Public Meeting on EPA's
Proposed Public Notification Rule and Handbook

FINAL REPORT – JULY 16, 1999

Best Western Inn on the Park
Madison, WI

May 26, 1999

Public Notification Public Meeting
Madison, Wisconsin
May 26, 1999

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing changes to its drinking water public notification (PN) regulations (64 *FR* 25963, May 13, 1999). The PN regulations apply to owners and operators of public water systems that fail to comply with the drinking water standards and related regulations under the Safe Drinking Water Act. EPA is also developing a draft *Public Notification Handbook* (EPA 816-R-99-004) to aid water systems in their efforts to prepare effective public notices.

EPA held a meeting to take comment on its proposed public notification (PN) rule and the Public Notification Handbook at the Inn on the Park Hotel on May 26, 1999. (This was one of a series of meetings EPA held throughout the country; the other meetings were in Washington, D.C., Allentown, PA, and Phoenix, AZ. EPA announced the public meetings in the *Federal Register,* 64 *FR* 27942, May 24, 1999.) Twenty-four people attended the Madison meeting (see Attachment 1). EPA had three major objectives during the meeting.

- *Invite public comment on the proposed rule:* EPA presented a summary of the requirements under the proposed PN rule. Participants asked clarifying questions during this presentation. Following the presentation, EPA invited people to submit formal public comments for the record.

- *Discuss the draft Public Notification Handbook in a workgroup setting*: In a plenary session, EPA solicited input on how easy the handbook is to use, its appropriateness for small systems, and its helpfulness for writing public notices. During breakout sessions, participants worked together to create draft notices and provided feedback on the usefulness of the templates and handbook as well as the effectiveness of their notice and chosen delivery method.

- *Obtain comment on sample public notices:* In an evening session, EPA asked a small group of people to review two sample notices created using the handbook. The group provided feedback on how effectively the notices communicated their message.

Introduction

Bob Baumeister of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) welcomed the group. He gave some background on the PN rule. PN was first required by the Safe Drinking Water Act in 1974. The 1996 amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act added a new requirement that goes beyond PN–the consumer confidence report (CCR). Mr. Baumeister encouraged the participants to look carefully at the proposed regulations and provide feedback during the comment period. He reminded them that by the time the state develops its regulations, EPA's requirements will already be finalized. He said that for this reason, it is important to comment now.

Carl Reeverts of the U.S. EPA Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, the rule manager for the PN rule, asked participants to introduce themselves.

Rule Summary

Mr. Reeverts gave a summary of the PN rule (Attachment 2 is a copy of the presentation.) During and after his presentation, participants asked clarifying questions and provided official comments for the record. (A transcript of this session is included as Attachment 3.)

Rule comment (40 CFR 141.202(b)): 24 hours was not enough time to give Tier 1 notice, especially via hand delivery. (Robb Pattison, City of Wauwatosa)

> Mr. Reeverts responded that there was discussion within the regulatory work group about the appropriate deadline for Tier 1 notification, however the 24 hour deadline is a statutory requirement. He also said that hand delivery would not be a required method for Tier 1; it is one of several options for the primary method of delivery.

Rule question/comment (141.203(a)): Why were total coliform violations assigned to Tier 2 rather than Tier 1? (Bob Baumeister, WDNR)

> Mr. Reeverts said that because a significant portion of total coliform violations do not end up posing a health threat, the EPA workgroup for the PN rule had decided not to put such violations in Tier 1. Mr. Reeverts added that EPA hopes that, where there is some evidence of a higher risk, the water system would consult the primacy agency within 24 hours.

Question: Would states have the authority to elevate violations to higher tiers on a case by case basis? (Ken Blomberg, Wisconsin Rural Water Association)

> Mr. Reeverts said yes.

Question: Why is EPA spending so much time rewriting the PN rule rather than on assisting systems on meeting their monitoring requirements, especially given that 90 percent of violations are for monitoring requirements? (WDNR-SER)

> Mr. Reeverts said he hoped that PN would contribute somewhat to increased compliance with monitoring requirements. He thought that better public notices might cause consumers to hold their systems accountable.

Question: Could you address the differences in the rule for nontransient non-community systems? (John Exner, Midwest Food Processors Association)

> Mr. Reeverts explained that nontransient non-community systems were subject to the same monitoring requirements as community systems. However, there are slightly

different method of delivery requirements for non-community systems in the proposed rule; they may use posting, hand delivery, and/or mail. He added that transient non-community systems are required to meet standards only for nitrate, coliform, and the surface water treatment rule.

Question: Why does the rule not require testing for *E. coli* instead of fecal coliform, since the technology now exists to test specifically for *E. coli* and since fecal coliform is not as good an indicator? (Jon Standridge, Wisconsin State Lab of Hygiene)

Mr. Reeverts said that this issue relates to the total coliform rule rather than the public notification rule, but that he would pass on the comment to the appropriate people at EPA.

Discussion of the *Public Notification Handbook*

Mr. Reeverts described EPA's PN handbook to the group. He asked participants to describe their experiences with public notification.

A participant from WDNR said it was often difficult to get systems, especially transient systems, to send in copies of their notices. She said that WDNR sends the systems templates but never gets anything back from the systems. WDNR does not know whether the systems actually use the templates, but it does not have the resources to follow up.

Chad Czarkowski mentioned that WDNR worked with a reporter in Milwaukee on a story about drinking water violations. The reporter initially expressed concern upon finding that 20 percent of systems had violations. WDNR explained the difference between the tiers, and the published story was well-balanced.

Megan Matthews described a focus group WDNR held in Door County with transient systems in noncompliance. Those systems truly making an effort to comply were reluctant to issue public notices because they would lose business and look bad. The loss of business was especially important since most systems make the majority of their income during the summer months.

Mr. Reeverts asked the group several questions on the handbook. He first asked them to read the introduction and "How to Use the Handbook." Mr. Reeverts asked whether these sections are useful to systems with a violation. The group provided the following comments.

- Item #2 of the "How to" list should mention the requirements for reporting the violation to the state for other tiers besides Tier 1. (All violations of NPDWRs must be reported to the state within 48 hours, but the proposed rule requires consultation with the state within 24 hours.) (Handbook, p. 3)

- Use a bigger font in Table 2 for the titles of each tier section. (Handbook, p. 7)

- The handbook should contain a checklist of what systems must do when they have a violation. Such a checklist would integrate PN requirements with NPDWR requirements.

- Recommend that systems write their own checklists specific to their system type or state requirements.

- There should be a checklist for certification.

Rule comment (141.31(d)): Item #7 (send a copy of the notice to state within ten days) in the "How to" list (p. 3) does not make sense. The state should not have to wait ten days to receive a notice. Consumers occasionally call the state about the notice, and states should be able to refer to a copy in order to answer questions. In addition, for Tier 1 violations, systems forget to send a copy of the notice to the state if they are allowed to wait ten days. The notice should be sent to the state at the same time it is provided to consumers. (Unknown)

Rule comment (141.31(d)): The certification requirements are vague. (Unknown)

- The handbook should contain a sample certification letter.

- The handbook should provide more language on population at risk for violations other than microbiological violations. Perhaps EPA could take such information from the individual contaminant fact sheets.

- Translations should be provided in Hmong (Handbook, Appendix C).

The group had the following comments on the template and instructions for the Tier 1 nitrate or fecal coliform violation.

Rule comment (Appendix B of Subpart Q): The health effects language for the fecal coliform violation should include the elderly in the population at risk. (Unknown)

- The nitrate notices should explain why only infants are affected by nitrate. (Handbook, p. 24, 78)

Participants read the template and instructions for a Tier 2 violation and provided the following feedback.

Rule comment (141.202(a)): Total coliform violations, even without the presence of fecal coliform, necessitate a boil water notice. (Barbara Federlin, WDNR)

Rule comment (141.203(a)): The treatment of the coliform issue in the handbook and the rule is good--it does not "cry wolf." (Jon Standridge, Wisconsin State Lab of Hygiene)

Rule comment (Appendix B to Subpart Q): The rule health effects language should explain the risk for gross alpha violations as well as the fact that gross alpha MCLs are actually action levels. (Bob McElmurry, Wisconsin State Lab of Hygiene)

- The template for radiological contaminants does not tell consumers what actions they should take. (Handbook, p. 47)

Rule comment (Radionuclides rule): Units used for radiological contaminants should be consistent. The MCL for beta radiation is in millirems/year rather than pCi/l, as is used for gross alpha and radium 226/228. (Bob McElmurry, Wisconsin State Lab of Hygiene)

The group had the following ideas on how EPA should distribute the handbook to systems, especially small systems.

- Emphasize in the descriptions of templates that they need to be tailored to the specific situation.

- States should send handbooks to municipal systems, but staff turnover at smaller systems is too high for the handbook to be useful.

- States should distribute the handbook; this way, they can revise as needed to fit their stricter rules. For instance, Wisconsin could revise it to require Tier 1 for all total coliform violations.

- States should send out the handbook as is along with supplements to address where their regulations differ from EPA's. States should not be able to modify the handbook.

- Handbooks could be distributed through operator certification classes or classes run through the Department of Health.

- Illinois EPA will probably do a mass mailing of the handbook to all systems.

- Tribes should get the handbook directly from EPA Regions.

- There should be a separate handbook for transient systems; distribution to transient systems is extremely difficult.

Other Comments

- The question and answer format and the placement of questions on the left margin of the handbook are helpful.

- The three-ring binder format is useful.

Breakout Sessions

Participants spent the afternoon session in small groups creating sample public notices based on four different scenarios. The group reconvened to discuss the notices created and provide suggestions and ideas for improving the handbook and templates. The sample notices each group created are provided in Attachment 4.

Group 1 -- Monthly Turbidity

Scenario: In January, Cubstown Waterworks reported that 96% of the turbidity samples taken were at 0.4 NTU, with one representative sample having a reading of 2 NTU. The February turbidity samples reported that 94% of the turbidity samples taken were at or below 0.5 NTU with 6% of the samples at 2 NTU. That six percent occurred during the big county wide bowling tournament, when the two best chemistry students were off bowling.

Participants determined that, according to the scenario, a violation occurred only during February. They used the table of contents to find the monthly turbidity template on page 52-53 of the handbook. The participants chose mailing supplemented by a newspaper notice as the method of delivery. Because the violation occurred during a bowling tournament attended by people from outside of Cubstown, the participants said they might also ask the tournament organizers for a list of registrants so they could mail notices to the bowlers.

The notice the participants created adhered rather closely to the template. Minor suggestions included the following:

> Add information on the actual turbidity levels (the templates say only that the system exceeded the limit of 0.5 NTU), and state what normal turbidity levels at the plant are. The group also suggested checking with health officials to make sure there has been no water-related outbreak.
>
> Insert some language after, "This is not an emergency. If it had been, you would have been notified immediately. . ." Stating that the system has increased sampling for coliform and did not detect bacteria in the finished water helps explain why there is no need for alarm.
>
> Include "we adjusted our plant operations" as a choice under corrective actions the system is taking in the template instructions. Although vague, it is a less confusing way to explain technical steps such as adding coagulant, checking the slow mixer, and modifying operation of the filter system.

Group 2-- Gross Alpha MCL

Scenario: The small community of Tigerville (~3,000 people) located in south central Wisconsin was required by the WDNR to collect a quarterly drinking water sample in 1998 and have it analyzed for gross alpha radiation and radium-226 and radium-228. The gross alpha levels in the 4 quarterly samples collected averaged 16.4 pCi/l. The combined radium 226/228 levels in those same 4 samples is 4.2 pCi/l. Was Tigerville required to notify the public? If so, why? If so, please use the PN handbook to meet public notification requirements.

Using Appendices A and B, the group determined that there was a violation and identified it as a Tier 2 violation. The group used template 2-3 on page 47 to construct a public notice. They relied more on the template than the instructions to create the notice.

Participants made several recommendations on the handbook appendices.

> They suggested that alpha emitters also be identified as gross alpha since both of these terms may appear in a notice of violation or laboratory report, and operators unfamiliar with nomenclature for radioactive contaminants may not recognize their violation in the appendix.
>
> It was suggested that the MCL for beta/photon emitters should be expressed in pCi/L, rather than mrem/yr to be consistent with the other entries for radioactive contaminants, and gross alpha exceedances should be action levels, not MCLs (Radionuclides rule issue).

Some participants suggested that the notice needs an understandable description of alpha emitters. They said that readers of the notice may not know what the violation is, and that the description of the violation should be reworded as follows:

> "Testing results we received on [date] show that the system exceeds the standard, or maximum contaminant level, for alpha emitters (<u>radiation</u>) . . ."

Some members of the group suggested that radioactive contaminants are sufficiently different from chemical contaminants to warrant a template specific to these contaminants that includes a description of radioactivity.

The group found the section of the template on "What does this mean to me?" to be unclear. They were confused by the many parenthetical statements in the template, especially in the phrase ". . . [well] in excess of the maximum . . ." Some participants thought the word "well" referred to a drinking water well. They suggested modifying the template as follows:

> "This is not an emergency. If it had been, you would have been notified immediately. [Insert health effects language from Appendix B.]"

The group offered the following comments on the health effects language:

The word “radioactive” is alarmist, invoking images of cancer from radium dial watches and Hiroshima.

The warning about drinking water containing alpha emitters in excess of the MCL over many years is ambiguous (i.e., how many years is too many?).

In the section of the template entitled “What should I do?” the group commented that not every one with health concerns need be advised to contact their doctor. They suggested modifying the template as follows:

> “You do not need to use an alternative (e.g., bottled) water supply. However, if you have specific health concerns related to this contaminant, consult your doctor.”

The group suggested that the template (rather than only the instructions) be clear that the contact for further information be a person at the utility, not a State official.

For corrective actions, the group provided some language that might not be appropriate for all radiological violations but in this case would explain that the system is waiting for revised standards to be issued before it decides what treatment to install. The group also suggested that consumers could install water softeners until such time as the water system installed treatment.

Group 3 -- Nitrate MCL

Scenario: Bob and Ethel’s is an established and popular roadside attraction that caters to an adult crowd in an unincorporated rural section of Wisconsin. Bob and Ethel support a number of local league teams which play softball, shoot darts, play pool and pitch horseshoes. Ethel and her son Timmy also cook and serve bar food along with daily specials. Bob and Ethel are required to collect a nitrate sample annually by the WDNR. Over the last 5 years the water sample collected from their well has tested between 10.6 and 17.1 mg/L for nitrate. What are the public notice requirements that Bob and Ethel have to fulfill? Please provide a sample public notice for Bob and Ethel that fulfills the requirements of the public notification rule.

As a non-community system, under Wisconsin law, Bob and Ethel are not required to issue a public notice that meets the requirements of the proposed rule. However, the group decided to prepare such a notice anyway using the nitrate template for non-community systems on page 78.

The group modified the template only slightly to explain the fact that the system is allowed to have nitrate levels up to 20 mg/l without violating drinking water standards. In addition, the term “routine sample” was changed to “annual sample” to be more specific, and “parents of infants” was changed to “those in charge of infants.” The group also chose to list the state as the contact, since the state would be able to provide more information on nitrate than Bob and Ethel could [the proposed rule, however, requires the notice to list a contact at the water system].

Rule comment (141.205(d)(3)): The main comment on the template was that the distribution language ("if other people, such as tenants, residents, patients, students, or employees. . .") did not seem appropriate for the situation, since the scenario is that the water system is a bar where presumably everyone at the bar would see the notice in the bathroom or on the door or counter. If the language is going to be mandatory for all notices, it should be modified, though the group offered no alternate language.

Most of the other comments made during this breakout session were on other parts of the handbook. Suggestions for the handbook in general included:

- Enlarge the font in the table of contents.
- Put the chapter number and page number together in the footer of each chapter.
- Separate the title for the instructions for each template into two lines.

Suggestions for the "How to Use the Handbook" section (p. 3) included:

- Move the recommendation to read Chapters 2-4 before a violation occurs to a sidebar.
- Item #7, which discusses sending a copy of the notice to the state along with a certification, should refer readers to the sample certification language on page 12.
- Add checklists for required activities.

The group also thought Chapters 3 and 4 of the handbook were useful, although it recommended that the font for the tier headings in Table 2 on page 7 be increased to make them more prominent. The group thought the graphics and question and answer format of the handbook were helpful and that Appendix A was a good reference.

Group 4 – Lead and Copper Corrosion Control

Scenario: A city of approximately 300,000 people provides drinking water to its citizens from a ground water source. The city wells are drilled deep into a protected aquifer. The water provided to customers is considered hard, usually with a hardness measurement of 250 to 400 mg/l. The community is required under the Lead and Copper Rule to complete corrosion control treatment steps. Furthermore, sampling conducted for lead and copper demonstrates that the community's water exceeds the 90^{th} percentile action level of 15 ug/l. Further analysis of the lead and copper results demonstrates that almost all of the high lead levels come from an area of the distribution system served by lead service lines. The community wants to solve its lead problem by replacing lead service lines, but the Lead and Copper Rule requires the completion of corrosion control treatment. Since the community has not installed corrosion control treatment, the community must notify the public that it has a treatment technique violation under the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations, 40 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 141. Please develop the public notice for this community.

The group acknowledged that it was in violation of the Lead and Copper Rule because it did not install corrosion control treatment and that a public notice was required, but the situation required deviation from the template and tailored communication. They offered the following comments:

- There was a sharp difference between the population affected and the population served: part of the distribution system was at significant risk for lead exposure and the other part was low risk, requiring tailored notification.

- The priority of the system was to move quickly on lead service line replacement as the way to mitigate the risk; their studies had shown that corrosion control would not solve the problem and would cause other water quality problems.

- Members wanted to explain why the system is choosing to replace lead service lines despite the fact that it is in long term noncompliance with the corrosion control requirements of the Lead and Copper Rule; also, they wanted to stress that the system has complied with the general public education requirements and all monitoring requirements.

- The group believed the system would have a difficult time getting community support to invest in both lead service line replacement and corrosion control treatment.

Members recommended that the notice follow the Tier 2 requirements. They further agreed that the system send out two notices–one to people in the section of the distribution system with normal lead levels and one to people in the section of the city showing high lead levels and where the lead service lines are located. The starting point for developing the notice would be Template 2-9 on pages 59-60.

No sample notices were prepared, but the group agreed on how to cover the ten elements and how the two notices would be different:

- Elements 1 and 2, description of the violation and when it occurred: Describe the violation and explain the lead action level exceedance, but mention that all sample exceedances were in x part of the system where there were lead service lines; indicate that the system is working with WDNR and that the violation may be long term because the system's priority is solving the lead problem in the x part of town.

- Elements 3 - 6, health effects; population(s) at risk; whether alternative water supplies are needed; and consumer actions: Provide the standard health effects information, but highlight that risk is higher in x part of town. Do not use the phrase "this is not an emergency" on notices for the affected part of town. Refer to the lead public education guidance on avoiding risk from lead in households. For notices in x part of town, explain the special circumstances of lead service lines and the need to take special mitigating measures.

- Elements 7 and 8, corrective actions and date return to compliance expected: Explain what was done and the planned schedule for lead service line replacement.

- Elements 9 and 10, phone number and standard distribution language: These should be the same for both notices.

The group had several comments on the template as the result of this scenario:

Rule comment (141.201(c)): We have to more sharply define who has to receive the notice, separating those clearly affected by the violation from those simply served by the water system. (Unknown)

- The term "action level" needs to be better defined to distinguish it from a violation.

- The phrase "This is not an emergency" should not automatically be recommended for violations of the Lead and Copper Rule; the template explanation should recommend that it be tailored to the situation and the people most affected.

- Public notification for Lead and Copper Rule violations should be linked more closely to the public education program required for exceeding the lead action level. Notices should complement the broader based communication on lead that is already in place.

Feedback

Each breakout group presented its notice, as described above. Mr. Reeverts asked if there were any additional comments and encouraged people to submit written comments. One participant suggested inviting public officials, in addition to operators, to future meetings on the handbook. Another recommended posting information on EPA's website if EPA was leaning towards certain changes in the rule. Mr. Reeverts thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting.

Attachment 1
List of Participants – Madison WI

Bob Anderson
Village of Brooklyn
102 N. Rutland
Brooklyn, WI 53521
Phone: (608) 455-1842

Bob Baumeister
Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources
Box 794
Madison, WI 53707
Phone: (608) 266-2299

Ken M. Blomberg
Wisconsin Rural Water Association
350 Water Way
Plover, WI 54467
Phone: (715) 344-7778
E-mail: wrwa@tznet.com

Chad Czarkowski
Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources
PO Box 12436
Milwaukee, WI 53212
Phone: (414) 263-8628

Bill Daley
City of Columbus
950 Maple Ave.
Columbus, WI 53925
Phone: (920) 623-5912

