

1 Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.

2 RPTS GONZALEZ

3 HIF088180

4

5

6 TRUSTING THE TAP: UPGRADING AMERICA'S

7 DRINKING WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

8 TUESDAY, MARCH 29, 2022

9 House of Representatives,

10 Subcommittee on Energy and Commerce,

11 Committee on Environment and Climate Change,

12 Washington, D.C.

13

14

15

16 The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:33 a.m.,

17 in Room 2123, Rayburn House Office Building and via Webex,

18 Hon. Paul Tonko, [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

19

20 Present: Representatives Tonko, Schakowsky, Sarbanes,

21 Clarke, Ruiz, Barragan, McEachin, Blunt Rochester, Soto,

22 O'Halleran, Pallone [ex officio]; McKinley, Johnson, Hudson,

23 Carter, Palmer, Curtis, Crenshaw, and Rodgers [ex officio].

24

25

26 Staff Present: Timia Crisp, Professional Staff Member;

27 Waverly Gordon, Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel;

28 Tiffany Guarascio, Staff Director; Anthony Gutierrez,  
29 Professional Staff Member; Caitlin Haberman, Senior  
30 Professional staff Member; Perry Hamilton, Clerk; Zach Kahan,  
31 Deputy Director, Outreach and Membership Service; Rick  
32 Kessler, Senior Advisor and Staff Director, Energy and  
33 Environment; Mackenzie Kuhl, Press Assistant; Brendan Larkin,  
34 Policy Coordinator; Elysa, Montfort, Press Secretary; Kaitlyn  
35 Peel, Digital Director; Kylea Rogers, Staff Assistant; Andrew  
36 Souvall, Director of Communications, Outreach and Member  
37 Services; Rebecca Tomilchik, Policy Analyst; Michael Cameron,  
38 Minority Policy Analyst, CPC, Energy, Environment; Jerry  
39 Couri, Minority Deputy Chief Counsel for Environment; Peter  
40 Kielty, Minority General Counsel; Emily King, Minority Member  
41 Services Director; Bijan Koohmaraie, Minority Chief Counsel,  
42 Oversight and Investigations Chief Counsel; and Mary Martin,  
43 Minority Chief Counsel, Energy and Environment  
44

45           \*Mr. Tonko. The Subcommittee on Environment and Climate  
46 Change will now come to order.

47           Today the subcommittee is holding a hearing entitled  
48 "Trusting the Tap: Upgrading America's Drinking Water  
49 Infrastructure."

50           Due to the COVID-19 public health emergency, members can  
51 participate in today's hearing either in person or remotely  
52 via online video conferencing.

53           In accordance with the updated guidance issued by the  
54 attending physician, members, staff and members of the press  
55 present in the hearing room are not required to wear a mask.

56           For members participating remotely, your microphones  
57 will be set on mute for the purpose of eliminating  
58 inadvertent background noise. Members participating remotely  
59 will need to unmute your microphone each time you wish to  
60 speak.

61           Please note that once you unmute you microphone,  
62 anything that is said in Webex will be heard over the  
63 loudspeakers in the committee room and subject to be heard by  
64 the live stream and C-SPAN.

65           Since members are participating from different locations  
66 at today's hearing, all recognition of members, such as for  
67 questions, will be in the order of subcommittee seniority.

68           Documents for the record can be sent to Rebecca  
69 Tomilchik at the email address we provided to staff, and all

70 documents will be entered into the record at the conclusion  
71 of this hearing.

72 I now recognize myself for five minutes for an opening  
73 statement.

74

75 STATEMENT OF HON. PAUL TONKO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS  
76 FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

77

78       \*Mr. Tonko. For many years under both Democratic and  
79 Republican majorities, this committee has heard from a chorus  
80 of State and local governments, public health and  
81 environmental organizations, labor unions, and American  
82 manufacturers urging Congress to provide greater Federal  
83 assistance in support of our Nation's crumbling water  
84 infrastructure.

85       We are all too aware of water systems' struggles,  
86 frequent main breaks, massive leaks of treated water, PFAS  
87 contaminations, and an estimated ten million lead pipes in  
88 service, which are overwhelmingly found in low-income  
89 communities and communities of color.

90       These challenges on top of a growing backlog of  
91 maintenance projects put financial stress on local  
92 governments and water authorities, which then translates to  
93 rate increases for water users.

94       I believe that every federally elected official should  
95 bear some responsibility and, frankly, some shame that there  
96 are so many Americans that lack access to safe, reliable,  
97 and, yes, affordable drinking water.

98       Only since last year can we say that we have made an  
99 honest attempt to tackle the scale of this problem. Last

100 year's bipartisan infrastructure law made an historic down  
101 payment to address our long-neglected water infrastructure.  
102 It included more than \$50 billion for water systems, and  
103 today we will have an opportunity to examine the funding  
104 being distributed through the Drinking Water State Revolving  
105 Funds.

106 This includes some \$11.7 billion to supplement the  
107 Drinking Water SRF annual appropriations; \$15 billion for the  
108 replacement of lead service lines; and \$4 billion to address  
109 emerging contaminants in drinking water, such as PFAS.

110 Furthermore, Congress has required that 49 percent of  
111 the funds for the SRF supplemental and lead lines be provided  
112 as grants and forgivable loans to our disadvantaged  
113 communities.

114 Given this historic investment, there will certainly  
115 need to be some adjustments made by States, and with that in  
116 mind, earlier this month EPA issued an implementation memo to  
117 provide information to States on how best to administer these  
118 new funds, and by providing this funding through the SRF,  
119 States have flexibility to meet their unique needs.

120 This is the nature of the cooperative federalism  
121 enshrined in the Safe Drinking Water Act, and I have no doubt  
122 that it can continue to be a successful model.

123 It is my expectation that EPA will continue to provide  
124 technical assistance and guidance on how States can make the

125 most of these funds, including by identifying best practices  
126 to enhance capacity building and program access for rural and  
127 disadvantaged communities.

128         We know that ramping up State and local governments'  
129 capacity to administer these funds effectively will have its  
130 challenges, but we should not allow these challenges, which  
131 can and will be overcome by committed States, to overshadow  
132 the immense opportunity being provided by this funding.

133         States and local governments will finally be able to  
134 address their immense infrastructure backlogs. They will  
135 have a pipeline of resources to enable recruitment and  
136 training of the next generation of water sector employees and  
137 the ability to access SRF funds as grants and forgivable  
138 loans which provides new opportunities to small and  
139 disadvantaged systems that previously would never have been  
140 able to consider an SRF loan.

141         It is no surprise that stakeholders, such as the  
142 National Rural Water Association and the Rural Community  
143 Assistance Partnership, have submitted letters which will be  
144 entered into the hearing record later today that celebrate  
145 this funding's potential benefits to rural communities.

146         The bipartisan infrastructure law will resolve long-  
147 overdue work getting done. It will fund projects that will  
148 make Americans healthier, and it will create jobs.

149         The City of Newark has proven it can be done, and the

150 work being done in Milwaukee is further confirming that there  
151 are replicable models for removing lead lines and repairing  
152 infrastructure that results in developing a localized,  
153 unionized workforce.

154         This funding will not solve all of our Nation's water  
155 issues. There is still work to do both to ensure effective  
156 implementation of these funds as well as efforts to improve  
157 water affordability, system resilience, and certainly  
158 standard setting.

159         But I am excited that today we will hear from State,  
160 local, public health, and labor organizations to understand  
161 the opportunities created by this bipartisan infrastructure  
162 law.

163         I do thank our witnesses for joining us this morning,  
164 and I look forward to your testimonies.

165         [The prepared statement of Mr. Tonko follows:]

166

167         \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

168



169           \*Mr. Tonko. And with that, I will now recognize the  
170 ranking member of the subcommittee, Representative McKinley  
171 of West Virginia.

172           The mike is yours.

173

174 STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID B. MCKINLEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN  
175 CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

176

177 \*Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

178 Mr. Chairman, according to the American Society of Civil  
179 Engineers, they publish a report card that ranks the States  
180 according to their water quality and their whole  
181 infrastructure system, and they commented that Nevada and  
182 Oregon were ranked first and second for their quality of  
183 their infrastructure.

184 So it may be understandable that those States may have  
185 had some reservation about funding an infrastructure bill,  
186 but what about Mississippi, West Virginia who ranked last?

187 If you look at the report card, we are ranked last in  
188 the country. Our drinking water alone in West Virginia was  
189 given a D, the lowest rating.

190 These States are desperate. Nearly everyone in Congress  
191 says America needs better infrastructure, but when they were  
192 given a chance to vote for the bill last year, it did not  
193 pass unanimously.

194 So, Mr. Chairman, look. I have been a member of  
195 Congress for nearly 12 years, and this was the first  
196 opportunity we had to get a real infrastructure bill to the  
197 President's desk.

198 Oh, President Obama talked about doing it, but in the

199 eight years he never did it, and then President Trump wanted  
200 to pass an infrastructure, but Speaker Pelosi would not let  
201 his bill come to the floor.

202         And after months of bickering here, partisan bickering,  
203 I appreciate the leadership's decision to keep the social  
204 spending known as Build Back Better separate from the bill.  
205 Now, this bill we have passed by the legislature is pure  
206 infrastructure.

207         And according to Forbes, the social spending portion is  
208 dead in the Senate.

209         So when I am back in West Virginia, I hear great things  
210 from stakeholders everywhere I go about this bill, from Marie  
211 Prezioso with the West Virginia Water Development Authority  
212 and Todd Grinstead with the West Virginia Rural Water  
213 Association. They talk about communities like Aurora,  
214 Fairview, Paw Paw, and McDowen, and Wayne County, McDowen and  
215 Wyoming County. These communities are struggling, Mr.  
216 Chairman.

217         According to the West Virginia DEP, our State had nearly  
218 2,500 miles of contaminated water streams. So this  
219 bipartisan infrastructure bill is a once in a lifetime  
220 opportunity for these small and rural communities to get  
221 clean, affordable water.

222         But this committee is going to need to conduct rigorous  
223 oversight. Democrats unfortunately have a history of

224 prioritizing climate change over drinking water and putting  
225 urban interests over those of rural communities.

226 For example, President Obama cut funding for the State  
227 Revolving Fund for rural areas by half.

228 So these communities must be vigilant to ensure, and  
229 this committee particularly and to you, Mr. Chairman; we have  
230 got to be vigilant that the small and rural communities are  
231 not left out again.

232 So I look forward to today's discussion, and I yield  
233 back the balance of my time.

234 [The prepared statement of Mr. McKinley follows:]

235

236 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

237

238           \*Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

239           The chair now recognizes Representative Pallone, the  
240 hard-working chair of the full committee, for five minutes  
241 for his opening statement.

242

243 STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN  
244 CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

245

246 \*The Chairman. Thank you, Chairman Tonko, particularly  
247 for that hard-working remark. Thank you.

248 \*Mr. Tonko. It is true.

249 \*The Chairman. Today the committee is continuing its  
250 ongoing work to ensure all Americans have access to safe and  
251 clean drinking water.

252 And when you think about it, there is no more basic  
253 necessity in our lives than drinking water. We all need to  
254 be able to trust that when we turn the tap on, our faucets  
255 have water coming out that is safe for us and for our  
256 families.

257 Unfortunately, for far too long we failed to properly  
258 invest in our aging drinking water infrastructure, and as  
259 Chairman Tonko mentioned, the American Society of Civil  
260 Engineers just last year gave our Nation's water  
261 infrastructure a C-minus grade, and that is simply  
262 unacceptable for a Nation as prosperous as ours.

263 Fortunately, last November this Congress acted by  
264 passing the bipartisan infrastructure law, which included \$30  
265 billion to strengthen and rebuild our drinking water  
266 infrastructure, and this is the single largest Federal  
267 investment in our drinking water infrastructure in our

268 Nation's history.

269           Specifically, the law provides over \$11 billion to  
270 bolster the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, our main  
271 funding mechanism for drinking water projects, and the  
272 Drinking Water SRF provides flexibility to States to address  
273 pressing drinking water challenges. It is imperative that we  
274 leverage this flexibility to ensure that we are lifting up  
275 communities.

276           And while the SRF has been a critical lifeline, there  
277 are many small, rural, and underserved communities that face  
278 barriers to access this Federal funding source. Our ranking  
279 member mentioned that, and those communities, which often  
280 have the greatest needs, will benefit from additional  
281 resources and assistance, and we should ensure that they can  
282 tap into them.

283           Now, the bipartisan infrastructure law also includes \$15  
284 billion to help accelerate the inventory and removal of lead  
285 service lines, which is one of my priorities as chairman.  
286 Earlier this year, I was pleased to see Newark, and we have  
287 Director Adeem here representing Newark in my home State.  
288 They completed their efforts to replace all of the lead  
289 service lines.

290           But millions of other Americans in other places are  
291 being exposed to lead in drinking water through lead service  
292 lines, and this is extremely troubling considering that there

293 is no safe lead exposure level.

294 All of these lead pipes must be replaced, and this  
295 funding will provide a huge boost in our efforts to finally  
296 address the longstanding issue of lead in drinking water.

297 The law also allocates \$9 billion to remove dangerous  
298 PFAS chemicals, also known as "forever chemicals," from  
299 drinking water, and this funding will help water systems  
300 clean up PFAS contamination that is becoming more prevalent  
301 and is linked to adverse health effects.

302 This investment will accelerate current infrastructure  
303 projects and kickstart new, often costly projects.

304 So with the bipartisan infrastructure law, we are not  
305 only modernizing our infrastructure in a more resilient way  
306 for the future, but we are also strengthening our local  
307 economies.

308 With provisions to expand the use of American iron and  
309 steel and prevailing wage protections, the bipartisan  
310 infrastructure law will help create good paying jobs across  
311 industries and bolster domestic manufacturing.

312 But as I said, clean, safe drinking water is, in my  
313 opinion, a fundamental right, and the bipartisan  
314 infrastructure law provides our Nation with the necessary  
315 resources to take a long overdue step towards making safe  
316 drinking water a reality for all, including disadvantaged  
317 communities that have been disproportionately impacted by



318 environmental contamination.

319 I just wanted to take a minute to say that I appreciate  
320 all our witnesses today, but especially Newark's Water and  
321 Sewer Utilities Director Kareem Adeem. Thanks to his  
322 leadership, along with the mayor, Mayor Baraka, and Governor  
323 Murphy and our congressional delegation, Newark successfully  
324 completed the replacement of all of its lead lines earlier  
325 this year.

326 And I really want to commend you for your work, Director  
327 Adeem. Mayor Baraka made this a major point that he wanted  
328 to do this, and you know, Congress helped in other ways. We  
329 actually had to redirect some of the funds from the Clean  
330 Water Act with legislation that I had introduced in the House  
331 and Senator Booker championed in the Senate and Donald Payne  
332 also. I have to mention Congressman Payne who represents  
333 Newark.

334 But I still think it was amazing that you did this so  
335 quickly, that you were able to do it so quickly. It really  
336 was amazing.

337 So thank you again and thank you for being here.

338 We have an incredible opportunity to build resilience  
339 and invest in the future of communities. We also have an  
340 opportunity to continue to work on a bipartisan basis to  
341 ensure these funds have a long-lasting impact, which is why  
342 Chairman Tonko is having this hearing today.

343           And while this funding is a critical step in closing the  
344 resource gap for drinking water, there is a lot more we can  
345 do and should do to ensure that every person can trust the  
346 water that is coming out of the tap.

347           So thank you, again, Chairman Tonko. This is a very  
348 important hearing.

349           I yield back.

350           [The prepared statement of Mr. Pallone follows:]

351

352           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

353

354           \*Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

355           Now the chair will recognize Representative Buddy Carter  
356 of Georgia, who is speaking on behalf of Mrs. Rodgers, the  
357 ranking member of the full committee.

358           Mr. Carter, you are recognized for five minutes please.

359

360 STATEMENT OF HON. EARL LEROY "BUDDY" CARTER, A  
361 REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

362

363 \*Mr. Carter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank all of  
364 our witnesses for being here. We appreciate your attendance  
365 very much.

366 From Day One I urged for there to be transparency on the  
367 massive amounts of money this Congress has been providing to  
368 the executive branch. Record government spending is fueling  
369 inflation, and it is out of control.

370 From the gas pump to the grocery store, it is making it  
371 harder for people to pay for basic expenses to get by. We  
372 just learned that funds from the Democrats', quote, "American  
373 Rescue Plan,'" have been spent on things like a hotel, a  
374 ballpark, and ski slopes.

375 This is the kind of waste we warned about when Democrats  
376 acted alone to spend \$2 trillion. Where is the  
377 accountability we have been asking for?

378 Whether it is over this \$2 trillion and inflationary  
379 spending or over this Senate infrastructure law, there must  
380 be proper oversight over how we spend people's hard-earned  
381 taxpayer dollars.

382 American families who are struggling to afford gas,  
383 cars, food, new clothes, and heating their homes, they  
384 deserve the certainty that their duly elected representatives

385 are leading to ensure funds are not wasted or abused. We  
386 should all be asking if the Federal Government wants to spend  
387 more money, can the American people afford it.

388 Today is an important opportunity for this subcommittee  
389 to review and conduct oversight over the Safe Drinking Water  
390 Act provisions in the Senate infrastructure law, and I  
391 appreciate the chairman scheduling it.

392 That being said, we are missing an important witness,  
393 the Environmental Protection Agency. The EPA is responsible  
394 for implementing the law we are discussing today. I hope,  
395 Mr. Chairman, that you will work with us to invite EPA to  
396 testify about its implementation of the \$35 billion in  
397 funding for safe drinking water programs.

398 So let me be clear. My stated concerns with the  
399 drinking water provisions in the Senate infrastructure law  
400 are about transparency and accountability. Without question,  
401 I want our communities to have safe drinking water.

402 I was a mayor one time. I get it. I understand how  
403 important it is. Making that water safe though costs money.  
404 Some communities, because it requires a monetary investment,  
405 again, I get it and I understand. I was a mayor of a growing  
406 city.

407 Because it requires a monetary investment, they need  
408 help from the Federal Government, but simply throwing money  
409 at drinking water challenges using a Federal one-size-fits-

410 all approach is no way to solve the problems that many  
411 communities face.

412 My concerns start with the large amounts of spending,  
413 but also include whether EPA is using this bill as an excuse  
414 to overtake drinking water program management, spending  
415 flexibility, and utility operations.

416 These are all areas that traditionally fall to local  
417 governments and to the States. A Federal takeover would be  
418 unprecedented and troubling.

419 My concerns with the Safe Drinking Water provisions in  
420 the Senate infrastructure bill go further. First, whether  
421 they impact the law's mandates on required spending.  
422 Promoting purchasing power for communities should be our  
423 highest aim.

424 If we swallow up these goals with requirements that  
425 strain the ability to complete necessary projects, we do both  
426 taxpayers and those serving communities a disservice.

