

**Thelen, Mary Beth (DEQ)**

---

**From:** Wyant, Dan (DEQ)  
**Sent:** Monday, December 14, 2015 3:42 PM  
**To:** Lori Gliha (Lori.Gliha@aljazeera.net)  
**Cc:** Wurfel, Brad (DEQ); Krisztian, George (DEQ)  
**Subject:** FW: FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS  
**Attachments:** Resident\_Sampling\_Instructions-12-11-2015\_508290\_7.pdf

**Importance:** High

Dear Lori,

This is in response to your second email of December 11, 2015, please see below.

**Your Questions**

In our interview, you said the following, "Simply said, the protocol that we were using - I do not believe it is protective of public health and therefore more needs to be done in our testing protocol to ensure that we're identifying risk. We're addressing lead exposure and we are dealing with the issue proactively. Flint deserves safe drinking water."

Are you referring to the method by which the state was testing for lead in the water when you use the word protocol in this statement?

**DEQ Answer:**

What was meant by this statement is that the lead and copper rule, as written, was designed to assess the effectiveness of corrosion control measures utilized by a water supply. It was not designed to determine individual health exposure risks.

As a result the DEQ has become very proactive in engaging all of our partners to address health exposure concerns. The testing that is currently being done in the Flint Schools is very rigorous and goes well beyond any regulatory requirements. We typically take approximately 200-300 samples at each school in a single sampling event. We are evaluating the water mains, the piping throughout the building as well as the components used such as the solder and fixtures. The good news is that the testing so far indicates that the issues in the schools are predominantly fixture related and they are not deep in the plumbing, so the fixes are going to be relatively straight forward.

Once we have completed our evaluation we will use what we have learned to create guidance for all of the schools in the State of Michigan. In addition we will share our information with the U.S. EPA and we will partner with them to develop protocols that go beyond corrosion control and focus on health exposure.

Thank you.

Dan Wyant  
 Director  
 517-284-6700

**From:** Wyant, Dan (DEQ)  
**Sent:** Monday, December 14, 2015 3:30 PM

**To:** Lori Gliha (Lori.Gliha@aljazeera.net)  
**Cc:** Wurfel, Brad (DEQ); Krisztian, George (DEQ)  
**Subject:** FW: FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS  
**Importance:** High

Dear Lori,

Per your email questions of December 11, 2015, we are providing you with the following answers:

**Your Questions:**

1 – What is the current method that the state is using to test the water in Flint?

How, specifically, is it different (or the same as) the testing that occurred prior to the public recognition of a lead risk in the water?

Does pre-flushing occur now?

Is the state using wide-mouthed bottles or narrow bottles?

Is the water sampled?

In our interview, you said the following, "Simply said, the protocol that we were using - I do not believe it is protective of public health and therefore more needs to be done in our testing protocol to ensure that we're identifying risk. We're addressing lead exposure and we are dealing with the issue proactively. Flint deserves safe drinking water."

Are you referring to the method by which the state was testing for lead in the water when you use the word protocol in this statement? (Please see second email response)

**Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Answers:**

It is important to note that the protocol that the DEQ utilizes for assessing corrosion control is compliant with the lead and copper rule. The lead and copper rule does not include requirements with respect to issues such as bottle mouth size, flow rate and other such issues.

We have recently revised the sampling instructions and submitted them to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) for review. The U.S. EPA has since reviewed the instructions and has indicated that they agree with the revised instructions. A copy of these instructions is attached for your convenience.

We understand that there has been some discussion regarding flow rates and other related sampling issues and we will be evaluating these factors in a scientific manner to determine what, if any, affect these variables have. We believe that an open peer review investigation of these issues with samples analyzed by a lab certified under the auspices of the Safe Drinking Water Act is the best way for everyone to benefit. There are many partners involved in this issue and we want to ensure that the voices of all affected parties are represented.

Finally it is important to understand that corrosion control evaluations and sampling for health exposure assessments are not the same thing. The protocols that have been developed for the testing of the schools and for home exposure investigations are very extensive. These protocols utilize many samples at one location and are specifically designed to evaluate sources of lead within that school or home. These sources may include lead service lines, lead solder, brass fixtures that contain lead and other potential sources.