David Denig-Chakroff
Madison Water Utility
523 E. Main Street
Madison, WI 53703
Phone: (608) 266-4652

Marilyn Dukes-Winters
Madison Water Utility
110 S. Paterson
Madison, WI 53703
Phone: (608) 266-4654

Jim Dunning
Ho-Chunk Nation
PO Box 636
720 Red Iron Road
Black River Falls, WI 54615
Phone: (715) 284-7548

John Exner
Midwest Food Processors Association
PO Box 1297
Madison, WI 53701
Phone: (608) 255-9946

Barbara Federlin
Wisconsin Dept. Of Natural Resources
PO Box 12436
Milwaukee, WI 53212
Phone: (414) 263-8626

Christine Gengler
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
PO Box 12436
Milwaukee, WI 53212
Phone: (414) 263-8635

Jerry Gray
Cross Plains Water Works
2417 Brewery Rd.
Cross Plains, WI 53508
Phone: (608) 798-4060

Joe Janczy
U.S. EPA Region V
Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources
Box 794
Madison, WI 53707
Phone: (608) 267-2763

Thomas J. Konrad
City of Oshkosh Water Utility
PO Box 1130
Oshkosh, WI 54902
Phone: (920) 232-5365

Robert A. McElmurry
Wisconsin State Lab of Hygiene
2601 Agriculture Dr.
Madison, WI 53707
Phone: (608) 224-6227

Dale Mejaki
Milwaukee Water Works
841 North Broadway
Room 409
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Phone: (414) 286-2802

Mark Nelson
Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources
101 S. Webster
Madison, WI 53702
Phone: (608) 267-4230

Christine O'Brien
U.S. EPA Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water
401 M Street SW
Mail Code 4606
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 260-4275
Fax: (202) 260-4656
E-mail: obrien.christine@epa.gov

Dale Paczkowski
Fond Du Lac Water Works
160 Macy St.
Fond Du Lac, WI 54935
Phone: (608) 929-3266

Robb Pattison
Wauwatosa Water Department
7725 W. North Avenue
Wauwatosa, WI 53213
Phone: (414) 479-8965

Mary Reed
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
1021 N. Grand Ave. E
P.O. Box 19276
(MC: # 19)
Springfield, IL 62794-9276
Phone: (217) 785-0561

Carl Reeverts
U.S. EPA Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water
401 M Street SW
Mail Code 4606
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: (202) 260-7273
Fax: (202) 260-4656
E-mail: reeverts.carl@epa.gov

Linda Selmer
WD-15J
U.S. EPA Region 5
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, IL 60604-3507
Phone: (312) 886-6197

Lori Severtson
UW-Madison
K6/380
600 N. Highland
Madison, WI 53792
Phone: (608) 835-2419

Jon Standridge
Wisconsin State Lab of Hygiene
2601 Agriculture Dr.
Madison, WI 53707
Phone: (608) 224-6209

Liz Spaeth Wein
Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources
PO Box 12436
Milwaukee, WI 53212
Phone: (414) 229-0824

Jim VandenBrook
Wisconsin Dept. of Agriculture, Trade, and
Consumer Protection
Agricultural Resource Management Division
PO Box 8911
Madison, WI 53708
Phone: (608) 224-4501

Louis Workman
St. Croix Tribe
PO Box 287
Hertel, WI 54845
Phone: (715) 349-2195

Attachment 2
EPA Presentation on PN Rule

Attachment 3
Transcript of Presentation on PN Rule Public Comments/Questions

Attachment 4
Public Notices Created by Breakout Groups

The notices on the following pages were created by members of the breakout groups. The meeting report provides details on the breakout session discussions.

Monthly Turbidity Exceedance Notice – Group 1

INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR DRINKING WATER
Cubstown Water System Did Not Meet Treatment Requirements

We routinely monitor for turbidity (cloudiness). This measurement tells us whether we are effectively filtering and disinfecting the water supply.

During the month of February, 6 percent of turbidity samples were above 0.5 turbidity units. Those samples were at 2 turbidity units. The standard is that no more than 5 percent of samples may exceed 0.5 turbidity units. 94 percent of the turbidity samples were below 0.5.

What does this mean to me?

