To: Lopez-Carbo, Maria[Lopez-Carbo.Maria@epa.gov]
From: Travers, David
Sent: Wed 2/5/2014 2:49:15 PM
Subject: FW: URGENT: WVa question

From: Allgeier, Steve
Sent: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 9:49 AM
To: Travers, David
Subject: Re: URGENT: WVa question

Not to my knowledge (with the exception of the EPA CID lab in Denver). Most interactions I'm aware of involve EPA requesting info from the utility about what they did.

From: Travers, David
Sent: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 9:38:31 AM
To: Allgeier, Steve
Subject: RE: URGENT: WVa question

Did the water system consult with Region 3 or anyone at EPA?

From: Allgeier, Steve
Sent: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 9:24 AM
To: Travers, David
Subject: Re: URGENT: WVa question

Thank you. That was spot on.

From: Travers, David
Sent: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 9:11:54 AM
To: Burneson, Eric; Clark, Becki; Lopez-Carbo, Maria; Allgeier, Steve
Subject: RE: URGENT: WVa question

Steve cannot access email well due to some issue deriving from us having 1990s era computers, so here's a very brief summary from Steve's lengthy discussions with the state and water system last week. Hopefully, Steve will be back online soon and can add more depth if necessary.

The utility is still receiving some water quality complaints, especially in the outlying zones. In many cases, it's discovered that the customer with the complaint did not flush their premise plumbing. Before determining that flushing would be an appropriate solution, WVAW contacted Eastman to obtain critical properties of the constituents of the mixture. A key parameter is the octanol-water partition coefficient (Kow). Eastman reported that one component had a Kow around 0.6 and a second around 2.4.

Based on an AWWARF study that evaluated decontamination of pipe materials, in which American Water was a collaborator, WVAW concluded that contaminants with a Kow below 6 would not appreciably adsorb to pipe materials (although they did not discount the possibility of MCHM permeating the walls of plastic pipe materials). Based on this information, WVAW concluded that hydraulic flushing would be sufficient to remove MCHM from the system.

From: Burneson, Eric
Sent: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 8:43 AM
To: Clark, Becki; Lopez-Carbo, Maria; Allgeier, Steve; Travers, David
Subject: RE: URGENT: WVa question

I am looping in David Travers and Steve Allgeir. Steve has been the one trying to help Region 3 answer the adsorption /permeation question.

From: Clark, Becki
Sent: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 8:08 AM
To: Lopez-Carbo, Maria
Cc: Burneson, Eric
Subject: RE: URGENT: WVa question

Maria,

My bberry refused to accept or send messages after about 6 pm yesterday so I am just seeing this. Looping in Eric; I think he can answer this better than me.

From: Lopez-Carbo, Maria
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 8:46 PM
To: Clark, Becki
Subject: Fw: URGENT: WVa question

Hi Becki:
Press office wants to know the whole does mchm stay in the pipes and why it smells.

My understanding is we didn't help with the flushing...can we talk in the morning about the response? Thanks

---

From: Behringer, Caroline
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 7:45:28 PM
To: Loop, Travis; Senn, John; Lopez-Carbo, Maria
Cc: Johnson, Alisha
Subject: URGENT: WVa question

Hey there – We're preparing a Q&A with CDC and HHS in advance of a press event that R3 Administrator Shawn Garvin will be doing with Gov. Tomblin, CDC and HHS tomorrow in West Virginia. Can you all help us with this one? Do we have an answer? Did CDC consult with us for the flushing guidance? We're going to need an answer first thing tomorrow morning.

Flushing: Does MCHM stay in the pipes? Why is the smell still there?

Thanks,

Caroline

Caroline Behringer

Deputy Press Secretary

Office of the Administrator

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office: (202) 564-0098

Cell: (202) 760-1732