**Your Question:**

2 – When you admitted a mistake in the "proper protocol," in October, were you referencing more than one specific protocol, or just the lack of corrosion control?

**DEQ Answer:**

The mistakes that were made were primarily with respect to the tone that was used initially in our responses. The U.S. EPA has stated that there are ambiguities in the lead and copper rule and that the rule was open to interpretation. Both the sampling and corrosion control evaluation process were acceptable under the lead and copper rule.

We are currently focused on moving forward. We have developed a plan for moving forward and we are well on our way. We look forward to working with all of our partners so that the faith of the residents of Flint can be restored.

If you have need any further information, please let me know.

Thank you.

Dan Wyant  
Director  
517-284-6700

**From:** Lori Gliha [<mailto:Lori.Gliha@aljazeera.net>]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 11, 2015 11:36 AM  
**To:** Wyant, Dan (DEQ)  
**Cc:** Wurfel, Brad (DEQ); Sameen Amin  
**Subject:** FOLLOW UP QUEST

Dear Mr. Wyant,

Thank you again, for sitting down with us for an interview regarding the water crisis in Flint.

I have a couple of quick questions to clarify if you can please help answer these today:

1 – What is the current method that the state is using to test the water in Flint?

How, specifically, is it different (or the same as) the testing that occurred prior to the public recognition of a lead risk in the water?

Does pre-flushing occur now?

Is the state using wide-mouthed bottles or narrow bottles?

Is the water sampled at a slow rate as it is coming from the faucet?

2 –When you admitted a mistake in the “proper protocol,” in October, were you referencing more than one specific protocol, or just the lack of corrosion control?

Thank you!

Sincerely,  
Lori Jane Gliha  
America Tonight  
Al Jazeera America  
(202) 997-1382

=====

=====  
**From:** Lori Gliha <Lori.Gliha@aljazeera.net>  
**Date:** December 11, 2015 at 10:52:44 AM CST  
**To:** "WYANTD@MICHIGAN.GOV" <WYANTD@MICHIGAN.GOV>  
**Cc:** "Wurfel, Brad (DEQ)" <WurfelB@michigan.gov>, Sameen Amin <sameen.amin@aljazeera.net>  
**Subject:** one additional question...

Hi Mr. Wyant,

In addition to the last email I sent, I wanted to clarify one more comment you made to make sure I clearly understand to which "protocol" you were referring.

In our interview, you said the following, "Simply said, the protocol that we were using - I do not believe it is protective of public health and therefore more needs to be done in our testing protocol to ensure that we're identifying risk. We're addressing lead exposure and we are dealing with the issue proactively. Flint deserves safe drinking water."

Are you referring to the method by which the state was testing for lead in the water when you use the word protocol in this statement?

Thank you for your help with these three questions.  
Our story is scheduled to air December 16, at 9:30pm.

Sincerely,

Lori Jane Gliha  
America Tonight  
Al Jazeera America  
(202) 997-1382

-----

Notice: This email and any files transmitted with it are intended only for the use of the individuals or entities to whom they are addressed and may contain information that is confidential and privileged. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender as soon as possible and delete this email from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Al Jazeera shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Al Jazeera.

Thank you!

Sincerely,  
Lori Jane Gliha  
America Tonight  
Al Jazeera America  
(202) 997-1382

---

**From:** Lori Gliha <Lori.Gliha@aljazeera.net>  
**Date:** December 11, 2015 at 10:52:44 AM CST  
**To:** "WYANTD@MICHIGAN.GOV" <WYANTD@MICHIGAN.GOV>  
**Cc:** "Wurfel, Brad (DEQ)" <WurfelB@michigan.gov>, Sameen Amin <sameen.amin@aljazeera.net>  
**Subject:** one additional question...

Hi Mr. Wyant,

In addition to the last email I sent, I wanted to clarify one more comment you made to make sure I clearly understand to which "protocol" you were referring.

