
From: Dettweiler, Dan (DNRE)
Sent: Wednesday, January 05, 2011 2:43 PM
To: Benzie, Richard (DEQ)
Subject: RE: Final draft DW Administrators letter to EPA

Thanks for copying me, Richard. I would like to stay abreast the progress of this.

DD

From: Benzie, Richard (DNRE)
Sent: Wednesday, January 05, 2011 1:04 PM
To: Shekter Smith, Liane (DNRE)
Cc: Howard, Brock (DNRE); Dettweiler, Dan (DNRE); Jones, Lynda (DNRE); Monosmith, Carrie (DNRE)
Subject: FW: Final draft DW Administrators letter to EPA
Importance: High

Liane,

The attached document is the collaborative effort of the Region 5 States to develop a single set of comments on the proposed revisions to the Total Coliform Rule. Richard Overmyer, Brock Howard and I participated in a number of conference calls and email dialogues to arrive at this final draft. Rich Overmyer had the most input, but Brock and I agree with the final comments.

The intent is to have all of the State Drinking Water Administrators sign the document. Currently, they listed my name because they didn't know who else to list, but I think it should be your signature block. If you agree, can we provide an electronic signature block and Michigan DNRE logo for this letter to EPA?

Once I have your answer, I will reply to Minnesota and answer the other questions. If you have questions or want to meet to discuss further, let me know.

Richard

From: Smith, Gerald (MDH) [mailto:Gerald.Smith@state.mn.us]
Sent: Wednesday, January 05, 2011 10:22 AM
To: Jonas, Jill D - DNR; Beth Messer; Kirk Leifheit; Mike Baker; 'pcarroll@idem.in.gov'; 'Eric.Portz@illinois.gov'; 'rick.cobb@illinois.gov'; Benzie, Richard (DNRE); Howard, Brock (DNRE); Monosmith, Carrie (DNRE); Overmyer, Rich (DNRE); Ellingboe, Randy (MDH); Smude, Robert (MDH); Boushon, Lee H - DNR
Subject: FInal draft DW Administrators letter to EPA
Importance: High

Good morning all

Attached is the final draft (yeah and a toss of confetti). The letter still needs formatting and that task has been given to our support staff. The track change is still on in case there are still changes to be made. Can everyone please send me their signature block. If you have already done so can you please resend as a couple of my archive email files were lost and I have someone trying to recover them. It will be faster if you resend the signature block.

Do we want the letter to go out with out a letterhead? One option would be to paste the logo from each state at the top of the letter.

Do the directors want to route the letter for signature or use electronic signatures?

Are we okay to send an advance copy of the letter to Region 5?

Thanks

Jerry

From: Jonas, Jill D - DNR [mailto:Jill.Jonas@Wisconsin.gov]

Sent: Monday, January 03, 2011 1:16 PM

To: Smith, Gerald (MDH); Beth Messer; Kirk Leifheit; Mike Baker; 'pcarroll@idem.in.gov'; 'Eric.Portz@illinois.gov'; 'rick.cobb@illinois.gov'; Richard (DNRE) Benzie; Brock (DNRE) Howard; Carrie (DNRE) Monosmith; Rich (DNRE) Overmyer; Ellingboe, Randy (MDH); Smude, Robert (MDH); Boushon, Lee H - DNR

Subject: RE: Recap REDuxp

Hi All,

Yes, we are okay with dropping the 2nd sentence in #2 as suggested by Beth.

Looking forward to seeing the final draft.

Happy 2011 everyone.

Jill

Jill D. Jonas, Director
Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
101 South Webster, PO Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921
phone: (608) 267-7545
fax: (608) 267-7650
jill.jonas@wisconsin.gov

From: Smith, Gerald (MDH) [mailto:Gerald.Smith@state.mn.us]

Sent: Sunday, January 02, 2011 12:43 PM

To: Beth Messer; Kirk Leifheit; Mike Baker; 'pcarroll@idem.in.gov'; 'Eric.Portz@illinois.gov'; 'rick.cobb@illinois.gov'; Richard (DNRE) Benzie; Brock (DNRE) Howard; Carrie (DNRE) Monosmith; Rich (DNRE) Overmyer; Ellingboe, Randy (MDH); Smude, Robert (MDH); Jonas, Jill D - DNR; Boushon, Lee H - DNR

Subject: RE: Recap REDuxp

Happy New everyone

I have changed the letter to incorporate Beth's comment in paragraph 3.

Regarding the Section 2 comment, I need to defer to Jill and Lee as this was language from their December 15 and 16 email attachments. I am good with dropping from the second bullet "What is needed is a compliance response path for total coliform positives that focuses on GWR responses for the initial confirmed total coliform positive and has an escalated response for additional confirmed total coliform positive results" Jill/Lee are you okay with dropping this sentence? If not can you please address Beth/Mike's questions.

