

From: [Shekter Smith, Liane \(DEQ\)](#)
To: [Sygo, Jim \(DEQ\)](#); [Wurfel, Brad \(DEQ\)](#)
Cc: [Shaler, Karen \(DEQ\)](#); [Feuerstein, Heather \(DEQ\)](#); [Devereaux, Tracy Jo \(DEQ\)](#); [Busch, Stephen \(DEQ\)](#); [Bloemker, Jon \(DEQ\)](#); [Benzie, Richard \(DEQ\)](#)
Subject: FW: Greater Saginaw Lead & Copper History
Date: Friday, October 16, 2015 10:18:00 AM
Attachments: [Saginaw"s consecutive pb cu summary.xlsx](#)
[SaginawLeadCopperHistory.xlsx](#)

FYI – it appears there's been some media interest. See e-mail below.

First spreadsheet provides history for the Greater Saginaw area.

Second excel spreadsheet provides summary of lead and copper results for the city of Saginaw.

Most recent round of monitoring (2013) 90th percentile for Pb was 8 ppb.

From: Bloemker, Jon (DEQ)
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2015 10:13 AM
To: Shekter Smith, Liane (DEQ)
Cc: Benzie, Richard (DEQ); Devereaux, Tracy Jo (DEQ); London, Bob (DEQ); Kaiser, Rebecca (DEQ)
Subject: FW: Greater Saginaw Lead & Copper History

Attached are a few documents that the Saginaw Bay District just forwarded to the city of Saginaw regarding their LCR history. Paul Reinsch, the Water Superintendent in charge of both the plant and distribution system, is worried about being contacted by the news media about the lead issue. Yesterday, one of the local TV stations were interviewing some local residents about their thoughts. The day before, it was the local paper.

From: Bloemker, Jon (DEQ)
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2015 10:07 AM
To: 'PREinsch@saginaw-mi.com'
Cc: London, Bob (DEQ); Kaiser, Rebecca (DEQ)
Subject: Greater Saginaw Lead & Copper History

Thanks to the good work by Bob and Rebecca are a few documents about the lead and copper history for the greater Saginaw area are attached or shown below:

1992 – Letter from City requesting DEQ approval of a modified consecutive monitoring approach for the City and its customer supplies. There is no DEQ letter of approval on file, but a modified consecutive approach was implemented for the two preliminary monitoring periods.

1993 – Letter from DEQ – action levels were met, but a corrosion study was still mandated due to system size. The letter established a July 1, 1994 deadline for submitting the study results and recommendations to DEQ and a January 1, 1997 deadline for installation of optimal treatment.

1994 – City submitted the results and recommendations from their corrosion study,

recommending lime addition to result in a finished water pH of approximately 8.5. There is no DEQ letter on file approving the corrosion study recommendations, but it appears that all parties proceeded as if an approval had been granted.

1996 – Letter from DEQ reminding City of the deadlines to begin optimal treatment and collect follow-up monitoring. The letter also confirms that DEQ had approved the City's proposal to optimize corrosion control through pH adjustment.

1997 – Two rounds of monitoring were conducted as a modified consecutive system with the finished water target pH of 8.5.

1998 – Letter from City summarizing the 1997 lead, copper, and WQP monitoring results and confirming that finished water pH averaged 8.5 and was within the range of 8.4 to 8.7 for the year.

1998 – Letter from DEQ setting WQP ranges for optimal corrosion control. As a minimum, WQP ranges must include pH and total alkalinity. In order to allow plant operators a small amount of flexibility while meeting the average finished water pH goal of 8.5, the following ranges were set : Plant Tap pH $\geq$ 8.1 and Total Alkalinity $\geq$ 65 mg/l, based on at least 90% compliance during each running 14-day period.

1998 – 2015 The City has consistently operated within the designated WQP ranges and has met action levels under a modified consecutive monitoring approach.

As apparent, not much has changed for the past 17 years. If there are any questions, please feel free to call.