

Fletcher Creek Improvement District

Treatment Committee – May 2022 News

WATER TREATMENT INFORMATION MEETING – 6:00 p.m. March 22, 2022

Present: Heather Kelly, Neil Kelly, Barbara Lawrence, Laurie Rutherford, Peter Sonnenberg, Robert Cunliffe, Alan Davidson, Rick Doucette, Graham Gilbert, Warren Pashkowich, Douglas Traub, George Wilson.

Questions and Comments Arising From the Slide Show Presentation

(Readers are encouraged to view the slide show presentation in conjunction with the following.)

- 1) Question: What types of pathogens/coliforms are present in Fletcher Creek's water tests to date, with reference to fecal coliforms? Answer: Fecal coliforms have been present in water samples but very infrequently. The person asking the question noted that there is a difference between organic matter and coliforms.
- 2) Question: Why are there only two options on the decision tree for capital to be returned to tax payers? Why isn't there a third choice to maintain the reserves? Answer: There is a question mark at the end of "Capital Return to Taxpayers?" in the first box to indicate that returning some or all of the reserves to tax payers is only one possibility. The questioner noted that he would like to see the capital maintained by FCID in order to support maintenance and future upkeep of the system.
- 3) Question: How would a Point of Entry system be managed? Answer: a point of entry system would be managed by the users, thus retaining the current user's more control over, and responsibility for their water.
- 4) Question: Would Interior Health approve a Point of Entry system? Answer: A Point of Entry system would need to meet a list of conditions presented by Interior Health before being approved. (Post meeting clarification: Any user is free to install a point of entry treatment system at any time and to whatever extent they deem appropriate without the approval of the Ministry of Health. The Ministry of Health has a policy regarding Point of Entry treatment systems and appears on the WWW.)
- 5) Question: Could Interior Health shut the water system down? Are there other consequences if FCID's water doesn't meet their standards? Answer: The provincial government issues a permit for both the use of the water resource and another for the distribution of the water. The second slide of the presentation clearly specifies our legal obligations:

The Drinking Water Protection Act, article 6 states:

Subject to the regulations, a water supplier must provide, to the users served by its water supply system, drinking water from the water supply system that

(a) is potable water

The presenter would not expect much in the way of repercussions if we maintain our current

operation. Page 8 of the information meeting handout shows that B.C. has a highest number of boil water notices compared to other provinces and territories in Canada. This has been going on for an extended period of time and indicates to the presenter that the province is not serious about removing Boil Water Notices.

- 6) Question: If the representative from Interior Health assigned to FCID's water system doesn't approve the water system, could FCID be assigned a different authority along with other options? Answer: Interior Health's water system approval process is not a rigid process and subject to uncertainty. The approvals process does provide for appeals of orders and decisions.
- 7) Comment from the presenter: FCID's water hardness is at the high end of manufacturer's applicability specification. This is thought to mean that meeting the standards for the U.V. bulb expected life of 9,000 hours may not be assured but this issue may easily be resolved by more frequent maintenance of the UV disinfection apparatus. We are fortunate to have a working example of a UV disinfection system running FCID water with regular analysis showing no threat to fitness for human consumption. It was noted that Interior Health is being kept updated with FCID's progress on a monthly basis.
- 8) Comment from the audience: A member would like it noted that he thinks FCID's investments saved over the years should be kept for deferred maintenance and not for Central Water Treatment or any other expensive upgrade. He feels that the system is under-capitalized.
- 9) Question: Why has Case 2 been left in the Decision Tree (page 3 of the handout) if it is not considered viable. Answer: all options, however unlikely, will remain in the decision process for the membership to vote on. It is not the mandate of the Treatment Committee to exclude treatment solutions that it does not find viable. It is the mandate of the Treatment Committee to develop the pros and cons of each treatment option that has been suggested by at least one member of the FCID users. The treatment committee will document its findings as to suitability and let the issue be decided by the voters.
- 10) Question: What are the specifics of Site 1 of the pilot study handout? Answer: Site 1 of the pilot study uses 20" filters and a 75/25 micron filter followed by a 2501 micron filter followed by a 1 micron absolute filter followed by an ultraviolet disinfection cell. Site 2 uses smaller filters with a 30 micron, a 5 micron and finally a 1 micron filter followed by an ultraviolet disinfection cell. The pilot study will prove which size filters and in what combination will be needed regardless of whether the system is Point of Entry or central treating.
- 11) Question: Does the number of people on the water system and the overall water usage affect filter size? Answer: Yes. Filter sizing is a function of sediment loading, available pressure drop, and desired service interval. Small filters will do the job but may require daily service. Large filters will do the job, cost more, but require less frequent service. The balance between initial capital expense and ongoing maintenance expense will be balanced.
- 12) Question: Has a hydrologist ever assessed the risk of Fletcher Creek running out of water or water being diverted due to a natural or human-caused disaster? Answer: one of the members present stated that he worked as the hydrologist in the area in 2013 and he did an assessment on Fletcher Creek. The assessment found that the risk of running out of water or water being diverted in the future is low but climate change makes this unpredictable. There is also a low

