
From: Wurfel, Brad (DEQ)
Sent: Tuesday, December 22, 2015 4:43 PM
To: Egan, Paul
Cc: Murray, David (GOV)
Subject: RE: Flint water

Paul, Thanks for the inquiry.

Most of these questions regard issues presently before the Governor's independent after action review panel. We don't want to get in front of that review. With the review group taking a close look at the past, the DEQ is now focused on present and future challenges related to implementing the Governor's 10-point plan.

To your final question, the department went through DTMB to confirm that the reply to Ms. Walters was sent to her email address and received by that address. I can forward it if you need to see it.

b

Brad Wurfel
Communications Director,
Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
wurfelb@michigan.gov

PPI

(cell)

From: Egan, Paul [<mailto:pegan@freepress.com>]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 3:44 PM
To: Wurfel, Brad (DEQ)
Cc: Rosenthal, Adam (DEQ); Busch, Stephen (DEQ)
Subject: Flint water

Hi Brad: I am working on an update/wrap-up on the Flint water issue. I have a few questions and I am hoping you can provide answers by the end of the day Tuesday. I am also copying two DEQ officials referenced in the questions, in case they want to answer directly. The questions are based on e-mails obtained through FOIA by Virginia Tech researcher Marc Edwards, and by the Michigan ACLU.

1/ Have any DEQ officials been re-assigned or disciplined in relation to the Flint drinking water issue, other than Liane Shekter Smith?

2/ Why did Stephen Busch say in a Feb. 27 e-mail to the EPA that Flint had "an optimized corrosion control program" when in fact Flint had no corrosion control program?

3/ On June 25, Adam Rosenthal of the DEQ's Office of Drinking Water and Municipal Assistance sent an e-mail about the water samples to Michael Glasgow, a utilities administrator with the City of Flint. "Just wanted to remind you/confirm that Flint is on track for a few items," Rosenthal wrote in the e-mail.

"We hope you have 61 more lead/copper samples collected and sent to the lab by 6/30/15, and that they are will be (sic) below the AL (action level) for lead," the e-mail said. "As of now with 39 results, Flint's 90th percentile is over the AL for lead."

Was Rosenthal encouraging Flint to collect samples that would be below the action level for lead? Many people are reading his e-mail that way. Is there any reason why I should not?

4/ Why was the DEQ strict in 2015 about disqualifying the sample with a high reading from the home of LeeAnne Walters, for the stated reason that she used a water filter, but not strict in disqualifying other samples for other reasons that could have been used, such as that they were not among the 100 homes that were sampled in 2014, or that they did not come from homes at high risk for lead (for example the homes on Flushing Road that had received a new water main in 2007?) Why is it that of the homes sampled in 2014, only homes that had tested below the AL for lead were sampled again in 2015 and none of the homes that had sampled above the AL for lead in 2014 were sampled again in 2015? Were the samples being cherry picked, as some have suggested?

5/ LeeAnne Walters says she never received a promised letter or email that was to follow up with her from the Aug. 4 meeting in Lansing with DEQ officials and aides to the Governor. Was she ever sent the letter, which was to explain to her, among other items, why the sample from her home was disqualified?

Thanks,
Paul Egan
Detroit Free Press
Lansing Bureau
517-372-8660