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1. **INTRODUCTION**

Osoyoos Lake is situated in the Okanagan Valley on the Canada-USA border. The study area is located on the east side of Osoyoos Lake. It begins approximately opposite Haynes Point and extends about half the distance to the USA border (See Figure 1). The dominant shoreline uses are recreational (campgrounds), residential and agricultural (orchards).

The use of septic tanks with drainfields near a lake shore can result in inadequate septic leachate treatment by the soil (refer to Figure 2). Water tables in such areas are often close to the soil surface and effluent may move with groundwater into the lake. Leachate plumes can emerge near lake shore. This may cause weed and algae growth due to increased nutrient inflows.

The east side of Osoyoos Lake was identified by the Okanagan Basin reports as potentially receiving significant quantities of phosphorus from septic tanks. Particular concerns have been expressed regarding the ability of the soils to adequately remove phosphorus from the peak loadings during summer months.

Direct evidence of nutrient inflows to the lake was desired to verify or allay the concerns. This survey was carried out in November, 1984 to attempt to detect leachate inflows from shoreline development. The details and results are discussed in this report.

2. **METHODS**

The shoreline in the study area was surveyed from a boat with a leachate detection system on November 6, 1984. The detection equipment consisted of a hand-held fluorometer (K-V Associates, Model 15 "Peeper Beeper") attached to a strip-chart recorder. Lake water was pumped continuously through the fluorometer as the boat
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moved along the shoreline. Fluorescence was displayed visually on
the meter and recorded on the strip-chart recorder.

The fluorometer is designed to respond to the degradation products
of human urine, the fluorescence of which has shown to be enhanced
by detergents. It is also sensitive to the whiteners found in
laundry detergents. The Model 15 differentiates between
contaminants of a septic nature and other organics by utilizing a
unique pulsing exciter/emitter system.

Water from various sources contains different levels of compounds
which may also fluoresce at the selected wavelengths. The equipment
is, therefore, required to be calibrated at the start of the survey
to compensate for this background level of fluorescence. This was
done about 100 m off shore in the area where the scan was started.
The fluorometer thus compared near-shore water to this background
lake water. It is assumed that the latter is unaffected by
shoreline development. Background fluorescence was set to read
approximately 1.5 on the 0 to 10 scale to allow for the possibility
of negative readings. Standard solutions ranging from 0.2% to 0.4%
urine in background were prepared. The fluorescence of the
standards was measured and recorded on the strip chart. Relative
fluorescence of the lake shore water can be compared to these
standards.

Water samples were taken at six locations. One water sample
corresponds to background fluorescence. The other five samples were
taken near shore and represent varying levels of fluorescence on the
chart. The samples were placed in a cooler and shipped the same day
to the Environmental lab in Vancouver for analysis.
3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 The complete strip chart record is given in Appendix A. It is important to note the limitations of leachate detector systems when interpreting the results. Some dissolved natural organics will fluoresce at wavelengths similar to those of whiteners and brighteners, thus increasing fluorometer readings or giving positive readings where none should occur. The Model 15 fluorometer has been designed to minimize these effects, but it may not have eliminated them entirely. Air entry into the system, such as when the pump is inadvertently lifted from the water, may also affect results. Entry of lake bottom sediments into the system generally causes a positive response. Known air or sediment responses are marked on the chart. Lake inflows such as springs or streams can dilute water in the area and thus cause negative chart readings.

There is also some fluctuation in the background and standards response records which is likely inherent in this fluorometer system. It may also be partially due to operation of the equipment at temperatures close to the operating minimum of 2°C. This background fluctuation has the effect of masking or enhancing minor variations, making interpretation of results more difficult.

3.2 Background and Standards

The initial background reading on the strip chart was 20 plus or minus 2 at approximately 100 m offshore at Lot A, Plan 26614, (point 1, Figure 3). The 0.2% urine solution had a reading of 29 plus or minus 2 and the 0.4% urine solution had a reading of 40 plus or minus 3.

The background adjustment was apparently bumped while maneuvering around the second dock at Lot 25, Plan 1958 (point 5, Figure 3). This was confirmed when the readings did not
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return to background levels along the subsequent undeveloped shoreline (points 7, 8, 9, Figure 3). A new background was then established off the point on Lot 24, Plan 1958 (point 10, Figure 3). This second background reading was set at 16. Apparent fluctuation is plus or minus 4. Background lake water was sampled about 100 m off shore at this point.

3.3 Major Peaks

Major peaks are defined as being approximately equal to or greater than the fluorometer response for the 0.2% urine solution. Six major peaks were recorded. These occurred at:

1. near Plan A9020 R/W (point 3, Figure 3). Campground. Reading was 10 above average background. Water sampled.

2. Lot 23, Plan 1958 (past point 21, Figure 3). House. Reading was 8 above average background.

3. Lot 11, Plan 3027 (point 23, Figure 3). Campground. Reading was 8 above average background.

4. Lot 13B, Plan 1958 (point 27, Figure 3). Campground. Reading was 10 above average background. Water sampled.

5. Lot 1, Plan 8023 (point 29, Figure 3). Campground. Reading was 10 above average background. Water sampled.

6. Lot A, Plan 31524 (point 31, Figure 3). Campground, boat house. Reading was 8 above average background. Water sampled.
3.4 Minor Peaks

Minor peaks are defined as being above the background fluctuation (4 above average background) and less than major peaks (8 above average background). Six minor peaks were recorded.

1. Lot A, Plan 26614 (before point 2, Figure 3). House and orchard. Reading was 6 above average background.

2. Lot 11, Plan 3027 (point 24, Figure 3). Campground. Reading was 6 above average background.

3. Lot A, Plan 10545 (point 35, Figure 3). Campground. Reading was 6 above average background. Water sampled.

4. Lot 3, Plan 10545 (point 38, Figure 3). Reading was 6 above background.

5. Lot 1, Plan 15248 (point 39, Figure 3). House. Reading was 6 above background.

6. Lot 3, Plan 15248 (point 41, Figure 3). House. Reading was 6 above background.

3.5 Lab Analyses

The results of the laboratory analyses of the six water samples are given in Table 1. There is a general increase in specific conductivity, nitrogen (particularly ammonia) and sulphates. Phosphorus shows a slight elevation at several locations, pH does not appear to be affected.
TABLE 1

Lab Analyses – Osoyoos Lake – November 6, 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Site 3</th>
<th>Site 27</th>
<th>Site 29</th>
<th>Site 31</th>
<th>Site 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Conductivity</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen:Ammonia</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen:NO₂NO₃</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen:NO₂</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen:NO₃</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen:Kjeldahl</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen:Organic</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen:Total</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus:Ortho-phosphate</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus:Total</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphate</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. CONCLUSIONS

Septic tank leachates appear to be entering the lake at several locations along this shoreline. Most of the major plumes occur directly in front of campgrounds. Water sampling indicates noticeable changes in specific conductivity, sulphates and nitrogen (particularly ammonia). Sampling was done in November, approximately 2 months after the end of the camping season. This may account for the minor changes in phosphorus compared to background.

Further work to pinpoint the sources of the leachates may be required. Groundwater sampling in conjunction with groundwater flow determinations are recommended.