

**SCIENTIFIC and PUBLIC HEALTH BASIS to
RETAIN PORTLAND's OPEN RESERVOIRS**

Request for Waiver from EPA Long Term 2

Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule

Open Reservoirs

“Science will determine the ultimate outcome”

EPA Administrator - Lisa Jackson

Scott Fernandez M.Sc. Biology / microbiology & water chemistry

2014 ©



EPA LT2 WAIVER SUPPORTERS

EARTH DAY 2011 PORTLAND CITY HALL

Preface

We will focus on 3 main issues repeated throughout the paper as they segue into new and important educational points;

- **Public health benefits of open reservoirs relating to toxic and carcinogenic chemicals. Our open reservoirs can already meet EPA microbial standard.**
- **Open reservoirs act as the most important public health “barrier” in the Bull Run system. They block contaminants before they reach the downstream distribution system using scientific principles of chemistry, physics and microbiology. Open reservoirs provide public health benefits resulting in contaminant reduction and elimination.**
- **Deficiencies of covered reservoirs. Covered reservoirs are the contaminant “enabler”. They allow toxic chemicals, etc., passage to the downstream water distribution system, unchallenged by the scientific public health principles of open reservoirs. Toxic and carcinogenic contaminants therefore ending up in schools, homes and work places.**

Contents

Executive summary	5
Introduction	8
Open Reservoir Provides Public Health Benefits	10
Reasons Open Reservoirs Function So Well	13
Adverse Effects of Covered Reservoirs	14
Open Reservoir Atmospheric Volatilization Benefits-Radon	15
Open Reservoir EPA LT2 and Stage 2DBP Benefits	30
Public Health Benefits of Open Reservoir Elimination of DBP	36
Covered Reservoir Toxic Chloroform into Your House Every Day	39
More EPA Regulated Disinfection Byproducts	41
Nitrification	44
Oxygenation of Open Reservoir	46
Natural Sunlight Disinfection	47
Summary	49
Conclusion	50
Glossary	54
References	55
Appendices	58
1. Portland Water Bureau Communication to OHA	58
2. Deficiencies of Closed Covered Reservoirs	63
3. City of Portland Auditors Reports	68
4. Open Reservoir Questions and Answers	75
5. Portland Water Bureau Frequently Asked Questions	79
6. Covered Reservoir Pattern of Corporate Cronyism	87

Executive summary-


The purpose and spirit of EPA drinking water regulations are to provide equal or greater public health benefits. *A decade of experience under the 1986 EPA Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) revealed several areas where responsible, science-based flexibilities and a better prioritization of effort could improve protection of public health compared to the one-size-fits-all approach of the 1986 statute. (EPA 1996)* It will be shown that the chemistry, physics and microbiology principles of open reservoirs of Mount Tabor and Washington Park will continue to provide safe healthy drinking water for generations to come. The reliable and scientifically sound approach to unwanted environmental chemicals will be achieved through open reservoirs. Covered reservoirs will degrade drinking water quality and increase public health risk through toxic and carcinogenic chemicals progression.

In the past 30 years, the Safe Drinking Water Act has been highly effective in protecting public health and has also evolved to respond to new and emerging threats to safe drinking water. Disinfection of drinking water is one of the major public health advances in the 20th century. One hundred years ago, typhoid and cholera epidemics were common through American cities; disinfection from chlorine was a major factor in reducing these epidemics.

EPA Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT2) addresses microorganisms and is one of several reasons Portland deserves a waiver from the regulation. First, because the Bull Run watershed does not have exposure to industrial, agricultural or municipal sewage; *Cryptosporidium*, viruses, and other microorganisms become a non- issue in regards to public health risk for the Bull Run water users. Portland open reservoirs already meet EPA microbiological standards. No positives for *Cryptosporidium* and other microorganisms in sampling during the 90's and during a recent year-long study AWWA RF 3021. The sampling methodologies used were good and more rigorous in assessment.

Second, over the years we have learned that chlorine and chloramine can generate many unwanted disinfection byproducts. Open reservoirs address the issue of effectively managing chemical disinfection byproducts using a natural ecosystem, thus providing safer water quality in complete contrast to that of covered reservoirs. Portland has air quality problems as seen in and around schools as well as homes and workplaces. 35

schools were ranked in the bottom 5% in the nation's high toxic hot spots from airborne metals and gases. Covering the reservoirs will not allow the chemical disinfection byproducts and other toxic and carcinogenic gases to vaporize efficiently before entering the water distribution system along with your schools, home and workplace. Thus adding to the already present health burden of poor indoor air quality, increasing toxic and carcinogenic chemical irritant risks for Portland's unsuspecting school children. Children, who we as adults are responsible to protect especially in these early stages of life.



EPA-Portland in red showing highest toxic air quality cancer risk. (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

A third public health benefit and critical component of the Bull Run system are the open reservoirs at Mount Tabor and Washington Park. The Portland open reservoirs provide a natural ecosystem ensuring safe drinking water before unwanted contaminants get into the large distribution system ending up in our schools homes and work places. They provide safe drinking water acting as a barrier to toxic and carcinogenic chemicals along with disinfection byproducts by vaporizing, biodegradation or breaking down molecules. Open reservoirs allow for efficient ventilation of toxic gases such as radon. Aerobic bacteria biodegrade disinfection byproducts. Sunlight is a great source of natural broad spectrum ultraviolet light (UV) that can reduce infectivity of microorganisms. While critical to maintain our healthy drinking water system, these scientifically supported public health benefits of open reservoirs have not been recognized City of Portland or the Portland Water Bureau. These public health benefits need to be the basis for their new open reservoir proposals.

EPA assertions for the basis of LT2 proved to be incorrect. *Cryptosporidium* has not had the negative public health impact EPA said it would. We have not seen the deaths, widespread outbreaks, or endemic disease identified from drinking water around the US in the public health data as EPA proposed. Sewage exposure catastrophes and fecal events such as in day care centers provide the illnesses seen that include hundreds of other disease causing microorganisms.



Introduction-

For over 100 years Portland's open reservoirs have successfully utilized the fundamental scientific principles of chemistry, physics and microbiology

Director of the Hygienic Laboratory of the United States Health

*& Marine Hospital Service Washington DC M.J. Rosenau 1902**

*He writes: Sunlight (direct) is an active germicide. It destroys spores as well as bacteria. The importance of the sun's rays in destroying or preventing the development or growth of microorganisms in nature cannot be overestimated. Even diffused light retards the growth and development of microorganisms, and if strong enough may finally kill them. In water or clear solutions it penetrates some distance. The importance of oxygen in the influence of light upon bacteria is emphasized. Bacteria in light, in the presence of oxygen and water cause a production of hydrogen peroxide which is well known to have strong disinfection powers.**

Citizens of Portland have been requesting a waiver from the EPA Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule regulation for over a decade. We as are not alone in requesting an EPA waiver. The City of New York, New York State Department of Health and the entire New York Congressional delegation are all requesting a similar waiver for their Hillview open reservoir.(6) Portland City Council needs to join the citizens of Portland in pursuit of a scientifically supported EPA open reservoir waiver.

We will review, identify, and demonstrate the superior public health benefits of the open reservoirs at Mount Tabor and Washington that covered reservoirs cannot provide.

Information presented by the Portland Water Bureau will be scientifically corrected.

Because Bull Run and Portland's open water reservoirs at Mount Tabor Park and Washington Park have been the foundation of the multiple-barrier approach to public health, we have had safe drinking water for over 100 years. A barrier approach allowing Portland to already meet and exceed EPA regulated contaminant standards. Microbial contaminants have traditionally received more attention from a public health standpoint. Bull Run has no sewage exposures so microorganisms are principally a non-issue. But in recent years there has been a growing concern for chemical contaminants present in drinking water that might be hazardous to our health.

* Milton J. Rosenau was commissioned as an assistant surgeon in the United States Marine Hospital Service (now the United States Public Health Service) in 1890. In 1899, he was appointed director of the Hygienic Laboratory of that service. He was instrumental in 1922 in the establishment of the Harvard University School of Public Health and, in 1940, became first dean of the School of Public Health at the University of North Carolina.

As a community we have focused on the EPA LT2 and Cryptosporidium in our drinking water system; a public health problem that does not exist because we don't have agricultural, industrial or municipal exposures in our Bull Run source water. We never found Cryptosporidium in our open drinking water reservoirs. Equally important we need to include a discussion of the EPA Stage 2 Disinfection and Disinfectant Byproducts Rule (S2DBP) relating to disinfection byproducts and other unwanted chemicals that our open reservoirs remove from our drinking water. Utilizing the applied natural laws of microbiology, chemistry and physics we show that our open reservoirs in Mount Tabor Park and Washington Park provide safe and healthy drinking water superior to water in covered reservoirs. Direct sunlight, oxygenation, an aerobic microbial ecosystem, and the large surface areas of open-air reservoirs break down and vent harmful gaseous chemicals reflecting the functioning of a healthy water system.

The Portland open reservoirs provide safe and healthy drinking water by naturally engaging in removal of toxic and carcinogenic disinfection byproducts and other chemicals. It is important to remove these environmental chemical exposures because they are the sources of great health risks.

Risks such as:

- lung and other cancers from **radon** gas and radon progeny of which “there is no safe level of radon exposure” US EPA (7-14)
- affected organ systems from **chloroform** such as: Cardiovascular (Heart and Blood Vessels), Developmental (effects during periods when organs are developing), Hepatic (Liver), Neurological (Nervous System), Renal (Urinary System or Kidneys), Reproductive (Producing Children) (15, 16)
- **Nitrosodimethylamine NDMA**, a drinking water disinfectant byproduct that is broken down by sunlight in open reservoirs, has been classified by IARC as a probable carcinogen for humans, liver cancer. The mechanism by which NDMA produces cancer is well understood to involve biotransformation by liver microsomal enzymes generating the methyl diazonium ion. This reactive metabolite forms DNA adducts, with most evidence pointing to O6-methylguanine as the likely proximal carcinogenic agent. (17)

Open reservoirs provide the following public health benefits –

We thank the people who fought for our Bull Run water source over 100 years ago. **Bull Run source water is federally protected from human entry that is not exposed to industrial, agricultural, or municipal activities.** Portland is fortunate to have very few chemicals in our drinking water. Open reservoirs are efficient in removing the chemicals we don't want to drink or have in our environment. We want chemicals removed because EPA *long-term* drinking water standards are based only on adults, not considering the extended exposures that increase health risks for younger ages. EPA long-term chemical exposure risk levels are based on 70 kg / +154 lb. adults, not children. (18)

PORTLAND'S OPEN RESERVOIRS

Operate as unique barriers efficiently impeding the movement of toxic and carcinogenic gases and chemicals into distribution system utilizing the following scientific principles:

- Atmospheric volatilization of toxic, carcinogenic gases-Radon
- Atmospheric volatilization, Trihalomethanes, (THM)- chloroform
- Aerobic microbial biodegradation – Haloacetic acids, (HAA₅), Stage 2 DBP
- Natural oxygenation – increases presence of helpful aerobic microorganisms
- Aerobic bacteria –18x increased oxidative activity v. anaerobic bacteria
- Direct sunlight- degrades carcinogenic N-nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA)
- Direct sunlight- inhibits nitrification bacteria, and the buildup of nitrites, nitrates and nitrosamines from ammonia disinfection.
- Direct sunlight - O₂/photons, natural disinfection from oxides formation

Removing Portland's open reservoirs raises the threat to public health from increased exposure to toxic and carcinogenic chemicals. (19)

Open Reservoirs Provide Superior Efficiencies as Multi – Barrier


Portland water users benefit from the environmentally sustainable and effective open air reservoir processes that remove or impede movement of toxic and carcinogenic gases and chemicals from our drinking water system. The Precautionary Principle * public health policy adopted by Portland City Council in 2006, fits well as open reservoirs provide an efficient method of eliminating unwanted drinking water gases such as radon-222 and chloroform through the process of *atmospheric volatilization*. Open reservoirs provide a natural, cost effective, and healthy solution to a recognized public health problem.

*** Precautionary Principle-** “When an activity raises threats of harm to the environment or human health, precautionary measures should be taken even if some cause and effect relationships are not fully established scientifically.”



**Open Reservoir Water Oxygenation from Fountain and Waterfall Aeration
Also Removes Toxic and Carcinogenic Gases Such as Radon and Chloroform**


- **Gases escape efficiently through diffusion***
- **Diffusion enhanced by wind and natural convection in water wave action**
***movement of particles from high concentration to lower concentration.**



Open reservoir drinking water inlet: waterfall agitating action aerates water providing oxygen, promotes water movement, while removing unwanted gases. Open reservoir sunlight also provides a public health barrier; using natural, sustainable gravity fed carbon-free process delivering safe and healthy water

REASONS OPEN RESERVOIRS FUNCTION SO WELL

OPEN RESERVOIRS ACT AS A NATURAL BARRIER TO TOXIC AND CARCINOGENIC CHEMICALS, HARMLESSLY RELEASING THEM BEFORE THEY ENTER DRINKING WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM



Highly efficient open reservoir chemical movement from water (higher gas concentration) to air (lower gas concentration) provides the desired natural & harmless removal of chloroform and radon gases from open reservoirs. Open reservoirs keep toxic gases out of water used in homes, schools work places.

***diffusion-chemicals moving from an area of higher concentration to an area of lower concentration.....water to air to harmlessly disappear**


ADVERSE EFFECTS of COVERED RESERVOIR

Covered reservoirs cannot effectively remove the toxic and carcinogenic gases and other chemicals. Gases such as radon and chloroform remain saturated in the drinking water and they cannot efficiently escape. Because covering the reservoirs creates a drinking water system closed to sunlight and poorly exposed to the atmosphere, these toxic and carcinogenic gases then end up venting in our schools, homes, and businesses. Without sunlight carcinogenic chemicals such as NDMA is not broken down and bacterial metabolic processes promoting toxic nitrification byproducts continue on unimpeded. Covered reservoirs have their place and purpose in areas of high wind, dust levels (Haboob), and heat/evaporation such as the southwest United States.

2 Small air vents opening combine to ~ 75 sq. ft. on a ~ 217,000 sq. ft.


~ 5 acre reservoir roof (PWB 9-6-2013 Powell Butte 2)

- Small vent allows water to move through covered reservoir. Without the small vent a vacuum would be created and water flow would be restricted.
- Small air vent is inefficient in removing toxic and carcinogenic gases
- History of US covered reservoirs documents bird entry to roost and contaminate water resulting in human deaths.




