
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@ahjazeera.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.