- In our interview, you said the following, "Simply said, the protocol that we were using - I do not believe it is protective of public health and therefore more needs to be done in our testing protocol to ensure that we're identifying risk. We're addressing lead exposure and we are dealing with the issue proactively. Flint deserves safe drinking water."
- Are you referring to the method by which the state was testing for lead in the water when you use the word protocol in this statement?

Thank you for your help with these three questions.  
Our story is scheduled to air December 16, at 9:30pm.

Sincerely,

Lori Jane Gliha  
America Tonight  
Al Jazeera America  
(202) 997-1382

---

Notice: This email and any files transmitted with it are intended only for the use of the individuals or entities to whom they are addressed and may contain information that is confidential and privileged. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender as soon as possible and delete this email from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of Al Jazeera shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Al Jazeera.

## DRINKING WATER LEAD AND COPPER SAMPLING INSTRUCTIONS

Dear Resident:

Thank you for helping to monitor for lead and copper in your drinking water. This sampling is required by the federal and state Safe Drinking Water Acts, and is being accomplished with the cooperation of homeowners, residents, and water system customers.

It is important that you follow these instructions so we obtain an accurate measurement of the lead and copper in your drinking water. This sample should represent the water you would typically drink and the faucet from where you drink the water. Select a faucet for sampling that was used the day before you intend to sample. Call your water supply if you have questions.

1. Water must sit idle in the pipes for an extended length of time before sampling. Therefore, do not use any water in the house for at least 6 hours before sampling. The best times to sample are early morning or after returning from work.
2. Select an unfiltered/untreated faucet in the **KITCHEN** or **BATHROOM** that is commonly used for drinking. **DO NOT** sample from a laundry sink or a hose spigot as these samples cannot be used for compliance. **DO NOT** use a faucet that has a filter attached to it unless you bypass the filter. **DO NOT** use a faucet that is connected to a home water treatment device (like a water softener, iron filter, reverse osmosis) unless you bypass the home water treatment device.
3. Place the open sample bottle below the faucet and gently open the **COLD** water tap. If you have a single handle faucet, turn it fully to the **COLD** side. Fill the sample bottle to the neck with the "first draw" of **COLD** water.
4. Tightly cap the sample bottle and place in the sample kit provided. Review the sample kit label to ensure all information contained on the label is complete and correct.
5. Answer the questions on the back of this form and sign the form.
6. Attach this form to the bottle and leave it outside your front door for pick-up.
7. Thank you again for your help. We will send you your individual results within 30 days of receiving them from the laboratory. A summary of information on this year's lead and copper monitoring will be printed in the annual water quality report that will be made available by July 1 of next year. Contact your water supply if you have questions.

If you have questions call:  
Water Supply: \_\_\_\_\_

Manager or  
Water Operator: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Or Contact:  
Michigan Department of Environmental Quality

DEQ Contact: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

**TO BE COMPLETED BY RESIDENT/CUSTOMER**

A. Which faucet did you use to fill the bottle?

☐ Kitchen    ☐ Main bathroom    ☐ Other

If OTHER, please describe: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

B. When was the faucet last used before sampling?

Date \_\_\_\_\_ TIME \_\_\_\_\_ AM/PM

Note: If the faucet has been idle more than 24 hours, we might not analyze your sample or be able to use your sample for compliance purposes.

C. When did you fill the bottle?

DATE \_\_\_\_\_ TIME \_\_\_\_\_ AM/PM

D. Is there a faucet mount filter?    ☐ YES    ☐ NO

If YES, was it bypassed?    ☐ YES    ☐ NO

E. Is this faucet connected to a home treatment device such as a water softener, a reverse osmosis unit, an iron removal device OR is any kind of additive used in the home?    ☐ YES    ☐ NO

If YES, please describe: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Note: If you have a home treatment device OR any kind of additive is used, it is possible we might not analyze your sample or be able to use your sample for compliance purposes.

