

And

"It is appropriately an issue for water service contract negotiations between the regional water system and its customers. To do otherwise invites unwanted intervention of the state into local decision making."

ODWMA cannot on its own assess an actual dollar value to any regional benefit for the City of Flint to remain a full customer of DWSD, but the following should be included in any additional analysis:

- The cost estimates provided in the TYJT report show a cost difference between full KWA and full DWSD participation of \$172 million over 30 years.
- The formation of KWA would itself be considered one of the largest regional drinking water authorities in the State in terms of capacity, and as such any regional benefits provided by DWSD may only be marginal in comparison.

Finally, we have additional questions for TYJT regarding the various DWSD supply options and the considerations they made in the operations of the Flint WTP. These considerations will have an impact on the cost estimates for DWSD options.

We look forward to further discussion of these comments during our meetings tomorrow, and please let us know if you have any additional questions for us between now and then.

Stephen Busch, P.E.
Lansing and Jackson District Supervisor
Office of Drinking Water and Municipal Assistance
MDEQ
517-643-2314

From: Busch, Stephen (DEQ)
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 3:58 PM
To: Wyant, Dan (DEQ); Thelen, Mary Beth (DEQ); Sygo, Jim (DEQ)
Cc: Willard, Veronica (DEQ); Shekter Smith, Liane (DEQ)
Subject: RE: Flint Draft Response

I will provide additional follow up by tomorrow (Wed.) afternoon to my previous email below based on our discussion and the conference call with Andy Dillon earlier today.

Stephen Busch, P.E.
Lansing and Jackson District Supervisor
Office of Drinking Water and Municipal Assistance
MDEQ
517-643-2314

From: Busch, Stephen (DEQ)
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 12:37 PM
To: Wyant, Dan (DEQ); Thelen, Mary Beth (DEQ); Sygo, Jim (DEQ)
Cc: Willard, Veronica (DEQ); Shekter Smith, Liane (DEQ)
Subject: Flint Draft Response

Director Wyant,

In preparation for our call today with Treasurer Dillon's office, ODWMA has developed the following for consideration. We can provide any additional info you require during the meeting.

ODWMA has reviewed the materials developed by the consultant Tucker, Young, Jackson, Tull, Inc. (TYJT) for Treasury regarding the City of Flint and potential alternatives for public water supply. Based on our reviews, we have developed the following comments to this point in our analysis:

1. The TYJT report does not contain the full scope of the Karegnondi Water Authority (KWA) raw water supply system. TYJT concerns over raw water supply redundancy and reliability are addressed to the satisfaction of ODWMA under the full KWA proposal. Please note some portions of the overall project are being financed independently by the Genesee County Drain Commission.
2. There are significant differences in contract language between KWA and Detroit Water and Sewerage Department (DWSD) with respect to the contracted maximum day demand capacity.
 - a. Under a KWA contract, a "maximum day" capacity of 18 million gallons per day (MGD) would fully satisfy current demands of the City of Flint, without the need to supplement raw water capacity using the Flint River. (18 MGD, average over a 30 day period).
 - b. Under a DWSD model contract, a "maximum day" capacity, even at 18 MGD, would not satisfy the current demands for the City of Flint. (18 MGD, over any 24 hour period).
3. Restrictions in contracted capacity that would prevent the City of Flint from meeting peak demand requirements present potential limits to economic development within the City of Flint, including possible connection bans and water system extension bans. This information was previously conveyed to the City of Flint by ODWMA staff.
4. All contract options with DWSD that are considered semi-competitive with the KWA contract do not fully supply the City of Flint, and would require the City of Flint to meet a significant, if not majority, of its water demands by treating water from the Flint River. Continuous use of the Flint River at such demand rates would:
 - a. Pose an increased microbial risk to public health (Flint River vs. Lake Huron source water)
 - b. Pose an increased risk of disinfection by-product (carcinogen) exposure to public health (Flint River vs. Lake Huron source water)
 - c. Trigger additional regulatory requirements under the Michigan Safe Drinking Water Act (LTZESWTR)
 - d. Require significant enhancements to treatment at the Flint WTP, beyond those identified in the TYJT report (see item 5 below).
 - e. Water Resource Division is evaluating potential impacts to NPDES wastewater discharge permits in downstream segments of the Flint River, as a result of decreased river baseflow caused by Flint WTP use.
5. The TYJT report does not adequately address increased requirements and costs associated with using the Flint River as a significant source for the Flint WTP, which are not necessary under a Lake Huron source water scenario. This includes:
 - a. The need to provide softening treatment
 - b. Limitations on disposal options for lime softening sludge
 - c. Increased ozone capacity, UV disinfection
 - d. Additional backup power, more power required for Flint River operation
6. The Flint WTP must operate at some minimum level and within a range of flow rates to maintain treatment effectiveness. Currently that minimum level is 9 MGD. This level may be reduced with additional capital costs to modify the WTP, not addressed in the TYJT report.
7. Allowing Flint WTP to blend water with DWSD sets a new precedent that could pose future consequences with other DWSD customers.
8. Costs impacts to remaining DWSD customers would be similar under the proposed scenarios, only retaining 8 MGD of 30+ MGD total Flint/Genesee Co. demands, based on the following: