EB Inc.

April 17, 2013

Honorable Craig Thurmond
Mayor, City of Broken Arrow
City Council Chambers, City Hall
220 South First Street
Broken Arrow, Oklahoma 74012

Honorable Mayor Thurmond,

RE: REJECT Chloramine Disinfection

Please don't allow yourselves to be tricked into the use of chloramine as a secondary water tr reason for you to make this change. While I appreciate City Council's desire to comply with US Byproducts Rule, as it has been represented to you; the City of Broken Arrow has never violat there is concern you might, the City of Broken Arrow is eligible for a waiver for at least two yea Capital Improvement Project, such as your new Surface Water Treatment Plant.

The arguments in favor of the use of chloramine are extremely outdated and quite frankly dan new evidence being published by a team of water treatment experts and medical doctors that to consider before you begin the process of causing unnecessary harm to your constituents. T of chloramine is cheap and easy. Deploying the state of the art designed treatment plant in 20 this regulation… why would you consider anything else, especially chemicals that do harm? I use may allow Broken Arrow to more easily blend its water supplies with wholesale water from of other problems for your consumers; financial and property damage, as well as, medical and **alternatives**… why wouldn't the City of Broken Arrow attempt chlorine dose adjustments rathe chemicals to its drinking water?

A far better approach might be to work with Tulsa Municipal Utility Authority to help them seek poisoning of its citizens; this can be done in Tulsa by enhancing coagulation, improving filtratio charcoal. You will be told these options are more expensive, but in truth they are ultimately mu additional benefits. Bottomline, enhancing coagulation, improving filtration or using activated c chemicals and toxins from the water then what you are doing now. If these chemicals are not t have anything to react with and can attack bacteria like it is supposed to. Your future Water Tr at removing these precursor chemicals than all of these technologies.

I want to call your attention to the March 2010 edition of the AWWA Journal (American Water water industry's premier publication – which has an extensive article on alternative disinfectan **ONLY** benefit listed is reduction of haloacetic acids (HAAs) and trihalomethanes (THMs). Und the list includes, *"N-Nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA) formation, Iodoacids, potential to form cyan as strong a disinfectant, more complicated to produce (avoiding di and tri chloramine), less eff nitrification problems and toxic to fish."* The author concludes, *"precursor control - versus switc disinfectant - is the preferred primary approach to compliance."* Why haven't you as a City Co alternatives?

What you have been told is, "everyone else is doing it… and, USEPA says it is safe", both par told you is… the USEPA and water industry leaders are predicting the end of chloramination w Why? Because it costs more, is toxic and provides your citizens with less protection then they encourage your reexamination of these facts and direct your professional staff back to open di simply brushing them aside. These concerns are real. If you have any questions, please conta Perhaps the most efficient way for us to communicate is to email me at: [redacted]
will be reaching out to your staff. Thank you and I look forward to a chloramine free Broken Ar