Government Affairs and Services Committee Members

I have attached some revisions to Ordinance 19-04-529 which you will be discussing during the June 4th meeting of the GAS committee. The revisions that I have proposed I believe make the ordinance clearer and solve many of the points of concern that citizens brought up.

The main revision is the removal of <u>aqueous storage facility</u> and replacing it with <u>storing liquids that</u> <u>contain</u> hazardous materials or hazardous waste. The term aqueous storage seems to be confusing to many and I believe that the word liquid will be better understood. This still captures my original intent of the ordinance by limiting the distance which a highly mobile liquid substance containing hazardous waste or hazardous materials can be to a surface body of water. This regulation will be a broad preventative environmental regulation which will encompass the entire borough and is not specific to any industry. Some potential examples are contaminated wastewater, leachates, solvents, pesticides, and herbicides. My hope is that the passing of this environmental regulation will help protect the waters of the borough from any potentially large disaster in the future.

The addition of exemptions should also help clear up any confusion with the ordinance.

First fuel storage would be allowed. It was never the intent of the original ordinance to prohibit fuel storage. We heard many times that people are worried that fuel storage would be limited. Fuels storage is highly regulated already and its use is necessary to heat homes, produce power, and run vehicles. This exemption should ease the fears of gas stations and power companies that they were going to have to shut down.

Second the storage of small quantities would be allowed. This regulation is to protect the environment from any large-scale contamination which could potentially occur and the allowing of small quantities which an individual or business may need to conduct everyday dealings should not be limited.

Third all borough facilities would be exempt. The borough has an obligation to protect the public welfare of its citizens and is not profit driven therefore it should be exempt.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. I have written this letter because I will be leaving on Friday and will be out of phone service while I am in Canada until the 5th of June and therefore will not be able to participate in the discussion at the committee meeting.

Thanks

William Prisciandaro