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Key Tips For Reaching Out

- **Know the facts:** To gain and maintain credibility, it is critical that you have all of the facts on both sides of any issue.
- **Have a clear and concise message:** Government officials, the press and the general public do not have time for long-winded conversations or documents — you need to get to your point quickly and concisely.
- **Nurture relationships and work collaboratively:** Advocacy is a joint venture — you need to find your allies and work with them. Be sure you and your allies have consistent data and the same messages.
- **Make your voice heard!** Advocacy is not the place for being shy. Make sure you spread the word.
- **Say “thank you”:** Always thank everyone who helped you achieve your victory!

Find Your Elected Officials

- [https://www.Whitehouse.gov/Contact/](https://www.whitehouse.gov/contact/)
  - Write-or-call
- [Http://www.Senate.Gov/Senators/Contact/](http://www.senate.gov/senators/contact/)
- [Http://www.Whoismyrepresentative.com](http://www.whoismyrepresentative.com)
- [Https://www.Govtrack.us/Congress/ Members/map](https://www.govtrack.us/congress/members/map)
Tips for Writing Your Legislator

1. Begin by stating that you are a constituent.
2. Personalize your letter. Handwritten letters have the most impact. In making your case on the issue, use personal examples.
3. Make a strong connection between the issue and your local community.
4. If the legislator has supported your issues in the past, acknowledge this.
5. Keep your letter brief — one to one and a half pages at the most.

Tips for Calling Your Legislator

1. Plan: Before you make the call, plan what you are going to say. Your phone call will be very brief, so keep your message simple and to-the-point.
2. Message: Think about a key point or personal story that supports your position.
3. Call Local: If your legislator is in your home district on specific days or on weekends, call when he or she is in your home district.
4. Staff or Message: Be prepared to talk to one of the legislator’s staff or to leave a message instead.
   Make sure you get the staff person’s full name.
5. Call Back: Call more than once. As you monitor the issue, call back to ask for specific support or action as appropriate to the process.

Keep the Momentum Going

1. Influence Policy by generating personal contacts with state legislators or members of Congress.
2. Maximize Voter Turnout: Grassroots organizing is the most effective way to engage in voter engagement efforts.
3. Energize: Grassroots organizing creates a sense of energy, excitement, and momentum.
4. Provide a Personal Touch: Grassroots puts a “human face” on an issue.
5. Win: Organizations and campaigns that ignore grassroots organizing have been losing more and more in recent years.
NEWEA AFFILIATED STATE ASSOCIATIONS

CONNECTICUT: CTPAA.ORG AND CAWPCA.ORG
MAINE: MeWEA.ORG
MASSACHUSETTS: MAWEA.ORG
NEW HAMPSHIRE: NHPCA.ORG
RHODE ISLAND: RINPCA.INFO
VERMONT: GMWEA.ORG
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Member 1</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Member 2</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Member 3</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Energy &amp; Commerce</td>
<td>Joe Kennedy</td>
<td>MA-4</td>
<td>Peter Welch</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Ways &amp; Means</td>
<td>Richard Neal, Chair</td>
<td>MA-1</td>
<td>John Larson</td>
<td>CT-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>Chris Pappas</td>
<td>NH-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Transportation and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Steven Lynch</td>
<td>MA-8</td>
<td>Chris Pappas</td>
<td>NH-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Environment and Public Works</td>
<td>Sheldon Whitehouse</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Bernie Sanders</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Ed Markey</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>Richard Blumenthal</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HANDOUTS AND EXAMPLES
RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Provide dedicated Federal funding source(s) to communities.
2. Develop a National Performance Verification Program.
4. Modernize NPDES permits to include integrated planning and watershed-based approaches.
5. Develop tools to implement pollutant source control.

Source: WEF Stormwater Institute
Federal Investment in Water Infrastructure is Critical

Federal investment enables local investment and makes projects possible. SFR funding of $1.3 billion and $50 million in WIFIA funding is needed.

Lack of Investment Effects All Communities and Regions

USDA Rural Water/Wastewater funding of $2 billion and $500 million, respectively, is needed.

98% of Rural Americans who receive their drinking water from small systems.

Investment in Water Infrastructure Creates Jobs in Other Industries

each job in water or wastewater construction or rehab adds 3.68 more jobs to the national economy
TIPS FOR PLANNING YOUR FLY-IN/ DRIVE-IN

- Keep message clear, concise, and consistent
- Know what your ask is and don’t leave without an answer
- Get to know the staffers
- Identify other issues important to Legislator
- Identify current bills/initiatives and your Legislator’s POV
- Consider Drive-ins - More likely to get time at “Home Office”
- Take pictures and follow up with an article
- Give credit for past support
NEWEA FLY-IN TALKING POINTS 2019

- US water & sewer systems received a “D” grade from ASCE, resulting in a funding deficit of billions to repair aging infrastructure
- Infrastructure repair and replacement costs keep increasing, straining municipal budgets
- Federal Funding dropped from $17 billion in 1977 to $4.4 billion in 2014, while communities continue to grow and infrastructure demands increase

- Funding is needed to address Combined Sewer Systems
- Funding is needed to address emerging contaminants in wastewater and drinking water
- Funding is needed to address the effects of climate change
- Rural systems are often overlooked for funding programs

- Integrated and regional approaches are needed to address current needs and issues
- Regulations need to be based on sound science
- Regulatory response needs to consider the cost vs. the benefits to communities and provide relief for high costs of compliance
- Water and Wastewater systems do not create contaminants of concern – they are unwilling recipients
- Groundwater extraction for other industries can impact the ability of municipalities to continue to provide safe drinking water
- EPA funding for research and development needs to be increased, with a focus on sustainability and regional solutions
Ongoing access to clean, safe water is critical to our economy, health, and way of life. Although we live in different parts of the country, Americans are united in our dependence on water and the infrastructure that connects, protects, and supports it.