I suggest keeping "state actions" in the first bullet under Section 2.

I had not thought about this until Jill sent me her electronic signature, I am wondering do all the drinking water administrators want to sign the letter electronically or route the letter and sign?

If there are no further comments I will send the final draft to everyone Wednesday for one last review and okay.

Thanks

Jerry

From: Beth Messer [mailto:Beth.Messer@epa.state.oh.us]

Sent: Wednesday, December 29, 2010 7:31 AM

To: Kirk Leifheit; Mike Baker; 'pcarroll@idem.in.gov'; 'Eric.Portz@illinois.gov'; 'rick.cobb@illinois.gov'; Richard (DNRE) Benzie; Brock (DNRE) Howard; Carrie (DNRE) Monosmith; Rich (DNRE) Overmyer; Smith, Gerald (MDH); Ellingboe, Randy (MDH); Smude, Robert (MDH); Jill D - DNR Jonas; Lee H - DNR Boushon

Subject: RE: Recap - MI Comments

Hey All,

Mike is out this week, but I got his input on this via email and I've combined our comments. The comments are tracked in the attached. The first comment in paragraph 3 is pretty straightforward.

The other comments are in Section #2. We weren't sure what it was trying to say. I think if you remove the sentences, it still gets the point across. Also in the first bullet under #2, we don't think it needs to refer to state actions again since it's in the above paragraph.

Mike would like to see the final version before sign off.

Thanks,
Beth

>>> "Overmyer, Rich (DNRE)" <OVERMYERR@michigan.gov> 12/27/2010 3:26 PM >>>

All,

Yes, thanks to everyone for their work on this especially Jerry & Beth. Pat's last draft to Mikes revision looks good. Just note we should be consistent in the "1000 or less" population cutoff (eliminate the "less than 1000"). Also the 3rd bullet under item 4 should be: Maintain baseline monitoring as quarterly for all *groundwater systems serving 1000 or less*. (Not all pws).

1. Is this a draft that we can now share with the Region? YES
2. Is this proposal all or nothing? What happens if US EPA is okay with the simplified monitoring process but does not consider dropping the monitoring and reporting from clean compliance history? **NO, NOT ALL OR NOTHING BEING ABLE TO KEEP OUR FIND & FIX PROCESS IS VERY IMPORTANT. HOWEVER, MI ESTIMATES A 60-70% VIOLATION RATE IF MONTHLY MONITORING STAYS IN AS PROPOSED. I SUSPECT THAT WOULD MEAN MASS REFERRALS TO EPA FOR ENFORCEMENT OF MOST M&R VIOLATIONS.**
3. By using "significant deficiency" as part of reduced monitoring are we saying it is not necessary to define "sanitary defect"? **WE DON'T NEED ANOTHER DEFINITION.**
4. Is it okay to drop the following in #2? "Failure to follow Ground Water Rule would trigger a RTCR Level 1 Assessment. A second Level 1 trigger within a rolling 12-month period would trigger Level 1 Assessment and a third Level1 trigger would require a Level 2 assessment" If not, I need clarification of what is meant by failure to follow GWR? **MIKES VERSION WORKS.**
5. Do we need to provide comments or proposed definition of season system, clean compliance history, sanitary defect? **NO, NOT AT THIS STAGE. LET'S NOT MAKE THIS OVERLY DETAILED.**
6. Is it possible to open up the reduced monitoring to NTNCWS as well as TNCWS? The reason I ask is based on my conversation last week with Miguel. In this case we may be able to get a little more. It is still possible that through the rule negotiations that we may need settle for only transient noncommunity systems. Miguel just needs to know our initial and fall back positions. **MI HAS ALMOST 1500 NT'S BUT IT IS DIFFICULT FOR US TO ARGUE VERY CONVINCINGLY TO JUSTIFY ANNUAL COLIFORM MONITORING FOR THEM. WE UNDERSTAND IT'S A LITTLE DIFFERENT FOR MN'S PROGRAM THAT IS SET UP BASED ON ANNUAL SITE VISITS & MONITORING FOR THE SYSTEMS. OUR TAKE ON THIS IS MONTHLY MONITORING IS NOT AN EFFICIENT USE OF SCARCE PUBLIC HEALTH RESOURCES. IF WE NEED TO CONCEDE ANNUAL MONITORING FOR NT'S TO MAKE MONTHLY FOR EVERYONE GO AWAY, WE SHOULD. PUTTING IT ON THE TABLE NOW AND BEING FIRM ON IT WOULD BE MI'S VOTE.**

Happy New Year!

Rich

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency Unless otherwise provided by law,
this communication and any response to it constitutes a public record.



The linked image cannot be displayed. The file may have been moved, renamed, or deleted. Verify that the link points to the correct file and location.