Public Comments on Water Treatment Options
Weekly Compilation for week of July 24–July 31, 2017
of comments submitted via https://www.portlandoregon.gov/water/73924

Following the June 27, 2017, Portland City Council work session to discuss options for treating Bull Run drinking water for *Cryptosporidium*, the Portland Water Bureau created a submission page for public comments on its website. When encouraging the community to submit their thoughts via social media and the bureau homepage, the Water Bureau communications group offered to compile comments weekly and share them with City Council.

Here is the compilation for July 24–July 31, 2017. Please contact Water Bureau Communications Director Nicole Adams, Nicole.Adams@portlandoregon.gov, with any questions or comments.

1.
7/25/2017
Please consider the least chemical interventions on our water. We truly have the best water around and I would hate to taste chemicals and ingest them. I heard there is a UV light option. I strongly recommend that. Our water prices are very high right now and a costlier mitigation options would force more people out of Portland who are currently living on the margins. Thank you.

2.
7/25/2017
PLEASE DO NOT add chemicals to our drinking water ! find lower impact options !!!!!!!!!!!!

3.
7/25/2017
Please kill the parasite with UV light, please.

4.
7/25/2017
Thank you for your attention. My preference is for water to be treated by UV. Recent crypto samples not withstanding, we have relatively excellent source water needing minimal treatment. More complex system would result in long term cost increases for already cost burdened Portland residents. For instance, as a landlord I charge a per person water surcharge on my rental properties. This charge would necessarily increase along with water rates, an increase which would stretch some of my tenants already thin budgets. Impacts on residents would be non-linear, disproportionately effecting lower income households. Thank you for your good work,Adam Cornell

---

5.
7/25/2017
Please do all you can to eliminate chemicals. Chemicals and pesticides are killing our city. Clean health.

6.
7/25/2017
Please use the low cost & less chemicals to treat our water.

7.

7/25/2017
Please keep my water chemical free! UV is a Better option though my water bill is so expensive! Thank you for your time.

8.
7/25/2017
I am a portland native. I am highly concerned about the citys responsibility to keep bull run resivor water clean and drinkable for all. It would not ever be acceptable to permit toxic contaminated water reach our homes, offices, resturants and bussinesses. Something needs to come together that will protect portland inhabitants and would be affordable for all

---

9.
7/25/2017
Please go with the UV treatment which is effective, but less costly than filtration. We already pay too much for water due to the big build. I pay more for water in rain soaked Oregon than I did in drought stricken California.

10.
7/25/2017
From what I have read, the filtration option, while costlier, is a much better, more effective, long term solution.

11.
7/25/2017
Please, use UV light to treat our water. One: It is less expensive than chemical treatment and will save my family money. Two: 12 years ago when my father in law visited from Texas, he said we had the best tasting water he's ever had. He was right. Now, it tastes like chlorine. My autistic son will no longer drink tap water because of its taste. Three: we don't need more chemicals in our food!!

12.
7/25/2017
UV light treatment please.

13.
7/25/2017
I prefer the water is treated with UV light. Please do not use chemicals in our water. There are already chemicals in our water and more would only add to the unknown synergistic effects. Please use UV light for this process.

14.
7/25/2017
Thank you for seeking public input. I am in favor of UV treatment as an interim measure and purification thru filtration as a long term solution. I am also in favor of covering all of the currently in-use reservoirs on Mt. Tabor.

15.
7/26/2017
I grew up drinking Bull Run water and have always loved it. Please consider this comment my "vote" to treat treat with UV light. I prefer my drinking water not have chemicals in it when possible. Thank you

---

16.
7/26/2017
There has simply not been a problem with infectious cryptosporidium in the Bull Run Watershed, demonstrated by the remarkable absence of drinking water related cryptosporidiosis in the Portland area. The required water sampling method is outdated and does not determine whether any found cryptosporidium is activated or inactivated, or what animal it came from, which would be informative about whether it was infectious to humans, while newer tests make those determinations.Furthermore we do not want to risk degrading the water quality. There is concern that a filtration plant would introduce new chemicals into the water, and alter the taste. That would be detestable. And concern has been expressed about the breakage of mercury bulbs in an ultraviolet plant.Furthermore the construction and maintenance of a treatment plant would require human activity in the watershed, which we want to minimize. And the presence of a treatment plant would encourage additional human activity, such as logging, especially the presence of a filtration plant.A Bull Run water treatment plant would be an exceptionally poor use of limited ratepayer dollars.The LT2 rule, as well as a treatment plant, is not appropriate for the Bull Run Watershed.

17.
7/26/2017
I really appreciate Amanda Fritz raising the question as to whether chlorine content can be lowered if UV filtration is incorporated. You didn't seem to get a clear answer in response. Portland can significantly reduce it's chlorination with a UV filtration system. At 1.75 mg/L (ppm), we are nowhere near the lower limit of chlorination. In fact, cities with far inferior water quality such as Charlotte, NC have lower chlorine content (1.25 mg/L). The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends a minimum of 0.5 mg/L. Cities such as Vancouver, BC are operating with similar water sources to Portland and maintaining chlorine levels at 0.7 mg/L. In areas where they have dropped below recommended residual chlorine levels, they test for bacterial growth (and come back negative). Other cities like Amsterdam and The Hague have actually abandoned chlorine all together due to the effectiveness of UV filtration1. We really need to look into dropping our chlorination levels, not only from an environmental and health perspective but also from a cost perspective. With UV filtration, Portland could be dropping it's chlorination levels by 50% or more. Can this be discussed at the city council meeting this week?