Open Reservoir Atmospheric Volatilization Benefits Efficient Escape of Radioactive Radon and Other Toxic Gases

Covered Reservoirs are Inefficient in Escape of Gases




Portland's open reservoirs can efficiently vaporize /diffuse radioactive radon-222 gas to the atmosphere using natural aeration. Due to a high Henry's Law constant, radon leaves water on contact with air especially if agitated. Radioactive radon gas is a serious and widely underestimated health risk that is naturally occurring in soil and groundwater. Portland's drinking water radon gas originates from the Columbia South Shore Well field. Because it is not chemically reactive with most materials it will move freely as a gas and can move substantial distances from its point of origin. Ingestion of radon through drinking water can also contribute to internal organ illness such as stomach cancer once it is absorbed into the blood stream. EPA acknowledges there is ***no safe level of radon exposure***, regardless of the source, air or water. The cancer risk of radon in water is higher than cancer risk from any other drinking water contaminant. Radon from drinking water can end up in the air of buildings in several different ways: **substantial radioactive water aerosols** can be created from showering, clothes washing, dishwashing, flushing toilets, and bathing. Radon is the second leading cause of lung cancer and contributes to +20,000 deaths each year. Radioactive alpha emitting radon gas also decays into radioactive atoms such as daughter progeny *polonium*, *lead*, and *bismuth*. These atoms can get trapped in the lungs when you breathe also emitting alpha, beta and gamma particles continuing to release bursts of energy damaging cells. This energy can genetically damage lung, blood and other tissues' DNA. Over time these atomic exposures can lead to lung and other types of cancer. Because ***children have a much higher respiration rate than adults more radon can be inhaled***. EPA danger levels **underestimate** increased risk of radioactive particle inhalation and public health impact expectation in children.

RADON ISOTOPES and DECAY PARTICLES




3 types of **radioactive radon** decay particle energy and negative impact on health



Radon decay particles; alpha, beta and gamma radioactive energy levels. **All** can initiate negative health effects. Alpha particles i.e., polonium can penetrate cellular DNA promoting tissue damage and cancers. Beta and gamma particles have higher energy levels that promote greater tissue damage resulting in **increased** health risks.

Radon **alpha** particles penetrating cell DNA ending in tissue damage and cancers




RADON-222 DECAY PROCESS

Contains radioactive isotopes emitting all 3 types:

Alpha, Beta, and Gamma particles

- Radon 222- alpha particles and few gamma particles
- Polonium 218- alpha decay
- Lead 214 – beta particles and gamma particles
- Bismuth 214- beta particles and gamma particles
- Polonium 214- alpha particles and few gamma particles
- Lead 210- 22 year half-life so first 5 are basis for effect (20)



Concurrent radioactive beta β and gamma Γ activity from radon 222 progeny

Data from the Oregon Department of Health and Human Services show more than 25% of the homes tested in Multnomah County exceed the soil origin **indoor air** action level of 4pCi / liter due to geological conditions. The Portland Water Bureau wrongly down plays the high public health risk of **any** level of radon in our drinking water by not acknowledging subsequent inhalation. In a closed drinking water system without open reservoirs the risk of aerosolized radon inhalation from drinking water increases substantially. **Any** level of radon exposure from water would contribute to the total cumulative effect of inhalation risk associated with radioactive indoor air. A 1000 sq. foot house with a 4 pCi / of radon has nearly 2 million atoms in the air decaying every minute in *addition* to the decay atoms of the radioactive progeny such as polonium, etc. ***One single atom / alpha/ beta/ gamma particle can begin the cancer process when inhaled.*** Homes in the zip codes 97210- 97213 in north and northeast Portland are especially at risk, and there are many other areas in the city. ***Open air reservoirs provide the most efficient and sustainable radioactive radon risk mitigation process through volatilization.*** The open reservoirs use the laws of chemistry and physics; utilizing

diffusion up the water column, water agitation at the inlet, wind action promoting diffusion, leading to natural and harmless volatilization **free of elect.** (EPA radon map)

State of Oregon does not participate in the EPA Multimedia Mitigation Program. Under the **proposed** EPA radon regulation states that choose not to develop enhanced indoor air programs, community water systems in that State will be required to reduce radon levels in drinking water to 300 pCi/L. This amount of radon in water can contribute ~ 0.03 pCi /L of radon to the air in your home. The City of Portland Columbia South Shore Well fields (CSSW) produce radon 222 in excess of 300 pCi /L exceeding the EPA action level. The Portland Water Bureau will tell the community the radon levels are diluted to 10% during summer usage. However if we incur turbidity events excluding Bull Run water use we will be using CSSW water with radon 222 gas exceeding recommended levels. This does not include the cancer causing radioactive progeny atoms such as bismuth, polonium, lead, etc., from radon 222 decay. (21)

EPA and Drinking Water Radon-

EPA does not regulate radon in drinking water. The health concern with radon in drinking water is also associated with everyday household uses that can transfer radon to indoor air throughout the house along with the many radioactive decay isotopes.

Radon in water can be released into the air when water is used for showering, laundry, washing dishes, toilet use, and other household activities. Some researchers have estimated that 1 pCi /L of airborne radon will result from the normal use of a water supply containing 10,000 pCi /L. This number is only an average and **subject to variation**. The amount of radon transferred from water to air is a function of:

- The waterborne radon level;
- The amount of water used;
- The type of water use activity, e.g. shower (high transfer) vs. running water in a sink (low transfer); and
- The water and air temperatures (as the temperature of the water increases, radon transfer increases).

Because radon 222 is an unregulated radioactive contaminant in drinking water the Portland Water Bureau did not include it in our Water Quality Report in 2013. In the past years we have seen drinking water radon levels from the Columbia South Shore Well field above 350 pCi/L. Portland Water Bureau says radon is a non-issue at these levels, yet EPA says “**there is no safe level of radon**”. (EPA)


Even at small levels of radon, the cumulative effect of continuous household multiple water uses impacts the ultimate level of radon and daughter radioactive particles accumulating daily and weekly. Radon needs to be removed from our drinking water even if EPA has not completed a final rule. National Academy of Sciences (NAS) conclusions are assumptions based on estimates that underestimate the overall public health effect. If the NAS study was acceptable as scientific fact, why was it not adopted by EPA as the standard for the final EPA Radon regulation? EPA says radon is the most cancer causing contaminant, yet there is **no** EPA Radon drinking water regulation.

Open reservoirs will harmlessly and efficiently vent the radon and other gases into the atmosphere. Covered reservoirs are not designed for such activity of radon removal. So we begin to see what the effect of even conservatively estimated exposures will present from our closed water system and covered reservoirs.

USGS cites a 1000 sq. foot house with 4 pCi /L having 2,000,000 radon decays a minute. That does not include the daughter decay units and their radioactive material accumulations.


2000 Year Roman Open Reservoir in Tunisia Providing Sunlight Radon Ventilation






Radon and other Drinking Water Gases Can Enter Your Entire Home, School, and Working Place Through the Shower, Toilet, Washing Machine and Faucets.

Open Reservoirs Act as A Barrier Allowing Gases to Harmlessly Vent Into Atmosphere Before Entering Distribution System Downstream.



Portland metropolitan radioactive radon-222 areas of risk. (US EPA)

Uranium-238 Radioactive Decay Chain



Radon -222 itself is a gas with a half-life of about 4 days. However, the radon 222 decay products are isotopes of ***solid elements*** and will quickly attach themselves molecules of water and other atmospheric gases. These, in turn, attach to dust particles. If inhaled, the decay products, whether attached to aerosol particles or ‘unattached’, will largely be deposited on the surface of the respiratory tract and, because of their short half-lives (less than half an hour) will begin to decay there.

Case study projection estimate- drinking water radon-222 exposure in closed system during Bull Run turbidity event.

Radioactive decay process for radon-222 from Portland CSSW drinking water.

Radon-222 decays in 1000 sq. foot house with 4pCi radon = 2,000,000/min (USGS)
In one hour there would be 120,000,000/hour radon 222 radioactive decays not including progeny.

PWB CSSW >300 pCi / L radon x .0001 water transfer/air variable = .03 pCi /L (EPA)
1 pCi/L air = 500,000 radon decays/ minute
 $500,000 \times .03 = 15,000$ radon decays / minute

Decay time for daughter progeny -

Estimated radioactive decays in ~ one hour with continuous .03 pCi /L exposure

Radon-222	60 min. x 15,000 decay/min = 900,000 decay
Polonium 218- 3minutes	
Lead 214- 29 minutes	
Bismuth 214- ~11 minute	
Polonium 214- <1 second	
Lead 210- 22 years	

See next page-

Estimated Household Impact from Continuous Decay of Radon 222

And Radioactive Decay Chain Progeny Over one Hour Period

Minutes	RADON 222 α	POLONIUM 218 α	LEAD 214 $\beta \gamma$	BISMUTH 214 $\beta \gamma$	POLONIUM 214 α	LEAD 210
1	15k direct >	15k				
2	15k	15k				
3	15k	15k 3 min >	15k			
4	15k		15k			
5	15k	15k	15k			
6	15k	15k	15k			
7	15k	15k	15k			
8	15k	15k	15k			
9	15k	15k	15k			
10	15k	15k	15k			
11	15k	15k	15k			
12	15k	15k	15k			
13	15k	15k	15k			
14	15k	15k	15k			
15	15k	15k	15k			
16	15k	15k	15k			
17	15k	15k	15k			
18	15k	15k	15k			
19	15k	15k	15k			
20	15k	15k	15k			
21	15k	15k	15k			
22	15k	15k	15k			
23	15k	15k	15k			
24	15k	15k	15k			
25	15k	15k	15k			
26	15k	15k	15k			
27	15k	15k	15k			
28	15k	15k	15k			
29	15k	15k	15k			
30	15k	15k	15k			

31	15k	15k	15k			
32	15k	15k	15K29min>	15k		
33	15k	15k	15k	15k		
34	15k	15k	15k	15k		
35	15k	15k	15k	15k		
36	15k	15k	15k	15k		
37	15k	15k	15k	15k		
38	15k	15k	15k	15k		
39	15k	15k	15k	15k		
40	15k	15k	15k	15k		
41	15k	15k	15k	15k		
42	15k	15k	15k	15k		
43	15k	15k	15k	15k11min>	15k x 60/min	Stable
44	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
45	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
46	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
47	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
48	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
49	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
50	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
51	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
52	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
53	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
54	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
55	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
56	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
57	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
58	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	
59	15k	15k	15k	15k	15k	

60 min 15k 15k 15k 15k 15k
Decays ~ 900,000 ~900,000 ~855,000 ~ 420,000 ~15,200,000

Hour = ~18,275,000

Public Health Risks from Showering With Radon-Rich Water

- ~70% of Radioactive Radon ^{222}Rn Gas is Released in Shower Aerosol Into Household
- Percentage Measurements of Radioactive Radon ^{222}Rn Gas Becoming Aerosol From Shower Heads at Different Water Temperature
- Aerosol Dynamics of Radon in Water Before and After Shower
- Eventually Decaying Into Radioactive Daughter Progeny


One of the potentially important sources of short-term exposure is the emanation (discharge) of radon from water during showering and the subsequent in-growth of the radon decay products that continue to produce radioactive materials shower after shower.

TABLE 1. Laboratory Measured Emanation Fraction


shower head	water temp (°C)	^{222}Rn in water concn before shower (kBq m^{-3})	^{222}Rn in water concn after shower (kBq m^{-3})	emanation (%)
head 1	32	374	108	71
	32	773	233	70
	21	375	124	67
	21	207	58	72
head 2	32	254	69	73

^a Errors in these values are approximately $\pm 2\%$.

Household –Aerosol of Radon 222 Gas Exposures from Everyday Activities



**Spikes of Radon 222 Gas Entering Living Space from
Closed System That Did Not Allow Radioactive Gas Escape**



-Drinking Water- Aerosol of Radioactive Radon Decay

-Radioactive Radon Decay Appeared Later as Expected

Establishing an Aerosol Presence Over a Long Time Period

-PAEC – potential alpha energy concentration (22)

OPEN RESERVOIR – EPA LT2 & Stage2 DBP Benefits

EPA Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (Stage2DBP)

The Bull Run drinking water system was designed by highly accomplished engineers over 100 years ago. These engineers incorporated the brilliant scientific and public health principles that had been established in the preceding decades. As a continued reminder our Bull Run drinking water system was designed with **3 critical public health barriers**:

- Portland is truly fortunate to have the federally protected closed to human entry Bull Run Management Unit as our first public health **barrier**, providing safe drinking water free of municipal, industrial and agricultural sewage exposure. The primary sources of US surface drinking water contamination.
- Second **barrier** is simple chlorine/ammonia as a disinfection process that provides protection against waterborne disease causing microorganisms.
- Portland's open reservoirs providing the most important **barrier** by removing unwanted gases, chemicals and disinfection byproducts using natural sustainable aerobic processes, before entering our major distribution system. Open reservoir removal of toxic and carcinogenic chemical DBP can take place through the following processes;
 - Volatilization efficiency
 - Photolysis/ sunlight
 - Biodegradation-microbial
 - Aerobic activity/oxygenation
 - Water agitation

Another reason for open reservoirs and unwanted chemicals

“Some people who drink water containing haloacetic acids in excess of the MCL over many years may have an increased risk of getting cancer. Some people who drink water containing trihalomethanes in excess of the MCL over many years may experience problems with their liver, kidneys, or central nervous system, and may have an increased risk of getting cancer.” (23)

The **EPA Stage 2 Disinfectant Byproduct Rule** is intended to reduce potential cancer, reproductive and developmental health risks from disinfection byproducts which form when disinfectants are used to control microbial pathogens. Our open reservoirs not only currently meet EPA LT2 needs but are also needed to enhance the removal of the EPA regulated trihalomethanes (TTHM), haloacetic acids (HAA₅) as well as other toxic chemicals before these can enter our homes, schools and workplaces. Natural aerobic

atmospheric volatilization of gases and biodegradation of DBP chemicals from open reservoirs diminish the related potential health risks and can provide more efficient public health protection than covered reservoirs can offer. Because long term EPA drinking water standards do not include children but are based on 70 kg /+154 lb. **adults**. Further DBP chemical removal enhanced by our open reservoirs is needed to decrease public health risk for children, pets, as well as adults.

Only 11 DBPs Regulated in U.S.

DBP	MCL (µg/L)
Total THMs	80
5 Haloacetic acids	60
Bromate	10
Chlorite	1000

Toxic and carcinogenic disinfection byproducts regulated by EPA Stage 2DBP

List of EPA's 11 regulated DBP's – sampled only 4 times / year

Total Tri Halo Methanes TTHM's

- Chloroform – most prevalent
- Bromoform
- Bromodichloromethane
- Dibromochloromethane


Halacetic acids HAA's

- Monochloro
- Dichloro
- Trichloro
- Monobromo
- Dibromo

**Bromine-
Chlorite-**

Many disinfectant byproducts not known or well-studied

But, more than 50% still not known....



>600 DBPs Identified

Halogenated DBPs


- Halomethanes
- Haloacids
- Haloaldehydes
- Haloketones
- Halonitriles
- Haloamides
- Halonitromethanes
- Halofuranones (e.g., MX)
- Oxyhalides (e.g., bromate)
- Many others

Non-halogenated DBPs

- Nitrosamines
- Aldehydes
- Ketones
- Carboxylic acids
- Others

US EPA

Open reservoirs can reduce/remove many toxic and carcinogenic chemicals *before* being inhaled, ingested and absorbed through skin exposures.



