

Thelen, Mary Beth (DEQ)

From: Wyant, Dan (DEQ)
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2015 3:42 PM
To: Lori Gliha (Lori.Gliha@aljazeera.net)
Cc: Wurfel, Brad (DEQ); Krisztian, George (DEQ)
Subject: FW: FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS
Attachments: Resident_Sampling_Instructions-12-11-2015_508290_7.pdf

Importance: High

Dear Lori,

This is in response to your second email of December 11, 2015, please see below.

Your Questions

In our interview, you said the following, "Simply said, the protocol that we were using - I do not believe it is protective of public health and therefore more needs to be done in our testing protocol to ensure that we're identifying risk. We're addressing lead exposure and we are dealing with the issue proactively. Flint deserves safe drinking water."

Are you referring to the method by which the state was testing for lead in the water when you use the word protocol in this statement?

DEQ Answer:

What was meant by this statement is that the lead and copper rule, as written, was designed to assess the effectiveness of corrosion control measures utilized by a water supply. It was not designed to determine individual health exposure risks.

As a result the DEQ has become very proactive in engaging all of our partners to address health exposure concerns. The testing that is currently being done in the Flint Schools is very rigorous and goes well beyond any regulatory requirements. We typically take approximately 200-300 samples at each school in a single sampling event. We are evaluating the water mains, the piping throughout the building as well as the components used such as the solder and fixtures. The good news is that the testing so far indicates that the issues in the schools are predominantly fixture related and they are not deep in the plumbing, so the fixes are going to be relatively straight forward.

Once we have completed our evaluation we will use what we have learned to create guidance for all of the schools in the State of Michigan. In addition we will share our information with the U.S. EPA and we will partner with them to develop protocols that go beyond corrosion control and focus on health exposure.

Thank you.

Dan Wyant
 Director
 517-284-6700

From: Wyant, Dan (DEQ)
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2015 3:30 PM

To: Lori Gliha (Lori.Gliha@aljazeera.net)
Cc: Wurfel, Brad (DEQ); Krisztian, George (DEQ)
Subject: FW: FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS
Importance: High

Dear Lori,

Per your email questions of December 11, 2015, we are providing you with the following answers:

Your Questions:

1 – What is the current method that the state is using to test the water in Flint?

How, specifically, is it different (or the same as) the testing that occurred prior to the public recognition of a lead risk in the water?

Does pre-flushing occur now?

Is the state using wide-mouthed bottles or narrow bottles?

Is the water sampled?

In our interview, you said the following, "Simply said, the protocol that we were using - I do not believe it is protective of public health and therefore more needs to be done in our testing protocol to ensure that we're identifying risk. We're addressing lead exposure and we are dealing with the issue proactively. Flint deserves safe drinking water."

Are you referring to the method by which the state was testing for lead in the water when you use the word protocol in this statement? (Please see second email response)

Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Answers:

It is important to note that the protocol that the DEQ utilizes for assessing corrosion control is compliant with the lead and copper rule. The lead and copper rule does not include requirements with respect to issues such as bottle mouth size, flow rate and other such issues.

We have recently revised the sampling instructions and submitted them to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) for review. The U.S. EPA has since reviewed the instructions and has indicated that they agree with the revised instructions. A copy of these instructions is attached for your convenience.

We understand that there has been some discussion regarding flow rates and other related sampling issues and we will be evaluating these factors in a scientific manner to determine what, if any, affect these variables have. We believe that an open peer review investigation of these issues with samples analyzed by a lab certified under the auspices of the Safe Drinking Water Act is the best way for everyone to benefit. There are many partners involved in this issue and we want to ensure that the voices of all affected parties are represented.

Finally it is important to understand that corrosion control evaluations and sampling for health exposure assessments are not the same thing. The protocols that have been developed for the testing of the schools and for home exposure investigations are very extensive. These protocols utilize many samples at one location and are specifically designed to evaluate sources of lead within that school or home. These sources may include lead service lines, lead solder, brass fixtures that contain lead and other potential sources.

Your Question:

2 – When you admitted a mistake in the "proper protocol," in October, were you referencing more than one specific protocol, or just the lack of corrosion control?