

July 24, 2017  
To PUB members,

I truly appreciate your volunteer service on behalf of public health!

According to Nick Fish, "PUB may forfeit its ability to weigh in at all", if you don't quickly deliver a treatment option recommendation to City council. But I can think of 3 questions, that still call for clarification and a full response:

- **Is it regulatory - OR is it a health-risk - urgency in expediting a crypto treatment option decision?**

The tribune reported that Dr. Lewis now strongly favors the filtration option to improve health<sup>1</sup>. However, not even a month ago Dr. Lewis indicated there was not public health threat: "The awkward thing I'm about to say is...we did not see a human health problem from cryptosporidium. We were basically at or below the average number." Also, "We have the best water in the world."<sup>2</sup> Conversely, at the PUB 7/18/17 meeting, Commissioner Fish stated, "The number of crypto has caused alarm bells to sound off". Ms Sollmer underscored that, "We are under orders" [to choose a crypto treatment expeditiously]. I sought clarification in a followup email, but as of this writing, I have not heard back.

Competing messages like these - health vs regulatory urgency - hinder good decision-making. As well, they perpetuate confusion to the public about what makes our water safe for drinking.

- **Why hasn't there been wider communication about the crypto-related meetings, providing better public education and engagement, and thereby better transparency?**

The Water Bureau and Commissioner Fish presented benefits and downsides of treatment options, which increased some of my understanding. My thanks to them. But more public information is needed considering the scale and scope of these projects.

- **Is disinfection and corrosion control treatment part of the primary objective, OR, in no way related to the cryptosporidium treatment?**

Finally, the Bureau staff, Commissioner Fish, and Dr. Lewis did not include this in discussion of corrosion control (particularly to decrease lead<sup>3</sup>) or disinfection at either the 7/18/17 PUB meeting, the 6/27/17 crypto Work Session, previous crypto news articles, nor in Dr. Lewis's 7/20/17 letter. Does that mean it is insignificant or not related at all? Alternatively, would corrosion control and disinfection discussion help inform the cryptosporidium treatment options? Either way, I think the public deserves to know all benefits and downsides in the path forward.

Thanks again for your expertise, efforts and important contributions on behalf of the public.  
Sincerely,  
Lorie McFarlane

Sources:

<sup>1</sup> **7/18/17** Dr. Lewis' letter: "*Health official recommends most expensive crypto treatment option*"  
<http://cni.pmgnews.com/documents/artdocs/00003583413258.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> **6/27/17** Dr. Lewis' testimony: "*We did not see a human health problem*".  
Cryptosporidium Work Session (presented to city council), @48:20 minutes  
<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/video/player/?tab=council>

<sup>3</sup> Portland's lead levels since the "alternative approach to the LCR" began, when not exceeding, often bump against the AL=15 ppb.. The Bureau has used *partial* corrosion control since 1997. Portland's recent monitoring is at **17.6\*\* and 14.9 ppb** (10/2016 & 4/2017 respectively). For comparison purposes, I looked at the most recent Water Quality Reports in the region.\*\*

**\*\*for comparison- 90<sup>th</sup> percentile's (unit=ppb).**

Source: 2016 data/2017 Water Quality Reports

<u>Oregon:</u>	<u>Lead sampling</u>	*ND = 0 - <1.0 ppb
Ashland	1.0	
Bend	ND*	
Cannon Beach	3.0	
Corvallis	6.0	
Eugene	3.0	
La Grande	ND	
Pendleton	4.5	
<b>Portland</b>	<b>17.6</b>	
Salem	5.9	(Range < 1.0 – 23; 2 exceeded AL)
Tigard	3.7	(Range ND – 42 ppb; 2 exceeded AL)

(Regional):

Washington:

Bellingham	4.0	(2014, last required) (Range <1 to 13 ppb)
Olympia	7.0	(2015, last required)
Seattle	3.0	(2013 last required)

California:

Berkeley	<5.0	
Fresno	ND	
Las Vegas	2.6	
Palo Alto	1.1	(Range ND - 2 ppb)
Sacramento	ND	
San Diego	ND	(2014, last required)
San Francisco	4.8	
Santa Cruz	<2.0	