F. If any plumbing repairs or replacement has been done in the home since the previous sampling event, please note this information here:

If YES, please describe: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

I have read the Drinking Water Lead and Copper Sampling Instructions and have taken a tap sample in accordance with these directions.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

**Thelen, Mary Beth (DEQ)**

---

**From:** Wyant, Dan (DEQ)  
**Sent:** Monday, December 14, 2015 3:30 PM  
**To:** Lori Gliha (Lori.Gliha@aljazeera.net)  
**Cc:** Wurfel, Brad (DEQ); Krisztian, George (DEQ)  
**Subject:** FW: FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS  
**Attachments:** Resident\_Sampling\_Instructions-12-11-2015\_508290\_7.pdf  
  
**Importance:** High

Dear Lori,

Per your email questions of December 11, 2015, we are providing you with the following answers:

**Your Questions:**

1 – What is the current method that the state is using to test the water in Flint?

How, specifically, is it different (or the same as) the testing that occurred prior to the public recognition of a lead risk in the water?

Does pre-flushing occur now?

Is the state using wide-mouthed bottles or narrow bottles?

Is the water sampled?

In our interview, you said the following, "Simply said, the protocol that we were using - I do not believe it is protective of public health and therefore more needs to be done in our testing protocol to ensure that we're identifying risk. We're addressing lead exposure and we are dealing with the issue proactively. Flint deserves safe drinking water."

Are you referring to the method by which the state was testing for lead in the water when you use the word protocol in this statement?

**Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Answers:**

It is important to note that the protocol that the DEQ utilizes for assessing corrosion control is compliant with the lead and copper rule. The lead and copper rule does not include requirements with respect to issues such as bottle mouth size, flow rate and other such issues.

We have recently revised the sampling instructions and submitted them to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) for review. The U.S. EPA has since reviewed the instructions and has indicated that they agree with the revised instructions. A copy of these instructions is attached for your convenience.

We understand that there has been some discussion regarding flow rates and other related sampling issues and we will be evaluating these factors in a scientific manner to determine what, if any, affect these variables have. We believe that an open peer review investigation of these issues with samples analyzed by a lab certified under the auspices of the Safe Drinking Water Act is the best way for everyone to benefit. There are many partners involved in this issue and we want to ensure that the voices of all affected parties are represented.

Finally it is important to understand that corrosion control evaluations and sampling for health exposure assessments are not the same thing. The protocols that have been developed for the testing of the schools and for home exposure investigations are very extensive. These protocols



- utilize many samples at one location and are specifically designed to evaluate sources of lead within that school or home. These sources may include lead service lines, lead solder, brass fixtures that contain lead and other potential sources.

**Your Question:**

2 – When you admitted a mistake in the “proper protocol,” in October, were you referencing more than one specific protocol, or just the lack of corrosion control?

**DEQ Answer:**

The mistakes that were made were primarily with respect to the tone that was used initially in our responses. The U.S. EPA has stated that there are ambiguities in the lead and copper rule and that the rule was open to interpretation. Both the sampling and corrosion control evaluation process were acceptable under the lead and copper rule.

We are currently focused on moving forward. We have developed a plan for moving forward and we are well on our way. We look forward to working with all of our partners so that the faith of the residents of Flint can be restored.

If you have need any further information, please let me know.

Thank you.

Dan Wyant  
Director  
517-284-6700

**From:** Lori Gliha [<mailto:Lori.Gliha@aljazeera.net>]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 11, 2015 11:36 AM  
**To:** Wyant, Dan (DEQ)  
**Cc:** Wurfel, Brad (DEQ); Sameen Amin  
**Subject:** FOLLOW UP QUEST

Dear Mr. Wyant,

Thank you again, for sitting down with us for an interview regarding the water crisis in Flint.

I have a couple of quick questions to clarify if you can please help answer these today:

1 – What is the current method that the state is using to test the water in Flint?

How, specifically, is it different (or the same as) the testing that occurred prior to the public recognition of a lead risk in the water?

Does pre-flushing occur now?

Is the state using wide-mouthed bottles or narrow bottles?

Is the water sampled at a slow rate as it is coming from the faucet?

2 –When you admitted a mistake in the “proper protocol,” in October, were you referencing more than one specific protocol, or just the lack of corrosion control?