

## Water Committee Meeting

October 22, 2014

J.T. LANE: Thank you all for being here. So what we're going to do is since we did confirm we are not going to have a quorum today we did reach out to everyone else and at least confirm with everybody, one we couldn't reach, will not make it. Dr. Guidry is doing planning at the hospitals this morning. So what we're going to do instead is not have an official meeting and not take any official action of course. In the new and old business on the agenda we will have to cover that officially in the next meeting if we have a quorum. I guess in the interest of everyone's time I don't think it's necessary to discuss it twice. But what we can do since Caryn was ready to give us an update on the amoeba and the sampling we could at least review. And if there's anything else in particular we want to discuss in particular we can do that. Does anybody have any objections to that approach? With that you have the role, correct? The other thing is please, we will still take the minutes for this unofficial meeting, but if there are any questions or comments you have please make sure before you start talking, as we all are very much conversational style people, please make sure you have a microphone in your hand before you start talking because we're not able to get everything on the transcript. We need to make sure we really stick with that. With that, Caryn do you want to give us a quick overview of the past couple of weeks?

CARYN BENJAMIN: I think the last meeting we had passed out the results for round one and two. So everybody is aware of for round one there was a detection of the naegleria fowleri in the St. John system. And then round two the EBARB water system, EBARB-Aimwell that purchases water from South Toledo Bend they had a hit at one of their ACR sites for naegleria fowleri. All other samples were negative for that amoeba.

So round three consisted of two ground water systems. Those results were negative for the amoeba, for the naegleria fowleri. Round four consisted of two water systems, two surface water systems and those results were also negative for naegleria fowleri, however both raw water samples had amoebas present, thermophilic amoebas, and also naegleria, but not the fowleri. It looks like one ACR site for Assumption and one ACR site for Schriever had amoebas present, but not naegleria. Round five, that consisted of all surface water systems. Again, there was no detection for the naegleria fowleri, but there were some amoeba present in the raw water and also at a TCR site for Algiers and also Port Sulphur. Looks like Carrollton was just in raw water. Round six, one is Shreveport surface water system, Brownville, and West Highway 80 Ark Road. Again, there is no detection for naegleria fowleri in those samples. It looks like Shreveport had amoebas in the raw water which is common. There was amoeba in one of the ultra filters for West Highway 80 Ark Road TCR site. And we also did another round of sampling at St. Bernard and DeSoto just to confirm that their burn was affective. And again all these were negative just like the last round in May for naegleria fowleri. There were some amoebas present in some of the samples. And that's all the results we have so far. We sampled round seven and eight recently. We're waiting on those results. And we have another round nine to sample next week. Three rounds of sample results, at least two more rounds will be presented at the next meeting. That will conduct our surveillance for the summer. We will test St. John and EBARB once their chlorine burns are done. I believe St. John ends November 18th so we'll probably go out after that and then we'll repeat the sampling in the summer time.

J.T. LANE: Any questions? In the future what are y'all planning? Sort of take a break in the winter, but have y'all started spring planning?

CARYN BENJAMIN: We're going to start next year when we know the water

temperatures are above 20 degrees Celsius. The lab should be, this time we were waiting for the lab capacity before we started sampling. So hopefully we can start sampling in May or June. I think when we sampled St. Bernard and DeSoto in May of this year, which those samples went to CDC, the DHH lab wasn't ready yet. Those water temperatures I think were just at the 20 degrees Celsius. So sometime in May or early June the temperatures will increase to greater than that. That's when we'll start the surveillance again. I'm not sure if we will be able to get all the systems in the state, but we will try.

J.T. LANE: Those of you who don't remember the public health lab which is currently split up in three different places is now being consolidated into a brand new facility. We've renovated the old DEQ lab that is behind the governor's mansion. They've also expanded it to fully, so that we can fully use the full capacity of the public health lab needs. About 70 percent of all of the tests run in the public health lab are water sample tests. We do a whole array of clinical test, but the vast majority is sampling. The move time will take 30 to 45 days to get all of the equipment that we are moving from Metairie where the bulk of the work is done. But for many of the instruments it's going to take about three months to be tuned and re-commissioned and verified for testing. We are in the process of doing that as well. Any questions about Caryn's update?