427 Second, how will this additional new funding and EPA's  
428 guidance affect existing State Drinking Water Revolving  
429 Funds?

430 And will any of the changes relate only to the Senate  
431 infrastructure funding or would they have long-term impacts  
432 to project prioritization on the State Revolving Fund?

433 Third, will this law improve cybersecurity at drinking  
434 water plants or does it just increase the burdens on

435 utilities and strain their resources?

436 Fourth, there are questions about the lead service line  
437 replacement provisions. For example, do EPA and the States  
438 know where the lead service lines are?

439 And will the agency ensure that millionaires do not  
440 benefit under this program?

441 Finally, there are concerns about rural communities'  
442 role in the funding. Will rural communities have access to  
443 funding and technical assistance or could they fall just  
444 outside of the definition of disadvantaged communities?

445 The Senate infrastructure law has both substantial  
446 authorizing and appropriations provisions. So we have a lot  
447 to cover today. Again, I hope in a future hearing the EPA is  
448 here to formally answer questions about its use of \$35  
449 billion in additional funding.

450 This is important to ensure accountability and  
451 understand any changes that may be needed in the law.

452 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I look forward to our  
453 conversation today, and I yield back.

454 [The prepared statement of Mr. Carter follows:]

455

456 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

457

458           \*Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

459           The chair reminds members that, pursuant to committee  
460 rules, all members' written opening statements shall be made  
461 part of the record.

462           I now introduce the witnesses for today's hearing. We  
463 have Mr. Eric Olson, Senior Strategic Director for Health and  
464 Food, Natural Resources Defense Council.

465           We have Ms. Lori Mathieu, Public Health Branch Chief of  
466 the Environmental Health and Drinking Water Branch of  
467 Connecticut's Department of Public Health, and President of  
468 the Association of Drinking Water Administrators.

469           Mr. Kareem Adeem, Director of Water and Sewer Utilities  
470 for the City of Newark, New Jersey.

471           And on Zoom, we have Mr. Richard Diaz, Midwest Regional  
472 Field Organizer for the BlueGreen Alliance.

473           And then finally, Mr. Jim McGoff, Chief Operating  
474 Officer and Director of Environmental Programs, Indiana  
475 Finance Authority, on behalf of the Council of Infrastructure  
476 Financing Authorities.

477           We welcome each and every one of you here today and on  
478 Zoom.

479           And at this time the chair will recognize each witness  
480 for five minutes to provide the opening statements.

481           Before we begin, I would like to explain the lighting  
482 system. In front of our witnesses is a series of lights.



483 The light will initially be green. The light will turn  
484 yellow when you have one minute remaining. Please begin to  
485 wrap up your testimony at that point. The light will turn  
486 red when your time expires.

487         Since we have witnesses appearing virtually, I need to  
488 ask my colleagues in the hearing room to mute themselves  
489 whenever they are not directly speaking during their Q&A  
490 portion so that we can, indeed, clearly hear the witnesses'  
491 responses.

492         So with that, we now recognize Mr. Olson for five  
493 minutes please to provide your opening statement, and again,  
494 welcome.

495

496 STATEMENT OF ERIK D. OLSON, SENIOR STRATEGIC DIRECTOR FOR  
497 HEALTH AND FOOD, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNSEL; LORI J.  
498 MATHIEU, PUBLIC HEALTH BRANCH CHIEF, ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND  
499 DRINKING WATER BRANCH, CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC  
500 HEALTH, AND PRESIDENT, ASSOCIATION OF DRINKING WATER  
501 ADMINISTRATORS; KAREEM ADEEM, DIRECTOR OF WATER AND SEWER  
502 UTILITIES, THE CITY OF NEWARK, NEW JERSEY; RICHARD DIAZ,  
503 MIDWEST REGIONAL FIELD ORGANIZER, BLUEGREEN ALLIANCE; AND  
504 JAMES P. MCGOFF, CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND DIRECTOR OF  
505 ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS, INDIANA FINANCE AUTHORITY, ON BEHALF  
506 OF COUNCIL OF INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING AUTHORITIES

507

508 STATEMENT OF ERIK D. OLSON

509

510 \*Mr. Olson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank Ranking  
511 Member McKinley and all members of the committee.

512 I am Eric Olson with NRDC, Natural Resources Defense  
513 Counsel.

514 And I wanted to emphasize that this bipartisan  
515 infrastructure law -- I will call it "the bill" -- really  
516 makes historic investments, and I appreciate the bipartisan  
517 nature of the investments that are being made and appreciate  
518 the ranking member's vote in favor of this as well as many  
519 other members of this committee.

520 It is an historic investment that is going to yield

521 benefits for a long time.

522 One issue that we talked about, heard about a little bit  
523 already, is the \$15 billion that are going to be invested to  
524 remove these lead pipes, which is basically like drinking  
525 water out of a lead straw. We do not want to be doing that.

526 And the good news is that that investment is going to  
527 take a big bite out of this problem. But \$15 billion is  
528 about a third of what we need. The reconciliation bill that  
529 this body passed some time ago would add an additional \$10  
530 billion that is really urgently needed money in addition.

531 And I wanted to point out that this historic investment  
532 really is something that is broadly supported. All the  
533 polling shows that about 90 percent of the public supports  
534 investing in things like pulling out all of these lead pipes.

535 So this is something that is both good sense from a  
536 public support standpoint, but also of course from a public  
537 health standpoint.

538 One thing that we really need to do, as several members  
539 have already mention, is make sure that this money is being  
540 targeted well to the disadvantaged communities that need it.

541 And I will emphasize that the States get the vast  
542 majority of this money. This is not going to be administered  
543 by the Federal Government in most cases. Most of that money  
544 is going out to each individual State.

545 The State defines what a disadvantaged community is, and

546 the State is going to be allocating the money.

547         So we need to make sure that that money is being  
548 targeted where it is needed most, be it a rural community  
549 that has urgent need or be it a large city that may have a  
550 pocket of low-income people that really need to get that  
551 help.

552         The bill also includes, as has been mentioned by a  
553 couple of members, \$9 billion to address these so-called  
554 PFAS, the chemicals that have been around for now many years  
555 and are just starting to show up in West Virginia, New York,  
556 many other States. North Carolina has a severe problem with  
557 PFAS contamination. Basically every State has this.

558         We believe that it is going to be a top priority to make  
559 sure that is addressed.

560         In addition, there are a lot of good jobs that are going  
561 to be created. You are going to hear from Mr. Adeem in  
562 Newark who has created a lot of jobs of local people who are  
563 trained by a local union.

564         These jobs are very well paying. We hope that they are  
565 going to be permanent. I cite in my testimony a study that  
566 found over 560,000 job-years that are going to be created  
567 just by pulling out the lead pipes. Those are going to be  
568 good paying jobs under this infrastructure legislation. It  
569 is crucial that that go forward.

570         But I will point out that industry estimates are that

571 the total cost is going to be a trillion dollars for all of  
572 our drinking water infrastructure fixes. That is a big  
573 investment. We are going to need more than has already been  
574 put on the table. We have got an historic investment, but  
575 there is a lot more needed.

576         Nine to 12 million lead service lines still in the  
577 ground; lead in schools, which this legislation did not quite  
578 tackle. There are widespread PFAS contamination problems,  
579 and 30 million people are served by systems that are in  
580 violation of the Safe Drinking Water Act. All of that needs  
581 to be addressed.

582         In addition, we have got some pockets in Appalachia and  
583 Texas border communities, low income, deep South [inaudible].  
584 We need to address this. [Audio malfunction.]

585         We also need to tackle the fact that with climate change  
586 there are going to be more and more challenges that are going  
587 to be coming. Texas' recent experience with losing huge  
588 swaths of the State and of Mississippi with no water and now  
589 power as a result of a storm. That is an initial indication  
590 that we have got this huge problem.

591         So we envision a future where every person in America  
592 gets safe, sufficient, and affordable drinking water. That  
593 is something that can be done. Newark is showing that it can  
594 be done in a big city. It can be done in rural communities.  
595 That is something that we ought to tackle and make the

596 investments to make happen.

597 Thank you.

598 [The prepared statement of Mr. Olson follows:]

599

600 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

601

602           \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Olson.

603           And we now recognize Ms. Mathieu.

604           Ms. Mathieu, you are recognized for five minutes please,

605 and the mike is yours.

606

607 STATEMENT OF LORI J. MATHIEU

608

609 \*Ms. Mathieu. Good morning, Subcommittee Chairman  
610 Tonko, Ranking Member McKinley, members of the subcommittee.

611 My name is Lori Mathieu, and I am the President of the  
612 Association of State Drinking Water Administrators, known as  
613 ASDWA. We have 57 members, and we include all 50 States and  
614 five territorial programs, a Navajo Nation, and the District  
615 of Columbia.

616 Thank you for this incredible opportunity to appear  
617 before you and the subcommittee to discuss effective and  
618 efficient implementation of the bipartisan infrastructure law  
619 for safe drinking water.

620 A collaborative partnership is always and has always  
621 been needed since the beginning of time with the Safe  
622 Drinking Water Act between all of us, States, tribes,  
623 territories, and the Federal Government.

624 First of all, first and foremost, we collectively and  
625 sincerely wish to say thank you for this funding. This is a  
626 substantial increase in funding under the bill, and an  
627 investment in safe drinking water and public health.

628 ASDWA members have compliance oversight and enforcement  
629 authority or primacy of the State Drinking Water Act. Our  
630 members and their staff are the scientists and the engineers  
631 on the front lines every day implementing the Act and



632 executing the laws that you pass.

633 We provide technical assistance and oversight of  
634 drinking water systems. That is our job every single day.

635 I am also, as you mentioned, the Public Health Branch  
636 Chief of the Environmental Health and Drinking Water Branch  
637 of the Connecticut Department of Public Health. I have been  
638 a public health official for over 34 years.

639 I have received Statewide programs and addressed primacy  
640 and the Safe Drinking Water Act and regulation of drinking  
641 water systems, also the SRF Program. We also have a PFAS and  
642 Emerging Contaminants Program, Certified Operator Program.  
643 We started a new Climate Change and Public Health Program.

644 We also oversee a number of lead programs that work to  
645 prevent lead exposure.

646 Today I will discuss ASDWA's perspective on  
647 implementation of the bill. My testimony has three basic  
648 themes.

649 We want to focus on getting the lead out everywhere.  
650 ASDWA support the removal of all lead service lines across  
651 the country from the water main to where the lead service  
652 line goes to the building wall.

653 The development of the inventories is only the first  
654 step. Then we need to move toward removal. ASDWA requests  
655 that Congress consider providing for additional subsidization  
656 up to possibly 100 percent loan forgiveness for lead service

657 line replacements.

658 In Connecticut, Governor Lemont has proposed Bill 5045,  
659 which focuses on childhood lead poisoning, and we are working  
660 to merge all efforts to reduce lead exposure.

661 Flexibility and ease in bill implementation are critical  
662 to achieving the goal of equity and helping systems and  
663 communities that need the funding the most.

664 As stated in EPA's recent implementation bill memo from  
665 Radhika Fox, States are responsible for defining  
666 disadvantaged communities, taking into account local  
667 conditions.

668 In Connecticut and in many States, we are currently  
669 working with our leadership to right now enhance our focus on  
670 communities that need the funding the most, with a focus on  
671 health equity.

672 Streamline the SRF Programs, the application process.  
673 States and EPA need to work together to make applying for the  
674 bill funds and the SRF Programs as simple and as easy as  
675 possible, while ensuring the requirements are addressed.

676 Let's work together to develop waivers. ASDWA  
677 recommends the development of waivers in limited  
678 circumstances for the requirements of Buy America, Build  
679 America, and the Davis-Bacon Acts. Make funds simpler to  
680 obtain for those most in need.

681 Sustainability, durability, and longevity. Public water

682 systems that receive bill funding need to be durable,  
683 resilient, and have longevity. While the bill funding is  
684 substantial, we need the public water systems that use these  
685 funds to be able to appropriately operate and maintain their  
686 infrastructure. Being resilient into the future is  
687 important.

688         There are over 124,000 small community public water  
689 systems in this country. Many lack long-term durability and  
690 to meet the challenges, the many challenges of the Safe  
691 Drinking Water Act.

692         In Connecticut, we have 400 of those small systems in  
693 rural settings, many in disadvantaged communities. The DWSRF  
694 Programs, States, and EPA need to work together to ensure  
695 that the SRF loans are sustainable and have longevity with  
696 the split of loan versus principal forgiveness.

697         The bill funding is only the first step to address the  
698 needs of our drinking water infrastructure.

699         Workforce. The workforce needs a sustainable workforce  
700 through these bill funds and beyond, with a particular focus  
701 on engineers. It is incredibly hard to find engineers to  
702 take our jobs these days.

703         Cybersecurity. We must never forget this issue, and we  
704 must recognize and address it, and it is a growing threat,  
705 and we want to work closely with EPA and our colleagues at  
706 the Department of Homeland Security.

707           As we participate today in this hearing, ASDWA members  
708           are hard working on the implementation right now, and we are  
709           moving forward. In Connecticut right now, we have an open  
710           call for projects. This unprecedented funding will improve  
711           the country's infrastructure and public health, and we look  
712           forward to keeping Congress informed of our progress.

713           And, again, thank you so much for this investment in  
714           safe drinking water and public health. It is greatly  
715           appreciated by our membership across the country and  
716           certainly within the State of Connecticut Department of  
717           Public Health, who I represent.

718           Thank you very much.

719           [The prepared statement of Ms. Mathieu follows:]

720

721           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

722

723           \*Mr. Tonko. You are most welcome. Thank you, Ms.

724 Mathieu.

725           And next we move to Mr. Adeem. Let me congratulate you  
726 and Newark on the efforts you have made and the achievement.

727           So you are recognized, sir, for five minutes please.

728

729 STATEMENT OF KAREEM ADEEM

730

731 \*Mr. Adeem. Thank you, Chairman Tonko, Ranking Member  
732 McKinley, and subcommittee members, and Congressman Pallone,  
733 New Jersey's own.

734 Good morning. It is an honor to be here in front of  
735 this congressional Subcommittee on Environment and Climate  
736 Change, and I would especially like to just, you know, thank  
737 the Congress for the bipartisan infrastructure bill.

738 This bill the City of Newark has seen firsthand how  
739 investment in infrastructure can impact communities. This  
740 investment is not just in our water and wastewater  
741 infrastructure. This bill is going to provide human capital  
742 infrastructure.

743 You know, from employing local residents to come and  
744 work on union-scale jobs to remove lead service lines, to  
745 installing water mains, but also having Mom and Pop  
746 businesses take a part of what is going on in their  
747 community.

748 Moreover, the bipartisan infrastructure bill is the most  
749 significant investment in the Nation in my lifetime. This  
750 bill is an essential step in the right direction to provide  
751 safe drinking water to everyone in America.

752 In addition, the Federal Government will invest  
753 infrastructure upgrades and provide economic capital to

754 communities, like others in New Jersey. I have witnessed the  
755 investment benefits in water infrastructure improvements  
756 firsthand and would like to just share a couple of them with  
757 the committee.

758 I would like to talk about our lead service line  
759 replacement program. With the investment in human capital  
760 and the solution to a long-neglected problem, of the 200  
761 million spent on repair and replacement of lead service  
762 lines, 70 percent of that money stays in the local community,  
763 the City of Newark.

764 In the State and the community when we hired local  
765 contractors, subcontractors and emphasized that they hire  
766 Newark residents from the union apprenticeship program that  
767 we created, and we created a unique program with assistance  
768 from the city's Department of Workforce Development, our  
769 State Department of Labor, and the Local Union 472.

770 Collaboration made the success of this program  
771 appreciated. The apprenticeship program trained into a dozen  
772 of our residents the skills that they need for the future to  
773 earn middle-class salaries and get permanent jobs, permanent  
774 union jobs.

775 As more cities replace lead service lines and start  
776 water infrastructure with Federal infrastructure money, our  
777 residents will find continued employment.

778 In addition, we have women and minority-owned business

779 find business opportunities for these projects, support in  
780 everything from engineering inspections to printing door  
781 hangers, to informing our residents in community meetings.

782 One of tremendous successes is the joy of community  
783 being a part of the economic investment. They actually see  
784 it. A lot of times when we look at government doing a  
785 project, we look at our highway system. No disrespect to the  
786 highway system. We always see that construction lasts for  
787 decades.

788 You can ride down the New Jersey Turnpike. We can ride  
789 down I-95, and we always see construction going on. However,  
790 no one takes a look at water and wastewater needs because it  
791 is a buried asset.

792 This buried asset is only brought upon light when there  
793 is a crisis or we have a major flooding event or water main  
794 break where there is a lack of water, and everyone wants to  
795 know then that we need hurry up and fix our aging  
796 infrastructure.

797 As fellow Congress members today pointed out, the  
798 American Society of Engineers gives is a C average. We are  
799 in the greatest country in the world. We should have an A.  
800 We should have an A for infrastructure.

801 You know, investments in water are an investment in  
802 human capital because we are protecting valuable lives with  
803 drinking water.



804           So I leave here today. I just want to say, one, engage  
805 with your State. A part of making these programs efficient  
806 and effective would be engaging with your State Revolving  
807 Loan Program early. Have meetings and conversation with them  
808 to understand the process, limits of funding, the terms, and  
809 construction long-term financing.

810           Lead service lines are on the homeowner's property. We  
811 have to make sure we have special legislation in place to  
812 remove lead service lines by spending public money on private  
813 property.

814           Schedule meetings with your local county and State  
815 officials. The infrastructure money is to be used to replace  
816 infrastructure, not to be held up by bureaucratic red tape in  
817 the permitting process.

818           In Newark, most disadvantaged people rent. In other  
819 major cities, too. Seventy-four percent of our residents in  
820 the City of Newark are renters. We needed a council  
821 ordinance to pass to make sure we had the right of access to  
822 go on private and replace lead service lines.

823           We understand that collaboration on the Federal, State,  
824 and local level will move projects forward, but we understand  
825 that there are emerging contaminants that also need to be  
826 addressed, and this infrastructure funding bill will provide  
827 the needed necessities to move it forward.

828           Thank you.

829 [The prepared statement of Mr. Adeem follows:]

830

831 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

832

833           \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Adeem.

834           And now we will move to our next witness who is joining  
835 us virtually. Mr. Diaz, you are recognized please for five  
836 minutes.

837

838 STATEMENT OF RICHARD DIAZ

839

840 \*Mr. Diaz. Thank you, Chair Tonko, Ranking Member  
841 McKinley, and members of the committee.

842 My name is Richard Diaz, and I am the Midwest Regional  
843 Field Organizer with the BlueGreen Alliance. We are a  
844 national partnership of labor unions and environmental  
845 organizations.

