Message

From: Jones, Enesta [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=65B8E6C6E5CA4A7A9AE85D98A4C8EEDB-EJONES02]
Sent: 7/28/2017 4:56:50 PM
To: Jordan Houston [Ex. 6]
CC: Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]
Subject: Re: Final email

Hi Jordan,

I have your request and deadline.

Enesta Jones
U.S. EPA
Office of Media Relations
Office: 202.564.7873
Ex. 6

"The root of all joy is gratefulness."

On Jul 28, 2017, at 12:56 PM, Jordan Houston <Ex. 6 wrote:

Hi Enesta,

Thank you so much for your help on this project thus far. We're wrapping up and have some findings specific to the EPA we would like to run by you to get comments on. These findings may appear in our story.

Our analysis showed that active systems serving 63.2 million people in the U.S. (not including territories) violated SDWA quality standards (health-based) more than twice during the past decade. Those systems were primarily located in small communities.

- What does the EPA do to ensure that systems that violate quality standards multiple times or have persistent compliance issues are brought back into compliance?

- This is nearly a fifth of the country. How can residents know that their water is safe to drink when this many people are served by systems that have delivered unsafe water multiple times? How can they trust that the systems are being monitored properly when systems violate monitoring and reporting standards hundreds of times?

- Have there been any audits done on the quality of the SDWIS data in recent years? The most recent we found was from 2011 by the Government Accountability Office, which found significant gaps. What has been done to resolve these omissions and errors since then?

Using the 2011 infrastructure needs survey, we found that U.S. systems will require more than $384 billion in the coming decades for water infrastructure improvements. The cost per person in small communities is more than twice as large as the cost in larger systems.

We note that the funds made available by the EPA and state governments are not enough for all the needs that water systems have. The vast majority of systems have to rely almost entirely customers to fund infrastructure improvements. This is often challenging in small poor communities.

- What steps is the EPA taking to provide support to small systems?
- Has the EPA's position on the importance of water infrastructure and small system support changed since it published its action plan last year?

Our analysis found that the EPA hasn't set a new contaminant standard since adding uranium to the radionuclide rule in 2000. While there have been other rules published since then, they have been either revisions or treatment techniques that don't measure for specific contaminants. We also found that unregulated contaminants were found in much of the country's water, including PFOA and PFOS that were found in the water of 15 million people, according to UCMR 3 data.

- What steps is the EPA taking to address emerging contaminants?
- What is the reason that so few drinking water regulations have been published since the 1990s?
- How is the EPA approaching rule revisions such as those to the lead and copper rule and other contaminants like nitrates?

Feel free to respond to any thing not specifically asked in these questions. If you'd like to set up an on-the-record interview to address our findings, we would be more than happy to arrange a call.

Thank you for your help on this. We're looking to get a response by next Wednesday.

Thanks,

Jordan