

Workman, Wayne (TREASURY)

From: Workman, Wayne (TREASURY)
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2016 7:34 AM
To: [REDACTED] Agen, Jarrod (GOV); Clement, Elizabeth (GOV); Muchmore, Dennis (GOV)
Cc: Baird, Richard (GOV); Hollins, Harvey (GOV); Khouri, Nick (TREASURY); Saxton, Thomas (Treasury); Headen, Frederick (Treasury)
Subject: Flint Water Litigation

Governor Snyder, Since our meeting yesterday afternoon, we have learned from Miller Canfield that the City of Flint has succeeded in Genesee County Circuit Court in substantially reducing the plaintiff's requested damages in the Shears case. We are working with Miller Canfield and the City to get a solid estimate of the savings, but it appears to be significant. In addition, Miller Canfield believes this decision will have a beneficial impact on the other water rate case (Kincaid). As additional information is available we will keep you updated. Wayne

Wayne L. Workman
Deputy State Treasurer
Michigan Department of Treasury

Workman, Wayne (TREASURY)

From: Headen, Frederick (Treasury)
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2016 7:42 AM
To: Khouri, Nick (TREASURY); Workman, Wayne (TREASURY)
Cc: Saxton, Thomas (Treasury)
Subject: RE: Update on Shears v City of Flint, 1-6-16

I can answer only the first question at this point. The order has not yet been issued by the court. The parties are in the process of the drafting it.

From: Khouri, Nick (TREASURY)
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2016 6:02 AM
To: Workman, Wayne (TREASURY) <WorkmanW@michigan.gov>
Cc: Headen, Frederick (Treasury) <HeadenF@michigan.gov>; Saxton, Thomas (Treasury) <SaxtonT@michigan.gov>
Subject: Re: Update on Shears v City of Flint, 1-6-16

Couple of things

(1) when was the recent order limiting the time period issued? 9 months for \$3m vs \$30 m for 48 months doesn't add, unless usage really changed? How did we get the \$30m original estimate? Was part of it Kincaid? Is there still the ongoing \$750,000 a month risk to the city?

(2) Tom or Wayne --I'm out this morning. Please send an email to the gov right away, cc the folks in the room yesterday, and tell him something like "since our meeting yesterday, we found out the court has eliminated most of the city's exposure to a refund....

Thanks

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 6, 2016, at 9:11 PM, Workman, Wayne (TREASURY) <WorkmanW@michigan.gov> wrote:

I recall that of this number is because of the Kincaid lawsuit as well. We can just generalize about winning on part and reducing the potential liability

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2016, at 9:05 PM, Headen, Frederick (Treasury) <HeadenF@michigan.gov> wrote:

The biggest change is the refund time frame: nine months instead of roughly 48 months. However, I caution that the \$3.0 million amount also is an estimate. We should have a better idea once the Circuit Court issues final orders and that has not yet happened.

Sent from my iPhone