Route of exposure is important....

- Can get 2X exposure from 10 min shower compared to drinking 2L of tap water (inhalation)
- Some DBPs dermally absorbed
- Evidence of increased bladder cancer with swimming in indoor pools (inhalation, dermal): Villanueva et al., *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 2007, 165, 148-156.


US EPA

- **Haloamides** (up to 14 ppb; highly genotoxic) may be increased with **chloramination**
- **Halofuranones** (up to 2.4 ppb for total MX analogues; genotoxic, carcinogenic); **chloramination** can also form
- **Haloacetonitriles** (up to 41 ppb; ~10% of THM4; genotoxic cytotoxic); may be increased with **chloramination**
- **Nitrosamines** (up to 180 ppt; probable human carcinogens increased with **chloramination**)

Emerging Chloramination Disinfection By-Products


But, all of this toxicity testing is for separate, individual DBPs...

DBPs
are really present as MIXTURES



>300 DBPs probably
present in glass of water

US EPA



US EPA

Structure of acidic natural organic material (NOM) reacts with chlorine generating disinfection by-products. Portland adds chlorine alone at Bull Run Headworks for hours of disinfection and later adds ammonia at Lusted Hill west of Sandy River creating chloramine disinfectant.

Public Health Benefits of Open Reservoir Elimination of Disinfection Byproducts Produced By Chlorine and Chloramine

TTHM –Trihalomethanes

Trihalomethanes were among the first disinfection byproducts to be discovered in chlorinated water. These EPA regulated chemical substances are one of many types formed during the disinfection process. The EPA regulated Stage 2 DBP chemicals such as trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids are tested by Portland every three months.

TTHM's can be divided into four different classes.

- **Trichloromethane** , (chloroform, CHCl_3)
- **Bromine dichloromethane** (BDCM, CHBrCl_2) (no bromines in system)
- **Chlorine dibromomethane** (CDBM CHBr_2Cl)
- **Tribromomethane** (TBM CHBr_3)

These chemicals contain chlorine and bromine but are not in a reaction with methane.


These reactions originate with NOM such as humic acid shown on previous page.


Chloroform is a commonly occurring trihalomethane and the principle DBP, making it the most important chemical to have removed from our drinking water.

One of the important chemical properties of chloroform's environmental fate is its ability to volatilize, passing into air as a gas. Open air reservoirs naturally provide volatilization, enhanced through the fountain spray effect as seen in reservoir 6 and water fall/ agitation used in other reservoirs. Open air reservoir actions efficiently vaporize this unwanted toxic gas where it is then harmlessly broken down by sunlight. (24, 25)

Chloroform (trichloromethane) production v. contact time

Chloroform gas content ↑ with organic material contact time. Because the water distribution system has been poorly maintained ↑ biofilm/sediment as seen with PWB.





Waterfall effects promoting volatilization of gases before they enter your home


Water use in homes contributes considerably to levels of chloroform in indoor air and total exposure. Toxic and carcinogenic chloroform can enter your body in 4 ways: as you breathe, eat food, drink water, and it easily passes through your skin as you take a bath or shower. ***Chloroform can cross the placenta and is also found in breast milk. When chloroform crosses the placenta in humans, it can result in concentrations in fetal blood that are greater than maternal blood concentrations.*** An epidemiological study indicated an association between chloroform concentrations in drinking water, and intrauterine growth retardation. Concentrations of chloroform in indoor air were higher than those in ambient outdoor air owing primarily to volatilization during water use. When the shower water is hot enough for it to vaporize, inhalation of even more chloroform will occur. Ongoing and continuous exposures to chloroform such as showering from an inefficiently vented closed reservoir water system can allow for increased toxicity. Studies in people and in animals show that after you breathe air or consume food that contains chloroform it can quickly enter your bloodstream from your

lungs or intestines. Chloroform is carried by the blood to all parts of your body, such as the nervous system, fat, liver, and kidneys. Indoor air exposure to the volatile THMs such as chloroform is particularly important with houses having low rates of ventilation and high rates of showering and bathing. **Chloroform is a California Proposition 65 carcinogen.** (26)(27)(28)(29)

Open Reservoir Atmospheric Volatilization- Total Trihalomethanes -TTHM

THM concentrations were important predictors of blood THM concentrations immediately after showering. Chloroform concentrations in the shower stall air were the most important predictor in determining blood concentrations after the shower.

Chloroform can be degraded photo chemically by sunlight and evaporates easily utilizing the open reservoir air surface/ water partial pressure differences in promoting atmospheric volatilization. The open reservoirs provide significant opportunities to efficiently volatilize toxic and carcinogenic THMs. In a closed system such as a covered reservoir, such sunlight degradation and atmospheric volatilization does not occur.



High chloroform blood level saturation from shower shown at 7 & 8


Covered Reservoirs- Toxic Chloroform into Your House Every Day




The diagrams on next page demonstrate how chloroform in the home can increase through drinking water aerosols formed through evaporation or routine activities: such as showering, bathing, washing clothes, cleaning. Because of the high Henry's Law constant inhalation can provide the greatest public health risk by absorption in the human respiratory system including the surface of the lung. The primary factor that determines the relative magnitude of deposition in different regions of the respiratory tract (nose, airways and alveolar) is the particle size distribution of the aerosol.

Hence, the nature of the source is very significant in aerosol exposure analysis. Another potential source of exposure from aerosols is via dermal sorption when the aerosols are deposited on the exposed skin surface during different water use activities. Open reservoirs can reduce or eliminate THM chloroform gases using efficient open air reservoir volatilization before entering homes, schools, and work places.

A. Concentration of household drinking water chloroform: shower, bath room, main house. Washing Machine OFF



a: Concentration Profile of Chloroform – Washing Machine Off



b: Concentration Profile of Chloroform – Washing Machine On

B. Concentration of drinking water chloroform increasing: shower (top), bathroom (middle), main house with washing machine ON (bottom) (31)

More EPA Regulated Disinfection By-Products Generated from Chlorine and Chloramine Managed by Open Reservoirs

Haloacetic Acids – HAA₅

The five most common HAA's

- **Monochloroacetic acid (MCAA) ClCH_2COOH**
- **Dichloroacetic acid (DCAA) Cl_2CHCOOH**
- **Trichloroacetic acid (TCAA) Cl_3CCOOH**
- **Monobromoacetic acid (MBAA) BrCH_2COOH**
- **Dibromoacetic acid (DBAA) Br_2CHCOOH**

Haloacetic Acids – HAA₅

In addition to trihalomethanes THM, haloacetic acids HAA₅ are a class of disinfection byproducts produced by chlorine and chloramine chemical reactions with natural organic material in the water. These disinfection byproducts are also regulated by EPA because of public health concerns. Loss of HAA₅'s in water distribution systems has been frequently attributed to biodegradation. Experimental *aerobic* biodegradation rates have shown to be rapid. Oxygen loving aerobic bacteria are associated with the biodegradation and removal of the HAA₅'s toxic and carcinogenic disinfection byproducts. Aerobic bacteria have a beneficial role in suppressing the concentrations in tap water. They are integral part of the efficient HAA₅ removal in drinking water such as open reservoir system.(32)(33)(34)(35)




Oxygen loving aerobic bacteria in our open reservoirs at Mount Tabor and Washington Park can biodegrade and remove HAA₅ from water.

HAA₅ are the second most prominent class of EPA regulated drinking water halogenated disinfection byproducts and are water soluble. HAA₅ chemicals such as DCAA and

TCAA present a toxic and potentially hepatocarcinogenic public health hazard that can be expected to be detected in chlorinated drinking water distribution systems. Genotoxicity, reproductive toxicity, embryo toxicity, neurotoxicity and immunotoxicity of DCAA have also been reported. The presence of DCAA and TCAA increases the toxicity of chloroform in female animal studies. (36) (37) (38)

Microbial removal of these HAA₅'s increases water quality and health.






Potential bacterial biodegradation pathway of MCAA. Glycolic acid is then in the general metabolism, and may be photodegraded by sunlight, stopping the HAA from being able to biopersist or bioaccumulate in the environment. (39)(40)

Summary of how open reservoirs provide support removing HAA₅

- The open reservoirs can provide a natural and sustainable aerobic biodegradation process of the unwanted HAA₅.
- Different bacteria are known to aerobically degrade HAA₅ either co-metabolically or as a sole carbon and energy source.
- Because HAA₅ are biodegradable compounds they can utilize the enhanced efficiency of *aerobic* microorganisms as a benefit for the open reservoir drinking water quality.
- Aerobic microorganisms are 18 times more efficient in metabolizing chemical compounds than the *anaerobic* microorganisms, found in closed and covered reservoirs
- Oxygen loving aerobic microorganisms degrading HAA₅ act as another desirable public health barrier found in the open reservoirs.
- Photolysis/ sunlight can provide additional degradation pathways for HAA₅ in natural waters.
- Open reservoirs support peroxide formation in aerobic biodegradation as a mechanism for reduction HAA₅ in surface waters before entering distribution systems.

- Aerobic biodegradation in open reservoirs provides superior public health benefits to the anaerobic conditions of covered and closed reservoirs.





HAA Biodegradation - R2A-DR11 *Aquabacterium* sp. Tap Water
Isolation of HAA degrading bacteria from drinking water using complex media (41)

NITRIFICATION of Drinking Water-

Nitrification is a microbial process by which reduced nitrogen compounds (primarily ammonia) are sequentially oxidized (broken down) to nitrite and nitrate. Ammonia is present in drinking water through either naturally-occurring processes or through the addition of ammonia during secondary disinfection to form chloramines. The addition of ammonia to chlorine forming **chloramine**, our drinking water disinfectant may provide the source of nitrogen which under certain conditions can be used to produce the nitrites/nitrates.

Ultraviolet light depletes free chlorine, whereas chloramines seem to be quite stable in sunlight. Although monochloramine can degrade *slowly* when exposed to the atmosphere at varying rates depending on the amount of sunlight, wind, and temperature the nitrifiers (bacteria) are very sensitive to near UV, visual, and fluorescent light; consequently, nitrification episodes in distribution systems occur

in the dark (in covered reservoirs, pipelines, taps, etc.) Because of the sunlight, nitrification has not been generated in our open reservoirs. (42) (43) (44)

The nitrification process is primarily accomplished by two groups of autotrophic (self feeding) nitrifying bacteria.

Step 1 - Nitrosomonas sp. oxidizing ammonia → nitrite



Step 2- Nitrobacter sp. oxidizing nitrite → nitrate



The two groups of bacteria commonly found in aquatic environments can break down ammonia into nitrite and nitrate. The presence of nitrite in a water supply is undesirable because of health concerns such as methemoglobinemia where nitrogen replaces oxygen in red blood cells. Nitrite can also accelerate the decomposition of monochloramine and interfere with chlorine and chlorine residual measurements.

Increased chlorine demand and decay change the disinfectant residual as it travels the distribution system as monochloramine. Ammonia concentrations naturally increase as the chlorine concentration decreases through this process. ***Sunlight in open reservoirs inhibits nitrification bacteria from oxidizing ammonia to nitrite and nitrate.***

Application of chlorine at the reservoir outlet binds to the ammonia efficiently and cost effectively increasing chloramine residual downstream in the distribution system. ***The absence of sunlight and the dark environment in closed and covered reservoirs allows microbial nitrification activity to continue oxidizing ammonia into unwanted nitrite and nitrate, etc.*** Nitrification issues have been documented in Los Angeles covered reservoirs such as Garvey and Orange County.

N-nitrosodimethylamine - NDMA important nitrogenous chemical reaction-



Chlorine and chloramine can react with organic nitrogen material that can contain precursors to NDMA. NDMA is routinely detected in drinking water utilities. NDMA detection may vary during seasonal changes due to differences in organic material levels. Water quality data from surface water sampling demonstrated that NDMA is significantly

attenuated in surface water due to ultraviolet degradation from exposure to sunlight. Based on the data, a half-life of 2.2 hours in surface water was estimated for NDMA. Photo degradation (sunlight) is the main process for removing NDMA from the aquatic environment. NDMA can persist in the absence of sunlight such as in a closed and covered reservoir, thus continuing on into the drinking water distribution system to be consumed in our homes, schools and businesses. (45)(46)

N-Nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA) is a member of a family of extremely potent carcinogens, the *N* – nitrosamines. Their cancer potencies are much higher than those of THM's. Concerns about NDMA mainly focused on the presence of NDMA in foods and drinking water. NDMA has produced liver tumors and parenchymal cell tumors when administered orally. **NDMA acts as a trans placental carcinogen and has been found in breast milk.** NDMA can be inhaled, and absorbed through the skin. Increases in lung, liver, and kidney tumors have been observed after inhalation exposure. NDMA is structurally related to known carcinogens and can be mutagenic in microorganisms. (47)(48)(49)(50)




“Blue Baby” syndrome from nitrification of drinking water. Nitrate poisoning where red blood cells have decreased oxygen resulting in *methemoglobinemia*.

Oxygenation of Open Reservoirs - O₂

Oxygen introduced at the open reservoirs' fountains and waterfall inlets saturates the water and provides many public health benefits. Oxygenation provides a secure environment for helpful aerobic bacteria, reduces unwanted anaerobic bacteria, and provides a natural source for disinfection precursors such as oxides and peroxides.

Oxygen enriched water naturally enhances aerobic bacteria metabolism, yielding superior efficiency in chemical biodegradation than closed reservoir anaerobic bacteria metabolism. Closed and covered reservoirs do not provide these advantages.

Natural Sunlight Disinfection-



Natural broad spectrum sunlight benefits in open reservoirs. The many wavelengths of natural sun light provide well established disinfection properties that artificial UV used in drinking water treatment cannot. Arrow shows the artificial UV radiation 254 nm wavelength used for drinking water facilities that have a history of mercury bulb breakage resulting in toxic contamination of drinking water.

Natural disinfection from sunlight is well known. Sunlight is among the most potent abiotic factors in the inactivation or killing of bacteria and other microorganisms in water. Sunlight imparts a broad and effective spectrum of photon wavelength exposures that include: gamma, x-ray, ultraviolet, visual, infrared. Sunlight photolytically (breaks apart) reacts with and disrupts microorganism chemical structures. Additionally our open reservoirs incorporate efficient oxygenation of water at the fountains and the inlet waterfalls, synergistically enhancing microbial disinfection. This is achieved when sunlight photons react with oxygen –based molecules forming free radicals and oxides such as peroxide. These chemicals also react with microbial structures providing a sustainable and natural disinfection effect. Covered and closed reservoirs cannot provide the natural disinfection benefits of sunlight.