**WE NEED WATER**

The average person living in the Northeast uses 114 gallons of water per day.

**WE RELY ON REGULAR SERVICE**

New York City, which has the largest engineered water system in the nation, supplies 1 billion gallons of water to 9 million people and cleans 1.3 billion gallons of wastewater each day.

**LOTS OF NEW TECHNOLOGY EXISTS**

The New England Patriots’ home, Gillette Stadium, uses recycled water for flushing.

**OUR SYSTEMS ARE AGING**

The combined average age of New York and Philadelphia’s drinking water pipes is 74 years old. Their average wastewater pipes are 92 years old.

**WE CAN SAVE**

6 trillion gallons of water, wastewater and stormwater is lost each year in the U.S. to faulty, aging or leaky pipes.

**WHAT WE MUST DO**

Invest in water, wastewater & stormwater! In the Northeast, they need $180 billion just to modernize their drinking water systems.

**WHAT WE CAN DO THIS**

60% of Americans say they are willing to pay more for water.

**DID YOU KNOW?**

Wastewater contains about ten times the amount of energy required to treat it—enough to meet the electricity needs of Chicago, Dallas, Houston and New York City.

**PROVIDING WATER ISN’T FREE**

People who live in the Northeast pay an average of $4.45 per 1000 gallons for drinking water, and $5.55 per 1000 gallons of wastewater that they use. In some cases, the true value of water can be as high as $30 per 1000 gallons!**

**SOURCES:**


** This is a general statement. The value, price, and cost of clean water services across the country are complex and diverse and can vary widely depending on variables and circumstances.

--

American Water Works Association

Water Environment Federation
Ongoing access to clean, safe water is critical to our economy, health, and way of life. Although we live in different parts of the country, Americans are united in our dependence on water and the infrastructure that connects, protects, and supports it.

**THE UNITED STATE(S) OF WATER**

**THE COST OF CLEAN**
Water is free, keeping it clean, safe, & flowing is not. We must invest in our systems.

- $4.8 trillion to maintain water & wastewater systems

**WHAT HAPPENS WHEN WE INVEST?**

We could gain over $220 billion in annual economic activity and generate 1.3 million jobs by meeting U.S. water & wastewater infrastructure needs.

- $20 billion

**GOING GREEN, SAVES GREEN**
30%–60%: the amount of $ saved by treating stormwater at its source with green & traditional infrastructure.

**VALUE OF WATER**

- 60% of Americans are in favor of paying more to invest in water infrastructure.
- 23 to 1 = return for U.S. public health from early clean water investments.

**THE THREE R’s**

Every drop is cleaned, reused, recycled, & returned to the environment.

- The average American sends between 66–182 gallons of wastewater to the system each day.
- 34 billion gallons of water are treated each day by U.S. water treatment plants.

**RETURN ON INVESTMENT**

Every new water sector job adds another 3.68 to the economy.

- Every $1 spent on infrastructure generates $6 in returns.

**AGE AT-A-GLANCE**

- Average age is 60–130 years old.
- 800,000 miles of water pipes
- 700,000 miles of wastewater pipes

**WHERE’S THE WATER?**

The average American uses 100 gallons of water daily.

The Economic Benefits of Investing in Water Infrastructure

Fact Sheet

The Value of Water Campaign commissioned a new report, “The Economic Benefits of Investing in Water Infrastructure” to assess how investments in the nation’s water infrastructure can affect economic growth and employment. This fact sheet outlines the key findings of the study, and the full report can be found at www.thevalueofwater.org/resources.

The US is funding just one-third of its water infrastructure needs.

- Most water and wastewater systems, which put food on our table, keep our lights on, and keep our businesses thriving, have been in operation for 75–100 years or longer, well exceeding their expected lifespan.
- The US needs to invest a total of $123 billion per year in water infrastructure over the next 10 years to bring systems to a state of good repair.
- Our national water infrastructure investment gap is $82 billion per year.
- Current local, state, and federal capital spending on water infrastructure only funds one-third of our national needs.
- While federal contributions to transportation infrastructure have stayed constant at approximately half of total capital spending, federal investment in water infrastructure has declined from 63% to 9% since 1977.

Closing the water infrastructure investment gap creates jobs and strengthens the economy.

By closing the annual investment gap in water infrastructure, we can generate:
- **Over $220 billion in economic activity** (direct, indirect, and induced), exceeding the gross domestic product generated by 26 states.
- **1.3 million American jobs** (direct, indirect, and induced), more than the employed workforce of 16 states.

Water service disruptions are more than an inconvenience to American employees and businesses; they are costly.

- At a national level, a one-day disruption in water services would result in a **$43.5 billion daily sales loss** to businesses and **$22.5 billion loss in GDP**.
- For every day of water service disruption, the average US business loses **$230 in sales per employee**. In industries most reliant on water, sales drop by up to 75 percent, or up to **$5,800 per employee**.

Keeping water infrastructure in a state of good repair is essential to business productivity.

- If the water infrastructure gap is not addressed, industries are projected to experience higher costs in the form of higher water rates, costs of self-supply, or costs of relocating to better-served areas.
- Closing the water investment gap saves businesses **$94 billion in annual sales**, and saves 505,000 jobs over the next 10 years.