846 Thank you for convening this hearing on upgrading  
847 America's drinking water infrastructure. As it was stated  
848 earlier, our Nation's drinking water infrastructure received  
849 a grade of a C-minus by the American Society of Civil  
850 Engineers.

851 The good news is that the \$55 billion investment in  
852 water infrastructure within the bipartisan infrastructure law  
853 is the largest Federal investment we have ever seen in our  
854 water systems, and it is a significant down payment on the  
855 \$434 billion investment gap identified in the ASCE's 2021  
856 infrastructure report card.

857 Fifteen of that \$55 billion investment will be to fund  
858 the replacement of lead service lines. There is no safe  
859 level of lead exposure. Communities of color and low-income  
860 communities often bear the brunt of the hazard of lead water  
861 contamination.

862 Eliminating lead exposure in our water systems can not

863 only keep communities healthy, but also create good paying  
864 jobs and boost local economies across the country,  
865 particularly if impacted communities are hired to do this  
866 work.

867         An analysis by the BlueGreen Alliance found that the \$15  
868 billion investment for lead service line replacement would  
869 result in the creation of about 200,000 jobs over ten years.  
870 Those same investments made by the bill will greatly benefit  
871 the construction industry.

872         For example, plumbing, pipefitting, and steam-fitting  
873 all have an industry that currently employs about 300,000  
874 workers, and there is expected to be a job growth of about 16  
875 percent through 2026. This investment will be a massive job  
876 creator for American manufacturing thanks to strong domestic  
877 procurement and prevailing wage provisions.

878         According to the Alliance for American Manufacturing,  
879 Buy America provisions lead to 33 percent increase in  
880 manufacturing jobs per dollar of public spending.

881         At McLean Ductile Pipe in Ohio, members of the United  
882 Steel Workers Local 7014 produced ductile iron pipe used in  
883 water infrastructure. Buy America helps keep this facility  
884 open and provides a foundation for more good union jobs in  
885 the decades to come.

886         We also have to make sure that these are not just good  
887 jobs but accessible jobs. This means supporting and growing

888 pathways into good union water sector jobs for women and  
889 workers of color historically underrepresented.

890 Provisions needed to ensure these jobs are good and  
891 accessible include registered apprenticeships, free  
892 apprenticeship programs, and other union affiliated training  
893 programs as well as project labor agreements, community  
894 workforce agreements, and community benefits agreements.

895 The bill also includes a number of changes that will  
896 help direct funding to communities that need it most. The  
897 requirement that 49 percent at least of that funding be  
898 distributed as grants or forgivable loans.

899 This will be help for people like Ms. Ledora Meadows  
900 from my hometown of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. She is someone who  
901 has been in the same house for over four decades in a  
902 neighborhood with a median income level that is well below  
903 the poverty line, and she is someone who is taking care of  
904 many children in the neighborhood, some of those lead  
905 poisoned children, and she has decided to get her lead  
906 service line replaced.

907 Trying to protect her family from lead exposure, Ms.  
908 Ledora ended up with a bill of more than \$1,000, and that is  
909 \$1,000 she does not have.

910 Resources in the bill will help families like Ms.  
911 Ledora's, but it will be crucial for the EPA to provide  
912 technical assistance for communities applying for funds to

913 ensure that disadvantaged communities benefit equitably from  
914 these investments.

915         The bill's funding will help rebuild our Nation's water  
916 infrastructure and will help protect Americans from the  
917 irreversible damage of lead poisoning. We will save billions  
918 of dollars that would have been spent on medical treatments,  
919 special education, crime and juvenile delinquency caring for  
920 lead poisoned individuals.

921         We also save billions of dollars in treated water that  
922 is lost from water main breaks and leaks. This translates  
923 into benefits for the environment and for all rural, urban,  
924 and suburban communities, and we do it while creating high  
925 quality union jobs not only at construction job sites, but at  
926 manufacturing facilities down the supply chain.

927         The bill's investment and continued investment in our  
928 water infrastructure is a win for our country.

929         Thank you, again, for the opportunity to speak today.

930         [The prepared statement of Mr. Diaz follows:]

931

932         \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

933

934           \*Mr. Tonko. You are most welcome, Mr. Diaz, and thank  
935 you for your participation.

936           And finally we turn to Mr. McGoff, who is recognized now  
937 for five minutes please.

938



939 STATEMENT OF JAMES P. MCGOFF

940

941 \*Mr. McGoff. Thank you, Chair Tonko, Ranking Member  
942 McKinley, Chair Pallone, Ranking Member Rodgers, and members  
943 of the subcommittee.

944 My name is Jim McGoff, and I am the Director of  
945 Environmental Program for the Indiana Finance Authority. I  
946 am testifying today on behalf of the Council of  
947 Infrastructure Financing Authorities, which represents the  
948 Clean Water and Drinking Water Revolving Funds.

949 I would like to begin my testimony by taking this  
950 opportunity to personally thank you and the other members of  
951 Congress for trusting and empowering the State Drinking Water  
952 SRF Programs with the financial resources to make meaningful  
953 investments in our Nation's drinking water infrastructure.

954 I know the success of our programs is well documented  
955 and included in my written testimony. So I will get right to  
956 the purpose of this hearing.

957 I visit today with a simple request. Please consider  
958 expanding our ability to quickly and effectively deploy the  
959 historic funding in the bipartisan infrastructure bill. My  
960 comments will focus on the SRF's ability to utilize the  
961 funding for emerging contaminants and lead service line  
962 replacement in a way that achieves our shared goal of  
963 protecting the health of the American people.

964 I can confidently say the SRF Programs are experts in  
965 providing low-cost financial assistance for every community's  
966 drinking water needs. Congress was right to choose the SRF  
967 Programs when looking for the appropriate vehicle to address  
968 emerging contaminants and lead service line removal.

969 However, to be able to achieve the intent of the law,  
970 this targeted funding requires more flexible and innovative  
971 approach than the base program that we currently monitor.  
972 For example, firefighting foam. It is currently stored at  
973 every firefighting station and usually contains PFAS or PFOA.

974 We believe the intent of the legislation included the  
975 ability of States to inventory, collect, and properly dispose  
976 of these toxic chemicals.

977 My apologies of being from Indiana. I feel compelled to  
978 make at least one basketball analogy here. This is a layup.

979 Of course, we should be able to use this funding to  
980 eliminate that public health threat. However, because we  
981 would not be providing financial assistance directly to a  
982 drinking water utility, we have been informed that we are not  
983 permitted to use the emerging contaminant funding you have  
984 provided to address this critical problem.

985 Another example, PFAS and PFOA and other contaminants  
986 that would qualify as emerging can be found in our soils and  
987 other areas not associated with the drinking water utility.  
988 Again, the SRF Programs cannot go into these urban

989 neighborhoods desperately needing the financial assistance to  
990 address known and identified emerging contaminants with this  
991 funding unless they are somehow associated with a drinking  
992 water utility.

993 EPA has provided flexibility in the past, primarily  
994 within the Clean Water SRF Program, and however, we would  
995 hope with your urging and/or modifications to the bill, EPA  
996 would do the same with the Drinking Water SRF Program.

997 For example, an SRF Program has used its Clean Water SRF  
998 Funds to fund energy efficiency projects with EPA approval  
999 under the theory that energy efficient additions to homes  
1000 would reduce energy use, which would reduce energy  
1001 production, which would reduce stack emissions, which would  
1002 reduce particulate matter leaving the stack and falling into  
1003 a receiving stream.

1004 Arguably, there is a greater threat of a container of  
1005 firefighting foam failing and leaking in the basement of a  
1006 firehouse or the more likely scenario of it being used and  
1007 then flowing into a receiving stream or well, and that may be  
1008 the town's only source of drinking water.

1009 I will now turn my attention to our ability to address  
1010 lead service lines. Federal law requires that we provide EPA  
1011 with a list of projects we intend to fund before we can draw  
1012 down the first dollar. So the funds you have made available  
1013 to the States cannot be used unless and until we provide EPA

1014 with a list of projects that will be funded.

1015           Therein lies the problem. Utilities in many States have  
1016 not begun the process of developing an inventory of lead  
1017 service lines. It would be logical to think we would be able  
1018 to use these funds to generate a statewide inventory and then  
1019 begin the process of removing the lead lines.

1020           However, we are limited to only using a fraction of the  
1021 funds for this purpose. Funds referred to as set-asides are  
1022 generally reserved for program administrative expenses or  
1023 State-specific initiatives maybe eligible, but in the  
1024 aggregate would not be sufficient to adequately address the  
1025 necessary inventories.

1026           Logic suggests and we believe your intent would be that  
1027 the lead service line funding be eligible for use in all  
1028 things associated with the removal or at the very least the  
1029 first and second year of funding be eligible for inventories,  
1030 believing that once inventoried the later years' funding  
1031 could be targeted for their removal.

1032           We do not believe wholesale changes in the legislation  
1033 are necessary. It is good legislation, but minor revisions  
1034 are needed to ensure we can achieve its goals. Thank you.

1035           [The prepared statement of Mr. McGoff follows:]

1036

1037 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

1038

1039           \*Mr. Tonko. Mr. McGoff, thank you.

1040           And thank you to all of our witnesses again for your  
1041 participation here today.

1042           That concludes your opening statements, and we now will  
1043 move to member questions, and I will start by recognizing  
1044 myself for five minutes.

1045           Now, we often hear about water systems' needs in big  
1046 numbers, \$472 billion often quoted as that needed for the  
1047 next 20 years. Mr. Olson, can you please help us  
1048 contextualize these needs?

1049           What does it mean today for American families, for their  
1050 health, for their pocketbooks that water systems require  
1051 nearly half a trillion in investment?

1052           \*Mr. Olson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1053           I will say that that is even a lowball estimate  
1054 according to the American Waterworks Association, which  
1055 estimates it could be a trillion dollars.

1056           I think what it means is there are so many communities  
1057 around the country, as we have heard, where this is a buried  
1058 asset. Most people do not know that they have problems with  
1059 their drinking water until they do not have water if there is  
1060 a water main break or they learn that they have lead  
1061 contamination in their water or if they are in a rural  
1062 community that they have serious contamination problems.

1063           So what it means to communities across the country is if

1064 we do not invest in these problems, I said in my testimony it  
1065 is a lot like a decades old car that has not had a brake job  
1066 or oil change in years.

1067 That is sort of what we are operating with in a lot of  
1068 communities across the country is these water systems are  
1069 starting to fall apart. They are not modernized. They are  
1070 delivering in many cases water that is not up to snuff. It  
1071 is especially true in lower income communities and in many  
1072 rural communities that have real problems.

1073 So what it means to Americans is many of us are getting  
1074 water that is not safe. Many of us are getting water that  
1075 should be better even if it meets standards, and these kinds  
1076 of investments from the bipartisan deal will take us a long  
1077 way towards helping to fix the problem.

1078 \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you.

1079 And, Ms. Mathieu, I looked up Connecticut's latest SRF  
1080 intended use plan. For a relatively small State, there were  
1081 a lot of proposed projects.

1082 Can you discuss how far this new funding could go to  
1083 addressing the State's infrastructure backlog?

1084 \*Ms. Mathieu. Excellent question. And thank you for  
1085 looking up our intended use plan. I very much appreciate it.  
1086 We are very proud of our SRF Program.

1087 So in our little State, we have 2,400 public water  
1088 systems, 2,400 in the little State of Connecticut. Two

1089 thousand of those are non-communities. There are about 725  
1090 that are formally eligible to apply for the SRFs.

1091 We have not used one word in here, but which is really  
1092 important: aging infrastructure. It is prevalent. Our  
1093 treatment systems, as Mr. Olson mentioned, a lot of our  
1094 treatment plants need between 40 to \$60 million in  
1095 replacement funding.

1096 Many of even our larger municipal systems cannot afford  
1097 that on their own. They need the subsidization. We have  
1098 actually rebuilt a treatment plant at Groton, which serves  
1099 about 80,000 people. They could not afford the \$55 million  
1100 price.

1101 We were able to pull together some State funding to help  
1102 them with the affordability of that loan.

1103 We have many small systems in our State. We have 3.6  
1104 million people. We have 148 really small towns, very rural  
1105 towns.

1106 Many small systems struggle. Many of you mentioned the  
1107 small system struggle. Many of you mentioned the small  
1108 system problem.

1109 A small system to us in Connecticut is 25 people,  
1110 literally 15 service connections. Affordability is a serious  
1111 problem, even taking on a loan. That is why one of the  
1112 comments that we made was let's make the process as simple as  
1113 possible. Taking out a loan is incredibly difficult. Even

1114 if you gave them 80 percent subsidy, just to fill out the  
1115 paperwork, so to make it simple and easy as possible.

1116 We like one of the ideas that has come out through EPA,  
1117 and I think through the President himself, this idea of  
1118 technical hubs. We want in. In our State of Connecticut, we  
1119 have asked our EPA Boston people and headquarters staff. We  
1120 would like a technical hub for Connecticut. We have enough  
1121 systems and enough problems. We want a focused effort.

1122 We as regulators, we scare people when we show up. All  
1123 right. Let's face it, right? Every time we show up, it is  
1124 thousands of dollars because we are pointing out violations,  
1125 as many violations that we identify.

1126 So to bring in a technical expert under a technical hub  
1127 idea that is funded directly by EPA to help, I would love to  
1128 have that. Three to 400 systems, to sit down and help apply  
1129 for an SRF loan; to help identify your lead service line  
1130 inventories.

1131 Many of them do not even understand how to put that  
1132 together. So to provide direct technical assistance to the  
1133 communities that need it the most in these three to 400  
1134 really small systems would be really very important to be  
1135 able to spend that money.

1136 \*Mr. Tonko. Well, thank you very much.

1137 Okay. We now recognize Mr. McKinley, subcommittee  
1138 ranking member, for five minutes of questions, please.



1139           \*Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1140           I tried to say in my opening remarks I believe there is  
1141 a nexus between States that have low per capita income and  
1142 the ranking with your infrastructure. Particularly, the  
1143 example would be Mississippi and West Virginia.

1144           So I want to keep that in consideration as we go with  
1145 this.

1146           Now, let me go to Mr. Olson. You made a comment about  
1147 lead water pipes and identifying. I really want to give a  
1148 shout-out to Clarksburg Water Department. What they did,  
1149 they found out they had a problem, and they have been  
1150 actively going after that. And they have replaced most of  
1151 those now. And they are identifying the water lines, the  
1152 lead pipes all throughout the district for that. So we are  
1153 making a move on that.

1154           Ms. Mathieu, you made an interesting remark. You said  
1155 you are finding a shortage of engineers to do this. I would  
1156 say to you we have got a shortage of engineers in Washington.

1157           I am just one of two licensed engineers in Congress and  
1158 think about it. Here we are dealing with a massive  
1159 infrastructure bill, and as we say, there are two licensed  
1160 engineers, but there are 242 attorneys.

1161           So the question is who do we want addressing our  
1162 infrastructure, and I will end up on that. We will go back.

1163           But just last week I had a meeting with a water group,

1164 and they were telling me the lack of oversight. The concern  
1165 they are having is the massive increase in water pipes and  
1166 copper and fire hydrants and all.

1167 As a matter of fact, what they showed me was because of  
1168 this lack of oversight and this control that we have now put  
1169 in, eight-inch PVC pipe, kind of the heartbeat of water  
1170 systems, it has already increased our suppliers 210 percent  
1171 over the last three years, 210 percent.

1172 The same thing with six-inch; 157 percent increase.  
1173 Fire hydrants, 30-some percent increase in just two years.

1174 So I am hoping that we can develop some kind of  
1175 oversight with this, our chairman and our committee, to be  
1176 able to control this because our communities are not going to  
1177 be able to meet the infrastructure if we are faced with this  
1178 kind of supply cost that is facing us.

1179 So let me go to two quick questions with Mr. McGoff, if  
1180 I could with you.

1181 States each have their own idea of what a disadvantaged  
1182 community is and whether it is urban or rural, and so that  
1183 both of these communities, both rural and urban communities,  
1184 are on a level playing field.

1185 How can we ensure that the population and needs are part  
1186 of the equal consideration if we go ahead?

1187 Need is huge for us in areas in West Virginia and  
1188 Mississippi and others that are struggling now to do this.

1189 How can we do that?

1190 How can we make sure that need is also included?

1191 \*Mr. McGoff. Thank you for the question.

1192 And the SRF Programs have been identifying and getting  
1193 or targeting disadvantaged communities for years. So we are  
1194 well equipped so each State has the ability and the  
1195 flexibility to tailor their definitions of disadvantaged  
1196 communities to fit their State need.

1197 For example, in Indiana we have both urban and very  
1198 rural communities. Many of the rural communities are very  
1199 much like what you have described in some of the Southern  
1200 States.

1201 And so our disadvantaged community definition recognizes  
1202 very low median household income, high user rates, and we  
1203 target our grant funding that we have available or forgivable  
1204 loan funding that we have available to those communities.

1205 And the communities that can afford a standard interest  
1206 rate, that is where we program those loans to.

1207 \*Mr. McKinley. Thank you.

1208 Ms. Mathieu, last year and then prior to the  
1209 infrastructure bill being passed, this committee had hearings  
1210 on drinking water, but primarily over leaking pipes and  
1211 breaks. And according to the American Water Association when  
1212 they testified, they said that we are probably losing 30 to  
1213 40 percent of all the water treated because of leaks and

1214 breaks.

1215           So how will this legislation start to address that so  
1216 that we can be more efficient in our systems?

1217           \*Ms. Mathieu. Thank you for question.

1218           It is an important one when you lose 30 percent of your  
1219 product that you spend a lot of money producing. It is a  
1220 shame.

1221           So aging infrastructure is a real problem. Water main  
1222 replacement has always been a big part of the SRF Programs,  
1223 and I hope that it will continue. Some of our water mains,  
1224 if you see the water main that runs right on Capital Avenue  
1225 on the City of Hartford, it is 100 years old.

1226           And what is interesting is they say, well, we have got  
1227 another 20 years on that pipe. It is good.

1228           So we are in the northeastern part of the country. We  
1229 have a lot of aging infrastructure. My colleague from New  
1230 Jersey, the pipes are old, systems are old.

1231           We need the investment, and I know that one thing in  
1232 Connecticut, our intended use plan or last call for projects,  
1233 we had over 120 project requests totaling over \$520 million  
1234 in requests.

1235           We believe on this most recent call for projects, we  
1236 will have over \$800 million in requests for a little State of  
1237 Connecticut.

1238           We also have 12 lead service line removal projects

1239 totaling asking for over \$134 million. A one percent State  
1240 like we are in Connecticut for the SRFs, we are receiving in  
1241 the bill \$150 million over five years.

1242 \*Mr. McKinley. Thank you.

1243 I have gone over my time. I yield back.

1244 \*Mr. Tonko. That is fine. Engineers love that.

