provide for
recreation in and on the water be achieved by July 1st,
1983.

Well, when I think about the Pierce Island water 6 treatment plant, I think about the fact that there's a tidal 7 flow and that tidal flow carries some of that effluent down 8 to New Castle, where there's a public beach. Our area 9 children go there. What concerns me is that we're getting 10 bad water there, essentially, that these children are 11 playing in. And granting another waiver would allow this 12 13 problem to continue.

The city claims that this would cost \$30 million 14 per year, and goes on to discuss the aesthetics of a 15 secondary treatment facility, none of these which are in 16 17 consideration in regards to the Clean Water Act and granting What is a consideration is recreation, and it 18 waivers. concerns me greatly that this is going to be allowed in an 19 area where children frequent the beaches. And I think that 20 it's up to the EPA to make sure that the town and the city 21 becomes in compliance with what is a Clean Water Act. 22

Thank you.

24 25

23

MR. WEBSTER: Thank you very much. I next call on Dr. Frederick Short.

APEX Reporting (617) 426-3077

DR. SHORT: Thank you. My name is Fred Short. I'm a research professor at the University of New Hampshire, based at the Jackson History & Laboratory. I wanted to speak against the waiver and particularly about the nitrogen issue in the bay.

The Great Bay estuary is viewed as a pristine system and the many places you can view the estuary, it looks beautiful. It's always pristine. But under the waters of the estuary, the system is in trouble. There is increasing evidence of excessive nitrogen building up in the estuary and it's quite well-documented.

12 As other people have mentioned, the sources of the 13 nitrogen have been looked into and the Portsmouth sewage 14 treatment plant is determined to be the largest source of nitrogen into the estuary. Now they will say that when the 15 16 tide is running out, that all goes downstream, but the other 17 half of the time it all goes upstream, and it's not hard to 18 figure that those nutrients get up into the upper part of 19 the estuary, as well.

I mean, the salt that makes Great Bay 20 to 25 part per thousand salinity comes from the ocean and works its way up into the bay, so certainly the nutrients are not flushed out of the estuary. And those that are flushed out go into the coastal zone and go down the shore or into a little harbor, and I believe are responsible for the excess

APEX Reporting (617) 426-3077

1 of algae that's been documented.

If you remember the green balls or the green globs that were found two or three years ago on the beaches in Hampton, those large productions of seaweed are a result of excess nutrient inputs, and I think that's evidence of the plume that comes out of the Piscataqua River and Portsmouth Harbor.

8 Increasing nitrogen levels in an estuary are a 9 problem because it increases gradually and suddenly -- all of a sudden you get a change in the system, a dynamic 10 turnover in the system. And the prime example of that is 11 12 Chesapeake Bay, where in the 1980s the Chesapeake Bay 13 estuary ecosystem collapsed. It lost its eelgrass, it lost 14 its blue crabs, its oysters, because the system was too heavily loaded with nitrogen and the system fell apart. 15 And 16 I'm concerned at the levels of nitrogen that we're seeing 17 here in the Great Bay estuary.

18 Being a professor, I brought my references. The State of New Hampshire put out the state of the estuary 19 report in 2003 and he shows a significant increase in 20 21 nitrate levels in the Great Bay estuary. And I looked up those nitrogen levels and compared them to what the levels 22 were in Chesapeake Bay in the 1980s, at the time of the 23 collapse, and we are as high or higher than the levels were 24 in Chesapeake Bay, so I think that's a concern. 25

APEX Reporting (617) 426-3077

1 And there's other evidence. The EPA put out a 2 guide to the Gulf of Maine, and one of the things it lists 3 is inorganic nitrogen levels; that is, the levels of 4 nitrogen in the water, and it shows the coastline from 5 Massachusetts all the way across the coast of Maine with 6 green, yellow and white dots for different levels of pollution, nutrient input, and the Great Bay estuary is the 7 8 only site that has red dots, aside from Boston Harbor. 9 Again, another line of evidence suggesting that there is a 10 problem.

Even Great Bay Matters put out by the Great Bay Estuary & Research Reserve has an article talking about the mysterious green algae that's appearing more and more on the shores of the bay. Green algae is an indicator. It only grows because there's excess nitrogen around. So I think the system is building up, increasing amounts of nitrogen.

Dr. Art Mathison, who contributed a letter also talked about other seaweeds that are called nuisance seaweeds that develop under eutrophication conditions. So I think we're in danger of upsetting the balance in the Great Bay estuary and we need to pay a lot of attention to that.

In that regard, over the last four years, I've developed an environmental indicator, which I call a nutrient pollution indicator, and it uses eelgrass, which is one of our local species, to detect levels of nitrogen in

APEX Reporting (617) 426-3077

1 the system, because eelgrass grows in the water and it 2 integrates the water that goes by, and we tested this all 3 the way up the estuary. And as you could imagine, when you 4 get close to the rivers coming in, you have higher levels of 5 nitrogen. As you come down the estuary, those levels drop 6 down until you get in Portsmouth Harbor, and then after you 7 get by the New Hampshire Port Authority, levels start to go 8 up, again, and they stay up until you get beyond Seavey 9 Island and out to Portsmouth Harbor.

10 So what that's saying is that we're detecting 11 higher levels, elevated levels of nitrogen in the vicinity 12 of the Portsmouth sewage treatment discharge. So it is 13 having an effect on the system and I think it is a system 14 under stress.

15

16

17

Thank you.

MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Dr. Short.

I next call on Lee Roseberry.

18 MR. ROSEBERRY: Good evening, gentlemen. I'm Lee 19 Roseberry, Portsmouth resident, New Hampshire certified 20 wastewater treatment plant operator, former 15-year employee 21 of the City of Portsmouth wastewater treatment plant.

I've brought to the attention to the City of Portsmouth, to NPDES and to US EPA some questions concerning the reporting of discharge incidents in which I was personally involved, and I would like to ask respectfully

APEX Reporting (617) 426-3077