The condition of oocysts is very important in determining the risk of infection. Oocysts are exposed to many conditions in the environment that can reduce their infectivity

before entering the distribution system. The length of time post shedding, water temperature and the amount of ultraviolet UV exposure from sunlight can reduce oocyst infectivity. Although oocysts are considered environmentally resistant they exhibit considerable loss of infectivity as environmental temperature increases. Above 50⁰ F loss of infectivity increases. In addition, surface waters are exposed to natural UV irradiation in sunlight which may damage oocyst DNA therefore inhibiting DNA replication and reducing infectivity. Due to specific gravity influences, many organisms such as Cryptosporidium, Giardia, etc., exist at the top of the water column surface where UV sunlight can render them harmless. (51)(52)(53)

SUMMARY - Open reservoirs-

The public health benefits of open reservoirs at Mount Tabor and Washington Park are profound. The citizens of Portland and the EPA Administrator have adopted and agreed to the LT2 position; “*science will determine the ultimate outcome*” of our open reservoirs. This has been historically illustrated by the City of Portland’s Open Reservoir Independent Review Panel 2004 majority vote that supported retaining the open reservoirs. The open reservoirs provide a complex ecological tapestry of benefits showing many levels of scientific interactions that must occur to retain the public health of our community. Sunlight, water aeration, and oxygen loving microorganisms create an ecosystem that keeps our drinking water safe and healthy. During the last century open reservoirs throughout the United States have provided a long and well documented history of safe drinking water. Microbiological scientists in the 1800’s and 1900’s such as Louis Pasteur and physician John Snow furthered the understanding of healthy drinking water by unraveling the relationship between identifiable microorganisms and disease. They determined that separation of fresh drinking water from water filled with sewage is important for public health; public health lessons learned from London’s case study of water contaminated with the bacterium *Vibrio cholera*, confirming what the Romans knew long ago. One of the many Bull Run system benefits is providing safe drinking water free of sewage in contrast to the previous Portland source, the increasingly contaminated Willamette River. Consistent with our open reservoirs, scientists of the 19th and early 20th century recognized the many benefits of sunlight in promoting public health. European scientists discovered by chance that sunlight could kill bacteria. Media grown without sunlight exposure became cloudy from organism growth, while media grown with sunlight remained clear because of organism mortality. Later experiments from the 1900’s confirmed the presence of oxygen as well as sunlight is critical to this destructive microbial process. Soon it was accepted by the scientific community; “sunlight and fresh air are the enemies of disease”.

CONCLUSION-

Portland City Council- It's OK to change your position on open reservoirs based on this new information that is scientifically supported.

A decade of experience under the 1986 Safe Drinking Water Act revealed several areas where responsible, science-based flexibilities and a better prioritization of effort could improve protection of public health compared to the one-size-fits-all approach of the 1986 statute. (EPA 1996)

What is the reason for keeping Portland's open reservoirs all about? **Public health** and recognizing we need to reduce/eliminate environmental toxic and carcinogenic chemicals that have no place in our drinking water. **We can already meet EPA microbiological standards. Additional open reservoir LT2 sampling was an arbitrary decision based on the intention to cover.**

The PWB and water engineers want to disconnect Portland's open reservoir system. Citizens of Portland and other local Bull Run customers are addressing their concerns about added exposures of toxic and carcinogenic chemicals in their drinking water. EPA regulates 11 disinfection byproducts and now has identified +600 more chemicals present in drinking water that is a concern but not regulated. Open reservoir principles can help. The open reservoirs provide the most important and critical public health benefit of the Bull Run water system. Open reservoirs ***act as a stop sign and thus a barrier to toxic and carcinogenic chemicals*** that would otherwise enter the distribution system ending up in our homes, schools and work places. We have seen the negative air quality outcome when closed drinking water systems allow toxic aerosol gases such as radon and chloroform exposures into everyday living situations. The shower/bath induced chloroform places the household health at risk because EPA long term toxin standards are not based on children or pregnancy exposures, only adults. There is no safe level of radon and its radioactive progeny exposure in the household air and water. Pets, vegetable gardens, etc. are also at risk.

Covered reservoirs cannot efficiently provide the chemical mitigation public health process of open reservoirs because they are significantly anaerobic (without O₂), principally enclosed, and in an environment without sunlight. Because of their public health and toxic chemical mitigation shortcomings, covered reservoirs ***act like an express lane for contaminants on their way to the distribution system and into your homes.*** For the benefit of public health and continued commitment by the City of Portland Precautionary Principle, the open reservoirs must be retained and maintained as they are today with added security measures.

While all Americans now carry many foreign chemicals in their bodies, women often have higher levels of many toxic substances than do men. Some of these chemicals

(chloroform) have been found in maternal blood, placental tissue, and breast milk samples from pregnant women and mothers who recently gave birth. Thus, chemical contaminants are being passed on to the next generation, both prenatally and during breastfeeding. Some chemicals indirectly increase cancer risk (radon) that can be influenced by the effect of carcinogens. Children of all ages are considerably more vulnerable than adults to increased cancer risk and other adverse effects from virtually all harmful environmental exposures. In addition, some toxics have adverse effects not only on those that can be exposed directly (including in utero), but on the offspring of exposed individuals.

The Portland Utility Review Board in July 2002 voted unanimously to pursue an EPA Waiver from the Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule. That voted position remains in force today. City of Portland later only asked EPA “if a waiver was available?” without providing EPA any of our scientific evidence or reasoning for the waiver request. Portland Water Bureau did not support the PURB EPA waiver request because they were committed to build a treatment plant and reservoirs we did not need. When the PWB representative for all Unfiltered System utilities (New York City, Boston, Seattle, San Francisco, Tacoma, Portland, etc.) to the EPA LT2 decision committee, was asked by PURB why the waiver option was arbitrarily removed from the final EPA LT2 version, she just laughed.

New York City – Comment to EPA March 2011

“the draft LT2 rule included a waiver provision that would have allowed for site-specific risk assessments and appropriate treatments. This waiver provision was inexplicably eliminated from the final LT2 rule.”

EPA-Retrospective Review Plan (Dkt. No. EPA-HQ-OA-2011-0156)

“Science will determine ultimate outcome” as directed by the EPA Administrator. Yet the City of Portland and the Portland Water Bureau have completely ignored the primary scientific public health benefits of open reservoirs as barriers to distribution system toxic chemical contamination. Scientifically supported public health benefit examples could have been easily presented to OHA such as: sunlight UV (AWWARF 3021), nitrification mitigation (EPA 2002), and gas volatilization (radon). **The City of Portland needs to restart the process of working with the; Congressional delegation, Oregon Health Authority, and citizens of Portland familiar with the science and advocacy administrative experience in keeping the reservoirs open. Begin with the scientific information and principles outlined in this document.**

Portland’s open reservoirs utilize the principles of chemistry, physics and microbiology to support a safe and healthy drinking water outcome that covered

reservoirs cannot meet. We're building on the new way of thinking that reduction and elimination of drinking water environmental chemical exposure is the new future of open reservoirs and our public health.

FINAL THOUGHT -

Open Reservoirs with Joe Meyer-

Interview-Dr. Gary Oxman Medical /Public Health Director Multnomah County

KBOO Radio May 10, 2011

Q. What about Portland's current water?

A. Dr. Oxman- "I think Portland's water is superb. We have a wonderful water source in Bull Run watershed. Well designed system and responsibly run system and we have excellent water."

Q. Are there any known public health issues today?

A. Dr. Oxman-" No there really aren't. If you are talking, are there diseases caused by our water- environmental diseases, chemical diseases, bacterial diseases, microbial diseases- no we have not been aware of or detected any diseases or sign of illness associated with our water system."

Q. If Portland does cover reservoirs will you expect fewer illnesses?

A. Dr. Oxman- "We are not detecting any illnesses associated with water in Portland. No I would not expect we would get fewer illnesses after covering reservoirs."

Q. Anything else to say?

A. Dr. Oxman- "Great drinking water system here in Portland. Levels of citizen involvement that we have in the debates, of what the directions are a very positive thing. What we need to do as a community is to come together and debate the issues honestly, debate them openly, a lot of different factors that will influence the decisions that our policy makers will make. Council and other elected officials, and I think we need to be an active part of that process, part of the gift we can give to future generations here in Portland."

Glossary-

AWWA RF- American Water Works Association Research Foundation
CSSW – Columbia South Shore Wellfield located on the Columbia River between the Portland airport and Blue Lake areas. It is the source of our drinking water containing radioactive radon 222.
DBP- disinfection by-product
pCi- pico Curie- measurement of radioactive material
EPA –United States Environmental Protection Agency
LT2- EPA Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule
NOM- natural organic material, reaction with chlorine and chloramine
PAEC- potential alpha energy concentration
PWB - Portland Water Bureau

Radioactive chemicals from Columbia South Shore Wellfield

Bi- bismuth 214, 210 β , Γ **Pb- lead 214, 210, 206 β , Γ**
Po- polonium 218, 214, 210 α **Rn- radon 222 α , Γ**
 α -alpha is form of radioactive particle
 β - beta is one form of radioactive particle
 Γ -gamma is form of radioactive particle
S2DBP- Stage 2 Disinfection and Disinfectant Byproduct Rule
SDWA- US EPA Safe Drinking Water Act
USGS- United State Geological Survey

References -

1. USEPA-University of Massachusetts, Amherst Political Economy Research Inst. 2009
2. Neighbors for Clean Air- Revisiting the Smokestack Effect 2011
3. Oregon DEQ –Portland Air Toxics Solutions - 2014
4. USA Today- Toxic Air and America's Schools- 2009 showing Portland's Abernathy, Alameda, and Arts, Communication and Technology Schools as examples of worst US air quality exposing to heavy metals, nickel, arsenic, chromium, and diisocyanates
5. USCenter for Disease Control (CDC)-Preventing Asthma and Death from Diisocyanate Exposure -1996
6. EPA Letter to Senator Schumer NY-
http://www.opb.org/news/media/uploads/pdf/2011/scan_signed_response_to_existing_control_11.pdf
7. EPA –Proposed Radon Drinking Water Rule-1999
8. US Geological Survey- The Geology of Radon-1995
9. EPA-A Citizens Guide to Radon -2010
- 10.EPA- Basic Information about Radon in Drinking Water-2012
- 11.Oregon Health Authority-Testing for Radon Gas
- 12.Michigan Department of Environmental Quality- What is Radon? 2012
- 13.Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment-Radon 2012
- 14.Conrath, Susan, Kolb, Laura. The Health Risk of Radon. Journal of Environmental Health. October 1995
- 15.CDC –ATSDR Toxicological Profile for Chloroform 1997
- 16.CDC- ATSDR Public Health Statement Chloroform 2011
- 17.WHO- N-Nitrosodimethylamine 2008
- 18.EPA – Drinking Water Standards and Health Advisories 2012
- 19.Fernandez, Scott, Benefits of Deep Open Reservoirs 2004, 2009
- 20.UC Berkley Dept. Nuclear Engineering- 2013
- 21.EPA- Radon in Drinking Water- 1999
- 22.Hopke, Philip Showering in Radon –Rich Water. Center for Air Resources Engineering and Science. Clarkson University
- 23.EPA - Finished Reservoirs 2002
- 24.Disinfection byproducts- Lenntech-2012
- 25.World Health Organization- Trihalomethanes in Drinking Water. 2004
- 26.Toxicology- National Library of Medicine- Chloroform
- 27.California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment- Chloroform-2003
- 28.World Health Organization- Trihalomethanes Summary-2004
- 29.CDC-ATSDR- Chloroform- 2011
- 30.Environmental Health Perspectives - Exogenous and endogenous determinants of Blood THM levels EHP Jan.2008

- 31.Khanal, Rajesh. Chemical Contaminants in Drinking Water; An Integrated Analysis- May1999
- 32.EPA 2013- Basic Information About Disinfection Byproducts
- 33.EPA- Fact Sheet – Stage 2 Disinfectant and Disinfection Byproducts Rule
- 34.Biodegradation of HAAs in Distribution Systems - Project #3122
- 35.Zhang, Ping, Hozalski, Raymond et al. Isolation and characterization of haloacetic acid degrading *Afipia* spp. from drinking water. FEMS Microbiology 2009
- 36.California Office of Health and Hazard Assessment- Risk Assessment Chemicals Haloacetic Acids – 2004
- 37.Health Canada Guidelines for Haloacetic Acids-2010
- 38.Davis ME. Dichloroacetic and trichloroacetic acid increase chloroform toxicity. Journal of Toxicology Environmental Health 1992-September:37(1):139-48
- 39.Grigorescu, Alina, Lapara, Timothy, Hozalski, Raymond. Biodegradation of Haloacetic Acids and Potential Applicability to Drinking Water Treatment. J. Biochem, 47, 2 165-177 (2010)
- 40.EPA – Glycolic acid CAS # 79141
- 41.Chuang, Yi-Hsueh, Tung Hsin-Hsin. Isolation of HAA degrading bacteria from drinking water using complex media. Sustainable Environmental Research 2012
- 42.White GC (1992) The handbook of chlorination and alternative disinfectants, 3rd ed. New York, NY, Van Nostrand Reinhold, p. 196.
- 43.World Health Organization. Monochloramine in Drinking Water. 2004
- 44.EPA- Nitrification 2002
- 45.Valentine, Richard, et al. Factors Affecting the Formation of NDMA in Water and Occurrence #2678. 2006
- 46.Todd-Field Degradation of NDMA Demonstrated in Groundbreaking Study. 2007
47. EPA- N-Nitrosodimethylamine-IRIS-2010
- 48.Mitch, William, Trussell, R. Rhodes, et al. N-Nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA) as a Drinking Water Contaminant: A Review. Environmental Engineering Science 2003
- 49.WHO- N-Nitrosodimethylamine in Drinking Water-2002
- 50.CDC ATSDR- Public Health Statement for N-Nitrosodimethylamine-2008
- 51.Johnson, Anne, et al. The Risk of Cryptosporidiosis from Drinking Water. #3021 2008
- 52.EPA- Cryptosporidium Water Database- 2014
- 53.Diagnostic Clinical Parasitology, University of Tennessee. Giardia. 2014
- 54.EPA-Uncovered Reservoir Manual 1999
- 55.EPA-Finished Storage Water Facilities 2002
- 56.Seattle Times. Major Do-Over for Two Seattle Reservoirs. July 17, 2009
57. Salmonella Outbreak in Alamosa Colorado, March and April 2008 Colorado Department of Public Health-Disease Control and Environmental Epidemiology
58. Treated Water Reservoirs-The Neglected Facilities-2002

59. Mount Tabor Reservoirs Historic Structures Report, Reservoirs 1,5,6,7. Cascade Design Professionals Executive Summary. May 2009
60. American Journal of Public Health. August 1979 vol 69 no.8

Appendices

APPENDIX – 1

Summaries and Portland Water Bureau Communications to Oregon Health Authority

“Science will determine the ultimate outcome” is the benchmark for administering a Waiver from EPA LT2. This message has been the established standard for all EPA drinking water utility decisions for years. Yet in the case of Portland Water Bureau communications to retain the open reservoirs, the relevant scientific approach to chemistry and microbiology has been intentionally left out of the discussion with OHA. In one OHA communication PWB was also incorrect in stating methods used in AWWA RF 3021 was not EPA 1623 but a different method. A modification of EPA 1623 (EPA 1623 using high volume) that gives a more accurate assessment was used and therefore is acceptable. As the community expected, Portland showed zero *Cryptosporidium* in the year- long test. (PWB 2/10/12) Additionally samples taken in 1994/1995 from Reservoir 6 and Reservoir 4. NO *Cryptosporidium* oocysts and *Giardia* cysts were detected in any samples. (PWB 1/28/10)

Public Health Risk Evaluation -PWB

The current observable risk to public health is low. This conclusion is supported by the following:

- No waterborne disease outbreaks in PWB’s service area since inspections began – One criterion for maintaining a water supplier’s unfiltered status is evidence that the water source “has not been the source of a waterborne disease outbreak.” This criterion has been verified each year by State of Oregon Drinking Water Program for the Bull Run source since 1991, the effective date of the Surface Water Treatment Rule.
- A disease surveillance system sensitive enough to identify outbreaks – Oregon’s disease surveillance, investigation, and reporting system has been used as a benchmark of excellence for foodborne outbreaks. The protocols, structures and reporting that make Oregon well-known for foodborne investigations are identical to those used for waterborne illness. Despite the challenges inherent in cryptosporidiosis surveillance, the systems in Oregon are sensitive enough to identify local outbreaks. For example, a 1998 outbreak was traced to a swimming

pool in Multnomah County. No cryptosporidiosis outbreaks in Multnomah County have ever been attributed to PWB drinking water as a source.