1245 The gentleman yields back.

1246 The chair now recognizes Chairman Pallone of the full  
1247 committee for five minutes to ask questions please.

1248 \*The Chairman. Thank you, Chairman Tonko.

1249 I wanted to start with Ms. Mathieu. We have talked a  
1250 lot about the need to replace lead service lines, cleaning up  
1251 PFAS, but all that can be very costly, right?

1252 So in a City like Newark, you know, they struggled to  
1253 get the funding, right? I mean they did between the State  
1254 and the Federal Government.

1255 So I just wanted to ask basically about resources, Ms.  
1256 Mathieu. Is sustained and robust Federal investment like  
1257 that provided by the BIS critical to helping water systems  
1258 address these public health challenges or would we have just  
1259 gotten the job done just as well using the incremental annual  
1260 funding approach that we had until the bipartisan bill came  
1261 along?

1262 \*Ms. Mathieu. That is a very good question. Thank you  
1263 for that.

1264           This infusion of funding will significantly invest in  
1265 our cities in their aging infrastructure across the country,  
1266 as well as helping the smallest systems that need the help  
1267 the most.

1268           In our most rural communities, they struggle just to  
1269 pull water samples and to meet the time frames of the Safe  
1270 Drinking Water Act. This funding will help them and these  
1271 technical assistance helps in our increased ability at the  
1272 State level.

1273           We anticipate and are hopeful to hire additional  
1274 engineers to get the work done. We would love those  
1275 professional engineers to take our jobs. But we have a hard  
1276 time bringing engineers on. For whatever reason, there does  
1277 not seem to be many coming to the table.

1278           But with this additional funding, it gives our State and  
1279 other States across the country an incredible ability to  
1280 change the way we have been investing in public health and  
1281 drinking water.

1282           Our aging infrastructure in our State alone, again, the  
1283 needs are high, about \$800 million, we believe, and we know  
1284 that we cannot afford that alone.

1285           So my colleague had mentioned Mississippi. I know my  
1286 colleague well, Bill Moody, in the State of Mississippi, and  
1287 we just completed a nice week together during our member  
1288 meeting, and he said, "Lori, you know, when we invest this

1289 money in these small systems and any system, we have to make  
1290 sure those systems are resilient for the future.''

1291 We see this as an investment in the future, and again,  
1292 we cannot thank you enough for this investment in our  
1293 drinking water.

1294 As Mr. Adeem said, these are not -- I am going to say it  
1295 -- these are not the sexiest things, right, because they are  
1296 all buried. People do not know. People do not see the pipes  
1297 in the ground. People do not know about the work that you  
1298 all do to supply drinking water every day all day.

1299 They see the roads and the bridges. But to provide this  
1300 level of money to safe drinking water and public health  
1301 protection is tremendous, and we, again, we are thrilled with  
1302 it and want to get the work started.

1303 \*The Chairman. Well, thank you.

1304 Let me go to Mr. Adeem. You talked, of course, about  
1305 how there were a lot of jobs created and local jobs as a  
1306 result of this major effort to replace all the service lines  
1307 in Newark.

1308 Just tell me a little more about the benefits to the  
1309 community you have witnessed as your city invested in this  
1310 effort to replace the lead service lines.

1311 \*Mr. Adeem. Thank you, Congressman Pallone, Chairman  
1312 Pallone.

1313 As we have seen in our community, the City of Newark, we

1314 engage our local residents into coming into an apprenticeship  
1315 program with the local trade union. They had gotten an  
1316 opportunity that they would never see, but we "never see" is  
1317 always hard to get into a union skilled job. Unions always  
1318 had these announcements. "We are hiring.'" You see them in  
1319 the papers, and there is a long line where it could be as  
1320 much as five to 10,000 people trying to get 20 positions.

1321 In the City of Newark, because we knew we had an  
1322 infrastructure project that was going to impact one local  
1323 union, the Laborers Union for Local 472, we met with them  
1324 early and with the State Department of Labor to make sure  
1325 that we wanted to focus on putting Newark residents, right,  
1326 those underprivileged residents that did not have the  
1327 opportunity, men and women, Black and Brown, that may have  
1328 not had an opportunity to be a part of the union, to get into  
1329 the union.

1330 Immediately, we have seen the impact because not only  
1331 were we doing the lead service line replacement work in the  
1332 community. Residents that actually lived in the community  
1333 had the opportunity to replace their own lead service line.

1334 So you are working on a job where you are replacing your  
1335 own house, and the income that they received off those jobs,  
1336 the middle-class salary, they were putting that money back  
1337 into the community. They lived in the community. They were  
1338 investing back into the community.



1339 I was on a job site, me and one of my colleagues and a  
1340 former reporter, one early in the morning, and we had the  
1341 street blocked off, and we were helping a lady bring her  
1342 groceries into her house because the street was blocked off.

1343 And she saw her nephew out there. She said, "Leave  
1344 those gentlemen alone. They are working. Get away from  
1345 them."

1346 And he says, "Auntie, I am working."

1347 She said, "You are not working with them. Leave them  
1348 alone. Get out of the way."

1349 And he says, "No, I have been working. I went through  
1350 the apprenticeship program, and I have been working for two  
1351 months."

1352 Just the smile on her face and his face to let his aunt  
1353 know that he actually had a job, right, on a construction  
1354 job, on a union scale job, and today that gentleman is  
1355 working in Baltimore somewhere with one of the companies,  
1356 Pinello Company, which is a New Jersey company, but it works  
1357 around the Nation doing sewer replacement.

1358 So that is one impact that we see.

1359 Also it gives hope to the community. When we looked at  
1360 small subcontractors, giving them the ability to bid or be a  
1361 prime or a subcontractor on a government job, ushering the  
1362 progress, not progress; ushering the steps and making the  
1363 process easier for them to get in.

1364           So we set up and made sure they had MBEs and WMEs to be  
1365 a part of a project that they would never have thought that  
1366 they would have had the opportunity to.

1367           One night working with a construction company in the  
1368 City of Newark, the valve blew off at the meter, and it  
1369 damaged the hot water tank. We had a contractor that came to  
1370 one of our community outreach meetings that was a four-person  
1371 firm that did cleaning.

1372           They were able to come in at eight o'clock at night and  
1373 clean that basement up, clean the water up, sanitize the  
1374 basement, you know, do restoration, and you know, this lady  
1375 had a \$1,500 contractor come in and do restoration and  
1376 cleanup with a small company, which led her later on to  
1377 partner with another company.

1378           \*Mr. Tonko. Mr. Adeem. The time has expired. Thank  
1379 you. A great story. Thank you so much for sharing that.

1380           The gentleman yields back.

1381           Next, we will recognize the gentleman from Alabama.

1382           Mr. Palmer, you are recognized for five minutes please.

1383           \*Mr. Palmer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1384           I thank the witnesses for participating, and to the  
1385 subcommittee for holding this hearing.

1386           One of my concerns about what we are doing here is  
1387 asking for funds, additional funds, when we just passed the  
1388 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. And I am just

1389 wondering, and I guess this would be particularly for you,  
1390 Mr. Adeem, has the City of Newark received funds from that  
1391 bill we just passed yet?

1392 \*Mr. Adeem. No, sir.

1393 \*Mr. Palmer. Then why are we asking for more money when  
1394 we have not even utilized the funds?

1395 Are you telling me that we do not have enough money in  
1396 the bill we just passed, the 1.2 trillion?

1397 That is a yes or no.

1398 \*Mr. Adeem. No.

1399 \*Mr. Palmer. Okay. What concerns me about this, Mr.  
1400 Chairman and the witnesses, is who is exercising oversight  
1401 over this.

1402 I understand that Mitch Landrieu, the former mayor of  
1403 New Orleans, was named by the Biden administration as a  
1404 coordinator, and I find that interesting considering the  
1405 condition of infrastructure in New Orleans, particularly  
1406 their roads and how sluggish or even inept they were in New  
1407 Orleans in handling their infrastructure issues.

1408 And I just wonder if the needs, and there are needs out  
1409 there for replacing water systems, are going to be met in a  
1410 timely manner and in a most economically, fiscally  
1411 responsible manner.

1412 Mr. McGoff, if you would like, you can respond to that.

1413 \*Mr. McGoff. Yes, sir.

1414           \*Mr. Palmer. Yes, sir what?

1415           \*Mr. McGoff. The question to disburse the funds in a  
1416 responsible manner.

1417           \*Mr. Palmer. Yes. So you agree you have the same  
1418 concerns about the dispersal of funds, that none of which  
1419 have been disbursed yet and that the infrastructure that has  
1420 been put in place by this administration for doing that, I  
1421 think, raises some questions in my mind about how well this  
1422 will be done and how quickly it will be done, considering  
1423 that we have these needs and we have known about these needs  
1424 for a long time.

1425           And I see Ms. Mathieu nodding in agreement. Would you  
1426 like to comment on that?

1427           \*Ms. Mathieu. Yes, thank you. It is a good question.

1428           It is a lot of money to move fast and the SRF Programs  
1429 have been around for 25 years under State oversight. That  
1430 program in my State, which I have oversight of, has a lot of  
1431 measures and metrics, and EPA I will guarantee you is on us  
1432 constantly about a term known as ULO, unliquidated  
1433 obligations.

1434           They are on us also about pace of the program, and I  
1435 suspect they will be adding five or six more metrics on us  
1436 soon that will tell us how quickly we have to move this  
1437 money.

1438           The pressure to move the money is extensive. The timing

1439 of the lead and copper rule, the first phase, was really  
1440 important to send the signal to our water industry that it is  
1441 time to get moving, to get the lead out. That was an  
1442 important move.

1443 \*Mr. Palmer. Figuratively as well as literally.

1444 \*Ms. Mathieu. Right. Because we needed that signal  
1445 because it sends a message that this is real. Now the money  
1446 is there. We need to move quickly.

1447 Am I concerned that the money will not move fast enough?  
1448 Yes.

1449 Do we have the workforce to be able to move the money?  
1450 That is a critical need. We need the engineers, the  
1451 analysts, the financial analysts to be able to do this work.

1452 And my colleagues at ASDWA across the country are  
1453 working hard on staffing plans, and again, workforce is a  
1454 concern when it comes to this funding.

1455 But we are up to the task.

1456 \*Mr. Palmer. Well, you should also be concerned about  
1457 the permitting and other issues and how qualified the people  
1458 are who are acting in coordination positions, particularly in  
1459 respect to the ones who are overseeing the entire project and  
1460 are in getting this done.

1461 My big concern is with the inflation rate where it is  
1462 right now, we are all talking about the price of a gallon of  
1463 gas. We keep adding money to the money supply. We will be

1464 talking about the price of a gallon of milk.

1465           So it bothers me that we are having this discussion  
1466 about needing more money when we have not spent the money we  
1467 have, and the longer you delay, the more costly the project  
1468 becomes.

1469           And like Mr. McKinley, I worked for two international  
1470 engineering companies, and I understand a little bit about  
1471 how long it takes to get things done and how you need to move  
1472 through the permitting process, the design. All of that has  
1473 to be done, and the longer we wait, the more expensive it is  
1474 going to get.

1475           So, Mr. Chairman, it might be that this committee  
1476 considers exercising some additional oversight in regard to  
1477 the administration and the handling of these funds.

1478           With what, Mr. Chairman, thank you for your indulgence,  
1479 and I yield back.

1480           \*Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

1481           The chair now recognizes the representative from the  
1482 State of Illinois. The gentlelady from Illinois,  
1483 Representative Schakowsky, is recognized for five minutes  
1484 please.

1485           \*Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

1486           You know, over the last couple of years now we have been  
1487 talking about lead in drinking water, in schools, throughout  
1488 the State of Illinois, which happens to be number one in the

1489 lead service lines.

1490           And we are very, very concerned about this effect  
1491 particularly on the health of children, the long-term,  
1492 irreversible brain consequences that can happen.

1493           And I know that in the bipartisan infrastructure bill,  
1494 there is \$15 billion, although I do remember when the  
1495 President was talking about \$45 billion, and I know that  
1496 maybe yet we will still get something in legislation that  
1497 passes.

1498           And I know that all states are going to need funding to  
1499 address this lead service line issue, but I am very concerned  
1500 that Illinois, it seems, is disproportionately not getting  
1501 the amount of money. I do not know if the numbers did not  
1502 come through as our having such a huge problem.

1503           I know that the Mayor if the City of Chicago is very  
1504 concerned. We have had to turn off water faucets in so many  
1505 of our schools right now because it is dangerous.

1506           So I wanted to ask Mr. Olson. Does the current State  
1507 Revolving Fund consider the need for lead service line  
1508 replacements?

1509           And is there a review of how States, individual States,  
1510 are affected that could change the amount of funding that  
1511 goes to States like Illinois?

1512           \*Mr. Olson. Thank you for the question. It is a very  
1513 important one.

1514           As you mentioned there are \$15 billion in the bipartisan  
1515 infrastructure law that is supposed to be dedicated to  
1516 replacing these lead pipes, and Congress did pass the  
1517 America's Water Infrastructure Act in 2018 that says that  
1518 each State and EPA are supposed to assess how many lead  
1519 service lines they have and how much it is going to cost to  
1520 replace.

1521           The disconnect is that it is not clear that that  
1522 assessment is going to be done in time to affect how the  
1523 money is allocated at least for the next fiscal year. We are  
1524 very concerned about that and urge EPA to set that money  
1525 aside, that \$15 billion, and allocate it based on need and  
1526 get that needs assessment done ASAP.

1527           We are hearing it might not be done this year even  
1528 though it was supposed to be done this year. So we are  
1529 hoping EPA will expedite and allocate that money based on  
1530 need. It is really important for Illinois and important for  
1531 a lot of other States that are represented in this room.

1532           New York has the same issue. Many other States have  
1533 this issue.

1534           \*Ms. Schakowsky. Yes, we are proud of being number one  
1535 in some important areas, but not in having the most lead  
1536 surface lines.

1537           Yes, I wanted to ask Mr. Diaz a question about your  
1538 testimony. You stressed talking about jobs, and you were



1539 talking about some of the apprenticeship programs, actually  
1540 pre-apprenticeship program that we need.

1541 And I am wondering if you could discuss further how pre-  
1542 apprenticeship programs could help build the trained  
1543 workforce that we need for our clean water future.

1544 \*Mr. Diaz. Yes, thank you for that, Congresswoman, and  
1545 that is a great question about how pre-apprenticeship  
1546 programs -- can you all hear me now?

1547 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Yes.

1548 \*Mr. Diaz. Well, thank you, Congresswoman, about how  
1549 pre-apprenticeship programs fit into the greater workforce  
1550 development needs that we need to replace lead service lines.

1551 You know, speaking with the Laborers Union in my  
1552 hometown in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, you know, they mention that  
1553 pre-apprenticeship programs, a/k/a apprenticeship program and  
1554 pathways into apprenticeship programs are just so needed to  
1555 fill the needs of operating engineers, laborers, and also  
1556 plumbers that will be actually replacing these lead service  
1557 lines.

1558 I see that I am over time. So I will yield from my  
1559 response. I can definitely follow up with some more  
1560 information for you, Congresswoman.

1561 \*Ms. Schakowsky. I would like to hear that because I  
1562 think the people that would be the most benefitted, too, are  
1563 those individuals who want good jobs, need good jobs, and

1564 need these pre-apprenticeship programs.

1565 So thank you.

1566 I yield back.

1567 \*Mr. Tonko. The gentlelady yields back.

1568 Before we recognize the gentleman from Ohio, Mr.  
1569 Johnson, for five minutes, the ranker has asked to be  
1570 recognized.

1571 \*Mr. McKinley. Mr. Chairman, during my testimony or  
1572 questioning, I referenced the increased costs that are  
1573 occurring in an infrastructure, particularly copper and PVC,  
1574 waterline pipe.

1575 I would like the record that was prepared by the Parker  
1576 Utility Board on Friday of last week, that that be entered  
1577 into the record.

1578 \*Mr. Tonko. Okay. All requests to enter materials into  
1579 the record will be addressed at the end of the hearing. So  
1580 we will take care of that.

1581 \*Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1582 \*Mr. Tonko. Okay. The gentleman from Ohio is now  
1583 recognized, Mr. Johnson, for five minutes please.

1584 \*Mr. Johnson. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1585 You know, drinking water State Revolving Funds are a  
1586 good example of an effective Federal-State partnership, and I  
1587 know these funds have helped finance beneficial projects in  
1588 all of our districts. This is a good thing.

1589           But with the unprecedented huge infusion of cash from  
1590 the recent infrastructure bill, it is important that we  
1591 ensure proper oversight on where and for what these funds are  
1592 now being used.

1593           Mr. McGoff, I appreciate your mentioning Ohio in your  
1594 testimony with a great example on how these funds can be used  
1595 for a wide variety of small and large projects.

1596           Looking at the 2022 project priority list in Ohio this  
1597 year, in my district, the projects range from lead service  
1598 line replacement in Guernsey County to a water tower  
1599 replacement in Columbiana County, all the way up to a major  
1600 water treatment plant replacement in Washington County.

1601           With projects like these, it is clear this program needs  
1602 to remain flexible to address the safe drinking water needs  
1603 of the extremely wide range of communities in rural  
1604 Appalachian, Eastern and Southeastern Ohio, but at the same  
1605 time, we do not want to just throw enormous, unaccountable  
1606 amounts of money at these problems without being thoughtful.

1607           Mr. McGoff, in your testimony you talked about missed  
1608 opportunities, with the dangers of too much red tape in the  
1609 form of special categories, and one-time-only funding streams  
1610 with the example of lead service lines.

1611           So to you, Mr. McGoff, when will we know where all the  
1612 lead service lines are?

1613           And what will it take in reality to replace all of these

1614 lead service lines?

1615 \*Mr. McGoff. A very good question, Congressman Johnson.

1616 And our testimony did target the need for assessment.

1617 There are some States that have the un-assessment. Newark,

1618 for an example of a city that has done a very good job of

1619 assessing their lead service lines, but for the most part,

1620 because the SRF Programs did not have the funding to direct

1621 towards assessment, many States are just getting started with

1622 that.

1623 And we think it is very important to assess to make sure

1624 that we are targeting the appropriate lead service lines to

1625 have them removed, and to have the flexibility in the funding

1626 to do the assessment we think is a necessary first step.

1627 \*Mr. Johnson. Well, obviously, replacing these lead

1628 service lines is an important thing to do. How important is

1629 it to appropriately set public expectations on this?

1630 \*Mr. McGoff. Very important because it is a process. I

1631 mean, you need to identify, assess, and then you need to turn

1632 the work into contracts, and so it will take some time.

1633 The lead service lines will not be removed in two years,

1634 three years, five years. It will take some time and

1635 appropriate planning, too. Utilities should plan to do the

1636 lead service line removal when other projects are taking

1637 place, like a water main in the middle of the street is the

1638 ideal time to replace the lead service line.

