
From: Thelen, Mary Beth (DEQ)
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2015 3:20 PM
To: Sygo, Jim (DEQ)
Cc: Thelen, Mary Beth (DEQ)
Subject: FW: DAN WYANT: STOP SCREWING AROUND. WAS THE MDEQ EMAIL TO LEE-ANNE WALTERS EVER SENT? YES OR NO?
Attachments: LeeAnne email.docx

For Jim's review.

From: Marc Edwards [mailto:edwardsm@vt.edu]
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2015 12:07 PM
To: Andrew Leavitt; Wyant, Dan (DEQ); Dickinson, Jordan
Subject: DAN WYANT: STOP SCREWING AROUND. WAS THE MDEQ EMAIL TO LEE-ANNE WALTERS EVER SENT? YES OR NO?

Dear Dan,

Months back my FOIA of MDEQ revealed a surprising letter that your employees supposedly mailed to Lee-Anne Walters.

I immediately had a suspicion that this e-mail was a fraud.

In fact, on October 15th and 16th, I immediately and point blank (URGENT REQUEST) asked you whether that e-mail was ever sent.

Dan, you refused to answer my urgent direct question about the e-mail.

So I then submitted a FOIA and paid several hundred dollars, asking for the MDEQ e-mails that would prove the e-mail to Lee-Anne was actually sent. In the e-mail (see attached), not only is Lee-Anne Walter's cc'd, but other MDEQ employees are also cc'd. Would you agree that if the e-mail was ACTUALLY sent from Shektor-Smith to Lee-Anne, that it also had to appear in the mailbox of the other MDEQ employees. **Yet, in the new FOIA, there is no e-mail from your employees that shows they received the e-mail. Even though this is what I explicitly asked for.**

DOES THIS MEAN THE EMAIL WAS NEVER SENT? If so, why is an EMAIL that was never sent, in my FOIA?

If it was sent, where is my proof via FOIA, that another MDEQ employee actually received it? Lee-Anne says that she never received it.

Dan, what your employees did here was truly diabolical and pathological.

If you will not answer my direct question, you are part of it.

Marc

From: Marc Edwards [mailto:edwardsm@vt.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2015 3:06 PM
To: WyantD@michigan.gov; walters313@gmail.com; Andrew Leavitt (ALeavitt@senate.michigan.gov); Melissa Mays (indigrace@gmail.com); Dickinson, Jordan (Jordan.Dickinson@mail.house.gov)
Subject: RE: Urgent Request for Clarification: Letter to Lee-Anne Walters and justification for invalidating her samples.

Dear Dan,

I spoke with Lee-Anne, and it was Harvey Hollins that ordered MDEQ to respond to Lee-Anne in writing, about the reason for invalidating her samples, not the deputy chief of staff.

http://www.michigan.gov/snyder/0,4668,7-277-57577_57657_59871-260098--,00.html

Also, I asked Lee-Anne what she would have done, **IF she had received that e-mail from MDEQ about her invalidated samples.** She said one of the last things Miguel told her, **was to be sure that MDEQ did not invalidate her samples.** So if that e-mail had been received, which it was not, she would have screamed from the roof-top. How convenient it was not received.

Your employee's also told Lee-Anne and Melissa, at the August 4th meeting, **that they had no idea why her samples were invalidated. And that the City of Flint invalidated her samples.** This is also a lie. The e-mails have already shown that MDEQ employees led the invalidation of the samples. There is not a word from the City of Flint asking to invalidate Lee-Anne's samples.

My point is that if all of these shenanigans are not "wrong-doing," then what on earth is? If two of Lee-Anne's high lead samples are counted, Flint fails to meet the LCR, even with Flint just "throwing bottles out there," no sampling pool, a 5-minute pre-flush, and sampling in many homes like Melissa without any lead plumbing at all. People would have been protected. Corrosion control would have been required. Nobody would be running around, to this day, claiming in a city of lead poisoned children, that FLINT is meeting all Federal regulations, and that Flint is meeting the LCR. That false statement been a staple of almost every MDEQ press conference in the last few months. Your employee's made that happen.

Marc

From: Marc Edwards [<mailto:edwardsm@vt.edu>]

Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2015 10:44 AM

To: WyantD@michigan.gov; lwalters313@gmail.com; Andrew Leavitt (ALeavitt@senate.michigan.gov); Melissa Mays (indigrace@gmail.com); Dickinson, Jordan (Jordan.Dickinson@mail.house.gov)

Subject: Urgent Request for Clarification: Letter to Lee-Anne Walters and justification for invalidating her samples.

Hi Dan,

Thank you for your help (if any) with the MDEQ FOIA. I received the documents last night. I was hoping you could help me with something ASAP.

One of the things creating distrust between Flint residents and MDEQ, is a long list of miscommunications and false statements by your employees. I want you to help us understand one of those miscommunications as soon as possible.

On August 4th your employee's Wurfel, Busch and Shekter Smith met with Melissa and Lee-Anne. According to Melissa and Lee-Anne, in a meeting with the governor's Chief of Staff, your employee's could not explain to them, why Lee-Anne's samples were invalidated (i.e., thrown out of the samples used to calculate the 90%ile lead).

For your information, on the basis of records from the City, **Lee-Anne's home is the ONLY home in the 2015 sampling pool that is proven to have a lead pipe.** I have compared the sample sites that the city used to the database that Flint has put together, **and of 11 samples in the database that the city claims had a lead pipe, ZERO actually had a lead pipe.** Michigan and Federal law further states that if a sample is taken from a home with a lead pipe, **even if it has a point of use device like a filter or softener,** once that sample is collected it cannot be invalidated (see below). EPA R5 staff explicitly told your employee's in writing, that Lee-Anne's samples had to be counted for compliance purposes. **Your employee's nonetheless, over R5's written instructions and the law, threw out the only Flint LCR samples known to be legitimate in the 2015 sampling round.** They also double counted Melissa's samples for LCR compliance purposes, even though her house does not have a lead pipe, and has no lead plumbing. So I hope you can see the "adding insult to injury" dimension of your employee's actions. The irony-- using samples from the chief critics