- **Expert opinion is that the water system presents a low risk for cryptosporidiosis – A 2011 public health expert panel 10 examined the available data on cryptosporidiosis within the service area. The panel concluded that the data show no indication of an endemic disease burden due to Cryptosporidium from the water system and that no cryptosporidiosis outbreaks have ever been attributed to the Portland water supply.**
- **Record of safe operations – Because there is no sewage exposure in Bull Run Portland has an outstanding record of safe operations. Yearly watershed inspections conducted by State of Oregon since 1992 have also rated the water supply system as being in good operating condition. To ensure the continued safety of the system, many water quality parameters are monitored at the source and throughout the distribution system far more frequently than is mandated by law. In the event of a total coliform or E. coli detection, PWB has a rigorous response plan that includes a plan for notification, protocols for actions at the reservoir and in the distribution system, record-keeping, and follow-up actions.**
- **Water quality data collected from two of Portland’s uncovered reservoirs indicated no presence of pathogenic Cryptosporidium – 36 water samples totaling 7,000 liters were collected from Reservoirs 4 and 5 between June 2008 and April 2009 as part of Water Research Foundation study 3021. “The testing method employed was not EPA Method 1623 and was instead designed to detect only the presence of infectious Cryptosporidium.”* Zero infectious oocysts were detected in the 36 samples.**

*** PWB misunderstood the methodology and was incorrect in their assertions. Method EPA 1623 HV 1000 was used, is more rigorous, and is acceptable along with HCT 8 cell cultures. The study was appropriate.**

Very Important Friends of Reservoirs letter to Portland City Council

January 17, 2010

**Mayor Sam Adams and City Commissioners
1120 SW Fifth Ave
Portland, Oregon 97204-1926
RE: SDWA Open Reservoir Alternative Compliance
Dear Mayor Sam Adams and City Commissioners,**

On December 16, 2009 EPA replied [1] to Commissioner Leonard's November 2009 request for clarification regarding the reservoir Variance application process. In this reply the EPA contends that the Variance provided for by Congress within the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) is not available for the open reservoirs.

Ten months ago in March 2009 EPA responded in the same manner to New York City, another city seeking to retain their large Hillview open reservoir. New York was not deterred by EPA's response [2] and New York's legal team advised the Portland Water Bureau that the EPA's interpretation of the variance applicability is in fact wrong. We agree EPA is wrong. The SDWA clearly authorizes EPA to grant a variance from the LT2 "cover or treat" Cryptosporidium "treatment technique" requirement.

New York's Department of Environmental Quality spent more than a year compiling data, 161 pages, to support the retention of its Hillview reservoir.

Unfortunately, during that same period of time the Portland Water Bureau focused a majority of its resources on developing and implementing fast-tracked reservoir burial projects, doing so without any public involvement.

New York City's extensive undeterred efforts to preserve their open reservoir provide a clear blueprint for action by the City of Portland. The community expectation is that the City makes a serious effort to secure the available SWDA reservoir variance, an effort evidenced in part by a Water Bureau work product. A single late-date letter to the EPA regarding a reservoir variance is not enough.

The Friends of the Reservoirs offer the following advice:

1. Stop approving consultant contracts. The plan filed with the EPA in March 2009 gives YOU, City Council the power to alter the plan or the pace at which it is implemented. As noted in the fine print, the reservoir burial plan is contingent upon City Council approval of individual projects; it can be renegotiated with the EPA if the City Council does not approve the current schedule for any particular project within it.
2. Require the Portland Water Bureau to prepare a detailed report documenting relevant scientific data in support of a reservoir variance.
3. Seek an extension or deferral from the EPA from the burial projects. Community stakeholders have long recommended this action for both the open reservoirs and the source water requirement.
4. Engage the assistance of the City Attorney and/or outside counsel Foley Hoag.
5. Seek further assistance from Senator Jeff Merkley who has demonstrated his support for retention of the open reservoirs.
6. Submit the data to the EPA or state of Oregon if the state has assumed Primacy for the regulation; in 2006 the state legislature unanimously approved and the

Governor signed into law a state provision for variances with the full knowledge that Portland would be seeking such a variance for its open reservoirs.

7. Do not rule out legislation. The opportunity for further Congressional intervention is not only possible but also likely in light of the acknowledged flaws with EPA's source water variance plan [3].

The American Water Works Association Research Foundation 3021 study preliminary report addresses the flaws of EPA's LT2. This report is discussed in the Friends of the Reservoirs September 2, 2009 letter to City Council.

In an internal EPA memo (3/31/09) addressing the reservoir applicable SDWA variance provision EPA's legal counsel states "The alternative treatment technique is available but not approvable because the only alternative EPA is aware of is a risk mitigation plan ... (emphasis added)" EPA states that it wants to be consistent in its denial. Scientific data is an "approvable" way of demonstrating that our open reservoirs pose no greater risk to public health than covering or additionally treating [4].

The goal of the rule is to reduce disease incidence associated with *Cryptosporidium* and other disease-causing microorganisms in drinking water through "treatment techniques".

Scientific data from the recent American Water Works Association Research Association Foundation study AwwarF 3021 testing large volumes of water at the outlets of Portland's open reservoirs demonstrated that there are zero infectious *Cryptosporidium* in our open reservoirs. Burying, covering, or additionally treating the open reservoirs will not reduce the level of infectious *Crptosporidium* to below Zero. Portland's Total Coliform Rule data meets EPA standards. Our reservoirs are not subject to surface water runoff; they are cleaned twice a year.

As Commissioner Saltzman said last July about LT2, "this is a regulation in search of a problem... we should continue to pursue all alternative options beyond a large capital project."

Given the extensive scientific data in support of retaining Portland's open reservoirs, the broad-based community support for retaining our open reservoirs, the exorbitant cost of burial (\$403million, \$800 million with debt service) and the new public health risks [5] associated with covered reservoirs, it is incumbent on the City to push back and push back hard.

Sincerely,
Floy Jones

On behalf of The Friends of the Reservoirs

Cc Interested parties

[1] On January 12 during a Council session the community was told that a reply from the EPA on a reservoir variance had not been received; then on January 13 the Water Bureau issued a press release advising of the December 16 EPA response indicating that the original letter was somehow lost.

[2] Based on extensive review of water-quality data and other information collected by the Department of Environmental Protection, New York believes they can make the requisite showings required by the variance from the reservoir cover or additionally treat requirement. Portland's data is superior to that of New York. Portland can make the requisite showing that our open reservoirs have not caused Cryptosporidium or other drinking water related disease.

[3] EPA moved the goal post twice on the source water variance plan, which consumed more than 17 months. If EPA refuses to accept the new science that supports genotyping, confirming whether any oocyst is harmful (dead or alive, "viability of the oocyst), and insists on sampling away from our source water out in the tributaries then further federal intervention will be necessary

[4] While EPA has documented public health illness and deaths only with buried and covered storage, EPA failed to establish the general level of contamination in buried and covered storage thus EPA cannot factually state that buried and covered storage is more protective than open storage. See EPA white paper

http://www.epa.gov/safewater/disinfection/tcr/pdfs/whitepaper_tcr_storage.pdf

[5] EPA in its own white paper acknowledges that cancer-causing nitrification could be an unintended consequence of its LT2 reservoir requirement. Nitrification occurs in the absence of sunlight in chloraminated systems, see section 3.2 Absence of sunlight, pg.11

http://www.epa.gov/ogwdw000/disinfection/tcr/pdfs/whitepaper_tcr_nitrification.pdf

Radon gas is a recognized toxic contaminate that is found in Portland's Columbia South Shore Well Field ground water aquifers, which are Portland's backup water supply. This gas is a serious problem in NE Portland. Burying the reservoirs risks additional radon venting into Portland homes.

PORTLAND WATER BUREAU –LETTER TO OHA

August 23, 2011

Mr. David Leland, Program Manager

Oregon Health Authority Drinking Water Program

P.O. Box 14450 Portland, OR 97293-0450

Dear Mr. Leland:

Last Friday in a letter from Administrator Lisa Jackson, the EPA reversed its longstanding refusal to review the requirements of the federal LT2 rule as they

pertain to uncovered finished drinking water reservoirs. The reversal came in response to a July 20th request from Senator Chuck Schumer to the agency. In the letter, the EPA states:

“...as part of the Agency’s Final Plan for Periodic Retrospective Review of Regulations, as well as the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), the Agency will review the LT2 rule. In doing so, EPA will reassess and analyze new data and information regarding occurrence, treatment, analytical methods, health effects, and risk from viruses, Giardia, and Cryptosporidium to evaluate whether there are new or additional ways to manage risk while assuring equivalent or improved public health protection.”

In light of this significant and unanticipated change in federal drinking water policy, the City requests an indefinite suspension in Portland’s uncovered drinking water reservoir compliance schedule during EPA’s review of the federal LT2 rule. It is critical to the City to remain in regulatory compliance with the LT2 rule during EPA’s review and it therefore seeks written approval from the Oregon Health Authority Drinking Water Program of Portland’s request for a suspension of the City’s state approved schedule.

While it is uncertain what opportunities for alternative compliance may emerge from EPA’s review, the City may choose not to proceed with its current plans for constructing additional storage at Kelly Butte until the implications of EPA’s review and any subsequent changes in the federal LT2 rule are known.

Once the EPA’s review is complete and Portland is given the opportunity to explore any alternative compliance methods that may become available, the City will propose a detailed amended schedule for compliance with the rule.

Please do not hesitate to contact me to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,

David. G. Shaff

Administrator

Deficiencies of Closed and Covered Reservoirs –

In 1949- 1969: American Water Works Association, American Public Health Association, and US Public Health proposed covering reservoirs even though there were *no historical or current public health problems with open reservoirs*. While these organizations were covering reservoirs, closed reservoirs were being built and maintained with materials such as lead based paints and petroleum based coatings on the interior of reservoirs. As early as 1904 *lead based paints* were recognized as toxic. Since 1920's *benzene*, a component of petroleum has been known to cause cancer. (see more below) Thus, these materials have been widely known and recognized for decades as toxic and carcinogenic while in direct contact with drinking water. These toxic and carcinogenic chemicals can still be found and used with closed reservoir structures placed drinking water and public health at risk. (54)

Although the covered reservoir storage facility is normally an enclosed structure, numerous access points can become entry points for debris and contaminants. Consumer deaths from closed reservoirs are historically well documented from these points of entry. These contaminant pathways include roof top access hatches, sidewall joints, vent and overflow piping, roof cracks, and workmanship inconsistencies.

The most common problems reported from inspectors in covered reservoirs:

- no bug screens on vents and overflows,
- cathodic systems not adjusted or operating properly,
- unlocked access hatches,
- presence of lead paint (interior and exterior) and the
- presence of unapproved paints.


Common coating problems reported by tank inspectors relating to water quality:

- chemical leaching from incompletely cured coating;
- corrosion product buildup from excessive interior corrosion,
- turbidity events from bottom sediments,
- unknown chemical leaching from non approved coatings and lead leaching from lead based interior coatings.

Points of public health concern:

- disinfectant decay- nitrification facilitation from dark environment
- chemical contaminants- toxic and carcinogenic coatings
- DBP retention- lack of atmospheric volatility
- DBP retention-lack of sunlight

- Tastes and odors- anaerobic flora metabolites
- Sedimentation / biofilm- less frequent cleaning schedule + 5 years
- Microbial contaminants- known source of many consumer deaths
- Roof leakage and contamination cement seams (Seattle)
- Roof leakage and benzene from rubberized asphalt degrading(Seattle)
- Accumulation of toxic filtration media remaining in seldom cleaned tanks



**Unhealthy Accumulation of Post-Filter Media in Drinking Water.
Aluminum Sulfate (Alum) in Seldom Cleaned Covered Reservoir**

Covered reservoir storage facilities have been identified in microbial drinking waterborne disease deaths and outbreaks. Microbial- case studies:

- In 1993 *Salmonella typhimurium* was identified in a Gideon Missouri outbreak from bird contamination in a covered municipal water storage tank. Pigeon droppings from the roof area carried into the openings of closed tank were identified as the etiological agent. Seven persons died, and hundreds became ill.
- Also in 1993 a *Campylobacter jejuni* outbreak in Minnesota from a drinking water storage tower. Fecal coliform were also found.
- In 2008, *Salmonella typhimurium* caused another death and hundreds of illnesses from a drinking water closed reservoir in Alamosa, Colorado. Contaminants identified from bird access unobserved in covered reservoir.



Covered Alamosa Colorado reservoir- Salmonella bacteria from prolonged bird roosting exposures that were not visible or detected causing illness and death.

Concerns from Questionable Water Engineering Judgment Decisions; Past and Current Covered Reservoir Surfaces Coated with Toxic Materials

Coating materials are used to prevent hydrostatic (water) moisture migration in concrete tanks, pH changes and corrosion of steel storage tanks. Coatings used in finished water storage facilities were selected because of their structure protection and ease of application. The common use of coal tars, greases, waxes, and lead paints as interior tank coatings was accepted by engineers. These products contributed significant toxic chemical exposure to the drinking water. Grease coatings can differ in their composition

from vegetable to petroleum and can provide food for bacteria resulting in disinfection problems along with taste and odor issues in finished water.