RANDY HOLLIS: Is there a specific protocol that's ever been established for how the sampling equipment is prepared in the lab, how it's carried out? And I know nothing about the amoeba, nothing, okay. But if it's in the ground water, if it's in the soil, that came from a coauthored report from Jake, that it's in soil and ground water and surface water. I want to make sure there's a protocol that says there's no contamination possibility between the lab and taking the samples. And then are we using the official sites of the system to take it? I hope we're not using fire hydrants or flushing hydrants

because those have weep holes and could get dirt and soil in them.

CARYN BENJAMIN: We typically utilize the monitoring plan portal to pick the sites based on compliance history with the residual and what not and we allow the system to tell us their preference. And we've actually seen it to where some actually prefer us to sample from a hydrant, some preferred sampling from a residence, some preferred the sample station. So we left it up to the water system. Anytime we do sampling from a hydrant it's a minimum of 10 minute flush wide open. When we pull from the other types of taps we always disinfect the tap.

RANDY HOLLIS: Is sampling from a hydrant, I have to ask this, you know more about it than the system does so they're blind just like I would be. Hydrants have so many crevices and holes that I wouldn't dare take a bacteriological sample from a hydrant unless you disinfected it for three hours at 50 parts per million and did all that. Is it really, is that a good idea? And even if they say please take from a hydrant, should you be guiding them and say guys these have weep holes you could get dirt, soil in here. If we're looking for something this specific I don't think taking from a hydrant is a good idea.

PATRICK KERR: We agree.

CARYN BENJAMIN: It is attached to the distribution system so we did flush, that has been determined to be an adequate disinfection, or sterilization other states call it. Just a hot flush through the hydrant. We left it up to the water system, we didn't tell them either way. But I know the hydrants that we have sampled from in like DeSoto those are flush hydrants. I'm not aware of them having any weep holes. I think St. Bernard we did sample some of the big hydrants I guess it does have a weep hole, but we also got positive samples at sample stations and at residences. It's still water from the main and a ten minute flush at wide open I think could get rid of everything.

J.T. LANE: Bottom line I guess as far as what we've done we wouldn't make a decision based solely on a hydrant sample, but I think it's something that we circle and when Jake is back in town and Dr. Guidry our goal is we need to establish a clear line.

RUSTY REEVES: On the flush hydrant that don't have a weep hole it's just like that on a straight pipeline sitting above ground that water is sitting there in that heated environment and in most cases, now as I understand it, it takes chlorine 30 minutes contact time to destroy, kill the bacteria, whatever.

PATRICK KERR: Just to comment I think to follow up with Randy. I think it would be in the department's best interest not to allow it for the simple reason that if you get a positive result it's going to be made public and if it's in fact not indicative of what's in the system we've caused a scare for no reason. We're at ground zero on Ebola in Louisiana unfortunately. I've been in meetings the last couple of weeks and everybody is talking about Louisiana and I just think it would be in our best interest not to do that because there's a lot of turbulence in a hydrant if you look at the mechanics of it. There could be things that don't flush out and when you close the fire hydrant to reduce the pressure on that pressure regulator you've got those weep holes are partially open. The fire hydrant's got to be completely open to close them and so through that turbulence you can pull ground water into that flow. I think you ought to take another look at it just because we're going to scare people and have a false positive. If you do every system in the state one of them is going to get screwed up.

J.T. LANE: We will look at it. Any other questions or comments? Does anybody want to share anything else while we're here? We got that update, there's nothing else left to discuss, this is not an official meeting. I'll say number one thank you to all of you that made it. I'm sorry for those of you that have to drive further than others to get here, but thank you none the less for that time. Rest assured at some point you'll get a pay

back on the work for that. Thank you very much.

RANDY HOLLIS: We do have one question. This is not official, just while we're here, that we can be thinking about as we go through these final versions we see the parenthesis DS and SS and as I take that DS is for design standard and then SS is for sanitary survey. Is this going to conflict with the grandfathering later on? In other words, for example under storage it talks about we need to have two clear wells and that was I think listed at design standard and sanitary survey. Well, if I don't have two clear at one of my plants cause it was built 60 years ago and we put that in here as a sanitary survey am I going to get dinged at one of my plants because I don't have two clear wells?

