
From: Moran, Susan (DHHS)
Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 7:41 PM
To: Lyon, Nick (DHHS); Wells, Eden (DHHS)
Cc: Lasher, Geralyn (DHHS); Hertel, Elizabeth (DHHS); Becker, Timothy (DHHS); Grijalva, Nancy (DHHS); Eisner, Jennifer (DHHS); Minicuci, Angela (DHHS)
Subject: RE: talking points

Comments below:

From: Lyon, Nick (DHHS)
Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 6:57 PM
To: Wells, Eden (DHHS)
Cc: Lasher, Geralyn (DHHS); Hertel, Elizabeth (DHHS); Becker, Timothy (DHHS); Grijalva, Nancy (DHHS); Moran, Susan (DHHS); Eisner, Jennifer (DHHS); Minicuci, Angela (DHHS)
Subject: Re: talking points

I like it. Does Eden have what she needs?

I do have a couple of questions.

Can we say publicly that there is no lead when the water leaves the treatment site?

No. On a call with EPA (as reported by Epi staff), it was noted that up to 50% of the city's lead supply lines are lead...these are outside the house and would include the portion of the run owned by the resident and the portion owned by the city water supply.

Is our lead program going to modify our lead home investigations or abatement strategy

Our lead program includes education and counseling about ways to remediate sources of paint based lead and evaluate for our lead abatement program; if there is a home investigation, and the home is a known hi risk zip code, the education and counseling should include the steps to take as noted in the advisory- flushing the water line, getting water tested, use of water filter, bottled water, etc.

Can I give summary info for the zip codes or city as a whole?

There is a big bump in 14 and then it drops again in the fall? Are we sharing the chart and if so does that give us some rationale to say it looked seasonal, even in the high impacted zip codes?

I'd like to express my appreciation to the Hurley doctors for bringing this issue to our attention. Is that ok?

My opinion- absolutely yes, you would be remiss if you did not acknowledge Hurley Health system and the pediatricians/physicians.

Can I confidently say that we were not aware before last week.

Geralyn probably has a better handle on timeline—it is my understanding that we became aware of the physician concerns last week, and that prompted us to review our program data which showed the seasonal variation, but we then did the deeper dive etc.

Somewhere in my talking points I want to say that the department goal or my goal is to prevent or minimize lead exposure in children regardless of source. I think that fits in nicely before the lead part in my points.

You want to say **prevent**- no amount of lead in children is safe.

I was told we really don't do surveillance per se, but instead treat children as we become aware. Should we modify our point that?

Well, we do surveillance in that we track lead results and we provide the elevated lead results to the local health departments. So it is a shared responsibility.

Also, FYI, you should be aware that the new Medicaid Health Plan contract requires that every child with elevated lead (above 5) now must be referred for the plan's case management program. Previously, the contract required that plans develop processes to identify individuals for case management; the new contract stipulates that this process must include the kids with lead above 5.

Do you have a document that describes the lead program I can use if asked that contains general info like: Will check on that...

How long does a child need to have a blood level of .05 before it compromises a child's health or future? How about above .14?

What does blood test measure? (Parts per million). Micrograms per deciliter

Anything else that I might be asked that I should know if Eden isn't standing next to me.

One thing I thought of- you may get a question now that you know the high risk zip codes, will there be any additional efforts-outreach or education (ie "boots on the ground")- to make sure THESE households are reached? Is that a community response?

Tim - Did you see the exact filter? Is it easy to install? Are we audit meets federal standards?

That's all for the moment.

Thanks,
Nick

On Oct 1, 2015, at 6:09 PM, Wells, Eden (DHHS) <WellsE3@michigan.gov> wrote:

Oh good!

.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 1, 2015, at 5:57 PM, Lasher, GERALYN (DHHS) <lasherg@michigan.gov> wrote:

And these are the updated MDHHS talking points and the DEQ talking points for this issue.

From: Minicuci, Angela (DHHS)

Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 5:29 PM

To: Eisner, Jennifer (DHHS) <EisnerJ@michigan.gov>; Lasher, GERALYN (DHHS) <lasherg@michigan.gov>

Subject: RE: talking points

Attached is the updated current draft of our MDHHS talking points.

~~Angela~~

~~Pin It Water Talking Points 100115.docx~~

~~153001. Talking points.docx~~