Now is the time to invest.

Reliable water infrastructure is fundamental to our nation’s economic health and competitiveness. Meeting the investment need will require collaboration across public and private sectors, including strong partners at the local, state, and federal level.

To learn more about the Value of Water Campaign and our efforts to educate the nation about the importance of water and the need to invest in water infrastructure, visit www.thevalueofwater.org.
Fourth Annual
Value of Water Index

Over the past four years, the Value of Water Campaign has polled American voters to better understand their opinions about the state of our nation’s water infrastructure and what they view as priorities for action and potential solutions. The Value of Water Campaign is pleased to share the results of our fourth annual national poll of over 1,000 American voters, conducted by the bipartisan research team of Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz, and Associates (D) and New Bridge Strategy (R).

Water infrastructure is a TOP PRIORITY.

Americans support rebuilding our nation’s infrastructure more than any other issue facing the current administration, including building a border wall, repealing or replacing Obamacare, providing permanent status for Dreamers, or increasing military defense spending.

79% of voters say rebuilding America’s infrastructure is extremely or very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebuilding America’s infrastructure</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing military defense spending</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing permanent status for Dreamers</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repealing or replacing Obamacare</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a border wall</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Americans support INVESTING NOW, before our nation’s water infrastructure fails.

85% of Americans support (with 52 percent strongly supporting) increasing federal investment to rebuild our water infrastructure.

67% of voters support a proactive program of water infrastructure upgrades, rather than fixing problems as they arise.

68% continue to support capital investments at the national, state, and local levels—even when told that investment carries a $1.2 trillion price tag.

80% of American voters say what they pay for water service is affordable and more than three in five voters would be willing to pay a modest increase in local water rates to fund improved service.
Agreement across party lines and demographics: water infrastructure is essential to all.

Support for investing in water infrastructure cuts across age, gender, party, geography, and ideology.

Democrats + Republicans

More than three in four Democrats and Republicans agree rebuilding America’s infrastructure should be a top priority for the President and Congress this year.

Water quality concerns emphasize need for investment and innovation.

74% of Americans—living in both urban and rural areas—are concerned about contaminants affecting their water quality.

More than five in eight Americans support local water agencies increasing the use of potable recycled water in their community.

About the Value of Water Campaign
The Value of Water Campaign educates and inspires the nation about how water is essential, invaluable, and in need of investment. Spearheaded by top leaders in the water industry, and coordinated by the US Water Alliance, the Value of Water Campaign is building public and political will for investment in America’s water and wastewater infrastructure through best-in-class communications tools, high-impact events, media activities, and robust research and publications. More at thevalueofwater.org.
ONE WATER FOR AMERICA*
State Toolkit Summary

Seven Big Ideas for Sustainable Water Management

1. Regional Collaboration
2. Form Agriculture-Utility Partnerships
3. Sustain Adequate Funding for Water Infrastructure
4. Blend Public & Private Expertise & Investment
5. Redefine Affordability
6. Protect Public Health
7. Accelerate Technology Adoption

We Need Your Help

Not long ago many of the rivers and streams in the United States were regarded as nothing more than open sewers. After the Clean Water Act was established, public and privately owned wastewater treatment facilities were created to improve the quality of rivers, lakes, and oceans. Today, our waterways sustain wildlife, people and local economies.

This success is due to the men and women who work in the water quality industry. We need your help to continue to keep our waters clean.

Consider a career as a water quality professional.

Career Opportunities

There are many different career opportunities in the water quality industry. Career preparation ranges from a high school diploma to college degrees.

**Wastewater, Drinking Water and Town Operations**
- Plant Operator, Town Water/Sewer Worker
- Maintenance Worker
- Laboratory Technician
- Accounting/Administrative Clerk
- Plant Supervisor/Manager, Public Works Director
- Municipal Engineer

**Consultants, Equipment Personnel**
- Design Consultant
  - (Civil, Environmental, Structural, Electrical, Instrumentation Engineer, etc.)
- Contract Laboratory
- Computer IT
- Environmental Scientist
- Environmental Lawyer
- Equipment Manufacturer
- Equipment Sales Representative

**Academics**
- College Professor
- Researcher

**Regulatory**
- State Agencies
- Federal Agency

**Typical Minimum Degree/License Requirements**
1. High School Diploma
2. Wastewater and/or Drinking Water License
3. Bachelor and/or Master’s Degrees in specific discipline
4. Doctorate Degree
Water is the only substance on earth needed by every living thing. Our health and economic well-being depend on our ability to sustain adequate and clean water. Water quality professionals are key to that success.

For More Information

To learn more about career opportunities and certification in the water quality field, visit:

Connecticut
ctwpaa.org & cwwa.org

Maine
mewea.org & mwua.org

Massachusetts
mw pca.org & mwma. memberclicks.net

New Hampshire
nhwpca.org & nhwwa.org

Rhode Island
rin wpca.info & riwwa.net

Vermont:
gmwea.org & vtruralwater.org

New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission (NEWPC) neiwpcc.org

New England Water Environment Association (NEWEA) newea.org

New England Water Works Association (NEWWA) newwa.org

Water Environment Federation (WEF) wef.org

Go Where the Action is...
Be a Water Quality Professional
EXAMPLE LETTERS AND PRESS RELEASES
April 4, 2016

The Honorable Thad Cochran  
Chairman  
Senate Committee on Appropriations  
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Barbara Mikulski  
Vice Chairwoman  
Senate Committee on Appropriations  
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Lisa Murkowski  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies  
Senate Committee on Appropriations  
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Tom Udall  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies  
Senate Committee on Appropriations  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Chairman Cochran, Vice Chairwoman Mikulski, Chairman Murkowski, and Ranking Member Udall:

As the Appropriations Committee begins to develop legislation to fund EPA in the 2017 fiscal year, the New England Water Environment Association would like to express our continuing support for strong funding for programs that help provide clean and safe water infrastructure while making local utility investments more manageable for ratepayers.