J.T. LANE: What we need to do is that after the work with the grandfathering committee is done then we're going to have to cross check and make sure the system, even as we're implementing new, I mentioned before the new health department software for the new technology provider. It's actually eliminating a lot of our filing systems and we're still working through the impact on engineering. The hope is A if we have to go through manually and make sure there's no conflict we will, but I think what we want to do is make sure the system is catching as much as possible so we can catalog if it's grandfathered in when the survey time comes around that they are not (inaudible) grandfathering. The sanitary report should be customized to whatever clause that would apply to it.

RANDY HOLLIS: I think some of these are good check list items, I agree with them. But if we have something that's listed as a sanitary survey, a physical component that I just can't, without spending five million dollars, I can't do.

CHRIS RICHARD: I noticed this last time, some of the reports they'll have a statement that this applies only for sanitary survey in the portion of the code in the verbiage and that it doesn't apply for design only. I don't think we should say that in the code, that

has to be addressed in the grandfathering clause because my understanding of the way this code works is if I design a plant today, once this code is in place and it's constructed, then that plant will be subject to a sanitary survey up to the code at which it was permitted at. So you can't have clauses in there that say it doesn't apply to a sanitary survey because it most certainly does for that plant that I design. We can't have that language that we've been reading in the past couple of meetings saying this doesn't apply to sanitary surveys, can't be in the code it has to be addressed elsewhere so I think it needs to be taken out of the code.

PATRICK KERR: I agree.

GREG GORDON: I don't know it was ever imagined it would be in the code.

CARYN BENJAMIN: That was just purely to note how we're going to arrange it later.

GREG GORDON: It's not like what J.T. is saying we have to go back and cross check everything so we have some understanding. I think the customization that you talked about is very, very necessary.

J.T. LANE: That's sort of the root of what I think one of the major causes (inaudible) a lot of confusion and frustration. That we weren't necessarily able to provide that level of service so that's what we're trying to do is make sure that we are doing that consistent with the time at which the system was designed and built. Then that's not to say I think beyond that we're still going to need to work through issues we can easily come up with planning to get, grandfathering is going to work as a transition. I think we're going to talk about that as part of that, but ultimately what should be expected over a five year time period or ten year time period planning for investment and making sure, I don't think part of those, but that is also part of the long-term solution to eventually what we are adopting we agree is best practice and so the crux is how do we really aspire to achieve that fully for those that are not new.

GREG GORDON: I agree with you. I think the one thing that will be interesting and it makes it hard for you as an agency is that actually means DHH is going to have to step in through offices with these water providers and say okay now we want to help you protect water quality and make changes. How can we work with you so we make sure you stay on track 5, 10, 15 years rather than I come, I've done my piece of paper, send in your CYA thing to me, and I leave the building. It's got to be kind of like a team effort so to speak. I think it's hard with budget cutbacks and everything, but at some point the agents will have to kind of shift its focus relative to how it's coordinating with those regulators.

CHRIS RICHARD: Part of the thing I think the grandfathering is going to be complicated I think people need to keep in mind when we get to it is very seldom do you do a new project, you're rehabbing an old project. You're not going to bring everything at that plant up to, it would be cost prohibitive. You might as well demolish it and start over. So they'll be components that are new and built to a new standard that will have certain features that will be in place and be subject to that survey, but on the same site there's going to be things that aren't going to be in compliance with the new code, but they're going to be grandfathered in so even at a single site it's going to be very complicated to what applies and what doesn't apply. I think it's going to be on the water systems to maintain records of variances and permitting and when things were done to protect themselves when they get a sanitary survey saying no this applied to this and so on.

PATRICK KERR: Aren't you all disappointed that you didn't get to vote today. Early voting is open, take advantage of it in case you get hit by a bus next week or something.

J.T. LANE: Well thank you all for coming again. We are going to email you all about, I did have my checklist about the November 24th meeting at 10 a.m. or 1 p.m. Again, we will reach out to you by email about that. Do a poll and see if we can get a quorum.