
From: Wurfel, Sara (GOV)
Sent: Friday, November 06, 2015 2:14 PM
To: Murray, David (GOV)
Cc: Agen, Jarrod (GOV)
Subject: Re: Keeping in the loop

And Nancy called my cell before went into last round of mtgs. She/Freep is fixated on active role of Andy Dillon and Treasury at time and throughout and is asking if we had concerns, how could we have ever approved it.

I reiterated issues at time and tried to out heavy focus on we're focused on this task force work and letting them do their very important job of reviewing all actions related to this situation. Bipartisan group of people of high integrity, experts in their field and widely respected who are going to do a very thorough review.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 6, 2015, at 2:09 PM, Murray, David (GOV) <MurrayD1@michigan.gov> wrote:

Nancy is working with Brad on another column on the water issue. Here questions are below. I worked with him on some of the grammatical things, but also to stress that the governor has appointed a third-party task force to look at all of these steps and others and we expect a report in three months.

Below is the version prior to the update.

Dave

From: Wurfel, Brad (DEQ)
Sent: Friday, November 06, 2015 1:59 PM
To: Murray, David (GOV) <MurrayD1@michigan.gov>
Subject: DRAFT DELIBERATIVE RE: Need comment ASAP

These questions all make the presupposition that the state actually runs municipal drinking water systems. Every municipal drinking water system is required by law to have a certified operator on staff. In Flint's case, they added outside expertise on contract as well as having a certified operator. The nuance in your question is the idea that they don't do anything locally without being told to do so by the State. Not the case at all. Plenty of systems around the state make adjustments to their drinking water system within guidelines. The DEQ staff offer counsel and guidance, but State's formal role is to serve as regulator, not operator.

Flint commissioned the report you mentioned. If they ignored the recommendations in appendix of the report they commissioned, ask them why. Our take was that Flint was to run two consecutive tests of the system to determine optimization needs. The U.S. EPA finally came out with its finished guidance on that and distributed it nationally this week. I've

enclosed it. We were pleased that they acknowledged the Lead and Copper rule is worded ambiguously on continued corrosion control. The clarification will help Michigan and every other state going forward.

Your second questions also is more appropriately directed to Flint. The city made the decision to use the river, the historic backup, as their primary. DEQ's role was to oversee necessary changes to the drinking water plant to ensure the water met Safe Drinking Water standards.

To your final question, I believe it was reintroduced when the Flint City Council voted 7-1 to join Karegnondi, and DWSD responded by sending Flint a one-year contract termination notice. While that notice was not a shutoff notice, it did signal that the contract rates for water would be terminated and thus open for renegotiation. But again, this is a question best addressed by the city.

Hey Brad,

Just want to make sure you got my voice mail. I have some follow up questions based on the FOIA'd material I received yesterday.

Specifically:

- By 2013, MDEQ had a 2011 Flint report about the prospect of using Flint River water as a drinking water source. That report includes an appendix that lists phosphates, which we all now know are used for corrosion control, in the list of chemicals that would be required to treat the water. With a report in hand stating phosphates should be used, why were they not required?
- Based on the materials I received, the 2011 report comes up briefly in 2013, when the KWA switch was contemplated, then seems to drop out of the picture. Why was a report about the viability of the Flint River water as a drinking water source not part of the 2014 conversations about whether to switch to the river or to stay connected to DWSD?
- A report included in the material I FOIA'd said that by the end of 2012, Flint officials did not want to pursue the option of using the Flint River as a drinking water source. Why was it reintroduced?

Need a response ASAP. This is for Sunday.

Nancy

Nancy Kaffer
Columnist
Detroit Free Press
www.freep.com/abettermichigan
313-222-6585
@nancykaffer, @abettermi

<image2015-11-03-155158.pdf>