Covered reservoir toxic chemical - case studies:

- Petroleum grease from 1925, in a Florida storage tank interior caused odor, taste, disinfectant, and slime problems. In 1988 the facility and grease was reapplied. The grease was removed in 1996 and a polyamide epoxy was applied.
- East Bay Municipal Utility District used hot-mopped coal tar as their interior coating material for tanks through the 1960's. Hot-mopped coal tar is still seen today in operating water tanks at other utilities.
- Structural and building designs continue to be problematic in closed and covered reservoirs. Cracks in the ceiling of the new 2009 Seattle reservoirs can allow for intrusions of contaminated water and be problematic, regardless of the rubberized asphalt barrier replacement. The new toxic and carcinogenic material placed over cracks in the reservoir ceiling is a petroleum based asphalt/ benzene material. Microorganisms can break down the petroleum-based carbon substrate releasing benzene and other toxins into reservoir ceiling cracks and water.

There are newer coating applications such as aluminum, polyurethane, and chlorinated rubber. Leaching of organic contaminants from flat steel panels can occur with various coatings including vinyl, chlorinated rubber, epoxy, asphalt, and coal tar, etc. Coal tar coating and lining can still be found, and is used in California as a coating material. Elevated levels of alkyl benzenes, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH's) have been reported in coal tar bituminous coatings. In tanks that remain in use, organics can be leached into drinking water, especially if there is not enough curing time after coating application

Additional closed reservoir chemical problems occur from reduced disinfectant residual and sedimentation. Debris can enter any closed reservoir system. Cleaning schedules in closed reservoirs are recommended to be ~ 5 years. A case study of three elevated tanks in Brookfield Wisconsin documented cleaning intervals of 15 years for one closed reservoir, and 7 year cleaning intervals for the other 2 closed reservoir tanks. Sediment of 28 inches was found in the 15 year tank and 4-12 inches of sediment in the other 2 tanks. Extremely high bacteria counts were found in all tanks. (55, 56, 57, 58)



Covered reservoir that had not been cleaned for a long time. Deceased rat on layers of unhealthy alum filtration chemicals that remain in drinking water. Contaminated water consumed for extended periods of time.

APPENDIX 3

City of Portland Auditor reports – 2004, 2011, 2012*

Reviews of Portland Water Bureau neglected maintenance and poor management risking public health and unnecessary increased costs

✓ PORTLAND'S WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM Maintenance Program Needs Improvement- August 2004


Office of the City Auditor Portland, Oregon report #299

“Water mains are flushed and replaced infrequently, valves receive minimal exercising and maintenance, and meters are repaired and replaced slowly. In addition, the backlog of needed repairs has grown. Although water quality and reliability have not yet been adversely affected, we believe continued decline in the maintenance of the water distribution system assets could negatively affect water service performance in the future,” “The Bureau lacks a clear and comprehensive maintenance plan, complete and reliable information on the nature and condition of its assets and adequate methods to organize and schedule maintenance work.”


The AWWA indicates that periodic flushing of main water lines is needed to remove bacteriological growth, sediment, and corrosion, to improve flow, and to introduce fresh water with higher chlorine residual. The most effective form of flushing is unidirectional flushing, which entails comprehensive flushing of large areas of pipe in order to systematically cleanse the pipes of debris. The Bureau's ability to perform unidirectional flushing is also hampered because the Bureau does not regularly exercise and maintain valves and does not have a complete and accurate inventory of valve status and location.

“the feet of mains replaced dropped from 46,500 to 9,800 feet, a 79 percent decline. If main replacement continues at the same rate as the past five years, it will take the Bureau over 400 years to replace all the City's 2,000 miles of water mains.”
Fire hydrants, water meters, water valves being paved over and all being neglected by Portland Water Bureau maintenance.

“A recently completed analysis of outstanding work orders by Construction and Support supervisors indicates the work order backlog may currently represent in excess of 26,000 hours of needed repairs and maintenance.”



Biofilm buildup in water distribution pipes from neglected flushing




Microorganism Biofilm Build up Process-Distribution System Water Pipe.

Biofilm build up harbors unwanted disease causing microorganisms as we saw in the fall 2013 fecal contamination event throughout the Portland drinking water system. Reported exclusively by news journalist Carla Castaño KOIN 6 CBS.

Scheduled Routine Flushing of System Can Remove Microorganisms.

**Portland Water Bureau Does Not Keep Up With Routine Maintenance
Placing Water Quality and Public Health at Risk**



Biofilm and Sediment Buildup on Inside of Water Distribution System Showing

Bacteria and other Microorganisms Build up in Distribution pipes

✓ **SPENDING UTILITY RATEPAYER MONEY:**

Not always linked to services, decision process inconsistent

Office of City Auditor Portland, Oregon March 2011 report # 398

The City of Portland operates water and sewer utilities, and is required by City Charter to spend ratepayer money from water and sewer operations on these utilities. Recent concerns about the use of utility ratepayer money for non-utility purposes led us to conduct this audit. Our objectives were to determine whether utility ratepayer money is used for non-utility purposes, and whether the decision making process and uses of ratepayer money are transparent to the public. The audit scope included utility ratepayer money spent by the Bureau of Environmental Services (which operates the sewer system) and the Water Bureau.

Most City spending of ratepayer money was both related to providing a utility service and approved through the complete public budget process. However, we identified other examples where this was not the case. We found that ratepayer money spent by the City falls into three categories:

1. Ratepayer money spent for purposes directly linked to providing water and sewer services that also followed the City's complete financial planning and budget process.
2. Ratepayer money spent for purposes not directly linked to providing water and sewer services, but followed the City's complete financial planning and budget process.
3. Ratepayer money spent for purposes not directly linked to providing water and sewer services, and did not follow the City's complete financial planning and budget process.

The items to consider when making decisions regarding the spending of ratepayer money are whether the utility charges are just and equitable and based on reasonable cost-of-service principles, whether the revenue is spent on utility service related purposes, and whether the utility system is operated in an efficient and effective manner.



Neglected pipe. Deferred maintenance biofilm /sediment. Portland Water Bureau management risks public health. For over a decade below industry standards. Biofilm slime can exert a great demand for chlorine. Water quality is at risk.



Example of properly maintained water pipe that has been routinely flushed.

✓ **PORTLAND WATER BUREAU:**

**Further advances in asset management would
benefit ratepayers report # 405**

From City Auditor LaVonne Griffin-Valade June 2012

Water users depend on Portland Water Bureau assets- pipelines, pump stations, tanks, and other equipment that supply homes businesses with clean water. These physical assets are valued at \$7 billion. The Bureau supplies ~100 million gallons of water a day. Asset failures such as pipe breaks could result in health emergencies and significant repair costs.

City policy requires bureaus to maintain assets in good working order to minimize future costs of maintaining and replacing them, especially to avoid costly deferred maintenance.

We found that the Bureau has developed an overarching data management strategy, but has not yet implemented key tasks to meet general Bureau needs nor to meet specialized asset management needs. For many years the Bureau has known about its data limitations. These limitations impact the data quality used for decision-making, and the efficiency of its business processes.

Improving data management depends on leadership, dedicated technical resources and assigning responsibility for making data management improvements.

We found that although the Bureau has defined its service levels, it is not using essential service levels systematically in budgeting.

The Bureau has not gotten agreement from representative customers that the identified service levels are appropriate for decision making. In addition, many of its 27 defined service levels do not clearly express which service is delivered, and some are not clear about what is actually measured.

Without plans decisions are made on a case by case basis by individual managers and the Bureau may not perform asset maintenance repair and replacement at the best times to save costs.

We also found that even when the Bureau had plans for asset groups, the extent of implementing the plans was unclear. Plans were partly implemented, but lacked elements needed for accountability.

City of Portland Auditor's Office recommends that Commissioner in Charge direct the Portland Water Bureau to:

- ☐ Deploy resources, formalize leadership and develop accountability structures to implement a data management approach that meets the Bureau's asset management needs.**
- ☐ Identify and clarify the essential required service levels, obtain confirmation from representative customers so that required service levels can be more useful in decisions about resource allocation, and apply service levels as budget criteria.**
- ☐ Document management decisions and directions for action in Asset Management Plans to increase accountability and the likelihood of implementing the plans to benefit customers. Consider an overall asset management plan or other means of clarifying management policy and providing guidance for decision making.**
- ☐ Incorporate an accountability framework throughout the Bureau to increase the likelihood of successfully meeting its objectives.**

***For Auditor Reports see: City of Portland Auditor- Audit Report Index by year
<http://www.portlandonline.com/Auditor/Index.cfm?c=27096>**

OPEN RESERVOIR QUESTIONS and ANSWERS

Provided below are recent and supportive open reservoir engineering assessments and scientifically supported answers for the community's understanding of the public health benefits.


✓ Condition of open reservoirs at Mount Tabor 2009 Report

The Mount Tabor Park Reservoirs' structures and buildings are considered nationally significant as part of an early design for a city's open water storage system. The system is historically significant for its initial construction and subsequent additions involving monumental civic undertakings, for the exemplification of early concrete engineering construction technology, and for its architectural design. As recognition of their historic significance, the buildings, structures, and site were nominated to the National Register of Historic Places and received designation as the Mount Tabor Park Reservoirs Historic District on January 15, 2004. Generally, those features within the district boundary that date from the initial construction in 1894 through construction and additions dating to 1951 are considered historic contributing.

As viewed from a historic resource perspective, the historic resources in the Mount Tabor Park Reservoirs Historic District are, for the most part, in good condition. The structures and buildings were carefully designed and were built for durability and low maintenance. Those considerations have allowed the structures to age gracefully. The facilities are currently used on a daily basis.

Very few original construction components have been lost or removed. There have been minor modifications to the facilities to allow continued operation. In many cases, these alterations, such as new electronic measuring or pipe controls, supplement the historic resources instead of replacing them. The most significant deterioration is found at the oldest facility, Reservoir No. 1, where the decorative concrete finishes on the site wall and gate house are deteriorated. Some components have been recently renovated, such as painting of the wrought iron fencing assembly located around Reservoirs No. 1 and No. 5. Other components, such as roofing, are currently in serviceable condition but will need to be replaced shortly. Still other features may be advised to be replaced for restoration purposes. (59)

The general summary of the facilities being in good condition reflects the strong construction and engineering principles of 100 years ago. Attending to deferred maintenance and some cosmetic intervention of our open reservoirs will provide many more years of reliable safe and healthy drinking water for all.



History-

The City of Portland has 5 open reservoirs for drinking water. Three of the reservoirs are located at Mt. Tabor and two are located in Washington Park. Reservoir 1 at Mt Tabor and Reservoirs 3 and 4 at Washington Park were all completed in 1894. Reservoirs 5 and 6 at Mt. Tabor were completed in 1911. All of the reservoirs are of concrete construction and reflected the best thinking of the 1890's and early 1900's from an advanced engineering perspective and from the perspective of managing a public water supply. The engineering and construction principles of our open reservoirs were ahead of their time using advanced technologies that provide safe and healthy drinking water for us today. Ernest Ransome provided specialized cold twisted metal rebar rods and innovative reinforced concrete to build the open reservoirs that have lasted over a century and will last decades longer when properly maintained.

Ernest Ransome's engineering skills that were applied to our open reservoirs are further recognized from innovative construction in the San Francisco Bay area. Ransome's two experimental buildings at Stanford University survived the 1906 San Francisco earthquake essentially without damage while the university's newer, conventional brick

structures literally crumbled around them. The published analysis of Ransome's two buildings by fellow engineer John B. Leonard did much to advance the safety of buildings in post-1906 San Francisco and nationwide.

The movement to covered reservoirs came after 1946 when new jobs were needed for returning veterans. The US Public Health Service and American Public Health Association made the recommendation for covered reservoirs based on health benefits that contradict earlier acknowledgements of open reservoir health benefits.

(Dr. M.J. Rosenau 1902 Harvard School of Public Health)

Covered reservoirs have security and contamination issues. Open reservoirs are cleaned 2x year. Covered reservoirs have not provided the public health benefits open reservoirs provide. Covered reservoirs are cleaned every 5 years or longer allowing for sedimentation, increased disinfectant demand and disinfectant byproduct formation, and microbial issues.

“Although the storage facility is normally an enclosed (covered) structure, numerous access points can become entry points for debris and contaminants. These pathways may include roof top access hatches and appurtenances, sidewall joints, vent and overflow piping.”

“Microbial contamination from birds or insects is a major water quality problem in storage tanks (covered reservoirs). One tank inspection firm that inspects 60 to 75 tanks each year in Missouri and southern Illinois reports that 20 to 25 percent of tanks inspected have serious sanitary defects; and eighty to ninety percent of these tanks have various minor flaws that could lead to sanitary problems (Zelch 2002). Most of these sanitary defects stem from design problems with roof hatch systems and vents that do not provide a watertight seal. Older cathodic protection systems of the hanging type also did not provide a tight seal. When standing inside the tank, daylight can be seen around these fixtures. The gaps allow spiders, bird droppings and other contaminants to enter the tank. (Zelch 2002) reports a trend of positive total coliform bacteria occurrences in the fall due to water turnover in tanks. Colder water enters a tank containing warm water, causing the water in the tank to turn over. The warm water that has aged in the tank all summer is discharged to the system and is often suspected as the cause of total coliform occurrences.” (55)

The premise of covered reservoirs reducing risk has proven to be widely unfounded. Toxic and carcinogenic materials have been widely used in and on covered reservoirs. Materials that are NOT used on open reservoirs.

Portland open reservoirs have not had any deaths or public health outbreaks from chemicals or microorganisms. One alleged outbreak of waterborne Giardia illness in Portland took place in 1954. However, “failure to isolate *G. lamblia* from suspect water strongly influenced investigators to reject drinking water as the possible vehicle of infection.”(60)

Water samples from Oregon Health Authority remain within EPA standards. Viruses, Cryptosporidium, Giardia, and other microorganisms have not been identified in Portland’s open reservoirs. Algae are not a public health issue in our open reservoirs and are limited in growth from the nitrogen and phosphorous fertilizers originating from the Columbia South Shore Well field water. Bull Run water has minimal levels because there is no agricultural chemical exposure.

APPENDIX – 5

Portland Water Bureau Answers to Frequently Asked Questions About Portland's Open Reservoirs

The Portland Water Bureau answers are outdated.

1. Why is Portland required to discontinue using the open reservoirs at Mt. Tabor and Washington Park?

PWB -In 2006 the Environmental Protection Agency finalized the Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule, known as LT2 for short. The rule requires that water utilities discontinue the use of open finished water reservoirs or treat the water as it exits the reservoir for Cryptosporidium, Giardia, and viruses.

A. Since 2004 comment period, 2006 final rule, and 2012 LT2 review, the EPA regulation has been challenged by water utilities such as New York City, because it is scientifically unsupported. The EPA regulation is currently being reviewed for another 2 years yet our City Council continues to unnecessarily fast-track closure of the safe and healthy water from the open reservoirs. City Council has replaced one reservoir with a covered reservoir that is poorly engineered and constructed that leaked millions of gallons of water per week. Cryptosporidium, viruses and Giardia have never been detected in our open reservoirs and water samples for bacteria support the safety of the water. Had Portland City Council used the public health science provided by citizens and scientific literature, the reservoirs would remain open today with safer and healthier water than those that are covered as we have shown in this document.

2) What about getting the "waiver" people are talking about?

