

From: Goodwin, Kevin (DEQ)
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 3:08 PM
To: Berndt, Jason (DEQ)
Subject: CAZ description

Hi Jason –

Was going to give you a call this p.m. to discuss some CAZ ‘stuff’ – but looks like you’re out of the office. Until we can talk – I wanted to see if the description below (quoted), which is currently in our Assessment Methodology of the Integrated Report, is relevant to inland surface water intakes as well (e.g. Raisin River)? This language is worded relative to Great Lakes/Connecting Channels, but based on the GIS layer we have (which I’m told came from the drinking water program originally) it looks like a similar approach is applied inland perhaps.

“For public water supply intakes that are located in the Great Lakes or connecting channels, a concept of a Critical Assessment Zone (CAZ) around each intake was developed based on a Sensitivity Factor calculated for each intake. The two attributes used to develop the Sensitivity Factor are the water depth above the intake structure and the perpendicular distance from shore or length of the intake pipeline. Other factors such as localized flow patterns, thermal effects, wind effects, lake bottom characteristics, benthic nepheloid layers, etc., may be used to complete the sensitivity analysis. A radius for the CAZ, ranging from 3,000 feet for the most sensitive intakes to 1,000 feet for the least sensitive intakes, is assigned based on the Sensitivity Factor. A shape with this radius is then drawn around the intake to illustrate the CAZ. If the CAZ intersects the shoreline, then the geographic extent of the assessment unit is determined on a case-by-case basis as the most influential 12-digit HUCs that are along the shoreline within the CAZ. For intakes that are located in open waters of the Great Lakes where the CAZ does not intersect the shoreline, the geographic extent of the assessment unit is 1.5 square miles.”

That said, I seem to remember from a Source Water Protection standpoint that anything ‘upstream’ was considered? If so, I’m just trying to wrap my head around how that differs from a CAZ...(and if not, well...I’m wrong, which is likely). It’d be helpful to chat if you have some time in the next day or so. Thanks...

Kevin Goodwin
Senior Aquatic Biologist
Water Resources Division- DEQ
517-284-5552 (ph)
517-241-9003 (fx)

Rennaker, Joanne (DEQ)

From: Busch, Stephen (DEQ)
Sent: Friday, May 08, 2015 11:41 AM
To: Prysby, Mike (DEQ)
Subject: RE: CCCP letter to Flint
Attachments: Visit Ltr - April 2015 -revised.doc

See attached revisions.

Stephen Busch, P.E.
Lansing and Jackson District Supervisor
Office of Drinking Water and Municipal Assistance
MDEQ
517-643-2314

From: Prysby, Mike (DEQ)
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2015 3:02 PM
To: Busch, Stephen (DEQ)
Subject: CCCP letter to Flint

Steve,

Attached is a draft letter for your review to the city of Flint regarding their CCCP.

Michael Prysby, P.E.
District Engineer
Office of Drinking Water and Municipal Assistance
517 290-8817