This is not an emergency. If it had been, you would have been notified immediately. The turbidity levels are relatively low, but they are a concern. During this time, we sampled for coliform bacteria, and none were detected.

Turbidity has no health effects. However, turbidity can interfere with disinfection and provide a medium for microbial growth. Turbidity may indicate the presence of disease causing organisms. These organisms include bacteria, viruses, and parasites which can cause symptoms such as nausea, cramps, diarrhea and associated headaches.

These symptoms are not caused only by organisms in drinking water and may be caused by other factors. If you experience any of these symptoms and they persist, you may want to seek medical advice.

Some people, including immuno-compromised people, some elderly, and infants may be at increased risk. These people should seek advice about drinking water from their health care providers. Guidelines on ways to lessen the risk of infection by microbes are available from the Safe Drinking Water Hotline at 1(800) 426-4791.

What should I do?

You do not need to boil your water. However, if you have specific health concerns, consult your doctor.

What is the water system doing?

We made adjustments to plant operations. Turbidity so far this month has been at appropriate levels. For more information, or to learn more about protecting your drinking water please contact ___ at ____.

If other people, such as tenants, residents, patients, students, or employees, receive water from you, it is important that you provide this notice to them by posting it in a conspicuous location or by direct hand or mail delivery.

Water System ID: _____

Gross Alpha MCL Notice – Group 2

IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR DRINKING WATER
Tests Show Levels of Gross Alpha Above Drinking Water Standards

The Tigerville system routinely monitors for the presence of drinking water contaminants. Testing results we received on March 9, 1999, show that the system exceeds the standard, or maximum contaminant level, for gross alpha. The average level of gross alpha over the last four quarters was 16.4 picocuries per liter (pCi/l). The standard for gross alpha is 15 pCi/l.

What does this mean to me?

This is not an emergency. If it had been, you would have been notified immediately. However, *[Insert contaminant-specific health effects language from Appendix B*--Certain materials are radioactive and may emit a form of radiation known as alpha radiation. Some people who drink water containing alpha emitters in excess of the maximum contaminant level over many years may have an increased risk of getting cancer.]

What should I do?

You do not need to use an alternative (e.g., bottled) water supply. However, if you have specific health concerns about this contaminant, consult your doctor.

What is the water system doing?

We are waiting until EPA issues a notice of data availability, which will establish a final gross alpha maximum contaminant level. Once that occurs, we will determine what treatment options are economically feasible for the system to undertake to meet the standard.

In the meantime, consumers may install a water softener, which, if properly maintained, should remove approximately 85% of the radioactive contaminants in the water.

For more information, or to learn more about protecting your drinking water please contact ___ at ____.

> If other people, such as tenants, residents, patients, students, or employees, receive water from you, it is important that you provide this notice to them by posting it in a conspicuous location or by direct hand or mail delivery.

Water System ID: _____

Nitrate MCL Notice – Group 3

WARNING

FOR THOSE IN CHARGE OF INFANTS 6 MONTHS AND YOUNGER

DO NOT USE THIS WATER FOR INFANT FORMULA OR DRINKING

High nitrate levels have been found in our annual sampling over the last 5 years, since 1994.

We are providing bottled water that meets Food & Drug Administration standards, for infants and their families.

Adults and children older than 6 months can drink the water.

Annual sample results have shown nitrate levels between 10.6 mg/L and 17.1 mg/L. These results are above the nitrate standard or maximum contaminant level (MCL), which is 10 mg/L.

Possible Health Effects

Infants below the age of six months who drink water containing nitrate in excess of the maximum contaminant level could become seriously ill and, if untreated, may die. Symptoms include shortness of breath and blue baby syndrome. Blue baby syndrome is indicated by blueness of the skin.

Symptoms in infants can develop rapidly, with health deteriorating over a period of days. If symptoms occur in a child less than 6 months old, seek medical attention immediately.

If you are pregnant or have specific health concerns, you may wish to consult your doctor.

Steps We Are Taking

State law allows Bob and Ethel's Roadside Bar nitrate levels to be in the range of 10 mg/L - 20 mg/L, as long as the system provides public notice and takes an annual sample.

For more information, please contact the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources at:_____.

If other people, such as tenants, residents, patients, students, or employees, receive water from you, it is important that you provide this notice to them by posting it in a conspicuous location or by direct hand or mail delivery.

Water System ID: _____