As you know, the ongoing water crisis in Flint, Michigan has focused national attention on the needs of our water infrastructure. This has prompted welcome proposals by some members of Congress to dramatically boost water infrastructure spending next year. One such proposal would provide $2 billion each to the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds (SRFs), well-established programs that deliver funding to all states to help communities improve their water and wastewater infrastructure to protect public health. These programs also support our nation’s economy, both directly in the form of additional good jobs and indirectly through water and wastewater services that support our businesses and a healthier environment. Our organizations support these efforts to dramatically increase SRF funding in the 2017 fiscal year while bringing parity to Clean Water and Drinking Water SRF funding levels.

We also recognize that the budgetary situation faced by Congress may prevent total SRF appropriations from reaching these levels in FY17. If that is the case, at minimum we urge Congress to reject any cuts to the Clean Water SRF in 2017, and to bring the Drinking Water SRF to an equal level of funding.
While attaining strong SRF funding levels is essential, we also urge Congress to deliver robust funding to other important water infrastructure programs, such as:

- $35 million for the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (WIFIA) pilot program, its fully authorized level in FY17. As EPA plans to begin issuing WIFIA loans in FY17, fully funding the program will help communities to begin accessing these new infrastructure loans as quickly as possible.
- $23.365 million for Title XVI, which is the amount enacted in FY16, and support for other drought response and water reuse projects at the Bureau of Reclamation.
- $6.5 million to continue EPA’s Integrated Municipal Stormwater and Wastewater Planning Approach (Integrated Planning), which helps communities address their EPA regulations cost-effectively and strategically.

Providing these funding levels will help our nation’s water and wastewater systems begin to address the billions of dollars of investment needs they face in the coming decades. EPA has reported that our wastewater systems face $271 billion in documented needs over the next twenty years—investments in publicly owned wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities, combined sewer overflow correction, and stormwater management. Drinking water systems require $384 billion in documented infrastructure rehabilitation and improvements over the same timeframe according to EPA, and over $1 Trillion according to the American Water Works Association. With the crisis in Flint renewing national attention on water infrastructure, now is the time to take a stand by appropriating strong funding to the programs that help our communities ensure the ongoing delivery and treatment of clean and safe water.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration, and please do not hesitate to contact NEWEA for additional information.

Sincerely,

Raymond Willis III
President
New England Water Environment Association

Mary Barry
Executive Director
New England Water Environment Association
January 8, 2020

RE: Opposition to H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act

Dear Representative:

The undersigned organizations representing the nation’s drinking water and wastewater utilities are writing to express our opposition to H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act of 2019. Unfortunately, the legislation fails to protect water system customers from liability for PFAS cleanup costs.

We believe that per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) should be kept out of our nation’s water supplies, and that PFAS polluters should be held responsible. The fundamental mission of water and wastewater utilities is to protect public health and the environment, and in doing so they must also be mindful of affordability and the financial burden borne by their customers and the communities they serve. Utilities are tremendously concerned about what PFAS is doing in their communities and, as they have done with all previous public health and environmental challenges, are committed partners in finding a solution to this problem.

However, Congress must make a distinction between entities that introduced PFAS into the environment, and water and wastewater systems that are on the front lines of cleaning up the contamination. Utilities are not the producers of PFAS, but the receivers of PFAS. A water system that follows all applicable laws in its management of water treatment byproducts containing PFAS should not be held liable under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) for any further environmental cleanup costs related to these chemicals. Doing so would penalize customers twice: once when they make investments to remove PFAS from their waters, and again when they are forced to pay to cleanup PFAS contamination elsewhere.

Unfortunately, H.R. 535 would leave municipal water and wastewater systems customers subject to financial liability for PFAS cleanup under CERCLA – even in cases where the system followed all applicable laws and regulations related to PFAS disposal. This is in direct contrast to the objective of holding polluters responsible.

It is particularly disappointing that the manager’s amendment proposed for H.R. 535 would offer a CERCLA liability shield to airports that are required to use firefighting foam containing PFAS, but fails to extend that same protection to water and wastewater systems who may be required to remove and dispose of PFAS. As receivers of PFAS, water utilities should be afforded the same liability protections that airports are being awarded in the legislation.

Again, we share the goal of keeping the nation’s waters free of PFAS and holding accountable those entities that are responsible for environmental contamination. But because H.R. 535 would leave water system customers unprotected against liability for environmental cleanup of PFAS, we have no choice but to oppose the legislation in its current form.
Sincerely,

American Water Works Association
Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies
National Association of Clean Water Agencies
National Association of Water Companies
National Water Resources Association
National Rural Water Association
Water Environment Federation
March 8, 2012

Representative James Langevin
109 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC  20515-3902

Dear Representative Langevin:

On behalf of the Rhode Island contingent to the New England Water Environment Association’s 2012 Congressional Breakfast, I would like to thank you for making your staff available to meet with us while we were in Washington earlier this week.

