

MEADOW MOUNTAIN WATER SUPPLY

■ P.O. Box 162
■ Allenspark
■ Colorado
■ 80510
■ RCBarkworth@Yahoo.com

December 18, 2009

Serenity Valdez

Drinking Water Rule Manager
Water Quality Control Division
Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
4300 Cherry Creek Drive South
Denver, CO 80246-1530
serenity.valdez@state.co.us

Dear Serenity,

I am writing as promised during our telephone conversation on December 11th, 2009, regarding the Chlorine Residual Test results for the month of October 2009 at Meadow Mountain Water Supply. As you pointed out we were in violation on one day, October 11th, when the Chlorine Residual test dropped below the limit of 0.2 mg/L. On the day in question our original test result was performed at 7:30pm and it was found to be 0.0 mg/L. On investigation our operator realized that we were experiencing a problem with the chlorine feeder system into our clear well tank. He adjusted the chlorine feed to fix the issue, and he increased the chlorine dosage to adjust for the issue. He retested the chlorine residual one and a half hours after the original test, so that means the test was performed at 9:00pm on October 11th, 2009. The test result at this time was 0.1 mg/L. He then tested the chlorine residual 4 hours after the original test, which means that the test was performed at 11:30pm on October 11th. At this time the chlorine residual was tested at 0.4 mg/L. At this point our water plant operator stopped testing at 4 hour intervals and continued with the test on the following day at 11:00am. At this time the chlorine residual was tested at 0.5 mg/L.

I have discussed the appropriate process that our operator should have taken on October 11th and have indicated to him where on the form he should put the additional test information in future, or at least enter some comments. I have also advised him that he should have called and left you a message at least to let you know that we had encountered this issue. To resolve this issue in future I am preparing a set of instructions as a reminder for our operator on the correct procedure that he should have followed.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding this incident.

Sincerely



Rachel Barkworth