

Assessing the Need to Treat Winnipeg's Water Supply

Presented to Standing Policy Committee on Public Works October 31, 2000

1



Why Do We Need Water Treatment?

- Water treatment is about protecting Public Health
- *"The rationale for construction of a water treatment plant is based primarily on health concerns"* Dr. Margaret Fast
- *"Providing water that is safe and healthy to drink"* received the highest priority March 1999 Customer Survey

Why Is Water Treatment Being Considered Now?

• To reduce the risk of waterborne disease outbreaks caused by chlorine-resistant microorganisms

 To reduce the existing levels of chlorinated disinfection byproducts



Background

- Since 1919, Winnipeg has enjoyed a high quality reliable water supply from Shoal Lake
 - minimal treatment (chlorine for disinfection prior to 1937, and fluoride for dental protection since 1956)
- In 1993 Council
 - Accepted the recommendation to undertake water treatment within a ten year time frame
 - And established a Water Treatment Reserve
- Between 1995 and 1999 a comprehensive program of monitoring, pilot testing and engineering studies was undertaken



Public Consultation

- "Should Winnipeg Build a Water Treatment Plant?"an eight page brochure was widely circulated
- Special Meetings of Executive Policy Committee (EPC) were held October 21 and 28, 1999
- The public provided 32 written and oral submittals at the EPC Special Meetings
 - 20 "In Support"
 - 6 "In Opposition"
 - 6 "For Information"



Public Health Support

"The rationale for construction of a water treatment plant is based primarily on health concerns and it is for this reason that I offer my support for this request."Dr. Margaret Fast

"The Medical Officer of Health for Environmental Health agrees with the City of Winnipeg plan to construct a water treatment plant.".... Dr. Jim Popplow



Risk Assessment Workshop Participants

International Specialists

- Dr. J. Rose
- Dr. E. Nieminski •
- Dr. G. Finch \bullet
- ullet

Manitoba Public Health Representatives

- Dr. Guilfoyle •
- Dr. J. Blanchard •
- D. Rocan •

- Manitoba Medical Officer of Health
- Provincial Epidemiologist
 - Manitoba Environment

City of Winnipeg Public Health Representatives

Dr. M. Fast

City of Winnipeg Medical Officer of Health -

Dr. S. Harlos •

Deputy Medical Officer of Health

- University of Florida
- State of Utah
- University of Alberta
- Dr. B. Bellamy CH2M Hill, Denver, Colorado



Workshop Conclusions

- LOW RISK
- HIGH CONSEQUENCE

The Experts' Opinion:

 "The implementation of comprehensive water treatment for the Shoal Lake water supply system is considered to be justified from the public health perspective"



High Consequence

- Public confidence in municipal tap water is a valuable asset (and easily lost)
- Significant consequences result from a waterborne disease outbreak:
 - illness and loss of life
 - liability
 - loss of public confidence







Drinking Water Quality Regulation

- Unlike the USA, Canada sets guidelines rather than standards
- Provinces are responsible for regulation of drinking water
- Manitoba regulates under The Public Health Act
 - Minister issues certificates
 - Canadian guidelines used as reference for quality requirements



Regulatory Trends

- In USA, water quality is regulated nationally under the Safe Drinking Water Act
- Trend in the USA is for increasing stringency in water quality standards and guidelines to protect public health
- Canada is following this trend, ie. new Ontario Regulations



Waterborne Pathogens

• Chlorine is effective against bacteria and viruses

 Chlorine is relatively ineffective against *Giardia* and requires high doses and long contact times

Chlorine is not effective
 against *Cryptosporiduim*







Disinfection By-Products (DBPs)

- Formed as a reaction between chlorine and natural organic matter in the water
- Objectives for DBPs and waterborne pathogen control are in conflict
 - more disinfection, better pathogen kill
 - more disinfection, higher DBPs
- Research has identified an association between DBPs and illness
- The DBP guidelines in Canada have become much more stringent; the US continues to lower allowable concentration levels



Taste, Odour and Appearance

- Public confidence in tap water is strongly influenced by taste and odour
- Unpleasant taste and odour from algae are a frequent summer occurrence
- 41% of customers are not satisfied with how their water looks and tastes



Process Selection

- Goals and criteria for potable water in Winnipeg were developed
- A flexible evaluation model for evaluating alternative treatment technologies was developed
- Comprehensive testing program was conducted over 18 months
- Most cost effective approach to achieving water quality goals was selected
- A conceptual design for the preferred (base-line) "state-of-theart" water treatment plant was completed









Water and Waste Department

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT PROCESS



RAW WATER STORAGE TANK	MIXING / FLOCCULATION TANKS	DISSOLVED AIR FLOTATION TANKS	OZONE CONTACTORS	BIOLOGICAL ACTIVATED CARBON FILTERS	DISINFECTION FLUORIDATION CORROSION CONTROL	TREATED WATER STORAGE
------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	---------------------	--	--	-----------------------------



Water Quality Targets Using the Recommended Treatment Process

Treatment Goal	Specific Parameter	Typical Winnipeg Drinking Water Quality	Canadian Guidelines	Water Quality Goals	Pilot Results
Clear water	Turbidity (NTU)	0.3 – 2.6	< 1.0	<0.1	0.04 - 0.08
DBP control	TTHMs (µg/L)	112	100	100 (40)	<100 without GAC, <30 with GAC
	THAAS _{(µ} g/L)	80	NG	NG (30)	
Taste and odour control	TON (threshold odour number)	10 - >200	Aesthetic	<10	TON <10 (year-round)



New Technologies being Considered

- Ultraviolet Light Disinfection
 - may be an effective alternate for control of *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium* for unfiltered surface water
 - potential to reduce capital and operating costs
- Membrane Filtration
 - proven as an effective barrier to *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium*
 - membranes are becoming more cost competitive



What is the Construction Cost?

Construction costs (2000 \$)	\$149.0 Million		
Contingency	\$ 14.9		
Inflation allowance	\$ 11.0		
Engineering - Design & Contract Admin.	\$ 22.6		
- spent to-date	\$ 2.5		
Finance and Administration	\$ 3.0		
Other:			
 Alternate Service Delivery Study, 			
Risk Assessment, Environmental			
Hearings/Approvals	<u>\$ 1.0</u>		
Total Estimated Cost	\$204 Million		



What is the Operating Cost?

Power/Natural Gas	\$1.5 Million		
Chemicals/Consumables	\$4.0		
Operating Staff	\$0.7		
Residuals Management	\$0.6		
Plant Maintenance	\$1.4		
Inflation Allowance	\$1.8		
Taxes	<u>\$2.0</u>		

Total Annual Estimated

\$12 Million (2006)



Financial Plan

- In 1993, Council approved 10-year plan to finance and construct a water treatment plant
- The 10 year plan provides capital and operating cost for water treatment
- Water treatment will not cause rates to increase beyond current levels



Water Treatment Reserve Fund Capital Expenditure and Financing Plan

Year	CAPITAL	BLOCK 1	FINANCING			BALANCE, END OF YEAR	
	EXPENDITURE	WATER	Reserve Fund		Debt	Reserve Fund	Debt
		RATE (per hcf)	Rate per hcf	Annual Contribution			
4004		ф4 с с	¢0.07	4 500		4 500	
1994	0	\$1.55	\$0.07	1,503		1,503	
1995	240	\$1.70	\$0.13	3,435		4,698	
1996	977	\$1.89	\$0.02	1,287		5,008	
1997	533	\$2.10	\$0.02	904		5,379	
1998	362	\$2.32	\$0.40	9,640		14,657	
1999	261	\$2.54	\$0.42	12,024		26,420	
2000	2,500	\$2.70	\$0.44	11,318		35,238	
2001	3,000	\$2.75	\$0.44	11,477		43,715	
2002	6,127	\$2.75	\$0.46	11,986		49,574	
2003	26,000	\$2.78	\$0.59	15,157		38,694	
2004	84,000	\$2.82	\$0.47	12,530	34,012	1,235	34,012
2005	80,000	\$2.83	\$0.44	10,739	67,988	0	102,000
2006				0	,	0	102,000
Total	204,000			102,000	102,000	0	102,000



Rate Adjustments Without Treatment

- If Council decides not to proceed with treatment:
 - decrease in the combined water and sewer rate of about 18% from 1999 rates spread over the next 4 to 6 years



Proposed Water Treatment Program Schedule

- **2000**:
 - Decision to proceed
- 2000-2003:
 - Consider new treatment technologies
 - Alternative services delivery study
 - Environmental/regulatory approval studies
 - Risk assessment/cost reviews
 - Facility design
 - Tendering process
- **2004-2006**:
 - Construction
- late 2006:
 - Commissioning/Operation



Conclusion

- The risk of a waterborne disease outbreak is low but the consequences are high
- Long-term exposure to disinfection by-products are associated with cancer
- The present system does not meet all water quality guidelines
- Treatment plant will cost about \$204 M to build and \$12 M/yr to operate (2006 dollars)



Recommendations

- 1. The City proceed with treatment of the water supply as described in the report
- 2. Design and construction activities be undertaken so that the water treatment plant be operational in the year 2006
- 3. The water treatment process, as identified through the pilot testing, be adopted as a baseline process for comparison to alternatives and new technologies



Recommendations cont'd

- 4. The Administration:
 - Investigate and report on new technologies such as ultraviolet disinfection and membranes
 - Investigate and report on alternative project delivery strategies
 - Prepare documents in support of any application by Council for Federal and Provincial funding

What Would Water Treatment Do For Winnipeg?

- Helps protect against outbreaks from parasites such as
 Crytosporidium and Giardia
- Allows us to reduce the amount of chlorine added to the water supply
- Allows us to meet evolving *Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality*
- Supports the long-term health and well being of our community