It was good to see that we have many issues of mutual interest, with funding for our critical clean water infrastructure at the top of the list. As you are aware, we have some aging water and wastewater systems in Rhode Island upon which we, as Rhode Islanders, depend for both our health and our State’s economic growth and sustainability. As a bonus, these water infrastructure projects create jobs! However, the State Revolving Fund program continues to be the only real source of capital for local water/wastewater projects and its continued funding is crucial. In addition, there are several ideas along the lines of transportation infrastructure funding that could and should be studied for water/wastewater projects (please see enclosed). Continued funding for energy efficiency improvements would also greatly benefit our customers.

Cybersecurity is another area of your work that is of interest to us. Our treatment facilities have become dependent on Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) systems for process control and security breaches could wreak havoc with our operations. Career and technical education are also critical for our industry to replace the aging and retiring workforce of wastewater operators.

We would like to again extend an open invitation to you and your staff to visit any of our facilities whenever you are in Rhode Island. If you would like any real-world examples of water/wastewater infrastructure issues, we would be more than happy to give you a local perspective on prospective regulations or programs.

Thanks again for your time and your interest in these vital clean water issues.

Sincerely,

Janine Burke, Rhode Island State Director
New England Water Environment Association
March 8, 2012

Representative David Cicilline
128 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC  20515-3902

Dear Representative Cicilline:

On behalf of the Rhode Island contingent to the New England Water Environment Association’s 2012 Congressional Breakfast, I would like to thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to attend our breakfast and for making your staff available to meet with us while we were in Washington earlier this week.

It was good to see that we have many issues of mutual interest, with funding for our critical clean water infrastructure at the top of the list. As you are aware, we have some aging water and wastewater systems in Rhode Island upon which we, as Rhode Islanders, depend for both our health and our State’s economic growth and sustainability. As a bonus, these water infrastructure projects create jobs! However, the State Revolving Fund program continues to be the only real source of capital for local water/wastewater projects and its continued funding is crucial. In addition, there are several ideas along the lines of transportation infrastructure funding that could and should be studied for water/wastewater projects (please see enclosed). Continued funding for energy efficiency improvements would also greatly benefit our customers.

We would like to again extend an open invitation to you and your staff to visit any of our facilities whenever you are in Rhode Island. If you would like any real-world examples of water/wastewater infrastructure issues, we would be more than happy to give you a local perspective on prospective regulations or programs.

Thanks again for your time and your interest in these vital clean water issues.

Sincerely,

Janine Burke, Rhode Island State Director
New England Water Environment Association

Cc: Peter Eldridge, Narragansett Bay Commission’s Bucklin Point Facility
Scott Goodinson, Town of West Warwick
Daniel O’Rourke, Warwick Water Division
PFAS and Wastewater and Biosolids

PFAS is the acronym for multiple organic chemicals – per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances. These man-made compounds are a product of our modern convenience society. PFAS are found in furniture and carpet stain protection, non-stick cookware, water repellent products, dental floss, food packaging and many other consumer products. Certain manufacturing processes use them, and firefighting foam is a major source of PFAS in the environment. They are ubiquitous in the environment as persistent, toxic compounds at low parts-per-billion or parts-per-trillion concentrations.

Vermont has legislated a swift response to PFAS contamination. A drinking water health advisory and ground water enforcement standard of 20 ppt (parts per trillion) has been enacted for the sum of five PFAS compounds, including perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS) and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) (20 ppt is equal to 20 seconds in 31,700 years). A state-wide testing of ambient levels has been completed. Testing of water supplies and wastewater facility’s incoming water, discharge and process biosolids is in progress.

PFAS Facts:

- Use of the most common PFAS (PFOA and PFOS) has been mostly phased out in the U.S., but they persist in the environment. Thousands of newer, shorter carbon-chain versions have been developed and warrant further scrutiny.
- The most effective PFAS control policy is to eliminate PFAS from the source -- our homes and specific manufacturing -- and to address high-risk local sources such as industrial and firefighting sites.
- According to the Centers for Disease Control, human PFOA and PFOS blood contamination levels have declined more than 70% since 2000 (CDC NHANES, 2015) presumably because they were phased out.
- Average United States blood levels are 4,300 ppt of PFOS and 1,100 ppt of PFOA (American Red Cross, 2017).
- Testing confirms PFAS are present in wastewater in very low quantities near or below the Vermont regulatory limit. There is debate on testing reliability for wastewater and wastewater residuals. Currently, there are no EPA-approved PFAS testing methods for anything but drinking water.
- Public drinking water and wastewater systems do not use PFAS chemicals in their processes, and they do not generate PFAS. PFAS reach wastewater facilities via consumer products that are flushed down the drain. Testing in Vermont of wastewater and biosolids have found traces of PFAS, and they are ubiquitous in many other environmental media.
- Drinking water may become contaminated if the source of that water is contaminated with PFAS.
- The mean and median concentrations of PFOA in household dust in the United States was found to be between 10,000 and 50,000 parts per trillion (Trudel et al., Risk Analysis Vol. 28 No. 2, 2008).
- Over 55% of homes in Vermont rely on septic systems, the highest level per population in the United States. PFAS down the drain may reach groundwater and does reach soil.