risk of biological contamination. If logging roads were built nearby, there would be a significant risk of erosion but this scenario is unlikely at this time.

- 13) Question: Why is the option of drawing water from the lake not being considered? Answer: Lake water was reviewed as an option in the 2020 KWL engineering report and dismissed because of the high cost of pumping it up to all residences and the extra cost of adding the required pipelines.
- 14) Question: Why has the operation and set up of the emergency pump at the lake been surrounded by secrecy? Answer: The emergency pump's location is public knowledge. It accesses water from the lake in an emergency situation but is not suitable for operation over extended periods.
- 15) Question: What would be the cost of paying a maintenance person for a CWT system? Answer: It would be a substantial but unknown additional cost to the maintenance of a CWT system. It was noted that it would be fairly simple and much less inexpensive to have a CWT system that includes the addition of chlorine to the system.
- 16) Question: Why is there no adjustment for inflation in any of the cost estimates? Answer: The rate of inflation is an unknown factor but page 1 of the handout has a disclaimer of +/- 50% to take into account inflation among other uncertainties.
- 17) Question: Wouldn't pipeline water have chlorine? Answer: Yes. Water piped in from another municipality would be chlorinated but chlorine is simple and inexpensive to remove at the entry point.
- 18) Question: Why are footnotes 2, 4, and 5 not specified in Table 8 of the handout? Answer: footnotes 2, 4, 5 apply generally to all options.
- 19) Question: How does the analysis of lake water compare to the analysis of Fletcher Creek water? Answer: Lake water would need to be sampled below 60 feet. This is the point where the pressure and temperature are at levels which Interior Health approves. The 2020 KWL report stated that the analysis of lake water would only be accepted at exactly the spot where the water would be drawn.
- 20) Question: How much money should be kept in reserve for pipe repairs and maintenance? Answer: A former trustee who helps with maintenance explained that some pipe was repaired at a break last year and was in good condition. It is likely safe to assume that the rest of the water lines are in similar condition. Another member from the audience noted that we are often told the life of plastic in a land fill is 100+ years so what might guide one's opinion of the expected life of the buried pipe.
- 21) Comment from the audience: The system has worked well for 35 years but the amount in reserves compared to the number of users is low, especially when the rising property costs and assessments are factored in.

Sometime after the meeting mention was made that some members were of the opinion that Neil Kelly was "pushing his own agenda". Neil Kelly wants to be clear:

In the 2021 AGM Neil ran to become an elected trustee because he wanted to put control of the FCID in the

hands of the members. His campaign objectives included:

- a. Enabling the members to make an informed decision and select the path forward by way of secret ballot.
- b. Having the trustees prepare the annual budget for the approval of the membership at the AGM rather than the old way of having the trustees present the approved budget for information only.
- c. Enabling the members to introduce independent motions at the AGM or Special Meetings.

These objectives in no way reflect a desire to “push his own agenda” other than to push rule by democracy.