

## **Pleyte, Beth (Treasury)**

---

**From:** Saxton, Thomas (Treasury)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 25, 2016 9:54 AM  
**To:** Steckelberg, Larry (TREASURY)  
**Subject:** FW: Message from "RNP002673A81665"  
**Attachments:** 20160119133448197.pdf

**From:** Saxton, Thomas (Treasury)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 19, 2016 5:11 PM  
**To:** Khouri, Nick (TREASURY) <KhouriN@michigan.gov>; Workman, Wayne (TREASURY) <WorkmanW@michigan.gov>  
**Cc:** Stanton, Terry A. (Treasury) <StantonT@michigan.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Message from "RNP002673A81665"

Per our conversation a lot of these dates involve DEQ et al in which we/Treasury did not play a role i.e., someone else [DEQ] would need to confirm their accuracy.

Just quickly, items we would question from the document or need to investigate further...

12/20/12 (p.1) - we don't have the notification that is referenced

3/29/13 (p.2) – we are not aware of any veto by Kurtz.

The early offers by DWSD to reconnect were rejected because of the add'l cost, they were long term & the fact the City had executed a contract with KWA. On Jan 12 '15 they waived the reconnection fee but there were still issues re the length/term of the commitment.

3/12/15 – the Veolia report did mention corrosion control but the focus was on TTHM which was chlorination issue not related to the lead problem. I believe Treasury funded the study.

**From:** Khouri, Nick (TREASURY)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 19, 2016 3:14 PM  
**To:** Workman, Wayne (TREASURY) <WorkmanW@michigan.gov>; Saxton, Thomas (Treasury) <SaxtonT@michigan.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Message from "RNP002673A81665"

Wayne and Tom

We need to quickly look at this and see if we agree

Thanks

**From:** Posthumus, Dick (GOV) [<mailto:Posthumusd@michigan.gov>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 19, 2016 2:50 PM  
**To:** Khouri, Nick (TREASURY) <[KhouriN@michigan.gov](mailto:KhouriN@michigan.gov)>; Sally Durfee <[sdurfee05@michigan.gov](mailto:sdurfee05@michigan.gov)>; Sally Durfee  
<[sdurfee05@michigan.gov](mailto:sdurfee05@michigan.gov)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Message from "RNP002673A81665"

Let me know if this is accurate Thanks  
Dick

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Posthumus, Dick (GOV)" <[Posthumusd@michigan.gov](mailto:Posthumusd@michigan.gov)>  
**Date:** January 19, 2016 at 1:53:44 PM EST  
**To:** "Redford, James (GOV)" <[RedfordJ@michigan.gov](mailto:RedfordJ@michigan.gov)>, "Muchmore, Dennis (GOV)" <[muchmored@michigan.gov](mailto:muchmored@michigan.gov)>, "Agen, Jarrod (GOV)" <[AgenJ@michigan.gov](mailto:AgenJ@michigan.gov)>, "Creagh, Keith (DEQ)" <[creaghk@michigan.gov](mailto:creaghk@michigan.gov)>, "Pallone, Maggie (DEQ)" <[PalloneM@michigan.gov](mailto:PalloneM@michigan.gov)>, "Lyon, Nick (DHHS)" <[LyonN2@michigan.gov](mailto:LyonN2@michigan.gov)>, "Ruest, Karla (DHHS)" <[RuestK@michigan.gov](mailto:RuestK@michigan.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: Message from "RNP002673A81665"

To all;  
Senator Ananich would like to add additional items to our timeline that I sent. They are highlighted and I think show up on this scan. Please look at and let me know if they are factual (DHHS and DEQ) (and if you say they aren't tell me why because Senator Ananich will have his info). I want to make sure we are accurate as to what happened when. Need to know as soon as possible (by end of day would be nice)  
Dick

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [legislative\\_scanner@michigan.gov](mailto:legislative_scanner@michigan.gov) [[mailto:legislative\\_scanner@michigan.gov](mailto:legislative_scanner@michigan.gov)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 19, 2016 1:35 PM  
**To:** Posthumus, Dick (GOV) <[Posthumusd@michigan.gov](mailto:Posthumusd@michigan.gov)>  
**Subject:** Message from "RNP002673A81665"

This E-mail was sent from "RNP002673A81665" (MP C3503).

Scan Date: 01.19.2016 13:34:47 (-0500)  
Queries to: [legislative\\_scanner@michigan.gov](mailto:legislative_scanner@michigan.gov)