

INTERNAL DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT OF THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
DISCLOSURE AUTHORIZED ONLY TO CONGRESS FOR OVERSIGHT PURPOSES

The advanced notification and approval requirements in the LCR for long-term treatment changes and new sources were intended to make systems think about these source water and treatment transitions carefully so that they plan the transition accordingly and don't increase lead/copper levels.

I know it's a tough situation, and I agree that our primary focus should be on moving forward, but at a minimum we need to have a discussion with OGWDW and OGC on this.

Miguel A. Del Toral

Regulations Manager
U.S. EPA R5 GWDWB
77 West Jackson Blvd, (WG-15J)
Chicago, IL 60604
[REDACTED]

From: Kuefler, Janet
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 04:59 PM
To: Crooks, Jennifer; Bair, Rita; Damato, Nicholas; Deltoral, Miguel; Porter, Andrea; Shoven, Heather
Subject: RE: Flint Discussion

I agree with Jen's last sentence. I think focusing on what the system and local health department, or TSC-Cincy experts or CDC can do in the short term to assess the extent of the issue and offer remediation options that can be quickly implemented, if needed, is a sound approach.

I am not certain of the regulatory applicability related to previous consecutive systems, which can come to agreement with the parent system about who does what, and how this scenario applies to the former consecutive system for things like installation and maintenance of corrosion control (since the installation was not done by the former consecutive system.) Can we ask HQ if they know of other systems like this, or maybe this has been done already. I am still catching up on email.