1639           So proper planning is important to make sure the job is  
1640 done right.

1641           \*Mr. Johnson. Okay. You mentioned the difficulty of  
1642 using subsidized loans, that that may not be ideal for lead  
1643 service line replacements on private property.

1644           Is your organization concerned that State SRFs might not  
1645 be able to use the funding given to them or that they might  
1646 be tasked with programs where the costs well outweigh the  
1647 benefits?

1648           And if you agree with that statement, what would be a  
1649 better way to do it?

1650           \*Mr. McGoff. There is a concern because of the speed in  
1651 which we need to deploy the funds. We are sitting here at  
1652 now 18 months. We need to apply for the funding in the first  
1653 year, and we have to identify how that funding will be used  
1654 in order to apply for it.

1655           So the speed is going to be quick, and communities, as  
1656 is oftentimes the case, would prefer grant funding rather  
1657 than loan funding. We in Indiana and many other States have  
1658 been targeting lead service line replacement with loan funds.  
1659 We have been trying to encourage cities and towns to take  
1660 advantage of that, with zero percent loans, and we have been  
1661 making some progress with that.

1662           But with the speed at which we are being expected to  
1663 deploy the funds, the more favorable that funding, the better

1664 off or the more ability we will be able to meet the timelines  
1665 afforded us.

1666 \*Mr. Johnson. All right. Thank you.

1667 Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

1668 \*Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

1669 The chair now recognizes virtually Representative  
1670 Sarbanes from the State of Maryland.

1671 Welcome, sir, and you have five minutes please.

1672 \*Mr. Sarbanes. Mr. Chairman, thanks very much for  
1673 today's hearing, and I want to thank you for your ongoing  
1674 commitment to addressing the issue of drinking water  
1675 infrastructure. You have made it a priority for many years.

1676 In fact, you and I had the opportunity on your  
1677 initiative to visit the Ashburton filtration plant in  
1678 Baltimore a few years back, and I am grateful to the  
1679 leadership that you have exercised in this arena. So I  
1680 appreciate it.

1681 Obviously, this is a topic that affects every American  
1682 every single day. When you turn on the tap, you want to know  
1683 that clean water is coming out, that your family is safe, and  
1684 that is why these infrastructure investments are so  
1685 absolutely critical.

1686 We know that in communities where residents have a wide  
1687 disparity of income levels, some residents can be perfectly  
1688 satisfied with the safety and reliability of their well-

1689 maintained water supply, while just a few blocks away their  
1690 neighbors face a continuous struggle to access clean and safe  
1691 water despite being part of the same larger water system.

1692 This situation is very prominent, particularly in urban  
1693 areas such as Baltimore, where low-income residents have for  
1694 years faced issues like lead contamination. It is a real  
1695 problem in our city.

1696 And the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act will help  
1697 address these problems by providing robust funding to the  
1698 Clean Water State Revolving Fund, as we have discussed today,  
1699 which provides these key low-interest loans to States for  
1700 investments in water and sanitation infrastructure.

1701 Approximately half, 49 percent, of this amount will be  
1702 distributed in the form of grants or forgivable loans and  
1703 will be invested in disadvantaged communities, as you know,  
1704 these communities which have historically borne the brunt of  
1705 substandard water infrastructure.

1706 Mr. Adeem, in communities that have stratified income  
1707 levels in a small geographic area, how important is it to  
1708 ensure that water infrastructure resources like the SRF  
1709 Program are available to the residents who need them most?

1710 \*Mr. Adeem. This is hugely important. We see this time  
1711 and time again. You just spoke about Baltimore, but we see  
1712 that these are communities, if they are not adequately  
1713 addressed with their contaminants or funding to remediate a

1714 problem, it lasts for generations.

1715           \*Mr. Sarbanes. You know, by statute States are allowed  
1716 to set their own definition for the disadvantaged communities  
1717 that are eligible for the 49 percent of the SRF fund, and  
1718 that offers some opportunity. That control over the  
1719 definition can provide targeted assistance to areas that  
1720 really need it.

1721           And EPA has provided guidance to States to update those  
1722 definitions for the purposes of allocating these funds.

1723           Some States' current definitions of disadvantaged  
1724 communities would omit urban communities like those I  
1725 described earlier, where low-income neighborhoods are  
1726 considered part of larger water systems that also contain  
1727 more affluent neighborhoods.

1728           And so on average, they would be deemed not to be in  
1729 need of this water infrastructure support. So that is a  
1730 challenge that we have to address.

1731           Ms. Mathieu, in order to meet the required distribution  
1732 of 49 percent of the SRF allocation going to disadvantaged  
1733 communities, is it likely States are going to have to update  
1734 or redefine which communities qualify as eligible for these  
1735 funds?

1736           \*Ms. Mathieu. Yes, thank you for the question. It is  
1737 an important one.

1738           I can speak to our State, and in the offices today we



1739 are revising and looking at how we would revise the  
1740 terminology to help the people that need it the most. To  
1741 come up with a better definition of disadvantaged communities  
1742 is important to us.

1743         During the time of COVID, for the last two years, as a  
1744 health department, many of us have worked on COVID related  
1745 issues. I myself went out to a number of vaccine clinics and  
1746 other things, and I helped out where I could.

1747         But one thing that we found that was quite interesting  
1748 is the terminology that the CDC utilizes. It is known as  
1749 SVI, social vulnerability index. And this index is different  
1750 than the way we have traditionally looked at distressed  
1751 communities or defined them, you know, within the SRF  
1752 Program.

1753         So we are looking at the metric and all metrics,  
1754 frankly, of environmental justice, the EJ definitions, the  
1755 social vulnerability definitions, our disadvantaged and  
1756 distressed community definitions, and we are looking to  
1757 better define where we could help the people that need it the  
1758 most.

1759         So that work is ongoing, and from what I know of my  
1760 colleagues in our association of ASDWA, is that every State  
1761 is working on this right now to have a better definition.

1762         \*Mr. Sarbanes. Thank you very much. That is very  
1763 helpful.

1764           Mr. Chairman, I think this just shines a bright light on  
1765 how we have got to make sure these definitions and other  
1766 technical dimensions of how the money flows out and is  
1767 invested are aligned with our intent, the purpose behind the  
1768 infrastructure investment that we have made. I think we can  
1769 accomplish that, and I appreciate your bringing attention to  
1770 it in today's hearing.

1771           Thanks very much. I yield back.

1772           \*Mr. Tonko. I appreciate that assessment and could not  
1773 agree more.

1774           The gentleman yields back.

1775           The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.  
1776 Oh, I am sorry. I now recognize the gentleman from Utah, Mr.  
1777 Curtis, for five minutes please.

1778           \*Mr. Curtis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ranking  
1779 Member.

1780           I would like to bring up a point I have not heard  
1781 discussed today, and I do it carefully because I do not want  
1782 to imply that there are not serious needs that need to be  
1783 addressed, particularly among those who can least afford to  
1784 pay for it.

1785           But as I view the situation, during the 20th century,  
1786 Federal grants and public works programs largely built out  
1787 today's water infrastructure, and in my view this Federal  
1788 subsidization and other political choices have led to

1789 artificially low water rates and water consumption.

1790 Now, Utah is in the State's longest drought, and we are  
1791 struggling to get people motivated to conserve water, and we  
1792 talk about water as if it is free. Like it is an analogy,  
1793 right, as compared to water if it is free.

1794 I was a former mayor and dealt with an aging water  
1795 system in my city, and I worry that a lot of our efforts to  
1796 support cities are well intentioned but actually make  
1797 infrastructure worse in the long run, like creating a  
1798 backwards incentive for cities to wait for Federal funding  
1799 instead of being proactive.

1800 Mr. Olson, you referred to a decade old automobile, and  
1801 it made me think about my children. If I had given them a  
1802 car and they did not change the oil and they did not do any  
1803 maintenance on it, would I give them a new car when that car  
1804 was worn out or would I give them a lecture about maintaining  
1805 the car?

1806 And I am just worried that our cities were set up in a  
1807 situation that actually incentivized bad behavior and those  
1808 who did invest in infrastructure as a city or a municipality  
1809 or State are probably less likely to get help from us now  
1810 because their needs are less.

1811 Mr. McGoff, is it possible that too much Federal  
1812 subsidization of local infrastructure has created a city  
1813 where municipalities, counties, and States have not been

1814 building the cost of maintenance into water rates?

1815           And Ms. Mathieu talked about how expensive this is, but  
1816 it becomes less expensive if we look at this over decades and  
1817 decades of water users contributing to the cost.

1818           Mr. McGoff, could you comment on that?

1819           \*Mr. McGoff. Certainly. Thank you, Congressman.

1820           Many States, Indiana included, are now requiring asset  
1821 management plans be part of the finance packages that they  
1822 receive.

1823           So recognizing your comments, we wanted to make sure  
1824 that we are good stewards of Federal resources, and we now do  
1825 require utilities and many States are starting to adopt the  
1826 same philosophy that utilities do manage their assets  
1827 appropriately.

1828           And through the Safe Drinking Water Act there is the  
1829 subject of technical managerial requirements that are  
1830 associated with managing a utility, and we certainly look at  
1831 those as we are closing financing with those communities.

1832           \*Mr. Curtis. Thank you.

1833           Thomas Payne said what we obtain too cheap we esteem too  
1834 lightly, and I think that applies to water users as well as  
1835 communities who did not pay, right, for their systems.

1836           Mr. McGoff, nearly half of the supplemental funding in  
1837 this program in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act is  
1838 directed to principal forgiveness or grants in contrast to

1839 subsidized loans, the traditional instrument of the SRF  
1840 Programs.

1841           How big of a change is this?

1842           And are there any concerns you might have of this  
1843 becoming a more permanent aspect of the programs?

1844           \*Mr. McGoff. Because the base program is still being  
1845 funded and the supplemental funding for the base program is  
1846 continuing, the additional subsidization we are looking at is  
1847 in addition to, and it is a five-year window to target those  
1848 most in need.

1849           So we do not see this as being a long-term concern.  
1850 Certainly we are believers in a loan program that recycles  
1851 loans in and back out to communities as long as the base  
1852 program continues, as we did with ARRA. We can adjust and be  
1853 good stewards of this specialized funding, if you will, to  
1854 target in this instance lead service line and emerging  
1855 contaminants.

1856           \*Mr. Curtis. Thank you.

1857           Let me come back to something that was touched on  
1858 earlier that I want to go back to, and that is this concept  
1859 of homeowners. I believe most circumstances, certainly when  
1860 I was mayor, the homeowner owns the pipes from their home out  
1861 into the street.

1862           Are we giving adequate consideration to homeowners who  
1863 rarely have the funds, right, to replace those pipes?

1864           And what are we overlooking, if anything, here, and what  
1865 should we be talking about in the case of homeowners?

1866           It does not matter if all of the pipes are perfect up to  
1867 their home if it is lead from there into their taps.

1868           \*Mr. McGoff. And that would be the consideration for  
1869 having additional subsidization not just targeted  
1870 disadvantaged community, but if additional funds in the lead  
1871 service line replacement were available for additional  
1872 subsidization or for grant funding, then those homeowners --

1873           \*Mr. Curtis. We are going to get cut off from the  
1874 Chairman here. I see him reaching for his mouse.

1875           So let me just conclude by saying I think in addition to  
1876 that even though they can afford it, they rarely know that  
1877 they have the problem or how to do it, and certainly we need  
1878 to be looking at an educational component as well.

1879           Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield my time.

1880           \*Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

1881           The chair now recognizes the gentlelady from New York,  
1882 Brooklyn. We have Representative Yvette Clarke. You are  
1883 given five minutes to ask questions please.

1884           \*Ms. Clarke. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I  
1885 thank our ranking member, Mr. McKinley, for convening us  
1886 today for this important hearing.

1887           And let me thank our witnesses for your testimony.

1888           Access to clean drinking water is a basic human right.

1889 I think this is something that at least most of my colleagues  
1890 can agree to, and yet here we are in the year 2022, and the  
1891 right is still not a reality for too many folks in our  
1892 Nation, particularly when we look at lower income  
1893 communities, communities of color, and rural communities.

1894 This is a major injustice not only because nobody should  
1895 have to worry about whether their drinking water is safe, but  
1896 because we also have the technology to modernize our  
1897 infrastructure and guarantee clean water for each and every  
1898 American.

1899 If we have the ability to do the right thing, then we  
1900 also have the responsibility to do the right thing. This is  
1901 why I was proud to cast my vote in favor of the  
1902 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, which makes the  
1903 largest down payment on clean drinking water in our Nation's  
1904 history.

1905 One of the key beneficiaries of these investments will  
1906 be children, and up to 400,000 schools and childcare  
1907 facilities who have risk of exposure to lead service lines.

1908 Mr. Olson, can you briefly speak toward why lead  
1909 contamination in drinking water is so acutely dangerous to  
1910 children and why it is critical that we address this  
1911 contamination at schools and daycare locations?

1912 \*Mr. Olson. Thank you for the question, Congresswoman.  
1913 Schools and daycare centers are an underrecognized

1914 source of lead exposure. Certainly drinking water is one.  
1915 Also paint is something we should talk about separately.

1916 But we actually looked at the data in New York State,  
1917 which was collected. New York is one of the few States that  
1918 required pretty comprehensive testing schools, and they found  
1919 over 80 percent of the schools statewide had lead levels that  
1920 in at least one of their faucets or fountains that exceeded  
1921 New York State's then existing action level.

1922 So that is a lot of schools, a lot of kids drinking a  
1923 lot of this water that is lead contaminated, and it can have  
1924 lifelong impacts.

1925 The problem with lead, as we all know, is there is no  
1926 safe level, and a little bit of lead can cause harm for the  
1927 child's entire life, learning disabilities, lower ability to  
1928 earn money, and a lot of irreversible health impacts.

1929 \*Ms. Clarke. Very well. This issue is extremely  
1930 concerning to me, and that is why my Safe School Drinking  
1931 Water Act included in the House-passed bill, Build Back  
1932 Better Act, would support the installation of filtered water  
1933 fountains at children and childcare programs across the  
1934 Nation, with a focus on underserved school systems.

1935 These water stations will take advantage of the latest  
1936 filtration technology capable of removing lead from drinking  
1937 water.

1938 Mr. Olson, do you agree that this program would be an



1939 additional important step in protecting children from  
1940 contaminated drinking water at schools?

1941 \*Mr. Olson. This is absolutely a crucial program. It  
1942 is something that needs additional funding, however. I know  
1943 the reconciliation bill that this body passed would include  
1944 additional funding that can be applied to that, but it has  
1945 been a really under resourced issue and something that we  
1946 would really like to see major investment to address in  
1947 schools.

1948 And I will just point out one thing, which is those  
1949 filters, your approach of filtering, it is much less  
1950 expensive than ripping out all of the plumbing in the school  
1951 building, and it is more efficient because it will  
1952 immediately provide safe drinking water to the kids.

1953 So we strongly support that approach.

1954 \*Ms. Clarke. Wonderful. Thank you.

1955 Lastly, I want to turn to the existential threat of  
1956 climate change. As we have seen in Brooklyn with Hurricane  
1957 Ida and Super Storm Sandy, one of the major climate impacts  
1958 we are now having to deal with is more frequent and powerful  
1959 storms that wreak havoc on our infrastructure.

1960 That is why the infrastructure law established two new  
1961 EPA programs on water system resilience and sustainability.

1962 Mr. Adeem, can you speak to why this Federal support is  
1963 so crucial to cities as they upgrade water infrastructure to

1964 deal with the realities of climate change?

1965 \*Mr. Adeem. Thank you, Congresswoman. A crucial  
1966 question.

1967 Yes, just looking at the last storm and I would say  
1968 Hurricane Ida, living in a large urban City like Newark, one  
1969 of the oldest cities in the country, aged infrastructure  
1970 cannot sustain the capacity of these frequent rain events,  
1971 seven inches of water over a two-hour period. There is  
1972 nowhere for it to go in large urban cities versus rural areas  
1973 where water can recede.

1974 \*Ms. Clarke. Ms. Mathieu, is there anything you would  
1975 like to add?

1976 \*Ms. Mathieu. Yes, thank you.

1977 An excellent point. Storm Sandy taught us a lot in our  
1978 little State. It hit us really pretty hard, as well as New  
1979 York and New Jersey.

1980 So one of the things that we have recently started is a  
1981 Climate and Public Health Office. We applied for the BRACE  
1982 Grant under CDC, and we are now proud to say in Connecticut  
1983 that we are a BRACE State finally.

1984 So we want to focus on the people that are harmed the  
1985 most. We find that, again, it is the same people that are  
1986 harmed in disadvantaged communities that are exposed to heat  
1987 islands, heat stress, and other issues.

1988 And we are very pleased to get that work started, but we

1989 have to scramble to put the funding together to start to  
1990 focus on climate change and public health because there are a  
1991 lot of impacts that we are seeing, and we are going to work  
1992 really very hard on that.

1993 Air quality is really very important and so is water.

1994 \*Ms. Clarke. Well, my time has expired, Ms. Mathieu.

1995 \*Ms. Mathieu. I am sorry.

1996 \*Ms. Clarke. Thank you so much.

1997 And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

1998 \*Ms. Mathieu. Sorry, sir.

1999 \*Mr. Tonko. Sorry about that.

2000 The gentlelady yields back.

2001 The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

2002 Representative Carter, you are recognized for five minutes  
2003 please.

2004 \*Mr. Carter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2005 And thank all of you for being here and for indulging in  
2006 this.

2007 Mr. McGoff, I want to start with you, and I want to  
2008 discuss the very small and rural water systems.

2009 I am from Georgia. There are two Georgias. There is  
2010 Atlanta, and there is everywhere else, and I represent  
2011 everywhere else.

2012 So I am talking about the small towns. A lot of my  
2013 district in South Georgia is small towns, and as we discussed

2014 all during this hearing, that brings with it unique water  
2015 challenges.

2016 In fact, I had a small town of 300 people just two  
2017 months ago that inquired about how they could get some funds  
2018 to drill a well. They need help.

2019 As I mentioned earlier, I was a mayor at one time, and  
2020 these towns, especially these small towns, they do not have  
2021 this expertise that they need.

2022 How do you think, Mr. McGoff, that States can help  
2023 assist these communities that have never used the SRFs?

2024 And how can they use their expertise to assist?

2025 \*Mr. McGoff. Thank you, Congressman.

2026 And we do recognize that. I spend quite a bit of my  
2027 time in small towns personally visiting with the small-town  
2028 officials to try to educate them on our process.

2029 Many States have professionals whether it be engineering  
2030 professionals, finance professionals and/or the Alliance for  
2031 Rural Water, RCAP, some other agencies. Many of the SRF  
2032 Programs regularly engage with those professionals as well as  
2033 the agencies to inform them of the resources that we can make  
2034 available to small communities.

