The Be Well Study:

Creating treatment decisionmaking materials for well water contaminated with arsenic, nitrate, or lead

Contributions by (presenters bolded): Maritza Leon-Gutierrez, Lilly L. Anderson, Laura Neilson, Kara Baylog, Molly Kile, Veronica L Irvin, and Chrissy Lucas

Funding was provided by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS grant #R01ES031669), an institute of the National Institutes of Health





What is the Be Well Study?

• A 4-year, \$1.45 million grant from the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) to develop and test a well water treatment decision program for private well owners in Jackson County, Oregon

 Pilot project funded by OHSU Knight Cancer Institute, Community Partnership Program, a grant program that supports communities across Oregon in addressing local cancer-related needs

Study Overview

- 34 million Americans rely on unregulated private wells for drinking water.
 - Many of these wells have toxic chemicals (arsenic, nitrate, lead, etc.) present in concentrations exceeding health standards for public water.
- No comprehensive material available for water treatment decision-making.
- We conducted qualitative research methods to develop *risk communication material* in order to increase well water testing and treatment.
- o This material is being integrated into our RCT, The Be Well Study

Goal: Create extended messaging material about the water contaminants lead, arsenic, and nitrate. Material will have an overview of <u>exposures</u>, <u>health effects</u>, <u>prevention tips</u>, and <u>water treatment</u> options.

Material Development Steps



Step 1: Review Current Publications

- Goal: Find existing materials in the field.
- O Reviewed key dissemination sites for current materials for the community
 - Have previous groups created water-testing materials?
 - What water contamination material already exists?
 - How effective are the existing materials
- Key Takeaways from Existing Publications:
 - O Information was frequently inconsistent and out of date
 - O Information on contaminants, their health effects, and appropriate treatment was all housed in different materials
 - Limited information on treatment

Step 2: Expert Review

- Goal: improve contaminant guides through expert feedback
- Experts reviewed the contamination guides
 - O Expert reviewers included: Oregon DEQ, OHA, EPA, and multiple county health departments
 - Reviews focused on health aspects and levels of concern for each contaminant and how contaminants enter our water sources
- Key Takeaways from Expert Review
 - Change the health effects pages to reflect additional demographics
 - Modify contaminant action steps and treatment options
 - Confirm risk levels based upon contaminant levels were accurate

Step 3: English Language Focus Groups

- Goal: Improve contaminant guides through community advice, impressions, and general feedback.
 - Our focus groups were unique because themes were pre-developed before participants gave feedback
- Participants were recruited from across the state, with a concentration on OSU and Oregon State Grange list serves
 - We conducted 5 separate focus groups
- Contaminant guides were reviewed, then interviews were conducted for feedback
- Participants evaluated three education materials on lead, arsenic, and nitrate for the following:
 - What information was new, stale and missing
 - Was the material suitable, did it feel like it was for them?
 - Understandability-written in plain language

Step 4: Basic Design to Professional Design

- Goal: create contaminant guides that can provide easy to understand information using linguistic and culturally-appropriate images and language.
- Graphic designer used icons and images to convey important scientific and health information and risks
- Key Takeaways from graphic design help
 - Need visual representations of complex ideas and processes
 - Images helped to support text heavy information
 - Importance of variety of types of images



Health Effects, Before and After

ARSENIC HEALTH EFFECTS



What are the most common health effects linked to drinking water contaminated with arsenic? For more details, please visit atsdr.cdc.gov/toxfaqs and reach out to your healthcare provider if you are concerned about arsenic exposure.





Action Steps, Before and After

ARSENIC ACTION STEPS FOR CONTAMINATED WATER



For health-related questions about arsenic in your water and additional resources regarding well maintenance, testing, and treatment, please visit wellwater.oregonstate.edu





<u>AFTER</u>



Treatment Options, Before and After

ARSENIC TREATMENT OPTIONS

Treatment System	Description	Pros and cons	Point-of-use ¹ cost ³ estimate	Point-of-entry ² cost ³ estimate
Reverse osmosis (RO)	RO uses energy to push water through a membrane with tiny pores. The membrane stops many contami- nants while allowing water to pass through.	Pros: Removes a wider variety and greater amount of contaminants than many other treatment options. Cons: Can create a lot of wastewater. May require pretreatment to prevent the membrane from getting clogged.	Initial: \$300 to \$1,500 Maintenance: \$100 to \$200 ev- ery 1 to 2 years	Initial: \$5,000 to \$12,000 Maintenance: \$250 to \$500 ev- ery 1 to 2 years
Distillation	Distillers boil water, which makes steam. The steam rises and leaves contaminants behind. The steam hits a cooling section, where it condenses back to liquid water.	Pros: Removes a wider variety and greater amount of contaminants than many other treatment options. Kills 100% of bacteria, viruses, and patho- gens, so you can still drink your water during boil water advisories or if your well becomes contaminated. Cons: Heating the water to create steam can be expensive. Water may taste 'flat' because oxygen and minerals are reduced.	Initial: \$300 to \$1,200 Cost consideration: Energy cost to boil water.	N/A ⁴
Anion exchange	Anion exchange re- moves dissolved min- erals in the water. The owner adds sodium chloride or potassium chloride (salt), which replaces negatively charged minerals in the water.	Pros: Sodium chloride and potassium chloride are safe to handle and easy to buy. Cons: Anion exchange may affect how corrosive your water is and can corrode your pipes; this may be a health con- cern if you have copper or lead pipes. If treatment is not maintained properly, high concentrations of the contaminant can be dumped back into the water. Salt use can negatively affect the environ- ment.	N/A ⁴	Initial: \$1,500 to \$2,500 Maintenance: \$700 to \$900 ev- ery 8 to 10 years
Adsorptive media filtration	A charged media bed causes ions of the op- posite charge (contam- inants) to be pulled out of the water and attach to the media.	Pros: Produces very little wastewater. Does not require adding chemicals to the water. Cons: Treatment effectiveness may depend on the pH of the water.	Initial: \$300 to \$700 Maintenance: \$300 to \$500 every 6 to 12 months	Initial: \$2,400 to \$4,500 Maintenance: \$700 to \$900 every year

Point-of-use = at one faucet or one location (e.g., pour-through pitchers, faucet attachment, 1 under the sink, refrigerator water dispenser)

Point of entry= at the well, provides treated water at all faucets 2

3 Point-of-use and point-of-entry cost estimates are based on quotes obtained in 2017 and research in 2018; actual costs may vary. In general, the low-end cost is for a treatment unit the homeowner installs; the high-end cost is for a treatment unit installed by a water treatment professional.



ARSENIC TREATMENT OPTIONS



RO uses energy to push water through a membrane with tiny pores. The membrane stops many contaminants while allowing water to pass through.

Pros: Removes a wider variety and greater amount of contaminants than many other treatment options.

Cons: Can create a lot of wastewater. May require pretreatment to prevent the membrane from getting clogged.

Point-of-entry Initial: \$5,000 to cost estimate \$12,000

Maintenance: \$250 to \$500 every 1 to 2 years. Point-of-use Initial: \$300 to \$1,500

cost estimate Maintenance: \$100 to \$200 every 1 to 2 years.





Distillers hoil water which makes steam. The steam rises and leaves contaminants behind. The steam hits a cooling section, where it condenses back to liquid water.

Pros: Removes a wider variety and greater amount of contaminants than many other treatment options. Kills 100% of bacteria, viruses, and pathogens, so you can still drink your water during boil water advisories or if your well becomes contaminated.

steam can be expensive. Water minerals are reduced.

Point-of-entry N/A cost estimate Point-of-use

cost estimate Cost consideration:



Adapted from Minnesota Department of Health Home Water Treatment Fact Sheet.



Cons: Heating the water to create may taste 'flat' because oxygen and

Initial: \$300 to \$1,200 Energy to boil water.



Cost estimates are based on quotes. obtained in 2017 and research in 2018; actual costs may vary. In general, the low-end cost is for a treatment unit the homeowner installs; the high-end cost is for a treatment unit installed by a water treatment professional.





Oregon State University



Anion exchange removes dissolved minerals in the water. The owner adds sodium chloride or potaassium chloride (salt), which re places negatively charged minerals in the water.

Pros: Sodium chloride and potassium chloride are safe to handle and easy to buy.