PWB - There is no such thing as a "waiver." When advocates speak of getting a "waiver", they are talking about legislative action by the Congress to amend the federal Safe Drinking Water Act and exempt Portland from the rule which would then have to be signed by the President in order to become law.

Commissioner Leonard did ask our Congressional representatives about the likelihood of obtaining legislative action on behalf of Portland and was told there was no support in Congress for such an amendment.

A. This is an incorrect comment put out by Portland Water Bureau. The “waiver” option always exists with EPA. It is a *simple agreement* between the EPA and the water utility. Portland has been under a “waiver” from EPA for decades under the Filtration Avoidance Determination. It is a waiver from filtering in effect today. The problem in Portland is Portland City Council has never presented the scientific

argument for the EPA waiver as we have asked them to do. If the “waiver” does not exist.....then why are the New York City mayor, their Council and Congressional delegation asking for the EPA Waiver to keep their open reservoir? The waiver option does exist no matter what PWB says. It’s the only permanent solution. Portland City Council needs to adopt the 2004 decision of Open Reservoir Independent Review Panel’s majority vote outlining the well-defined scientific basis, asking for the EPA Waiver we so justifiably deserve.

3. Does covered storage increase risks of gas buildup in the reservoirs?

PWB - No. All reservoirs, covered or uncovered, have an air gap above the water surface that is vented into the atmosphere. For nearly 30 years, almost every customer of the Portland Water Bureau has consumed drinking water that has been stored in a covered reservoir or tank, and the water quality consistently meets or exceeds that of the open reservoirs.

Closed reservoirs, because they continue to have air exchange above the water surface, allow venting to occur. Screened vents in closed reservoirs are sized to ensure adequate air flow through the reservoir to prevent pressurization and also prevent "off-gas" buildup. Air quality has not been a problem at any of the Water Bureau’s many closed reservoirs and tanks. The Water Bureau inspects and maintains vents and reservoir access points are on a regular basis to prevent intrusions from animals, birds or humans. Additionally, the State Drinking Water Program performs inspections at these sites every three years.

- A. Another PWB answer that is false and has little scientific basis. Gas build-up such as methane in covered reservoirs has caused death from inhalation. Because covered reservoirs are so poorly maintained being cleaned from 5-25 years, anaerobic (oxygen absent) bacteria in sediments and debris generate toxic gases. The open reservoirs acting as a barrier to toxic chemicals provide 100% efficiency and volatilization/vaporization of gases before they enter schools, homes and businesses. Covered reservoirs cannot provide the same efficiencies in removing gasses. The vents of covered reservoirs are mostly allowing air IN to the reservoir to allow a smooth flow of water to the outlet and not allowing vacuum interference of water flow. Contrast in air efficiencies is shown by Open v. Powell Butte 2 inefficiency. For example: open reservoir at Mount Tabor 6 is 100% efficient with open air and fountains. Powell Butte 2 at 5 acres ~ 218,000 sq. ft. with small vents at ~ 80 sq. feet opening is ~ .00037% of outside air communication venting footage efficiency. Because of aeration, quality of Portland’s drinking water is excellent from open reservoirs. Changing to a covered drinking water system quickly degrades water quality with unwanted toxic and carcinogenic chemicals.**

4) Is radon an issue in Portland drinking water that will be affected by eliminating open drinking water storage?

PWB- No. Radon is not detectable in Portland's main supply, the Bull Run watershed, which contributes on average over 97% of the total water supply. Radon gas naturally occurs in the western United States from underground rock formations. Portland has detectable amounts of radon in its water system from the Columbia South Shore Well Field which is used for emergency backup and to augment the Bull Run source to provide summer supply and constitutes an average of approximately 3% of the total water supply. However, these amounts do not cause the drinking water to exceed the proposed rule for radon.

A. Radon in drinking water at any level is very serious. EPA "there is no safe level of radon, any exposure poses some risk of cancer."(EPA 2013) Portland receives radioactive radon water from Columbia South Shore Well field every year during maintenance or supplemental needs. CSSW can be used for emergencies at any time. Radon exposure for unknown periods of time can be expected to add public health risk entering homes, schools and work places. Radon in drinking water is not regulated by EPA. PWB does not have to disclose it exists in our water, but it is still there anyway producing radioactive materials we breathe and drink. That is why we need to retain open reservoirs for active ventilation and removal of radon gas before it enters homes schools and workplaces. EPA acknowledges radon to be the highest cancer causing risk of any drinking water contaminant. (EPA 1998)

5) What is nitrification, and are closed reservoirs a risk in Portland's system?

PWB- Nitrification is a biochemical process that in excess can interfere with the disinfection process in drinking water systems. The conditions within Portland's open finished drinking water reservoirs are more conducive to causing nitrification than the conditions within closed reservoirs.

In Portland's drinking water system, the first step of the nitrification process-- decomposition of chloramine disinfectant-- is accelerated by loss of chlorine residual as drinking water passes through the open reservoirs. Exposure of chloraminated water over a large surface area to wind and sunlight and airborne pollutants such as pollen, dust and animal waste has a significant role in this decomposition of the chloramines. Closed water storage facilities (i.e. tanks or covered reservoirs) do typically have the type of bacteria which are capable of feeding on ammonia and contributing to nitrification. However, without significant availability of ammonia from chloramine decomposition, or high temperatures, it is difficult for such bacteria to multiply and interfere with disinfection.

- A. The correct answer. *“consequently, nitrification episodes in distribution systems occur in the dark, i.e., in covered reservoirs, pipelines, taps, etc.”*(EPA 2002)

Open reservoirs *inhibit* nitrification, not encourage it, thus the explanation from PWB is far from truthful or accurate. Because PWB has neglected and deferred pipeline system maintenance, buildup of biofilm and sedimentation has increased the chlorine demand part of the chloramine molecule. This leads to ammonia/nitrogen exposures in the dark resulting in nitrification as EPA has already acknowledged. Sunlight from open reservoirs disrupts the microbial nitrification process seen in the pipes, and covered reservoirs. Unwanted nitrogen based chemicals are also broken down by sunlight like NDMA, nitrite, nitrate, etc.

6) What role does sunlight play in disinfection of drinking water in open reservoirs? PWB-Exposure to sunlight raises water temperatures and encourages the growth of algae and bacteria, which has been a recurring problem at our open reservoirs. Sunlight can also contribute to an increase in disinfection byproducts, loss of chlorine, reduction of pH (which can cause corrosion in home plumbing), increased total coliform production, and taste and odor issues. Additionally, elevated water temperatures in the open reservoirs increases nitrification and growth of total coliforms. In highly controlled settings, processes similar to sunlight are used to provide water treatment; however, natural sunlight is not strong enough to provide demonstrable improvement in water quality. The exposure to sunlight actually has a greater number of negatives than positives. Sunlight is not a controllable treatment method, and cannot not be relied upon to adequately disinfect drinking water.

A. Sunlight has been recognized over the centuries as an important and valuable asset to drinking water safety and health referred to as “solar disinfection”. The natural disinfection premise of open reservoirs was built on this principle. Algae and bacteria are growth based on the nutrients present such as nitrogen and phosphorous coming up from CSSW, not sunlight. Chloramine is a stronger molecule than chlorine and lasts longer in sunlight. (WHO 2004) Sunlight breaks down disinfection byproducts and other unwanted chemicals. Sunlight adds to the oxygenated water creating oxides for natural microbial control much on the principle of hydrogen peroxides. Algae are naturally present and remove acidic chemicals helping make water pH balanced. PWB does not seem to understand the microbiology, physics, or chemistry.

“In addition surface waters are exposed to natural UV irradiation in sunlight which may damage oocyst (Cryptosporidium) DNA thereby inhibiting DNA replication and reducing infectivity.” (AWWA RF 3021 2008)

7) Why have waterborne disease outbreaks been associated with closed drinking water reservoirs?

PWB- Portland has never had a disease outbreak caused by its closed storage reservoirs. Closed reservoirs that have had waterborne outbreaks have been in systems that experienced operational or mechanical failures and which have typically been infiltrated by animals.

Open reservoirs, on the other hand, with their large water surface areas are much more vulnerable to animals entering, swimming, defecating, or dying in them. It is fairly common for Portland Water Bureau maintenance workers to find dead animals, excrement and other contaminants in the open reservoirs – this water goes directly to the customers' tap without further treatment. Many of the documented outbreaks associated with closed reservoirs have been tracked to animals that have made their way into closed reservoirs. Animals are able to enter a closed reservoir through a broken or missing screen on its vent or overflow. Due to the screening of vents and overflow piping, evidence of animal access has never been discovered in our closed storage tanks. In Oregon, the State Drinking Water Program reviews the function of vent screens and overflows. The Water Bureau inspects and maintains vent screens and access points to its closed reservoirs and tanks on a monthly basis.

A. Our open reservoirs have never had a microbiological, chemical or disease issue resulting in illness or death. *Portland Water Bureau has never been able to demonstrate the debris they claim to find has a chain of custody originating from the open reservoirs.* All we see is material placed on a tarp in the area outside the open reservoirs. Portland's open reservoirs have never had a negative impact on water quality as shown by no *Cryptosporidium*, viruses, or *Giardia*. Water samples for bacteria meet EPA and Oregon Health Authority standards. Covered reservoirs in Portland have had vandalism and dangerous chemicals thrown in them. As an example, the covered reservoir at the top of Mount Tabor had hydrochloric acid and other debris dropped in it. It was never reported by Portland Water Bureau to the public (May 28, 2012). Other covered reservoirs in Missouri and Colorado have had deaths from bacteria. Unlike the covered reservoirs, other open reservoirs across US do not have health issues either. Open reservoirs continue to provide safe and healthy drinking water for the citizens of Portland.

8) What about rubberized asphalt coatings leaching into the water on a new reservoir?

PWB-The new reservoirs planned at Powell Butte and Kelly Butte will be built of reinforced concrete. No rubberized asphalt coatings will be placed inside the reservoirs next to the drinking water. However, it is standard practice to apply waterproofing to the exterior of concrete structures of this type.

A. Rubberized asphalt is a toxic petrochemical based sealant used on concrete reservoir roofs and elsewhere on the covered reservoirs. As we have seen in the Powell Butte 2 construction problems with many, cracks in the roof and elsewhere. Applying the rubberized asphalt compound becomes a public health problem. It is sealed with hot mopped coal tar that is also petro chemical based and has polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) cancer causing component. Rubberized asphalt has a benzene component that may be released through microbial degradation of the petrochemicals, thus reaching the drinking water through the many cracks in concrete. These toxic component health issues are overlooked or dismissed by those who are decision makers in constructing these poorly planned and developed covered reservoirs. Standard practice in construction has little value to those who are at risk for toxic and carcinogenic chemical health issues. It is listed in California Proposition 65 as a cancer causing agent.

9) Wouldn't it be cheaper to maintain the open reservoirs than build covered storage?

PWB-The open reservoirs range from 100 to 117 years old. While they may look fine when full, they are in poor condition. The concrete is deteriorated, with cracks and chunks missing, the lining panels have eroded, and the steel pipes and valves are corroding. In the last 10 years \$40 million dollars have been spent on reservoir maintenance, and the costs continue to climb. Perhaps most importantly, the reservoirs and pipes are not structurally sound enough to withstand an earthquake, and would be unusable for water storage at a time when they would be most needed. It has been estimated that the reservoirs would need over \$125 million dollars in improvements to seismically reinforce them. This would still not meet the EPA's regulatory requirement to cover them or treat the water exiting them.

A. The public health benefits of the open reservoirs far outweigh the minor costs to restore and maintain the open reservoirs. Architectural and engineering reports from 1990 have and as recent as 2009 confirm their condition as good with a small amount of restoration needed. The reservoirs are built soundly and have withstood earthquake activities. We reviewed the earthquake discussion during the 2004 Open Reservoir Independent Review Panel and it was confirmed earthquakes were not a structural issue. There is no scientific or engineering reason the reservoirs cannot last decades longer for our public health benefits. The PWB has unnecessarily spent hundreds of millions of dollars to build covered reservoirs we do not need because water usage is declining. The engineering from 100 years ago was ahead of its time and has been shown to remain structurally solid.

10) What was the AwwaRF Project 3021 sampling at Portland's open reservoirs and how does it relate to the requirements of the LT2 rule or a Variance for Open Reservoirs?

PWB- In 2008 and 2009 the Portland Water Bureau participated in the Water Research Foundation (WaterRF) Project 3021, Detection of Infectious Cryptosporidium in Water. The purpose of the WaterRF project was to "examine conventionally filtered surface water for the presence of infectious Cryptosporidium using both cell culture techniques and molecular methods," and "attempt to repeat a recent study that reported a risk of infectious Cryptosporidium in filtered drinking water so that a scientifically sound consensus may be reached."

The Water Bureau's sample volumes ranged from 83.5 liters to 305.6 liters, for a total volume of about 7,000 liters during the study. Eighteen samples were collected approximately twice per month from June 2008 to April 2009. The results of the study were that no infectious Cryptosporidium oocysts were detected in any of the Water Bureau's samples. Additionally, no infectious oocysts were detected for any utility participating in this study.

EPA has indicated that variances are not available for the open reservoir requirements of LT2. Even if a variance to the open reservoir requirements of LT2 were available, the WaterRF study would not be adequate to achieve a variance. The WaterRF study does not document the absence of Cryptosporidium and other public health risks in the open reservoirs. It simply shows that no infectious oocysts were detected in any of Portland's samples collected on 18 occasions. Given the literature that addresses the potential for direct microbial and chemical contamination and other forms of water quality degradation associated with 5 open finished water reservoirs, the data from the WaterRF study would not be considered convincing evidence for EPA, public health officials, or the scientific community in general.

Furthermore, the WaterRF study would not suffice as an adequate variance application (if one were available) for the following reasons:

- 1. The Water Bureau's sampling frequency and total number of samples from this study is insufficient compared to what EPA requested for the source water variance.**
- 2. The Water Bureau's sampling location was only from Reservoir 4 (and occasionally from Reservoir 5) and not representative of all open reservoirs.**
- 3. The WaterRF project did not use EPA Method 1623 for analysis. Method 1623 is required for LT2 monitoring.**
- 4. LT2 samples must be analyzed by an EPA approved laboratory. The laboratory in the Texas Agrilife Research center used in the WaterRF study is not an EPA approved laboratory for Cryptosporidium.**

5. The WaterRF research project did not sample for Giardia or viruses. The LT2 rule states that public water systems "using uncovered finished water storage facilities must either cover the storage facility or treat the storage facility discharge to achieve inactivation and/or removal of 4-log virus, 3-log Giardia lamblia, and 2-log Cryptosporidium." The open reservoir requirements of the LT2 rule are not solely concerned with Cryptosporidium.

A. In 2008 and 2009 the Portland Water Bureau participated in the American Water Works Association Research Foundation (AwwaRF) Project 3021 "Detection of Infectious Cryptosporidium in Water."