GMWEA Supports:

- Current monitoring efforts to determine the extent of PFAS contamination in Vermont.
- Creation of a grant program to help small drinking water systems pay for monitoring and to help any drinking water supplier cover the costs of treating water for PFAS if necessary. Program should also include wastewater facilities that receive landfill leachate if treatment becomes necessary.
- Focusing remediation efforts on highly polluted sites and controlling sources of contamination.
- A sensible response based on science and data collected.
- Standardized analytical methods for quantifying PFAS compounds in different sample matrices such as drinking water, surface water, soil, etc.
- Research on fate and impacts, if any, of PFAS in water, wastewater, and biosolids in the environment.
Once again, members of the NH Water Pollution Control Association (NHWPCA) traveled to Washington, DC on April 3-4 to participate in the annual New England Water Environment Association (NEWEA) Congressional Briefing. This visit coincided with the Water Environment Federation/National Association of Clean Water Agencies (WEF/NACWA) National Water Policy Fly-In for water professionals from all around the country. This year the Fly-In provided the opportunity to meet with our peers, EPA staff, and our elected officials. And it just so happened that we arrived as the cherry blossoms were at their peak!

New England was a good contingent with more than 30 folks attending, and New Hampshire was well represented by NHWPCA members including Dan Driscoll, Superintendent for Concord WWTF; Shelagh Connelly from RMI, Ray Vermette – Dover WWTF and President of NEWEA, and Tracy Wood of NH-DES.

The purpose of the Fly-In was to get in front of our elected officials to make sure they understand how important it is to continue funding water infrastructure and supporting programs and policies that ensure clean water for all our communities. With many programs seeking funding through the federal budget, it is important that water advocates are at the table. The other hot topic this year was PFAS and what these compounds will mean for wastewater treatment plants and biosolids recycling.

On our first day there was an excellent Policy Fly-In Plenary with an incredible line-up of speakers from the water industry. The panel of speakers included leadership from WEF, NACWA, EPA, Water Research Foundation, WateReuse, Dept. of Energy, and several staff with topics ranging from funding to blending to water reuse to PFAS, integrated planning to WIFIA and affordability. This was an excellent event and again well worth the trip. Following the Plenary meeting was a reception held at the Library of Congress Madison Building on the rooftop, followed by a lively time out to dinner with the NEWEA crew.

The next day kicked off with a Congressional Breakfast and Staff Roundtable which was packed with excellent policy discussion and could have lasted all day but was limited to 2 hours before we headed over to the Hill meetings with our elected officials. We managed to meet with staff from the offices of Senators Shaheen and Hassan and Congresswoman Kuster, and had the pleasure of meeting with our newest member Congressman Pappas in person!

It is good to remember the importance of participating in these Fly-Ins and being connected to our elected officials to remind them that clean water is a top priority for our government and investment in infrastructure is essential.
As Congressman James McGovern from Massachusetts reminded us – “your passion for water is important to share every year in Washington. With so many competing issues you have to be at the table sharing your story.” The message we carried was about the need to invest in our aging and failing water infrastructure, the difficulty of working with increasing regulatory burden, the acknowledgement that water is essential to our economy and public health, and the need for a sustainable water trust.

The NHWPCA is committed to visiting DC each year so that our delegation keeps water as a high priority. The unseen water infrastructure needs a champion – and that is what we are, because Water’s Worth It!

Dan Driscoll, Shelagh Connelly, Tracy Wood, Ray Vermette

On the steps of the Library of Congress

Dan Driscoll, Ray Vermette, Congressman Pappas, Tracy Wood, Liam Riehs, Shelagh Connelly

In Cannon Congressional Offices
Serving Vermont since 1993, GMWEA is a non-profit association with over 500 members – Vermont’s “boots on the ground” water quality professionals who protect the environment and public health, 24/7/365. We are:

- Water, wastewater, and stormwater facility operators and designers
- Municipal public works administrators
- Regional planners
- Water scientists, engineers, and lab technicians
- Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation staff
- Vermont and New England non-profit water quality organizations
- Water-related services and technology providers

We lead, sponsor, and provide:

- **Continuing education courses** for water, wastewater, and stormwater operators for re-certification credit and professional development.
- **Best-practice policy advice** to legislators and state regulators, leveraging the collective expertise of our membership in drinking water treatment and distribution systems, wastewater and stormwater treatment and management, engineering, laboratory standards, and biosolids management.
- **Public awareness activities**, such as Water Quality Day, promoting the value of clean water and the importance of water quality infrastructure.
- **Two major conferences/tradeshows** each year.
- **School programs** such as scholarships and facility tours.
- **Publications** including a quarterly newsletter and website, blog, and Facebook platforms that help inform and connect water quality professionals, the public, and policy-makers.
- **Coordination** with regional organizations like Vermont Rural Water Association (VRWA), Vermont League of Cities and Towns (VLCT), New England Water Environment Association (NEWEA), New England Water Works Association (NEWWA), and North East Biosolids Research Association (NEBRA).
GMWEA’S PRIORITY ISSUES FOR 2020

Visit [www.gmwea.org](http://www.gmwea.org) for more information!

- **We support the cleanup** of Lake Champlain, the Connecticut River, Lake Carmi and Lake Memphremagog through TMDLs, and the preservation of all Vermont waters. The improvements required must provide the most “bang for the buck.”

- **We support planning and funding** that provides communities with the capacity to address basic infrastructure needs – above and beyond water quality requirements and TMDL implementation needs. Vermont’s treatment works and piping systems are aging, causing failures that impact our communities.

- **We support Act 76** (statewide water quality funding) and are monitoring the Clean Water Service Provider’s rule-guidance development with interest.
  - Many municipalities are challenged to establish adequate funding for projects they are required to implement under the Lake Champlain Phosphorus TMDL and Act 64.
  - We support efforts to fund and incentivize wetland and stream restoration. Non-regulatory projects must not be prioritized for funding until the State and municipalities establish adequate funding for projects municipalities are already required to implement under Act 64 and the Lake Champlain Phosphorus TMDL.