18.
7/26/2017
If we have to treat the water, I would prefer the UV method over chemicals.

19.
7/26/2017
Portland's Bull Run water supply is one of the cleanest and safest water supplies in the country. It is outrageous that Portland area water consumers are being forced to spend up to a half billion dollars to supposedly make it even safer. I liken it to purchasing a brand new, expensive life preserver and attaching it to an existing life preserver and claiming that's going to make a better, safer life preserver. The existing life preserver will save a life just as effectively whether the new life preserver is attached or not. And if the

existing life preserver fails for any reason, we already have a spare life preserver in the form of groundwater that is available to use on a moment's notice. So I fail to see how spending hundreds of millions of dollars on a fancy new life preserver is actually going to accomplish anything, other than siphoning a tremendous amount of money from the local community that would be better used elsewhere.Understanding that the City of Portland apparently doesn't have any choice in the matter, I recommend proceeding with the least expensive option possible to comply with the federal mandate. I also would like to see ACTUAL cost projections for any proposal being considered, as there have been far too many instances where costs for public projects such as this have gone way over budget; sometimes 2-3 times the projected costs. For the City of Portland to make the best decision on this project in the best interest of consumers, it is absolutely necessary to have the most accurate, ACTUAL cost projection data available before deciding which way to proceed. As I understand it, there isn't even a design proposal developed yet for a new filtration plant.My last point is more political in nature, so I suppose I should also be writing this to my congressmen. I feel the need to point out that the current White House administration seems to have an overarching directive to move federal oversight and regulatory control away from the federal government and into the hands of individual states. If this is how they want healthcare reform enacted, why would public water safety be any different? One could argue that water safety is in fact a component of public health care, as water safety affects the health of everyone. I would like to see a stronger effort by our congressmen to use the current Administration's philosophy and directive to push for local control of our water supply.

20.
7/26/2017
Please use UV light to kill the cryptosporidium. We do not need more chemicals in our drinking water.

21.
7/26/2017
Please use UV treatment to Portland water. No one needs chemicals in their drinking water. Thank you

---

22.
7/26/2017
Please do not use chemicals to treat the water in Portland for chryptosporidium. UV treatment is the way to go! Thank you

---

23.
7/27/2017
No more chemicals, PLEASE!

24.
7/27/2017
Seems to be a big deal for public comment, but not for floridation

---

25.
7/27/2017
Please don't make Portland Oregon another city like Flint Michigan. Please

---

26.
7/27/2017
Please opt for using the least amount of chemicals. Ultra Violet light is effective in killing Cryptosporidium.Filtration has a high effectiveness in removing Cryptosporidium when using an absolute less than or equal to 1 micron filter (NSF Standard 53 or 58 rated "cyst reduction / removal" filter);Disinfection with iodine or chlorine is not effective in killing Cryptosporidium;

27.
7/27/2017
Please opt for the filtration system. It's much wiser investment for our city. To select the UV option is a bandaid that is a short term and doesn't help the city in the event of any other events.

28.
7/27/2017
Please use the UVight option to treat the water.

29.
7/28/2017
I'd like to advise against the construction of a water filtration facility, in favor of a UV disinfection, not only from a cost perspective but also from a water quality preservation standpoint. We are one of 5 major cities in the country that do not treat our municipal water system due to high quality natural water sheds. Water filtration reduces the natural integrity of our water supply and is unnecessary for compliance with federal regulations. Water treatment often utilizes undisclosed proprietary synthetic media from chemical manufacturers such as Dow and DuPont, which have an extensive history suppressing research and information regarding the toxicological effects of their products. Please take this into consideration.Thank you,

---

30.
7/28/2017
I prefer non-chemical and I believe less expensive UV or other light treatment. Light will kill cryptosporidium as well as most other problematic little beasties.

31.
7/28/2017
Please don't put chemicals in our water when there is a non-chemical option.

32.
7/30/2017
Dear City Council,please don't rush into a decision that will cost Portlanders hundreds of millions of dollars!A May 24, 2017 article in the The Oregonian/OregonLive reported that the type of Cryptosporidium found in the Bull Run samples rarely sicken humans. If this is true, if there are Cryptosporidium genotypes that do not cause health problems, then the fact that state and federal regulations do not distinguish between the types of Cryptosporidium seems like an inexplicable shortcoming of these regulations, not a reason to build a treatment plant regardless of what type of Cryptosporidium is found in the samples.I understand that fighting state and federal regulations is a hassle, but if I am asked to pay for a treatment plant, at the very least I'd like to be clear on the rationale. If there were no regulations related to Cryptosporidium, would we be talking about this at all? Are we being bullied into following one-size-fits-all regulations that cost a lot of money and

(in our specific case) provide no health benefit? Are we going along with this because we are too weak to fight back? These are not rhetorical questions; I'd like to see communication from you on this!If we absolutely must do something to placate the state and federal regulations, then I think the filtration plant is the better, albeit more expensive, choice. I am all for saving money, but spending a $105 million on a UV treatment plant that won't do anything except deactivate the Cryptosporidium that wasn't going to cause any infection in humans anyway doesn't seem like the kind of project you would want to be associated with.Sincerely,Zsombor Papp

---