The Portland Water Bureau sampled 7000 liters at the outlet of Portland's open reservoirs with zero detects of cryptosporidium while utilizing a sampling method superior to that recommended by the EPA.

The EPA's 1623 HV sampling method has been widely criticized by municipalities and national professional associations because the agency's approved sampling method fails to distinguish between harmless and harmful Cryptosporidium, dead or alive Cryptosporidium and between infectious and noninfectious varieties.

In a 2008 conference presentation AwwaRF 3021 researchers made this statement regarding the current EPA sampling method, "The detection of non-infectious oocysts or oocysts belonging to a species that is not infectious to humans could cause unwarranted concern for a contaminant that may not be significant public health risk."

Portland was one of 19 utilities participating in the study and, according to the study researchers; all utilities including Portland already meet the goal of the LT2 rule based on the statistically significant sampling. The goal of the LT2 rule is to reduce the level of disease in the community.

Both the Safe Drinking Water Act and Oregon state law provide for a reservoir "treatment technique" variance. It has long been recommended by community stakeholders that the Portland Water Bureau follow NYC's lead with regard to pursuing a reservoirs variance: collect and submit the AwwaRF 3021 cryptosporidium data (zero detects) along with Giardia and other necessary data to the State as part of a reservoir variance application.

Public health officials agree that there will be no measurable public health benefit from additionally "treating or covering" Portland's open reservoirs. The State Drinking Water Program now has primacy over the rule but can only consider a reservoir variance application if one is submitted. The City Council should act to ensure that the PWB applies for such a variance.*

***This statement was obtained from the Friends of Reservoirs. The documents from the AWWA RF 3021 study have been read and agree with their position.**

APPENDIX – 6

Covered Reservoirs pattern of corporate cronyism

Construction concerns from poor planning and workmanship


1. Seattle Washington-

http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2009485902_reservoir17m.html

Major do-over for two Seattle reservoirs

The concrete roofs on two of Seattle's newest underground water reservoirs showed leaks and a waterproof barrier must be replaced. West Seattle - Hundreds of waterproofing leaks found at reservoirs.

As Carlos Balansay stood inside the cavernous new underground reservoir that would soon hold 50 million gallons of drinking water, the last thing the construction manager expected to see was water, dripping from a roof that was supposed to be watertight. The drops, first detected last August, have triggered a massive do-over project involving the removal of waterproof coating applied to Beacon Hill's new covered reservoir. A second new reservoir, in West Seattle, had the same orange coating applied to its concrete cover, and it, too, is being blasted off with pressure washers.



Water proof membranes were removed and replaced with rubberized asphalt a petrochemical that contains toxic and carcinogenic chemicals such as benzene. Microorganisms over time begin to biodegrade petrochemicals into smaller components that can enter drinking water through cracks.

2. Seattle Washington-

<http://westseattleblog.com/2009/07/wsb-exclusive-hundreds-of-waterproofing-leaks-found-at-myrtle-beacon-reservoirs-membranes-now-being-dug-up-and-redone/>



West Seattle Blog has learned that Seattle Public Utilities has ordered waterproofing work dug up and redone at two newly covered city reservoirs — Myrtle Reservoir here in West Seattle (photo) and Beacon Hill Reservoir — because of hundreds of leaks discovered in the “membranes” applied to both projects.

3. Seattle Washington 2012

http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2019692615_reservoirs16m.html


Questions over whether 4 buried reservoirs can withstand quake

Four years after discovering leaks in what were supposed to be waterproof reservoir covers, the city is investigating whether its four new underground reservoirs were adequately built to withstand earthquakes.



4. Portland Oregon Powell Butte 2

<http://koin.com/2014/02/26/powell-butte-reservoir-failing-leak-tests/>



Carla Castaño journalist from KOIN 6 News CBS in an exclusive report learned the reservoir has more than 1,000 cracks leaking thousands of gallons of water each day. Using emails from the Portland Water Bureau obtained through a public information request, KOIN 6 News also learned the reservoir is four months behind schedule.

The Powell Butte Reservoir in Portland, Feb. 26, 2014 (KOIN 6 News)

“It appears our reservoir leaking is increasing. We are at roughly 200,000 gallons per 24-hour day in the east and 80,000 gallons per day in the west,” project manager Jim Hall wrote in one email. Hall agreed to speak with KOIN 6 News — until he spoke with the Portland Water Bureau.

“PWB has requested that all interview requests be coordinated through Tim Hall of the P-W-B,” he wrote Wednesday.

Hall spoke briefly with KOIN 6 News, but declined an interview. He released this statement:

“Working with our contractor to find and seal these hair-width cracks is a normal and expected activity, and one of the final steps before the reservoir is put into service.”

Design and engineering groups who worked on reservoirs in this area told KOIN 6 News 1200 cracks sounds like a high number and could be a design flaw. However, they also declined on-camera interviews.

PWB said they are not over budget on the project and said they were behind schedule due to the unexpected rain.

The Portland Water Bureau plans to have this reservoir online by March.

To: Interested Citizens

From: Scott Fernandez, M.Sc. Biology/ microbiology & drinking water chemistry

PUBLIC HEALTH BENEFITS of DEEP OPEN WATER RESERVOIRS

The deep open water reservoirs of Mount Tabor and Washington Park provide many public health advantages.

- Gases that are natural (Radon) and those that are part of the disinfection process (chloroform), two suspected carcinogens, are able to escape into the air before entering the household, school, or business indoor environment.
- Oxygenation from the fountain and waterfall action at the inlet provides additional disinfection similar to ozone. The resulting increased water surface area allows oxygen to diffuse close to the anaerobic organisms leading to death thus providing disinfection.
- Dissolved oxygen in open air reservoirs allows aerobic bacteria to further break down organic materials.

Unlike free chlorine, chloramines we currently use are a stable disinfectant. It will remain active in water for many days. Aeration and the boiling of water are not effective in removing chloramines. Chloramine is quite stable after sunlight exposure, and decay is negligible as a result of mixing in the water column. Conversely, ultraviolet light may deplete the free chlorine in the surface layer of the water. (1)(2)

- Sunlight and open air provide control of microbial growth by allowing the natural oxygen exchange process in the water to continue.
- Sunlight breaks down n-Nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA), a byproduct of chloramine disinfection and a suspected carcinogen. (1)
- Sunlight inhibits chloramine residual breakdown from nitrification bacteria and subsequent formation of nitrate and nitrite. The increase in nitrification episodes associated with covering previously uncovered reservoirs within chloraminated systems was not discussed or provided for in the Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule literature. (3) Increased levels of nitrate and nitrite can result in blood, gastric, and other serious health disorders. (4)

Permanent burial and floating covers may not provide a true public health benefit.

- Plastic covers will shrink, crack, and deteriorate over time. The subsequent unknown breakdown by-products will be consumed.
- Animals can contaminate the surface. They may breach the barrier through equalizer pressure vents to nest and drown. This debris will find its way into drinking water.

- Biofilm will develop under the surface. Algae will likely develop around the perimeter and off flavors and odors can be expected.
- Covered reservoirs do not vent disinfection by-products.
- Any contamination to drinking water systems can occur downstream from the reservoir and provide a catastrophic occurrence through backflow into the uncontrolled system. Monitored open reservoirs can quickly contain any deliberate action.
- Properly maintained open municipal reservoirs pose no more risk than any river, lake, or watershed contamination.
- Bird wires, current chlorination treatment at the outlet, added security, and public access hours will provide the acceptable protection we need.

RADON

Radon, primarily from the Columbia South Shore Wellfield, has been found in our drinking water at various levels. (5) Radon is a gas formed from radioactive decay of soil and rock material. It is odorless, colorless, and easily transfers from water to air. A storage tank left open to the atmosphere such as our open reservoirs will lose Radon through diffusion into the air and natural decay. (6)

Once Radon in water supplies reaches water users, it may produce human exposure via two methods: inhalation and direct ingestion. Radon in water transfers into the air during showers, flushing toilets, washing dishes, and washing clothes. The generated aerosols tend to deposit Radon in the lungs where they release radioactive particles that have been shown to increase the likelihood of lung cancer. Radon is second only to smoking in causing lung cancer in the United States, contributing ~ 20,000 deaths per year. Radon can also reach other body tissues through ingestion resulting in radiation exposure to the internal organs. Ingestion of Radon is believed to increase the risk of stomach cancer. (6) (7)

Current data from the Oregon Department of Health and Human Services show more than 25% of the homes tested in Multnomah County exceed the action level of 4pCi / liter, mainly due to geological conditions. A 1000 sq. foot house with a 4 pCi / of radon has nearly 2 million atoms in the air decaying every minute. (8) One single atom / alpha particle can begin the cancer process when inhaled.(9) Homes in the zip codes 97210- 97213 in north and northeast Portland are especially at risk, and there are many other areas in the city. (10)

In the spring of 2001 three Portland Public Schools were closed for monitoring high levels of Radon. Kelly, Whitaker, and Gregory Heights schools in northeast Portland were all affected. (11) Student health and safety were put at risk. Superior public health conditions exist, provided by our open drinking water reservoirs. We do not need to add Radon to all community area homes, schools, and businesses.

EPA has established methods for removal of Radon from drinking water. Seven of eight methods recommend aeration of drinking water. The eight uses activated carbon, a less desirable method. (6) (12)

Disinfectant Byproducts

While disinfectants are effective in controlling microorganisms, they react with natural organic and inorganic matter in source water and distribution systems to form unwanted by-products. Chlorine treatment of drinking water is necessary to prevent diseases that can be a major cause of illness. Because we have no sewage exposure in the Bull Run water system disinfectant by-products are well below EPA standards, but still need to be vented.

TRIHALOMETHANES

Trihalomethanes are disinfectant by-products regulated by EPA. These are generated during the disinfection process and are required to be kept at very low levels. These include the following chemicals;

1. Chloroform – chloroform can be formed during the breakdown of chlorine containing compounds, and may be found in drinking water. Chloroform evaporates quickly when exposed to air. People may ingest and inhale chloroform through drinking water, preparing food, laundry, or showering / bathing. New water saving technology significantly increases aeration of shower heads and faucets to increase water conservation goals. Chloroform is suspected of causing cancer. (13)(14)
2. Bromoform – Bromoform is formed as a by-product when chlorine is added to drinking water to kill microorganisms. It is soluble in water and readily evaporates into air. It can be broken down by sunlight. Bromoform may enter through the skin while bathing. It may be inhaled during cooking, doing dishes, or showering / bathing. In humans exposure can affect the central nervous system. In animals it has been linked to cancer, and is a probable human carcinogen. (14) (15)
3. Dibromochloromethane- This is another by-product of adding chlorine to drinking water systems. It is soluble in water and readily evaporates into air. It is also broken down by sunlight. It can be inhaled during showering / bathing, cooking, or other household activities. EPA classifies it as a possible human carcinogen. (14)
4. Bromodichloromethane – It is a by-product of the chlorine added to drinking water for disinfection. It is water soluble, but will evaporate when exposed to air. It is broken down by sunlight. Exposure can be through skin from showering / bathing. It also occurs by inhalation when cooking, bathing / showering, laundry, etc. The US Department of Health and Human Services has determined bromodichloromethane is reasonably anticipated to be carcinogenic. (14)

Summary – Our deep open water reservoirs at Mount Tabor and Washington Park have been wrongly portrayed as not supporting public health benefits for our drinking water, when just the opposite is true. The sunshine and open air waters break down and vent gaseous chemicals, reflecting the natural functioning of a healthy water system. We do not live in a sterile world and the open reservoirs expose us to nothing more than we are already subjected to in everyday living. Covering or burying the reservoirs will eliminate the natural Radon and trihalomethane gas removal process we currently enjoy in our drinking water system. Covering or burying our reservoirs will give Radon and the trihalomethane disinfectant by-products the next place to vent; our homes, schools and businesses.

References

1. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission -2003
2. Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality. World Health Organization.2003
3. EPA –Safe water / Nitrification. 2003
4. Nitrate in Drinking Water and Human Health. Center for health Effects of Environmental Contamination. University of Iowa. 2001
5. Portland Water Bureau – Water Quality Reports
6. EPA – Removal of Radon from Drinking Water 1999
7. EPA – Proposed Radon Drinking Water Rule April 2000
8. US Geological Survey. The Geology of Radon. 1995
9. EPA – Indoor Radon. NAS 1998
10. State of Oregon Health Services Division. Radon. 2001
11. Portland Public Schools Summary. Radon. 2001
12. US Filter. Water Technologies. Aeration. 2001
13. Wisconsin Department of Health. 2000
14. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. CDC. 1997
15. EPA. Air Toxics. Bromoform. 2003

Scott Fernandez M.Sc. © 2004

Moore-Love, Karla

From: Scott Fernandez <scottfernandez.pdx@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2014 4:07 PM
To: Moore-Love, Karla
Subject: [Approved Sender] Re: [Approved Sender] Re: Scott Fernandez request for 3 minute Council comment

Scott Fernandez
 1821 NE 65th
 Portland, Oregon 97213
 503.282.1894

subject - Future of Portland Water

Thanks

On Tue, Mar 4, 2014 at 1:59 PM, Moore-Love, Karla <Karla.Moore-Love@portlandoregon.gov> wrote:

Great, I'll put you on the May 7th agenda. I'll need your address, phone and what it is you will be speaking about.

Thanks Scott,

Karla

Karla Moore-Love |Council Clerk

Office of the City Auditor
503.823.4086

From: Scott Fernandez [mailto:scottfernandez.pdx@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2014 1:29 PM
To: Moore-Love, Karla
Subject: [Approved Sender] Re: Scott Fernandez request for 3 minute Council comment

OK, May 7th will be fine.

Thank you,

Scott

On Tue, Mar 4, 2014 at 11:21 AM, Moore-Love, Karla <Karla.Moore-Love@portlandoregon.gov> wrote:

Hello Scott,

We are full until Wednesday, May 7th. Let me know if that will work for you.

Regards,

Karla

Karla Moore-Love | Council Clerk
City of Portland | Office of the City Auditor
1221 SW 4th Ave Rm 130
Portland OR 97204-1900
email: Karla.Moore-Love@portlandoregon.gov
[503.823.4086](tel:503.823.4086) | fax [503.823.4571](tel:503.823.4571)
Clerk's Webpage: www.portlandoregon.gov/auditor/councilclerk

From: Scott Fernandez [<mailto:scottfernandez.pdx@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2014 11:17 AM
To: Moore-Love, Karla; Scott Fernandez
Subject: Scott Fernandez request for 3 minute Council comment

Hi Karla,

I would like to speak before Council for 3 minutes. What days are available as of today?

Thanks,

Scott Fernandez


Request of Scott Fernandez to address Council regarding future of Portland water
(Communication)

MAY 07 2014

PLACED ON FILE

Filed MAY 02 2014

LaVonne Griffin-Valade
Auditor of the City of Portland

By 

COMMISSIONERS VOTED AS FOLLOWS:		
	YEAS	NAYS
1. Fritz		
2. Fish		
3. Saltzman		
4. Novick		
Hales		