2035 And so I think each State has the ability to tailor our  
2036 financial resources to where their needs are within those  
2037 particular States, and from my experience, the small  
2038 communities are being heard and being served in multiple

2039 ways.

2040           \*Mr. Carter. Do you think States need more  
2041 flexibilities in order to help these communities?

2042           \*Mr. McGoff. The current flexibility we have works. It  
2043 is the unknown. I know that the substantial guidance that  
2044 was received from EPA suggests, pays a lot of attention to  
2045 disadvantaged community and defining disadvantaged  
2046 communities.

2047           So in the past the SRF Programs, I think, have proven  
2048 their ability to provide funding to get it out the door to  
2049 the appropriate places, and as long as we can continue to do  
2050 what we have done in the past, we feel confident that we will  
2051 be able to take care of it.

2052           \*Mr. Carter. Well, let me ask you something. In your  
2053 testimony, you highlighted how statewide strategies for  
2054 inventory in lead service lines and testing for contaminants  
2055 is limited.

2056           What are other challenges aside from just funding that  
2057 we need to work on with lead service line replacement  
2058 projects?

2059           \*Mr. McGoff. Because the lead service line replacement  
2060 specifically and the emergent contaminants are new for the  
2061 SRF Programs, they are not currently in our or on our  
2062 fundable ranges or in our project priority list, and in order  
2063 for us to access funding through EPA, we need to get them on

2064 those lists. So that's the target for those.

2065 And in the past or in ARRA for traditional  
2066 wastewater/drinking water projects, we already had fundable  
2067 lists that included those types of projects.

2068 So there will be a bit of a challenge with these new  
2069 targets, if you will. The greater flexibility we have from  
2070 EPA to identify those, get them on our project priority list,  
2071 submit them for funding would be helpful.

2072 \*Mr. Carter. Let's just say we are successful, wildly  
2073 successful in getting these lead lines removed and replaced  
2074 with non-lead ones. Are we done with the issue or is there  
2075 more?

2076 \*Mr. McGoff. With respect to the lead issue and for the  
2077 service lines going into the home --

2078 \*Mr. Carter. I was about to say that, you know, that is  
2079 still a problem, right?

2080 \*Mr. McGoff. The removal of lines into the homes, I  
2081 guess, after the Prentice Plumbing, we would not be aware of  
2082 what is actually happening inside the premise, but the  
2083 filters and other things could address it.

2084 \*Mr. Carter. Well, we cannot simply ignore it. I mean,  
2085 any suggestion?

2086 \*Mr. McGoff. I think through the assessment we will  
2087 come up with some of those suggestions because as we assess,  
2088 we will build a knowledge base of what is needed to take care

2089 of the problem.

2090 And so I think, as we have testified, the assessment is  
2091 a very important starting point for us.

2092 \*Mr. Carter. Okay. Just one last thing. Are there any  
2093 other areas that Congress should be watching during the  
2094 implementation? Because they may need some statutory  
2095 corrections. Anything else that you know of that we need to  
2096 be aware of we might be working on with this?

2097 \*Mr. McGoff. Apart from what has already been mentioned  
2098 in my testimony, I think that is what we find to be of most  
2099 importance especially since time is short for the SRF  
2100 Programs to make application for this funding, being 18  
2101 months is all we have to work with at this point in time.

2102 \*Mr. Carter. Look. I know it is run through the State.  
2103 I know all too well because, as I mentioned, I was a mayor  
2104 for eight years, and our city quadrupled in size during those  
2105 eight years.

2106 We would not have been able to do it had it not been for  
2107 having water and sewer available, and safe water was  
2108 important. We used the SRF loans, and we depended on the  
2109 State, and it helped us tremendously.

2110 So I hope everyone here realizes, and on the committee,  
2111 that this is extremely important to these small communities  
2112 and these growing communities.

2113 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will yield back.

2114           \*Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

2115           The chair now recognizes virtually the Representative  
2116 from California. Representative Barragan, you are recognized  
2117 for five minutes please.

2118           \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Chairman Tonko, for holding  
2119 this important hearing on the importance of upgrading  
2120 America's drinking water infrastructure and how the  
2121 infrastructure law that President Biden and Democrats bought  
2122 will help.

2123           Mr. Olson, the investment in the infrastructure law to  
2124 clean up PFAS is long overdue. In my district, Southgate, a  
2125 majority Latino community needs funding to remediate water  
2126 treatment systems to address PFAS contamination.

2127           However, for communities with limited resources,  
2128 accessing Federal water infrastructure funds can be difficult  
2129 because they are often given out through loans from a State  
2130 Revolving Fund and must be paid back.

2131           How important is it for the EPA and States to focus on  
2132 steering the infrastructure's law, set aside funding for  
2133 grants or for forgivable loans to disadvantaged communities?

2134           \*Mr. Olson. It is a great question, and it is something  
2135 that is absolutely crucial is to make sure that the money  
2136 that is set aside in the new bipartisan infrastructure law  
2137 will go to those communities that need it most in the form of  
2138 either grants or forgivable loans.



2139           And the good news is that about half of that State  
2140 revolving fund money is going to go to those disadvantaged  
2141 communities through those kinds of provisions, and also there  
2142 is specific direction for the PFAS money also that needs to  
2143 go to those disadvantaged communities.

2144           So I think things like you are describing really should  
2145 be able to get that money. The problem is going to be  
2146 helping them apply for the money, getting them the  
2147 information, the engineering help, as Mr. McKinley was  
2148 talking about, to actually hold together a good, strong  
2149 application.

2150           A lot of these communities just do not even have the  
2151 resources to apply for the money in the first place. So that  
2152 is going to be key, is getting the technical assistance from  
2153 the States and from EPA to those disadvantaged communities to  
2154 help them apply and get the money.

2155           \*Ms. Barragan. Director Adeem, following up on that  
2156 question, to meet the goals of Justice 40, what additional  
2157 steps should the EPA and States take to reduce any  
2158 unnecessary impediments to disadvantaged communities  
2159 receiving water infrastructure funds and technical assistance  
2160 needed to pursue them?

2161           \*Mr. Adeem. Excellent question, Congresswoman.

2162           I think the States should be more aggressive in meeting  
2163 with those disadvantaged and environmental injustice

2164 communities and overburdened communities, rural communities,  
2165 just having dialogue with them to know up front what they are  
2166 looking for, what their needs and the resources that the  
2167 State Revolving Loan Funds can provide, that technical  
2168 assistance, that engineering assistance that sometimes exists  
2169 but may be limited, but to let those systems know that is  
2170 available.

2171         \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you.

2172         \*Mr. Adeem. It would be a huge step to moving those  
2173 programs forward.

2174         \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you, sir.

2175         Mr. Olson, as you highlight in your testimony,  
2176 addressing underinvestment in our water infrastructure is  
2177 only part of the challenge. We also need to strengthen the  
2178 Safe Drinking Water Act and set pollution control standards  
2179 on water polluters.

2180         Why is this so important for clean water, and what are  
2181 the key steps that Congress and the Administration can take?

2182         \*Mr. Olson. Well, thank you for the question.

2183         One key issue is that the Safe Drinking Water Act,  
2184 frankly, is broken, and I am hoping the committee will spend  
2185 some time looking into that. It has been a problem for  
2186 years. EPA has not been able to adopt new standards for  
2187 things like PFAS that we have known about for years.

2188         So that is one issue. In addition, I think a key

2189 problem has been that with this underinvestment, EPA has been  
2190 reluctant to adopt rigorous standards for some of the  
2191 contaminants, and I am hoping that that starts to change.

2192 We really need to fix the law and to make sure that we  
2193 are making the kind of investments that are actually going to  
2194 make it possible for this to happen.

2195 \*Ms. Barragan. Well, thank you.

2196 We certainly are taking your suggestions on what we can  
2197 do to fix it.

2198 Director Adeem, my last question is for you.

2199 In Newark, your city council passed a law to give your  
2200 department the authority to go into private rental properties  
2201 without the owners' consent to replace lead services lines.

2202 Why was this property access important to your work in  
2203 disadvantaged communities and what actions the EPA and States  
2204 can take to support rental property access in order to meet  
2205 the administration's Justice 40 goals for the lead service  
2206 line replacement?

2207 \*Mr. Adeem. Thank you, again, Congresswoman, for this  
2208 most important --

2209 \*Ms. Barragan. This is about property access.

2210 \*Mr. Adeem. -- for this important question.

2211 And in the City of Newark, as we have made known, the  
2212 City of Newark is a city of over 315,000 residents. Seventy-  
2213 four percent of those residents are renters. They do not own

2214 their own home, and tenants that live in those properties  
2215 there are always onboard to getting their lead service line  
2216 replaced.

2217 But the owners can be a financial institution, an LLC  
2218 that does not have an interest in replacing the lead service  
2219 line.

2220 So part of us reducing exposure to lead, we thought the  
2221 ordinance played a huge role in making our program effective  
2222 and efficient and save money and time by letting us go by a  
2223 block-by-block approach and just have anyone give us right of  
2224 entry to a home we are replacing that service line, allowed  
2225 us to replace over 23,000 lead service lines today.

2226 So that legislation will be a crucial move forward for  
2227 any utility that is looking to replace lead service lines.

2228 \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you.

2229 With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back.

2230 \*Mr. Tonko. The gentlelady yields back.

2231 The Chair now recognizes the gentlelady from the State  
2232 of Washington and also the ranking member of the full  
2233 committee, Representative Rodgers. You are recognized for  
2234 five minutes please.

2235 \*Mrs. Rodgers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2236 Thank you, everyone, for being here.

2237 Ms. Mathieu and Mr. McGoff, your testimony discusses  
2238 small rural cities and towns and States that the Association

2239 of State Drinking Water Administrators has consistently  
2240 highlighted because small communities can be equally  
2241 disadvantaged.

2242         Why is it important for versatility and flexibility in  
2243 defining and meeting these small and rural communities'  
2244 needs?

2245         \*Ms. Mathieu. As I think it has been stated here  
2246 before, small communities struggle. A small system can be a  
2247 system of, say, 41 homes.

2248         I recently met with a new owner. Many of these systems  
2249 are owned or controlled by a homeowner's association. They  
2250 are a group of volunteers that have full-time jobs or maybe  
2251 two jobs, and they get together on a weekly basis trying to  
2252 manage a water system.

2253         So as you can imagine, that is difficult to do, and I  
2254 recently met with one in the small town of Lebanon, 41 homes,  
2255 a new person who took on all of this responsibility herself.  
2256 She is a young mother with four kids, just had COVID, but  
2257 wanted to meet with us.

2258         So we met with her in the town hall with the town's  
2259 First Selectman, and we talked it through for a couple of  
2260 hours, the needs that she has.

2261         A lot of it is financial. The rates have not been  
2262 raised in years, maybe decades. Full cost pricing, as I  
2263 think one of the gentlemen was getting at, really is not

2264 there for the smaller system. They have not raised the  
2265 rates.

2266 So we in our State two years ago, we passed the law  
2267 requiring small systems that serve under 1,000 people to  
2268 produce an asset and physical management plan. Keep it  
2269 simple, draft a plan, know what you have, know how old your  
2270 infrastructure is, know what your rates need to be.

2271 She in this small, small system has now started to step  
2272 up the rates. She has worked with her community. She has  
2273 communicated with her community, and they are all in  
2274 agreement.

2275 It is not easy. Then for her now to take on a loan for  
2276 the SRF, that is another step, and we are going to work  
2277 really very hard to get our engineers and our analysts to  
2278 meet, you know, as Mr. Adeem had said. Get out into the  
2279 community and sit down and meet with them. And talk with them  
2280 directly. It is really important.

2281 \*Mrs. Rodgers. Thank you.

2282 \*Mr. Adeem. And thank you, congresswoman.

2283 And I agree. It sounds like we spent the same time in  
2284 these small towns, having similar conversations.

2285 The beauty of the SRF Programs is in their flexibility.  
2286 Each State can tailor their programs to address the needs of  
2287 their State and to meet both urban, large environment or  
2288 utilities, as well as small towns and small utilities.

2289           So I think that is the hallmark of the SRF Programs, is  
2290 in the flexibility.

2291           \*Mrs. Rodgers. Okay. As a follow-up, your testimony  
2292 focused on ensuring Infrastructure Improvement and Jobs Act  
2293 funding is efficient, effective, and streamlined to lower the  
2294 paperwork burden on the stakeholders. I think that that is a  
2295 great idea.

2296           I notice that your testimony also calls out challenges  
2297 and barriers faced by communities, many without expertise in  
2298 navigating requirements like Buy America, Build America, and  
2299 Federal prevailing wage requirements.

2300           Why do you call out for the development of waivers for  
2301 these requirements in limited circumstances?

2302           And what did your officials learn from the use of  
2303 waivers to some of the requirements in the 2009 American  
2304 Recovery and Reinvestment Act?

2305           \*Mr. McGoff. The smaller towns, smaller utilities are  
2306 the least equipped to deal with red tape, if you will. They  
2307 need additional resources and/or professional assistance.

2308           We in Indiana hired labor standards administrators for  
2309 those utilities to take care of that red tape, and it did  
2310 come at an expense. Thousands of dollars were spent to  
2311 provide that service for the small communities.

2312           So it can be done. It just takes additional resources  
2313 and certainly hand-holding to get those communities through

2314 the process.

2315 \*Mrs. Rodgers. Well, and I will let you answer also.

2316 \*Ms. Mathieu. I would say the same.

2317 \*Mrs. Rodgers. I would love to hear what are some of  
2318 the specific challenges to Buy America, Build America?

2319 Because I think we all are anxious to see that happen,  
2320 but what is the reality on the grounds?

2321 \*Ms. Mathieu. Added costs, affordability of the loan.  
2322 A small system like the one I just described.

2323 \*Mrs. Rodgers. Can you give me some insights as to what  
2324 we are facing?

2325 \*Ms. Mathieu. I do not have the details. Maybe --

2326 \*Mr. McGoff. Uncertainty. It takes States some time to  
2327 get up to speed on new requirements and then educate our  
2328 borrowers and the professionals.

2329 \*Mrs. Rodgers. Do we have the supplies in America that  
2330 you would need?

2331 \*Mr. McGoff. Well, that is uncertain. If it can be  
2332 implemented along the lines of AIS, then we understand AIS,  
2333 but if it throws additional requirements to us, that is where  
2334 the uncertainty is.

2335 \*Mrs. Rodgers. Okay. Thank you all for being here.  
2336 I yield back.

2337 \*Mr. Tonko. The gentlewoman yields back.

2338 The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia,



2339 Representative McEachin. You are recognized for five  
2340 minutes, and thank you for joining us virtually.

2341 \*Mr. McEachin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I  
2342 appreciate the opportunity to participate in today's hearing.

2343 The bipartisan infrastructure law will provide  
2344 approximately \$30 billion in investment over the next five  
2345 years to improve our Nation's water infrastructure.

2346 Additionally, the Justice 40 Initiative should ensure  
2347 the funds are accessible to small and disadvantaged  
2348 communities to ease efforts in replacing lead service lines  
2349 and addressing emerging contaminants like PFAS.

2350 This hearing today is critical. As money begins to flow  
2351 to States and localities, we must ensure that in the  
2352 implementation of new funds that we decrease the pollution  
2353 burden on low-income Americans and communities of color  
2354 because all Americans deserve access to clean water  
2355 regardless of race or income.

2356 Mr. Adeem, first of all, I want to salute you and the  
2357 City of Newark for replacing all of your city's 23,000 lead  
2358 service lines in three years. Particularly I appreciate this  
2359 was done with no cost to residents, as low-income renters are  
2360 some of the most vulnerable populations.

2361 In order to provide lead service replacement to renters  
2362 in the City of Newark, the city asked your State legislature  
2363 to allow the use of public funds on private property. I know

2364 you have spoken of this somewhat in terms of Ms. Barragan's  
2365 question, but are there other challenges that came with lead  
2366 service lines and replacements on private property that you  
2367 were not able to discuss with Ms. Barragan?

2368 \*Mr. Adeem. Yes. Thank you for your question. Thank  
2369 you, Congressman.

2370 In the City of Newark, there is legislation around you  
2371 cannot use public money on private property because you may  
2372 be doing an improvement to that property which would create  
2373 some type of assessment.

2374 In the City of Newark, we have also found out that when  
2375 you start putting a price on replacing lead service lines, it  
2376 is an opt-in program. Many homeowners that own their home or  
2377 a company that does not live in the city there on the  
2378 property, does not participate in removing lead service  
2379 lines.

2380 So having legislation in place that you will not provide  
2381 an assessment on someone that cannot afford it anyway helps  
2382 us expedite the replacement efficiently and effectively.

2383 \*Mr. McEachin. Thank you, Mr. Adeem.

2384 Mr. Diaz, let me ask you. As you know, the EPA is  
2385 currently working to propose rules on PFAS pollution by 2023.  
2386 What rules would you like to see proposed on PFAS  
2387 contamination?

2388 \*Mr. Diaz. Thank you for the question, Congressman

2389 McEachin.

2390 I would say that those kinds of suggestions are out of  
2391 my wheelhouse, but I would like to add that, you know, as you  
2392 know, lead is not the only public health concern, and  
2393 contaminated water exposes communities to harmful chemicals  
2394 like PFAS and also arsenic.

2395 And you know, more than 27 million Americans get their  
2396 water from systems that violate health standards, and again,  
2397 low-income communities and communities of color are  
2398 disproportionately impacted by this contaminated water.

2399 The money in the bipartisan infrastructure law is a \$10  
2400 billion down payment on the cleanup of PFAS and urgent  
2401 contaminants, but continued investment will be needed, as  
2402 well as further research.

2403 Thank you.

2404 \*Mr. McEachin. Thank you.

2405 Let me open that question up to Mr. Olson or Ms.  
2406 Mathieu, if I did not pronounce your name too badly. Are  
2407 there particular rules that you would like to see proposed by  
2408 EPA concerning PFAS contamination, either one of you?

2409 \*Mr. Olson. Yeah, I will start briefly. Thank you for  
2410 the question. It is crucial.

2411 We would like to see EPA actually regulate the class of  
2412 PFAS. They are proposing to just regulate two out of 9,000  
2413 PFAS. So we know PFOA and PFOS are two that should be

2414 regulated, and EPA is moving on that.

2415           But they are short of like shark's teeth, right? I mean  
2416 you have got two of them that we are going to regulate, but  
2417 you have got thousands of them literally behind those two  
2418 that are being regulated. If we do not deal with the whole  
2419 class, we are never going to get this problem under control.

2420           And what we have seen in State after State, city after  
2421 city is that we are not just seeing one or two PFAS. We are  
2422 seeing a whole lot of different PFAS in a complex toxic  
2423 mixture that people are being exposed to.

