From: Lynch, James [JLynch@detroitnews.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2015 10:23 AM
To: Wurfel, Brad (DEQ)
Subject: Here you go. Realize, this is the equivalent of the kitchen sink...

Gentlemen,
I understand the demands being placed on you today regarding the vote in Lansing on the water funding, so thanks for trying to accommodate us with this alternate approach.
I'm interested in giving you the opportunity to respond to the most critical evaluations of the state's handling of water issues in Flint. To do that, I think it would be helpful to break the subjects into time periods: decisions made before the switch to the Flint River and decisions made after the switch.

Before the switch...

1. With Flint under the control of an emergency manager in the years leading up to the use of the Flint River as a water source, what role did DEQ play in arriving at the decision? Were the department's experts consulted on issues such as: the feasibility of the river as a drinking water source, the river water's effect on Flint's delivery infrastructure, etc.? Was the department pressured in any way to sign off on this arrangement from higher up – the governor's office?
2. Was the Flint River's water tested prior to the decision to switch to determine several key factors? Those include: compatibility with Flint's delivery system, the need for corrosion controls, etc.?
3. What legal responsibility did the state have in requiring corrosion controls for the Flint River water? Did the state meet its responsibility for that requirement?
4. Detroit Water and Sewerage Department officials used phosphates for corrosion control when running its water through Flint's infrastructure for years prior to the switch. Why was phosphate not included from the start as a protective measure? Was a cost estimate done on the use of phosphates and was that part of the decision-making process on whether to use it or not?
5. Dan, you've stated in the past that lime was utilized as a form of corrosion control when the switch was made. Marc Edwards has publicly suggested that the use of lime, when coupled with the addition of acid to reduce ph, actually increases the corrosivity of the water. Was the effectiveness/safety of lime as corrosion control tested ahead of time? If not, why?

After the switch...

1. From the outset, there were complaints about the water, ranging from contact rashes and itching, to taste, smell and discoloration. And early on, the city had to deal with Trihalomethane problems. Should these complications have been seen as an indication that there may have been other problems? Should it have triggered a more thorough investigation of the water situation in Flint which might have led you to the lead problem?
2. In October 2014, General Motors opted to go off Flint's water system because concerns about its corrosive effect on metal. Should that have been an indication that a greater investigation into the water's safety should have been conducted? If it's not good for GM, should someone have asked if it was good for residents?
3. In December 2014, January 2015, you had the results of six-months of water sampling which produced a reading of 6 ppb – just over the acceptable level of 5 ppb. Should that alone have triggered some additional system-wide investigation?
4. In February, water samples were taken at the home of Lee-Anne Walters that showed extremely high amounts of lead in her drinking water. I realize the physical dimensions of that home's tie-in line may have played a role in those readings, but again, in the context of what was happening, should that have triggered a system-wide investigation?
5. As evidenced by the Pat Cook email dated May 1, 2015, it appears EPA's Miguel Del Toral had unofficially expressed his concerns about the river water interacting with the system some time in April. His follow-up

unofficial memorandum was dated June 24. So at this point, an expert on drinking water is telling DEQ there is a potential problem here. Why did this not trigger a closer look?

6. Around that same time, Virginia Tech's Edwards makes public his findings about the heightened corrosivity of the Flint River water. Why wasn't this a trigger for a possible system-wide investigation? In retrospect, was the state's public response to those findings acceptable?
7. Dr. Hanna-Attisha's findings that Flint children were exhibiting higher-than-expected levels of lead in blood tests are released on Sept. 24. In response, Brad's response was that the water is "safe" and that it was "meeting state and federal standards." How do you assess that response now?
8. How do you respond to people who see the state's handling of Flint's water issues as a failure that put the public's health at risk? And has that handling compromised the director and department spokesman in their ability to do their jobs?