

happen with waivers. But taking into account waivers and probable waivers and all of everything that might go on, the department prepared for you a chart that showed, on the one side, the maximum estimated monitoring costs. This is the worst case scenario. And on the back side it shows the minimum estimated monitoring costs. And that particular estimate takes into account the fact that waivers are possible under the system, and that after the initial testing, which will be expensive, it may be possible to bring the regular testing costs, with effective waivers, with the allowance of waivers, down to the level that you see for the year 1996. But even comparing the year 1996 to the years 1989, '90, and '91, in there you'll see that the continuing testing costs, even in the best case scenario, are three to four times as high as the current level of testing costs would be under the current law, if the current law is not changed. Having pointed that out to you, I thought you might also be interested in this document that talks about waiver procedures. It describes in some detail what the waiver procedures being recommended by the EPA regional offices are. This document is a guidance document to each state health department, or each state regulatory agency, in our case the Health Department. And the Health Department, this year, will be coming down with its own waiver system. And so at some point in time, if you're interested, you can ask us, or you can go directly to the Health Department and we will get you, or they can give you a copy of exactly what their waiver provisions are going to be under the current law. And as you look through here you'll see that with regard to nitrates there's very little flexibility. With regard to other kinds of volatile organic compounds, and soluble compounds, and some of these other categories of contaminants, there is a lot of increased flexibility, and waivers are possible, both based upon the fact that particular contaminants may never have been used in a particular watershed, historically, or it may be granted on the basis of prior testing or other knowledge with regard to the level of contaminants in particular wells. And so things can be done, for example, in terms of spacing out testing of certain contaminants over time, whereas you may test once and find nothing in the water, maybe you don't have to test for 5, or 10, or 15 years for that particular contaminant, depending on the situation. In any event, that's what's happening with the current system. In Congress then, I passed out a third chart to show you simply some of the alternatives that are being considered at the congressional level. And it was here that we decided what we do know is the complaints we're getting from the