
From: Shekter Smith, Liane (DEQ)
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 5:40 PM
To: Sygo, Jim (DEQ); Kasprzak, Jim (DEQ); Epkey, Amy (DEQ); King, Kevin (DEQ)
Cc: Shaler, Karen (DEQ)
Subject: FW: Facility Notification: Flint State Office Building

Just a heads up.

I wanted to share with you a note that Richard sent in response to the notice from DTMB (scroll to bottom). The decision to provide bottled water when the public notice was not a "do not drink" causes us some concern.

Liane

From: Benzie, Richard (DEQ)
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 1:02 PM
To: Prysby, Mike (DEQ); Wolf, Jennifer (DEQ); Doll, Jeanette (DTMB); Busch, Stephen (DEQ)
Cc: VanOtteren, Bruce (DNR); Shekter Smith, Liane (DEQ)
Subject: RE: Facility Notification: Flint State Office Building

I have several questions about this matter. Why does "public traffic" deserve a higher consideration than concern for state workers? How does that reasoning appear to state employees? A visitor may take one drink of water from this site in their lifetime. State workers (like any employees) may get half of the water they consume each day at their place of employment. Which group faces the greater health risk from drinking water in state occupied premises? Are other state owned/occupied facilities in Flint being provided with the same service? How about a Secretary of State's offices or the DHS facilities? Are there any state correctional facilities that receive drinking water from Flint?

What would DTMB have done if the problem had occurred in Lansing? Would the state of Michigan be providing bottled water or an alternate supply of drinking water to all of the state owned or state employee locations that receive Lansing drinking water and allow public access? Who would make that decision? Why wouldn't that decision maker seek the advice of the Office of Drinking Water and Municipal Assistance before deciding? Would it be building by building or one decision be made for state facilities?

How does this action by DTMB impact the answer when ODWMA district staff are asked by others in the media or from the general public about whether Flint residents should continue to consume Flint's drinking water with elevated disinfection byproducts? No doubt it will make it more difficult from a perception standpoint for ODWMA staff.

If this matter were about an acute health threat, such as E.coli or nitrates, then I would applaud the decision. But when we are dealing with a chronic health threat in a community water system, I think the appropriate action is to ensure public awareness and education, establish a reasonable compliance schedule, and allow individuals to make personal choices if they wish. And if someone like GM or the State of Michigan decides to implement such measures as supplying an alternate water supply for a chronic health threat that should be of a limited duration, fine, but it should be uniformly implemented.

If DTMB would like to meet to discuss this issue and procedures for communication and possible actions in future, similar events, we would be willing to participate.

Richard Benzie, P.E., Chief
Field Operations Section
Office of Drinking Water and Municipal Assistance, MDEQ
517-284-6512

From: Prysby, Mike (DEQ)
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 10:22 AM
To: Wolf, Jennifer (DEQ)
Cc: VanOtteren, Bruce (DNR); Doll, Jeanette (DTMB); Busch, Stephen (DEQ); Benzie, Richard (DEQ); Shekter Smith, Liane (DEQ)
Subject: RE: Facility Notification: Flint State Office Building

Jennifer,

I spoke with Jeanette this morning. She informed me....given that this state building has high public traffic (Flint citizens); it was felt prudent to offer an alternative supply of drinking water to citizens entering the building. Jeanette asked me what should be expected with the next round of samples (March time-frame). I explained to her how compliance with TTHMs is determined (based on a running annual average of 4 quarters) and the public notification requirements. The city's next round of samples will be collected around the 3rd week of Feb; however, regardless of sample results, compliance with the TTHM MCL will not be re-achieved due to the high levels detected last summer. Although the city will remain out of compliance, (primarily based on the previous results), the November sample results were substantially lower (7 of 8 locations below the MCL). We anticipate that most (if not all) locations will be in compliance with the February monitoring. The city; however, needs to make a diligent effort to convey TTHM status to their residents as soon as possible after new results become available (regardless of compliance status). Jeanette will pass this information on.

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

From: Wolf, Jennifer (DEQ)
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 10:42 AM
To: Prysby, Mike (DEQ)
Cc: VanOtteren, Bruce (DNR); Doll, Jeanette (DTMB)
Subject: FW: Facility Notification: Flint State Office Building

Hi Mike!