

The balance here is between what is realistic and what is ideal. Of course, everyone wants 100% compliance. The reality, however, is that it's impossible. It's not that we "allow" a Flint to occur; circumstances happen. Water mains break, systems lose pressure, bacteria gets into the system, regulations change and systems that were in compliance no longer are, etc.

Do we want to put a goal in black and white that cannot be met but sounds good? Or do we want to establish a goal that challenges us but can actually be accomplished? Perhaps there's a middle ground?

From: Allan, Jon (DEQ)
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2015 8:04 PM
To: Shekter Smith, Liane (DEQ)
Cc: Fennell, Emily (DEQ)
Subject: Re: DW goal

Thoughts on Bills comment?

No drinking water advisories, beach closures or aquatic life impairments due to harmful algal blooms.

By 2020, 98% of population served by community water systems is provided drinking water that meets all health-based standards.

By 2020, 90% of the non-community water systems provide drinking water that meets all health-based standards.

No designated use impairments due to failing on-site wastewater systems.

No new designated use impairments due to emerging pollutants of concern.

Jon W. Allan, Director
 Michigan Office of the Great Lakes

Office 517.284.5034

From: Creal, William (DEQ)
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2015 4:25 PM
To: Allan, Jon (DEQ)
Subject: DW goal

I think you are nuts if you go with a goal less than 100% for DW compliance in the strategy. How many Flints do you intend to allow???