From: Mike Chase
To: Mary Anne Nelson
Subject: Recycled water rule making.
Date: Thursday, October 1, 2026 3:33:35 PM

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

Mary Anne Nelson
Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
1410 N. Hilton St.
Boise, ID 83706
Mary.Anne.Nelson@deq.idaho.gov

It has come to my attention that the DEQ is considering revisions to the recycled water rules related to the renewal of industrial reuse permits. While I agree that efficiencies may be needed, I question the value of reducing the amount of information needed when it comes to the protection of our groundwater supply as many residents obtain their drinking water from ground water sources such as wells and springs. Also wells and springs provide drinking water for much of the livestock raised in our state.

I presently obtain personal drinking water and water for livestock from private wells and want to be assured that the water from those wells continues to be safe for human and livestock consumption. I also raise feed crops for livestock, and I'm concerned that anything in recycled water may potentially contaminate the crops grown and in some cases be passed on the consumer of the animal and or its product.

I understand that there is a lot of research being done regarding the various chemicals that sometimes end up in sewer and other waste water. I would much rather that our government take the most cautious approach in dealing with the issues revolving around this topic and not be too hasty to make decisions without as much information as possible.

Consequently, I am opposed to a change in the rule making process that allows for less information needed or required in dealing with recycled water. I believe an applicant for a reuse permit needs to have provide all information currently requested and subject to re-evaluation as new scientific information may be available to protect the public.

Specifically, under a proposed change to exemption rule 300.04 would allow the Application content for permits to omit one or more of items currently listed in Subsection 300.03. This apparently would affect New, Renewed, or Modified applications. This change doesn't specify what items could be omitted or the number of items that would or could be left out of the application.

It's my opinion that we essentially get one good opportunity to do things correctly in

protecting our water, as I believe it would be impossible to completely remove forever chemicals or other contaminants once they end up in our aquifers.

Mike Chase