2424           So we need to crack down on the whole class.

2425           \*Ms. Mathieu. And I would add to that, to Mr. Olson's  
2426 point, I would wholeheartedly agree that we are happy to see  
2427 that EPA is moving in the direction of setting hopefully  
2428 maximum contaminant levels for OA and OS, but in our State we  
2429 are seeing prevalence of many more.

2430           And once we start testing, you will find it. And the  
2431 unfortunate thing is you might find it in school drinking  
2432 water because of septic fields and other things.

2433           So I would agree that, number one, if I had, you know,  
2434 things that we could ask of EPA to continue to move forward  
2435 with at least OA and OS and move that along as quickly as  
2436 possible, you know, reviewing all the science and the data,  
2437 but also help us where we need the help the most with all of  
2438 these other contaminants.

2439           To get a better handle on that is incredibly important  
2440 as we find them more and more in our State.

2441           \*Mr. McEachin. Thank you so much.

2442           I have run out of time, and I yield back.

2443           \*Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. The chair now  
2444 recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Crenshaw, for five  
2445 minutes please.

2446           \*Mr. Crenshaw. Thank you. Thank you to the chair.  
2447 Thank you to the ranking member, and thank you to all of the  
2448 witnesses for coming today on this important hearing.

2449           Look. I think even in the most limited government,  
2450 conservatives do think that the government has a role in  
2451 keeping everyday Americans safe and with safe drinking water.

2452           And there are communities in my district, for instance,  
2453 like Tamina, that do not have clean water. My office is  
2454 dedicated to helping that community get the water that it  
2455 needs.

2456           But along that same theme, there is a key component in  
2457 keeping drinking water safe, which is chlorine, and last year  
2458 there was a brief supply disruption in the production of  
2459 chlorine that resulted in several communities sporadically  
2460 losing access to chlorine products and requiring an abundance  
2461 of boiled water notices across the United States.

2462           Administrator Regan was so concerned about the  
2463 communities losing access to chlorine that he actually sent

2464 an urgent letter to the chlorine manufacturers, reminding  
2465 them that chlorine is used in the overwhelming majority of  
2466 water systems and that they need to prioritize getting those  
2467 shipments out the door.

2468 I will submit this letter for the record.

2469 But that same EPA also advocated so strongly against the  
2470 processes that create chlorine in the first place. Support  
2471 chlorine but just not how to make it.

2472 There are only two ways of making chlorine. One uses  
2473 asbestos and one uses PFAS. EPA is working on a draft rule  
2474 that bans asbestos, and this committee has worked on a plan.  
2475 We have passed it out of this Congress to effectively ban  
2476 PFAS or at least create such extreme liability for producing  
2477 it that many companies will simply choose not to do it.

2478 Mr. Adeem, you have got a water system. You use  
2479 chlorine, do you not? And what do you make of this? What do  
2480 you make of this?

2481 \*Mr. Adeem. Thank you, Congressman.

2482 Chlorine is crucial to our treatment process to provide  
2483 safe drinking water. It is a disinfectant that is widely  
2484 used across the country to disinfect water.

2485 We did see last year some of the manufacturers were  
2486 having delays in processing and shipping chlorine, especially  
2487 early, the first quarter of 2021, around that.

2488 \*Mr. Crenshaw. And can you import cheaper chlorine from

2489 abroad?

2490           \*Mr. Adeem. I am not sure. I never looked into that.

2491           \*Mr. Crenshaw. The answer is no. You are not allowed  
2492 to import chlorine.

2493           So you would have to buy it locally, and if there is a  
2494 scarcity or if it just becomes prohibitively expensive  
2495 because we crack down on the processes to make it, what do we  
2496 do?

2497           It is a rhetorical question. I do not think you know  
2498 the answer.

2499           The point I am making is it is a problem, and we cannot  
2500 regulate in silos. We have to regulate with the entire  
2501 picture in mind, and I think some of these pursuits have been  
2502 reckless or shortsighted.

2503           It is also worth noting that chloring is not just a  
2504 disinfectant for water systems. It is a foundational  
2505 chemical for fertilizer and medicine as well. It always  
2506 feels good to ban chemicals that you do not understand, but  
2507 the question is will it do any good.

2508           No. You are monitoring often about feelings, not facts.  
2509 In this case, you could have serious consequences. Health  
2510 care will be more expensive. Food will be more expensive.  
2511 Water will be more expensive. That is what happens when you  
2512 create scarcity via excessive government regulations:  
2513 increased cost.

2514           And so I ask the committee today with inflation being  
2515 the number one problem facing everyday Americans, do we do  
2516 away with this shortsighted crusade to effectively ban the  
2517 very chemicals that we need the most?

2518           I still have some time left, and so, Mr. Olson, you were  
2519 just talking about the need to crack down on PFAS chemicals.  
2520 How do we do that without having the second and third order  
2521 consequences that I just mentioned?

2522           Those are very real consequences. We talked to the  
2523 industries that make these chemicals that we absolutely need.  
2524 So how do we thread the needle?

2525           \*Mr. Olson. Well, I was speaking to the need to make  
2526 sure that they are not in the drinking water, to filter it  
2527 out of the drinking water before people drink it.

2528           But I think there is a need to go toward reasonable  
2529 controls on PFAS production, and the vast majority of PFAS  
2530 can be replaced with other compounds.

2531           So firefighting foam is one example where it is in  
2532 widespread use, and now all over the world a lot of airports,  
2533 for example, are phasing out or have phased out PFAS-based  
2534 firefighting foam.

2535           So in a lot of the big uses there are alternatives.  
2536 There may be some crucial, absolutely essential uses that  
2537 need to be retained until we can find out if there is an  
2538 alternative, but the basic problem is we are seeing a lot of



2539 profligate --

2540           \*Mr. Crenshaw. And I just mentioned one of them, but  
2541 those companies that make the PFAS membrane that will create  
2542 chlorine, they will not do it when they are faced with  
2543 trillion dollar liabilities because of being regulated under  
2544 CERCLA.

2545           So is that the right step to take?

2546           \*Mr. Olson. Well, what I will say is if you are  
2547 contaminating somebody's drinking water with PFAS, you ought  
2548 to be responsible for --

2549           \*Mr. Olson. But they are not. They are making  
2550 chlorine.

2551           Understand there is more to the supply chain than just -  
2552 - nothing here is touching the drinking water. The PFAS I  
2553 not contaminating the drinking water in this case. We are  
2554 talking about how to make chlorine, which is the opposite of  
2555 contaminating the drinking water. It is what allows you to  
2556 have clean drinking water.

2557           \*Mr. Olson. I understand. What I am referring to is a  
2558 lot of the actual manufacturing of the PFAS has caused pretty  
2559 widespread contamination in North Carolina and several other  
2560 States.

2561           \*Mr. Crenshaw. I am out of time.

2562           Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2563           \*Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. You are

2564 welcome.

2565           The chair now recognizes the gentleman from California,  
2566 Dr. Ruiz. Congressman, you are recognized for five minutes  
2567 please.

2568           \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this  
2569 hearing and for bringing attention to the important  
2570 investments we made in clean drinking water through the  
2571 bipartisan infrastructure act.

2572           Water is life. Access to clean drinking water is a  
2573 human right and a common good for all, and it is a priority  
2574 for me for two reasons.

2575           First, as a physician and public health expert, I know  
2576 firsthand how important clean water is for our communities'  
2577 health and for children's development. No matter if a child  
2578 is growing up in downtown Detroit exposed to lead or in a  
2579 farmworker trailer park exposed to arsenic in my district in  
2580 rural California, they must have access to safe and clean  
2581 drinking water.

2582           Second, over the last few years a number of communities  
2583 in my district have been exposed to water contaminated with  
2584 dangerous levels of arsenic.

2585           I want to be clear. There is no greater environmental  
2586 injustice than children having to drink contaminated water  
2587 that can increase their chances of developing neurological  
2588 illnesses, heart disease, diabetes, and cancer.

2589 I have been working on this issue since 2019 when the  
2590 EPA issued an emergency order against Oasis Mobile Home Park  
2591 located in Thermal on privately owned fee land in the Torres-  
2592 Martinez Tribal Reservation in my district.

2593 Since then the EPA has announced seven additional mobile  
2594 home parks in my congressional district whose water exceeds  
2595 the maximum contamination level for arsenic, which was  
2596 naturally occurring in the groundwater in their well water  
2597 system.

2598 We must do everything to protect the health of my  
2599 constituents, including getting these farmworker mobile home  
2600 parks linked up with the local water district so they do not  
2601 have to rely on these wells pumping unsafe water.

2602 Mr. Olson, in your testimony, you mentioned a study that  
2603 found that socioeconomic status and race were correlated with  
2604 exposure to contaminants like arsenic and are also correlated  
2605 with their water system being in noncompliance with safe  
2606 drinking water standards.

2607 What can we do to correct this environmental injustice?

2608 And how do we ensure that these vulnerable communities  
2609 are not exposed to these contaminants and are protected by  
2610 Federal standards?

2611 \*Mr. Olson. It is an absolutely crucial issue, and that  
2612 is one reason we are really glad that the bipartisan  
2613 infrastructure law targets at least 49 percent of this new

2614 funding to disadvantaged communities.

2615         Now, it is going to be up to your State of California.  
2616 It is going to be up to each individual State to make sure  
2617 that money actually goes to the communities that need it, and  
2618 what we have seen in case after case is and I just heard  
2619 earlier this week about a situation here State Revolving Fund  
2620 money was going to a golf course community, to expand a gold  
2621 course community's drinking water supply.

2622         So we want to target the communities that really need  
2623 it.

2624         \*Mr. Ruiz. See, that is the reason why we have  
2625 disparities. That is the reason why farmworkers get to drink  
2626 arsenic in their water, yet you have development of these  
2627 posh resorts in other areas.

2628         And this is a problem in California.

2629         Let me ask you another question. You know, I proudly  
2630 supported the bipartisan infrastructure act, which contained  
2631 \$11.7 billion in funding for the State Revolving Funds that  
2632 you just mentioned, which provide loans and other assistance  
2633 for water projects. This is a fund that could be used for  
2634 consolidating water systems and help bring clean drinking  
2635 water to my constituents in these farmworker mobile home  
2636 parks in the Eastern Coachella Valley.

2637         However, in the State of California, there is a rule  
2638 that prohibits utilities from using rate payer funds for non-

2639 rate payer projects like those in the farmworker trailer  
2640 parks in Eastern Coachella Valley which prevents those mobile  
2641 home parks or water districts like the Coachella Valley Water  
2642 District from accessing the federal loan portion of the State  
2643 Revolving Fund for water consolidating projects, like they  
2644 can in other States.

2645           So with this in mind, how can we help communities under  
2646 this restriction access the increased money we provided in  
2647 the infrastructure law for the State Revolving Fund,  
2648 particularly for water system consolidation projects?

2649           \*Mr. Olson. Well, I would love to talk to your office.  
2650 I do not know the details of the California rules, which  
2651 surprises me honestly. I know Community Water Center in  
2652 California has been working on trying to address some of the  
2653 very issues you are talking about. I would love to follow up  
2654 with you on that because that is a very important issue.

2655           Arsenic should not be in anybody's drinking water.

2656           \*Mr. Ruiz. Absolutely not. And we put \$11.-some  
2657 billion in the State Revolving Funds. This is a fund pool or  
2658 pocket that could be used, but we cannot bring those funds  
2659 that we just put money into.

2660           So we have to address this barrier in the State of  
2661 California to bring the money into consolidating these  
2662 projects.

2663           And so with that I yield back my time.

2664           \*Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

2665           And the chair now recognizes the gentlelady from  
2666 Delaware, Representative Blunt Rochester. You are recognized  
2667 for five minutes, and thank you for joining us virtually.

2668           \*Ms. Blunt Rochester. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman  
2669 and Ranking Member McKinley, for calling this hearing.

2670           And I also want to thank all of the witnesses for your  
2671 testimony today.

2672           The bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act is  
2673 an important step to provide long needed improvements in  
2674 drinking water quality and accessibility, and we are already  
2675 seeing the benefits of this legislation in Delaware.

2676           Earlier this month, Governor Carney announced that  
2677 Delaware agencies would start accepting applications for  
2678 grants and loans for drinking water and wastewater system  
2679 improvement across the State. Using the historic funding  
2680 from the infrastructure law to the existing Drinking Water  
2681 State Revolving Fund and Clean Water State Revolving Fund,  
2682 along with the recently established State Clean Water Trust,  
2683 to support these opportunities.

2684           Water accessibility and affordability in the United  
2685 States had been a mounting crisis for years, and the  
2686 infrastructure law gives us an opportunity to make real and  
2687 lasting improvements across our drinking water systems.

2688           But our investments cannot end there. The Environmental

2689 Protection Agency estimates that maintaining and upgrading  
2690 the Nation's drinking water and wastewater systems will cost  
2691 more than \$750 billion over the next 20 years.

2692 We need to continue to work together to ensure that  
2693 every person in this country, regardless of race, income, or  
2694 zip code, has access to clean, reliable, and safe drinking  
2695 water. This is a fundamental need that we can and should  
2696 deliver to all Americans.

2697 My first question is for Mr. Olson. In your testimony,  
2698 you highlighted the recommendation to create a low-income  
2699 water assistance program, and last year I introduced H.R.  
2700 3293, the bipartisan Low-Income Water Customer Assistance  
2701 Program, along with my colleagues, Representatives Katko,  
2702 Dingell, and Tlaib. This legislation was included in  
2703 previous past packages and would establish programs at EPA  
2704 that would assist low-income households to maintain access to  
2705 drinking water and wastewater services.

2706 Can you discuss why these types of financial utility  
2707 assistance programs are so important?

2708 \*Mr. Olson. Thank you for the question.

2709 Yes, we have actually been supportive of low-income  
2710 water assistance. We have this for heat. We have low-income  
2711 heating assistance, but we do not have a low-income water  
2712 assistance program.

2713 There is a little bit of a pilot program that was

2714 created, but it really has not been financed, and it is  
2715 something that I think is crucial.

2716 The other crucial thing to do is make sure that water  
2717 rates are structured in a way that will help lower-income  
2718 people. So we favor restructuring of water rates as well so  
2719 that there may be lifeline rates for very low-income people.

2720 So that it is a combination of low-income water  
2721 assistance and reform of water rates.

2722 \*Ms. Blunt Rochester. Great. Thank you so much for  
2723 also mentioning the LIHEAP Program.

2724 I am following up on Representative Carter's question.  
2725 A lot of today's hearing is focused on public water  
2726 infrastructure, but nearly two in ten Delawareans use private  
2727 wells, and some communities in the State are in such remote  
2728 and rural areas that even if they wanted to connect to a  
2729 public water system, they are unable to do so.

2730 What are States doing to reach more remote communities  
2731 that are not on public water systems?

2732 And how can Congress help support those homes that are  
2733 not on traditional water lines?

2734 \*Mr. McGoff. Is that a question for Mr. Olson?

2735 \*Ms. Blunt Rochester. Yes.

2736 \*Mr. Olson. Okay. I will start it. It looks like Ms.  
2737 Mathieu may also have something to say.

2738 But I think it is really important for States to make



2739 this a priority, and it is something that I know that for  
2740 years it has been debated about exactly what has to happen  
2741 for private wells.

2742 Right now the Safe Drinking Water Act does not protect  
2743 them at all, and it is ending up that so many States are  
2744 realizing USGS is showing that there is widespread  
2745 contamination of these private wells with arsenic, with  
2746 bacteria, with PFAS.

2747 We really need to address this problem, and currently  
2748 the Federal laws really do not reach them. It has been left  
2749 to States.

2750 \*Ms. Mathieu. And I will add to that.

2751 \*Ms. Blunt Rochester. Yes.

2752 \*Ms. Mathieu. If I may, I could add to that. In  
2753 Connecticut, there are 325,000 private wells. The only tests  
2754 that are done is during the first time when that well is  
2755 drilled.

2756 We are trying in Connecticut to pass a law through our  
2757 legislative session right now to require, at the very least,  
2758 testing on property transfer, at the very least.

2759 Now, that is not everything. We really do believe  
2760 private wells should be tested more often, and there are  
2761 substantial issues, sodium chloride, uranium, arsenic, iron,  
2762 manganese, people face every single day.

2763 A lot of these sources, a lot of these wells are not

2764 tested at all. We really truly believe that that water  
2765 should be tested.

2766 \*Ms. Blunt Rochester. Great. Thank you.

2767 I have another question that I will submit for the  
2768 record for Mr. Diaz about apprenticeships, but I want to  
2769 respect everyone's time.

2770 And thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back.

2771 \*Mr. Tonko. You are most welcome. The gentlelady  
2772 yields back.

2773 The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida.  
2774 Representative Soto, you are recognized for five minutes  
2775 please.

2776 \*Mr. Soto. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2777 We have a duty in the Congress to provide clean water  
2778 for every American. My test is pretty simple. If it is not  
2779 fit for my family, it is not fit for any family in Central  
2780 Florida.

2781 When we see the American Society of Civil Engineers,  
2782 they have given us a C-minus in the most powerful, wealthiest  
2783 country in the world. When I look at areas in my district,  
2784 we have in St. Cloud, Florida resin buildup that has made  
2785 water brown. We have neighborhoods like Kissimmee where even  
2786 my neighbor just the other day had a corroded pipe going into  
2787 our neighborhood that has to be replaced.

2788 East Orlando, Kissimmee, Haines City, Winter Haven, Lake

2789 Wales, all aging pipes from the 1880s to the early 1920s,  
2790 with some of them built in the 1950s.

2791         Add in the septic tanks and other water leaks affect the  
2792 water quality of our lakes as well, and you see there is a  
2793 big challenge ahead for Central Florida.

2794         I have the fastest growing district in the Nation. So  
2795 it is only getting bigger from there, but I am excited that  
2796 help is on the way. The infrastructure law, \$55 billion for  
2797 drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater, \$30 billion for  
2798 drinking water, helping State Revolving Funds that have been  
2799 talked about so much here; nine billion to remove PFAS, 15  
2800 billion for lead.

2801         We appreciate two of our Republican colleagues on this  
2802 committee for supporting the bill, as well as all Democrats.  
2803 We need to move forward on this.

2804         Mr. Adeem, it would be great for you to help us paint a  
2805 picture for my constituents. For pipes that were built from  
2806 the 1880s to the 1920s that are 100 to 120 years old, what do  
2807 those look like right now and how does that affect water  
2808 quality?

2809         \*Mr. Adeem. Thank you, Congressman, for that question.

2810         They are old. They are brittle. The C factor is  
2811 tuberculation build-up on old cast iron water mains or, you  
2812 know, in my city we removed in the early 1990s probably one  
2813 of the last wood water mains. It was great to see.