Cons: Anion exchange may affect how corrosive your water is and can corrode your pipes; this may be a health concern if you have copper or lead pipes. If treatment is not maintained properly, high concentrations of the contaminant can be dumped back into the water. Salt use can negatively affect the environment.

Point-of-entry Initial: \$1,500 to \$2,500 cost estimate Maintenance: \$700 to \$900 every 8 to 10 years.

Point-of-use N/A cost estimate



Treatment Options (New Requested Materials)

RSENIC WATER TREATMENT OPTIONS Oregon State University Types of water treatment and the contaminants they remove This table shows the most common types of water treatment systems and the contaminants that they can remove. If you have multiple contaminants in your well water, you may need to combine water treatment systems. Removes or partially removes O Only if the filter includes absorption media rated by the National Sanitation Foundation May be needed for pretreatment to Recommended water Additional treatment systems may be required if remove arsenic treatment systems multiple contaminants are present in your well water - Lead Nitrate Color, taste, or odor issues Bacteria and Viruses - Calcium and Manganese (Water Hardness) Chlorine -C Hydrogen sulfide -0-Sulfate Iron Radon -0--Uranium Pesticides Ο Perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) Trichloroethylene (TCE) and other volatile 0 organic compounds (VOCs) Adapted from: health.state.mn.us/communities/environment/water/factsheet/hometreatment.html

Step 5: Initial Translation

• Goal: Adapt English language materials to Spanish

Contaminant guides were first translated to Spanish for wider accessibility

• Adaptation, not just translation, was emphasized.

• Community feedback focused on cultural awareness to enhance the contaminant guides.



Reviewed by native, Spanish-speaking OSU Extension faculty

Spanish focus groups

) Step 6: Spanish Language Focus Groups

• Goal: Improve adapted contaminant guides based on community feedback

- O Participants in focus groups were recruited from OSU Extension and PCUN list serves, Corvallis y Albany Eventos e Información list serves, Radio Poder interview with our Spanish Focus Group facilitator, tabling at El Día de Niño at the Woodburn School District.
 - We conducted 1 separate focus group with two participants
- O Changes made to the Spanish contaminant guides based on community feedback:
 - Add culturally appropriate images of multigenerational household members and images that normalize water quality conversations
 - Change specific phrases to use terms more widely recognized
 - Add labels, "low, high and dangerous" to images with arrows to indicate risk (don't rely on color shading to indicate severity)

Spanish adaptions: Before and After Cover

ARSÉNICO EN SU AGUA POTABLE

¿QUÉ HAY EN ESTE GUÍA?

BE WELL PROJECT / PROYECTO POZO SANO

¿Qué es el arsénico? 2
Efectos sobre la salud 4
Opciones de prueba 6
Resultados de prueba 8
Pasos de acción para el agua contaminada 10
Opciones de tratamiento del agua 4000 12
Opciones de tratamiento del arsénico 14
Tipos de arsénico 16
Consejos para el tratamiento del agua 18



Spanish Adaptions: Additional Photo Additions













Step 7: Distribute Final Product (In-Progress)

- Contaminate guides are being made publicly available
 - Distribution to all Spanish and English households entering the study
 - Future plans also include posting on:

• OHA Domestic Well Safety Program website https://www.Oregon.gov/oha/PH/HealthyEnvironments/Dri nkingwater/SourceWater/DomesticWellSafety/Pages/index. aspx

• OSU Well Water Program website https://wellwater.oregonstate.edu

• OSU Extension Catalog (in vetting process) https://catalog.extension.oregonstate.edu/



Next Steps

- Analyze online survey with well owners to get additional feedback and suggestions
- Post materials online for general use
- o Publish methods in Journal of Extension
- Investigate alternative modes of delivery
 - Spanish language audio and video inserts
 - o Developing a mobile app
 - Develop a workbook for children to encourage multigenerational learning opportunities
 - Develop partnerships with 4H and other youth groups to increase environmental hazard education opportunities for young audiences

Thank you! Questions?

Lilly Anderson
<u>lilly.anderson@oregonstate.edu</u>

Maritza Leon Gutierrez
<u>leongutm@oregonstate.edu</u>





OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY | COLLEGE OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND HUMAN SCIENCES