To: Mogharabi, Nahal[MOGHARABI.NAHAL@EPA.GOV]; Montgomery, Michael[Montgomery.Michael@epa.gov]
Cc: Keener, Bill[Keener.Bill@epa.gov]; Zito, Kelly[ZITO.KELLY@EPA.GOV]
From: Albright, David
Sent: Mon 2/2/2015 9:20:34 PM
Subject: RE: Dec. 22 letter

Hi Nahal,

We kind of got wrapped around the axle on "numbers" in discussions with the Chron reporter, so I would be hesitant to get too far into the weeds on specific numbers. That said, the "532 wells in non-hydro formations" does include about 30 wells found to be in formations that are not USDWs (>10,000 ppm TDS), over 40 wells where there has never been injection, and another 48 wells where there is no formation TDS data (some of which could be non-USDWs). Finally, the list of 532 includes 94 wells that are permitted in the 11 disputed formations, which we are now on the record as saying "have been historically treated as exempt." Otherwise, the numbers are great! ☺

Regarding the 2021 wells in hydro formations, we do not have a similar scrubbing of that list from the State, but I would guess we are likely to end up with some similar caveats for that list once the scrubbing is done – e.g., not all injecting into USDWs, not all actually injecting.

Finally, we have not received the State's plan, but expect to receive it February 6th.

Let me know if you have any other questions.

David

From: Mogharabi, Nahal
Sent: Monday, February 02, 2015 12:37 PM
To: Albright, David; Montgomery, Michael
Cc: Keener, Bill; Zito, Kelly
Subject: Fwd: Dec. 22 letter

Hi David, please see the below from the reporter AP. Is there anything new that we can give her? Did we get the February 6 response?

Nahal

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Knickmeyer, Ellen" <EKnickmeyer@ap.org>
Date: February 2, 2015 at 12:22:35 PM PST
To: "Mogharabi, Nahal" <MOGHARABI.NAHAL@EPA.GOV>
Subject: RE: Dec. 22 letter

Hi, Nahal,

Just doublechecking to see if the number of UIC wells under review in this Class II injection well issue has gone up or down. Can you tell me if the EPA/state still is looking at the 532 wells in non-hydro formations, and 2021 wells in hydro formations, as it reviews California permitting of UIC wells into possibly non-exempt aquifers? Or has that number changed?

And are you all still waiting for the state's response by Feb. 6? Nothing new?

We're supposed to go with our (long in the works) story on the issue in next few days, so want to make sure we're not missing anything new/any changes.

Thanks again,

Ellen