- **We support beneficial reuse of biosolids** and generally oppose trucking them out of state due to the huge negative carbon footprint and loss of beneficial reuse.

- **We support efforts to update Vermont’s wetland regulations.** Updates must allow municipalities to maintain existing public infrastructure and must accommodate work necessary to meet Phosphorus TMDL and Act 64 requirements.

- **PFAS** We support current monitoring efforts to determine the extent of contamination, responses based on science and data collected and focusing remediation efforts on highly polluted sites first. We support creation of a grant program to help small drinking water systems pay for monitoring and to cover the costs of treating water for PFAS if necessary. The most effective PFAS control policy is to eliminate PFAS from the source.

- **We support work force training** and apprenticeship programs in water, wastewater, and stormwater to fill a critical gap: we expect 30% to 50% of our certified professionals will retire in the next ten years.

PLEASE CONSIDER GMWEA AN INFORMATION RESOURCE!

*We have first-hand knowledge and “hands-on” experience designing, operating, maintaining, repairing, and continually improving water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure – a pool of expertise unequalled in Vermont.*

Daniel Hecht  
Executive Director  
(802) 595-0997  
dan.hecht@gmwea.org

Tom DiPietro  
President  
(802) 658-7961  
tom.dipietro@gmwea.org

Bob Fischer  
Government Affairs Committee Chair  
(802) 658-7964  
bfischer@sburl.com
LINKS TO POSITION PAPERS

WATER ENVIRONMENT FEDERATION DOWNLOADABLE PDFS:
https://www.wef.org/advocacy/policy-and-position-papers/

NEWEA POLICY AND POSITION PAPERS:
https://www.newea.org/resources/government-affairs/letters-of-support/

AMERICAN WATER WORKS POLICY STATEMENTS:
https://www.awwa.org/Policy-Advocacy/AWWA-Policy-Statements

NACWA WHITE PAPERS:
https://www.nacwa.org/news-publications/white-papers-publications

NOTE: When referencing position papers from other organizations, make sure the message is consistent with NEWEA’s position
LINKS TO VIDEOS

NEWEA VIDEOS
https://www.youtube.com/user/NEWEA2013

WATER’S WORTH IT PSA
https://watersworthit.org/resources/

VIDEOS BY OTHERS
FAT-BERG: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iH7IwiHFVMs
GUIDANCE FOR CONNECTICUT
BIENNIAL BUDGET PROCESS IN CONNECTICUT ODD YEARS

**JULY 1**
- BEGIN FISCAL YEAR

**AUGUST**
- State agencies prepare budget requests

**SEPTEMBER 1**
- Budget requests due

**DECEMBER - JANUARY**
- OPM prepares biennial budget.

**SEPTEMBER - DECEMBER**
- Office of Policy and Management (OPM) makes recommendations

**FEBRUARY**
- Governor sends budget to General Assembly (GA)

**FEBRUARY - JUNE**
- GA holds public hearings & debates. Makes adjustments. Negotiate changes with Governor.

**JUNE 30**
- END FISCAL YEAR
LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IN CONNECTICUT

IDEA

Introduce to House (or Senate)

Committee Consideration

Recommend to another Committee

Take no action

DEAD

OFA adds cost estimate; OLR add “Plain English” explanation

Not Recommended

Recommend

Public hearings

DEAD

Vote in House (or Senate)

Not approved

DEAD

Approved

Approved

Veto - DEAD

Veto but passes with 2/3 vote

Note: If a bill starts in the House, it then must pass the Senate, and vice versa.
GUIDANCE FOR MAINE
Biennial Budget Process

1. State agencies submit budget requests to the Bureau of the Budget by September 1.

2. The Consensus Economic Forecasting Commission (CEFC) projects future economic conditions by November 1.

3. Using the CEFC’s projections, the Revenue Forecasting Committee projects state revenues by December 1.

4. The Governor submits a draft budget to the Legislature by the Friday following the 1st Monday of January.

5. The Legislature holds public hearings on the budget.

6. The Legislature’s policy committees make recommendations to the Appropriations and Financial Affairs Committee ("Appropriations") on the budgets of the departments and agencies in their oversight.
The Appropriations Committee votes on amendments to the budget.

The Office of Fiscal and Program Review prepares the Appropriations Committee’s amendments.

Legislators may propose further amendments in either chamber.

The House passes its version of the budget and sends it to the Senate.

The Senate passes its version and returns it to the House.

The budget is finalized when the House and Senate pass identical versions.

The Governor has 1 day to veto any line in the budget and 10 days to sign or veto the budget as a whole.

If necessary, the Legislature votes on vetoes. A majority vote by both chambers overturns a line-item veto; a 2/3 vote overturns a budget veto.
Maine's Legislative Process

**Idea**
An idea for a bill is developed. Ideas come from various sources, e.g., Legislators, the Governor, state agencies.

**Bill drafted**
Several nonpartisan offices of the Legislature assist in drafting the bill.

**Bill introduced**
A legislator gives the bill to the Clerk of the House or Secretary of the Senate. The bill is numbered (e.g., HP 65, LD 150).

**Committee**
The bill is analyzed and discussed in a committee, which recommends whether the bill should pass. The committee can also propose amendments to bills.

**Origining chamber**
The bill is debated in the chamber where it originated. If it is passed to be engrossed (i.e., printed with all passed amendments), it is sent to the other chamber.

**Second chamber**
The bill goes through a similar process. Both chambers must pass the same final version of the bill for it to be enacted.

**Governor**
The bill goes to the Governor who can sign it or veto it. If signed, it becomes law. If vetoed, it goes back to the House and Senate (the veto can be overridden by a 2/3 vote in both chambers).

**Law**
A bill becomes law 90 days after the end of the legislative session in which it was passed unless it is passed as an emergency law or it stipulates an effective date.

For a detailed version of the legislative process, see *Path of Legislation in Maine.*
GUIDANCE FOR MASSACHUSETTS
BUDGET PROCESS IN MASSACHUSETTS

**JULY/AUGUST**

- **BEGIN FISCAL YEAR**

**SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER/NOVEMBER**

- Committees propose their funding requests. Open hearings and public meetings are held.

**DECEMBER/JANUARY**

- Governor reviews recommendations. Governor proposes budget.

**FEBRUARY/MARCH/APRIL**

- House conducts 1st, 2nd, & 3rd readings; Public hearings held; Bill engrossed; Goes to Senate.

**MAY/JUNE**

- Senate conducts 1st, 2nd, & 3rd readings; Public hearings held; Bill engrossed; Goes to Governor.

**END FISCAL YEAR**
LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IN MASSACHUSETTS

IDEA

Get signatures/support

File petition with House (or Senate)

Goes to Committee

Public hearing and testimony presented.

Goes to Study

Doesn’t pass

DEAD

Pass

Committee report published in Journal of House or Senate

Governor reviews

To Governor

Debate, 3 readings, engrossment

Senate (or House) doesn’t approve

Senate (or House) approves

Senate (or House) doesn’t approve

Senate (or House) approves

Debate, 3 readings, engrossment

Return with Amendments; repeat process

Veto - DEAD

Passes with or without Governor’s signature

Note: If a bill starts in the House, it then must pass the Senate, and vice versa.
GUIDANCE FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE
BIENNIAL BUDGET PROCESS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

AUGUST (EVEN #CY)
- Governor releases spending targets

SEPTEMBER
- State Agencies begin budget development

OCTOBER 1
- Agencies submit budgets to Governor. Begin Governor’s review.

FEBRUARY 15 (ODD # CY)
- Governor presents recommended budget to House.

APRIL
- House adopts their recommended budget; Cross-over Day - Goes to Senate.

MID-JUNE
- Adopted budget sent back to governor
- Committee of Conference (COC) formed if House/Senate disagree

JULY 1 (EVEN # FY)
- Begin Fiscal Year

Passes with 2/3 vote from House and Senate.
- Governor Vetos
- Governor Approves

House and Senate adopt COC recommended budget
LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

IDEA

Advocacy/Show Support

DECEMBER

Goes to House (or Senate).

Goes to Committee

If funding is require, also goes to House Finance Committee.

Public comments/Hearings held

DEAD

Doesn’t pass

Pass

Retain

Revisited next session

Note: If a bill starts in the House, it then must pass the Senate, and vice versa.

SENATE (OR HOUSE) APPROVES

Goes to Senate (or House)

MARCH

Governor Vetos

DEAD

Passes with 2/3 vote of Legislature

Governor approves

Passes

Governor approves

November/December

Repeat process

Voted on by full body

Note: If a bill starts in the House, it then must pass the Senate, and vice versa.
GUIDANCE FOR RHODE ISLAND
BUDGET PROCESS IN RHODE ISLAND

JULY 1
BEGIN FISCAL YEAR

JULY - AUGUST
State agencies receive targets and prepare budget requests

SEPTEMBER
Budget requests due to Budget Office

DECEMBER - JANUARY
Governor approves recommendations

OCTOBER - NOVEMBER
Agency review of budget recommendations

Veto

Goes to Senate Finance Committee
Goes to House for approval
Goes to Senate for approval
Goes to Governor for approval

Passes with 3/5 approval of Legislature
Signed or presumed approval (6 days)

JUNE 30
Approved
LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IN RHODE ISLAND

IDEA → Introduce to House (or Senate) → Goes to Committee → Committee Consideration → Recommend to another Committee → Recommend with amendments → Recommend a substitute → Postpone → DEAD?

Repeat process → Goes to Senate (House) → Goes to Governor → Signed or presumed approval (6 days) → Approved → Veto but passes with 3/5 vote → Not specified

Note: If a bill starts in the House, it then must pass the Senate, and vice versa.
GUIDANCE FOR VERMONT
BUDGET PROCESS IN VERMONT

JULY 1
BEGIN FISCAL YEAR

AUGUST-DECEMBER
Department of Finance and Revenue begins budget process.
Governor proposes budget to Legislature.

JANUARY
Goes to House and Senate for debate. Both must agree on final appropriations.

FEBRUARY-JUNE
Governor proposes budget to Legislature.

JUNE
Goes to Governor for final approval.

JUNE 30
END FISCAL YEAR
LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IN VERMONT

IDEA

Introduce to House (or Senate), 1st reading

Goes to Committee

Committee Consideration

Not recommended

Recommended

Senate (or House) doesn't approve

Goes to Committee of Conference

Not approved

Approved

Passes without Governor's signature but 2/3 vote

Veto - DEAD

Senate (or House) approves

Debate, 3 readings, engrossment

Approved

Sent to chamber (House or Senate)

Debate, 2nd & 3rd readings, engrossment

Not approved

DEAD

Note: If a bill starts in the House, it then must pass the Senate, and vice versa.