2814           But this infrastructure has exceeded its lifetime. We  
2815 have pipes dating back to Abe Lincoln, when President Lincoln  
2816 was in power, the President when we ran our distribution  
2817 system.

2818           It is time to upgrade those systems.

2819           \*Mr. Soto. Thank you for mentioning the old cast iron  
2820 pipes because that is exactly what flooded in our  
2821 neighborhood next to a constituent's daughter's bedroom as it  
2822 was bringing water in for the neighborhood and for fire  
2823 hydrants.

2824           Ms. Mathieu, it would be great for you to also paint a  
2825 picture of what 100- to 120-year-old pipes look like and then  
2826 add in that some of them were made from lead. How does that  
2827 affect communities?

2828           \*Ms. Mathieu. So we have a lot of those aged mains in  
2829 our State, a lot in the Northeast. All of those need to be  
2830 replaced over the next ten years.

2831           We also have wooden water mains that are being replaced  
2832 in our State. The unfortunate thing is that there are so  
2833 many of them to replace, and in our State we have about 40  
2834 medium-size cities, and many of those struggle financially.  
2835 There are between 40 to 50,000 people.

2836           They are also dealing with stormwater, sewer water,  
2837 CSOs, you know, disconnecting the stormwater to sewer water,  
2838 as well as drinking water.

2839           This infrastructure funding, this influx to drinking  
2840 water infrastructure is timely. It is incredibly important  
2841 to working with those communities, those 40 communities that  
2842 serve larger populations, that have populations within them  
2843 that are disadvantaged, that need the help, that need the  
2844 investment in not only their pipes but their treatment, their  
2845 pump stations, and all the other mechanisms that run that  
2846 system.

2847           \*Mr. Soto. I am glad you mentioned midsized cities. I  
2848 have a lot of them that are around 50,000 people, like a St.  
2849 Cloud or a Kissimmee or Winter Haven, Florida. You mentioned  
2850 them in Connecticut, too.

2851           What would it cost to do a basic upgrade of aging pipes  
2852 and water systems in a midsized city of 50,000?

2853           If you want to defer to Mr. Adeem, by all means.

2854           \*Mr. Adeem. Thanks, Congressman.

2855           It would normally depend on the length of water main or  
2856 sewer main that they have, the length and the size, but it is  
2857 millions of dollars, probably billions of dollars.

2858           \*Mr. Soto. Well, thank you for that.

2859           When I think about wooden pipes and cast iron pipes that  
2860 are -- we do not have wooden ones in Central Florida. We are  
2861 a little newer than that, but we have cast iron pipes that  
2862 are corroded that when they are dug out of the ground, you  
2863 cannot believe that drinking water for our families in modern

2864 times was going through such an antiquated piece of piping.

2865 So thanks for your testimony today. Together we can get  
2866 this done for America.

2867 And I yield back.

2868 \*Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

2869 The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

2870 Mr. O'Halleran, you are recognized for five minutes please,  
2871 and thanks for joining us virtually.

2872 \*Mr. O'Halleran. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank  
2873 you, members, for this ensuring that every American has  
2874 access to clean drinking water hearing. What a novel idea.

2875 Now, this is a critical issue across America, but even  
2876 more so in Northern Arizona where tribal lands and rural  
2877 lands have continued to be left behind.

2878 I often talk about the digital divide, but there is also  
2879 a drinking water divide in our country. In my district, 40  
2880 percent of homes on the Navajo Nation do not have access to  
2881 clean drinking water.

2882 This problem is compounded by the historic injustices of  
2883 environmental degradation on tribal lands, and the  
2884 government's failure to clean up the over 500 abandoned  
2885 uranium mines on the reservation.

2886 These Super Fund sites directly limit the availability  
2887 of clean drinking water for thousands of Navajo residents and  
2888 put at risk huge aquifers in the Western United States.

2889           For far too long the government has stood in the way of  
2890 tribes' ability to protect our citizens from harmful  
2891 contaminants.

2892           Mr. Olson, tribal communities face unique challenges.  
2893 How can we support tribal communities so they can access  
2894 clean drinking water?

2895           What resources in the bipartisan infrastructure law can  
2896 be used towards that goal?

2897           And beyond funding from the law, what else can Congress  
2898 do to help these communities access safe drinking water?

2899           \*Mr. Olson. Thank you for that really crucial question.

2900           I mentioned in my testimony how tribal communities in so  
2901 many cases have in some cases no drinking water at all, no  
2902 sanitation at all. They have to carry their water.

2903           In a lot of other cases, they have contaminated water.

2904           A key is certainly funding. Another key is technical  
2905 assistance because a lot of these communities, they do not  
2906 have the wherewithal to even put together an application to  
2907 get the money.

2908           So we need to have money that is specifically set aside  
2909 for the tribes is one key aspect, and then we also need the  
2910 technical assistance to help them actually apply for the  
2911 funds and to actually implement and to operate and maintain  
2912 these facilities.

2913           And I would agree with you. What has gone on in the

2914 Navajo Nation with uranium mining contaminating large swaths  
2915 of the tribal area is inexcusable, and the Federal Government  
2916 really owes a lot to that community to clean it up.

2917 \*Mr. O'Halleran. Thank you, Mr. Olson.

2918 The bipartisan infrastructure law makes historic  
2919 investments to the United States drinking water restructure,  
2920 including \$9 billion to remove PFAS contaminants from  
2921 drinking water, a serious issue faced in the Tucson water  
2922 system.

2923 The law also includes \$30 billion for water  
2924 infrastructure, and this funding is badly needed throughout  
2925 the Western United States and America.

2926 Last week my staff visited a small town in my district,  
2927 Kearny, and saw the decaying water infrastructure firsthand.  
2928 The residents cannot drink the water. Cleanup and  
2929 replacement of drinking water infrastructure is often  
2930 prohibitively expensive, making it unrealistic that small  
2931 towns like Kearny can foot the bill.

2932 It is an historic mining area also.

2933 Ms. Mathieu, you mentioned in your testimony the  
2934 challenges towns and communities with very small populations  
2935 have with applying for funds through the drinking State  
2936 Revolving Funds.

2937 How can States, tribes, and the EPA work to ensure these  
2938 small communities are able to upgrade their drinking water



2939 infrastructure?

2940           What does a successful partnership look like in  
2941 implementation of these funds?

2942           And how can we work with the States especially to make  
2943 sure that their laws are in compliance with the intent of  
2944 Congress?

2945           Thank you.

2946           \*Ms. Mathieu. Thank you. Thank you for your question.  
2947           The smallest systems struggle the most. They struggle  
2948 with compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act, just the  
2949 most basic things.

2950           I think a number of panelists have said it. They need  
2951 direct technical assistance, and that may not be my engineers  
2952 who are regulators. That may be the rural water  
2953 associations, the circuit riders, this technical hub.

2954           And in not just one time and hold the night meeting and  
2955 leave, but to stay there. You know, I have talked to many  
2956 people who look at us as, you know, we are the bad guys. We  
2957 are the regulators.

2958           But you have to meet them in their neighborhoods. You  
2959 have to talk to the people, and you have to understand what  
2960 their concerns are, and again, a lot of it is financial.  
2961 They do need technical help in just completing the  
2962 applications.

2963           And I think Mr. Adeem also said --

2964           \*Mr. O'Halleran. Ms. Mathieu, I do have limited time,  
2965 and I do want to just say --

2966           \*Ms. Mathieu. I am sorry.

2967           \*Mr. O'Halleran. -- Mr. Chairman, we have to find a way  
2968 to make sure the States address the intent of what we are  
2969 trying to accomplish here for rural America and tribal lands  
2970 in America and not just concentrate on these other areas that  
2971 already have good drinking water, and they are just trying to  
2972 improve it a little bit more versus what we see day in and  
2973 day out in many areas of our rural America.

2974           Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

2975           \*Mr. Tonko. Point well made.

2976           The gentleman yields back.

2977           And the chair now recognizes virtually the  
2978 Representative from the State of Florida, the gentlelady,  
2979 Representative Castor, is recognized for five minutes please.

2980           \*Ms. Castor. Hi, Chair Tonko, and thank you to our  
2981 panelists very much for discussing clean drinking water  
2982 today.

2983           I mean, clean drinking water is central to the health  
2984 and prosperity of families across the country, making sure  
2985 that they can thrive and the bipartisan infrastructure law is  
2986 an enormous achievement for President Biden and all of us,  
2987 but most importantly, it will help our communities back home.

2988           So, Chair Tonko, this oversight hearing is very

2989 important. I appreciate you organizing it.

2990           Especially in the wake of the fact that we know we have  
2991 aging pipes. It is not lost on us that the American Society  
2992 of Civil Engineers had graded drinking water infrastructure  
2993 with a C. It is worse in a lot of areas due to aging  
2994 infrastructure.

2995           In my neck of the woods, in the Tampa area, we  
2996 consistently have water main breaks and having to replace  
2997 service lines.

2998           And now we know we also have more responsibility to get  
2999 the lead out of the piping, to replace the lead pipes, and  
3000 address the PFAS and other chemicals.

3001           But we also need to make sure that these substantial  
3002 funds as they are distributed across the country, that they  
3003 go to make communities more resilient; that our drinking  
3004 water infrastructure is resilient to the rising costs and  
3005 impacts of the climate crisis.

3006           And, Mr. Diaz, in your testimony, you noted the  
3007 importance of EPA's implementation guidance for ensuring  
3008 equity in climate resilience. EPA has said that States  
3009 should prioritize disadvantaged communities and support  
3010 projects that apply the best available and most  
3011 geographically relevant climate information projections and  
3012 standards, such as the federal flood risk management  
3013 standard.

3014 Communities across the country are already experiencing  
3015 those climate fueled rising costs and impacts, whether it is  
3016 sea level risk or more frequent and costly storms.

3017 So how can Congress help States and communities access  
3018 information about climate risk and vulnerability to ensure  
3019 that projects will be resilient into the future, to make sure  
3020 that they are making cost effective decisions?

3021 And how can States prioritize the needs of environmental  
3022 justice communities in State plans and funding allocations?

3023 \*Mr. Diaz. Thank you for that question, Congresswoman  
3024 Castor.

3025 You know, climate change has a great strain on our  
3026 Nation's water infrastructure, and the clean drinking water  
3027 State Revolving Loan Funds are the main sources of funding  
3028 for States, not only to update and maintain water  
3029 infrastructure, but also to assure that this infrastructure  
3030 is resilient to climate change.

3031 One study from the National Association of Clean Water  
3032 Agencies estimated that States will need an additional 448 to  
3033 \$944 billion by 2050 to reengineer water systems to cope with  
3034 sea level rise, extreme weather events, droughts, and floods.

3035 The EPA estimates that just the capital cost of clean  
3036 drinking water infrastructure over the next 20 years is about  
3037 \$750 billion.

3038 We have an historic infusion in funding in the bill and

3039 somewhere in the ballpark of about \$23.5 billion for drinking  
3040 water and clean water State Revolving Loan Funds, and that is  
3041 split equitably.

3042 This is a massive step and provides a significant down  
3043 payment on the investment needed to upgrade our water  
3044 systems.

3045 \*Ms. Castor. Well, and thank you very much.

3046 And, Mr. Olson, you have testified about the importance  
3047 of addressing climate risk to water infrastructure including  
3048 extreme weather and droughts and groundwater depletion,  
3049 saltwater intrusion. You recommend increasing the use of  
3050 integrated water resource management strategies to help with  
3051 water supply and flooding and water quality in a more  
3052 integrated way.

3053 How can Congress help promote that thoughtful strategy  
3054 on integrated water resource management?

3055 \*Mr. Olson. Obviously, funding is part of it and is  
3056 urgently needed, and unfortunately, we are going to be  
3057 facing, I think, a nationwide crisis as we see more and more  
3058 of these extreme storms and more of the drought conditions we  
3059 are seeing in many parts of the country.

3060 So I think funding is part of it. Assistance in  
3061 identifying where the problems are worse; we are seeing a lot  
3062 of coastal areas like your district where you are seeing  
3063 saltwater intrusion becoming a significant issue in many of

3064 these coastal areas, and as climate change happens, we are  
3065 going to see more of that.

3066 So I think help with planning and technical assistance  
3067 with planning and dealing with that are going to be key  
3068 aspects of it. But without the funding, you are not going to  
3069 solve this problem.

3070 \*Ms. Castor. Thank you very much.

3071 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

3072 \*Mr. Tonko. You are most welcome.

3073 The gentlewoman yields back.

3074 The chair now recognizes the gentleman from California  
3075 who joins us virtually. Representative McNerney, you are  
3076 recognized for five minutes please.

3077 \*Mr. McNerney. Well, I thank the chairman.

3078 I thank the witnesses for hanging in there. I may be  
3079 the last member. So thank you very much.

3080 I am very proud of the historic investment that we have  
3081 made with the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to  
3082 improve the drinking water and health of our systems.

3083 However, the American West is in the mega drought, at  
3084 least 112 years, the worst in 112 years. 2022, in fact, has  
3085 seen the driest January and February on record. Farmers are  
3086 facing severe water cuts. Wells are drying up. Some  
3087 communities have already run out of water.

3088 So we have to achieve long-term drought resilience,

3089 which requires long-term, dedicated investments. If you do  
3090 not have water, you do not have to worry about water quality.

3091 So our water systems lose about 14 to 18 percent of  
3092 treated water in leaks in the system, and an additional  
3093 amount is lost through inefficient fixtures.

3094 Mr. Diaz, you spoke of the energy and financial  
3095 implications of wasted water in your written testimony.  
3096 Would you elaborate on the benefits of improving water  
3097 efficiency and addressing water loss?

3098 \*Mr. Diaz. Certainly, Congressman.

3099 You know, the question is spending all this money to  
3100 replace our water infrastructure truly fiscally responsible,  
3101 and you know, in terms of lead service line replacement, you  
3102 know, investing in lead service line replacement not only  
3103 prevents lead poisoning and creates jobs, but also saves  
3104 taxpayers money in the long run.

3105 In terms of wasted water and, you know, what the  
3106 bipartisan infrastructure law investments do to help us  
3107 preserve water systems through preventing water main breaks  
3108 and leaks, it is an investment that is truly needed.

3109 I do not have an adequate response to your question in  
3110 detail, but I would like to follow up with your office to  
3111 provide some more insight.

3112 \*Mr. McNerney. Very good. I appreciate that.

3113 Mr. Olson, would regular audits and improved data

3114 collection help reduce loss in drinking water systems?

3115           \*Mr. Olson. Yes. We certainly believe that one key is  
3116 to have water loss accounting so that water systems are  
3117 actually tracking.

3118           I actually looked into one system, a large system in  
3119 Puerto Rico that said that they were losing 50 percent of the  
3120 water that they pumped into their system as unaccounted for.

3121           So what we are seeing is pretty widespread problems.  
3122 That is an extreme example, but we heard earlier just today  
3123 in this hearing that as much as 30 percent of water is being  
3124 wasted or lost, and that is just an unsustainable situation.

3125           We need to tighten up those pipes, replace the old  
3126 pipes. We have heard about 100-plus year old pipes. They  
3127 need to be replaced and tightened up, and we will actually  
3128 save money over the long term if we do that.

3129           \*Mr. McNerney. Well, given the water-energy nexus, I  
3130 mean, losing one and wasting one is wasting the other as  
3131 well. So very important in terms of water availability and  
3132 climate change.

3133           Ms. Mathieu, a 2014 GAO review found that 40 out of 50  
3134 State water managers expected shortages in the next decade,  
3135 and that additional uncertainty is likely with climate  
3136 change.

3137           What additional resources do drinking water  
3138 administrators need to plan for or need to plan for



3139 scarcities and shortages especially in the drought-prone  
3140 areas?

3141       \*Ms. Mathieu. I think what is mission critical for  
3142 public water systems, to have plans, to have long-term plans,  
3143 to test their sources of supply and understand what their  
3144 safe daily yields are, and then not to do that once 30-years  
3145 ago, but to do that maybe every couple of years so that you  
3146 understand the impacts of climate change.

3147       I think a lot of the impacts are not understood or  
3148 known, and I think many utilities maybe across the country  
3149 need to do more planning and invest in that planning.

3150       \*Mr. McNerney. Okay. Mr. Olson, in California's  
3151 Central Valley where my district is located nitrate pollution  
3152 is becoming increasingly common in groundwater. Many  
3153 communities have lost their wells to nitrate pollution  
3154 and are now relying on water delivery.

3155       What kind of strategies are needed to address and  
3156 mitigate legacy pollution in source water and groundwater?

3157       \*Mr. Olson. Well, there are basically two things that  
3158 need to happen. One is we need to control the sources of  
3159 nitrate pollution, which we are not doing a very good job of  
3160 in so many communities. Over-application of fertilizer or  
3161 sewage can be contributors.

3162       And we also, frankly, need to invest in fixing the  
3163 nitrate problem where there is a legacy contamination. That

3164 means pretty expensive treatment. Some utilities like Des  
3165 Moines, Iowa have had to spend tens of millions of dollars to  
3166 clean up their nitrate contamination.

3167 And some smaller communities especially are going to  
3168 need help in paying for treatment because it is not cheap.

3169 \*Mr. McNerney. Okay. Well, thank you.

3170 My time has expired. Mr. Chairman, I am going to yield  
3171 back to you.

3172 \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you.

3173 The gentleman yields back, and I believe that completes  
3174 the list of members that have chosen to ask questions of our  
3175 witnesses.

3176 I do, on behalf of the subcommittee, thank all of our  
3177 witnesses for joining us for today's hearing. A tremendous  
3178 information exchange, and thank you for the challenges you  
3179 are making our way to make certain that we move forward with  
3180 greatest progress.

3181 I remind members that pursuant to committee rules, they  
3182 have ten business days by which to submit additional  
3183 questions for the record that would be answered by our  
3184 witnesses.

3185 I ask that our witnesses please respond promptly to any  
3186 such questions that you may receive.

3187 Before we adjourn, I have a list of items that have been  
3188 requested for unanimous consent to enter the following

3189 documents into the record:

3190 A letter from the National Rural Water Association;

3191 A letter from the Rural Community Assistance

3192 Partnership;

3193 A letter from the American Water Works Association;

3194 A letter from the Association of Metropolitan Water

3195 Agencies;

3196 A letter from industry associations;

3197 A replacement ordinance notice;

3198 A letter from the Department of Environmental Protection

3199 of the State of New Jersey.

3200 Inventory source data from the Parkersburg Utility Board

3201 of West Virginia;

3202 And a letter from EPA Administrator Mike Regan.

3203 Without objection, so ordered.

3204 [The information follows:]

3205

3206 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

3207

3208           \*Mr. Tonko. With that, at this time the subcommittee  
3209 hearing is adjourned.

3210           [Whereupon, at 1:19 p.m., the subcommittee was  
3211 adjourned.]