

From: Benzie, Richard (DEQ)
To: [Busch, Stephen \(DEQ\)](#); [Prybyl, Mike \(DEQ\)](#)
Cc: [Shekter, Smith, Liane \(DEQ\)](#)
Subject: FW: DBP MCLs
Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2015 4:52:00 PM
Attachments: [DBP MCLs per SDWIS as of 01_20_2015.xlsx](#)

FYI – here is a spreadsheet with the list of other Michigan systems that have exceeded a MCL for DBPs. Some were under Stage 1, some under Stage 2. If the attachment lists LRAA in the Violation column, it was under Stage 2; otherwise the violations are under Stage 1.

There is one notable system missing from this list that should be on it at least by the time the system issues public notification.

I was wrong about Ann Arbor. They converted to chloramination to meet the Stage 1 DPB standard and when those MCLs were being reduced further and CT requirements became more stringent under the amendments to the SWTR, the city found itself in violation of the CT requirement. That violation is what resulted in a consent agreement and compliance schedule to install the ozonation. So it wasn't the violation of DPB standards directly that resulted in a compliance schedule for installation of ozone, but it did play a role because the alternative disinfectant installed to minimize DBPs resulted in the need for additional CT credit (and it took multiple years to design and construct the ozonation system).

From: Philip, Kris (DEQ)
Sent: Tuesday, January 20, 2015 4:06 PM
To: Benzie, Richard (DEQ)
Subject: DBP MCLs

Attached is the list of supplies that violated the TTHM or HAA5 MCLs according to SDWIS. They are re-reported each quarter they are out of compliance. Note the Flint MCLs are not appearing because the candidate violations have not been validated in SDWIS.