

**Rennaker, Joanne (DEQ)**

---

**From:** Wells, Eden (DHHS)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 11, 2015 6:20 PM  
**To:** Pete Levine  
**Cc:** Howard Croft; Andy Leavitt; Marc Edwards; Wright, Michael; Amy Hovey; Anthony Chubb; Brent Wright; Lytle, Darren; Dayne Walling; Deborah Higgins; donna.cole; Dykema, Linda D. (DHHS); Krisztian, George (DEQ); Gerald (Jed) Natzke; James Henry; Jamie Gaskin; Jason Lorenz; jmikewright; JoAnne Herman; John O'Brien; Kevin J. Keane; Kirk Smith; larry.koehler@mcc.edu; Laura Sullivan; Lawrence Reynolds; Lawrence Reynolds; Michael Glasgow; Schock, Michael; Mike Lane; Prysby, Mike (DEQ); MVALACAK@gchd.us; Natasha Henderson; Norb Birchmeier; Robert Bincsik; rosejo@msu.edu; Russell Hudson; Samir Matta; Sean Kammer; Shawn Patrick McElmurry; Busch, Stephen (DEQ); swalser@senatedems.org; Thompson, Sheryl D. (DHHS); Warren Green  
**Subject:** Re: Technical Advisory Team Information

Hi Pete,

I just want to check in on this one statement to be sure we are on the same page-I may be over-reading-as we go through the EBL investigations every child with a level of 5 or more is and will be undergoing a home investigation which will look at all sources of potential lead exposure, including potential water sources, regardless of the fact that the river source has switched. These home investigations have already begun by GCHD and additional PH staff.

My concern is that if we mitigate all of the potential water sources for a child, there will still be other environmental sources that should also be mitigated/abated as part of that investigation--I would hate to have the child continue to be exposed to any sources of lead, even as water is addressed?

My long-term view is that, as water sources improve (that is the goal!!), there will still be a need for general lead abatement, but I am not viewing this as a deflection as much as a need to consider for long-term public health planning.

Your thoughts welcome,

Eden

Eden V. Wells, MD, MPH, FACPM  
 MDHHS  
 Sent from my iPad

On Nov 11, 2015, at 9:57 AM, Pete Levine <[plevine@gcms.org](mailto:plevine@gcms.org)> wrote:

I also think it is important for folks to stop trying to deflect this crisis into a general lead abatement discussion.



This email has been sent from a virus-free computer protected by Avast.  
[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

Peter A. Levine, MPH  
Executive Director  
Genesee County Medical Society  
4438 Oak Bridge Dr. Suite B  
Flint, Mi. 48532  
Phone: 810-7339925  
Fax: 810-2303737  
[email:plevine@gcms.org](mailto:plevine@gcms.org)

On Tue, Nov 10, 2015 at 6:57 PM, Howard Croft <[hcroft@cityofflint.com](mailto:hcroft@cityofflint.com)> wrote:  
Andy,

We just recently converted to the new method with no flushing, the vast majority were done with the old procedure. Our original expectation focused on the thought of a new standard being put in place statewide for uniformity but eventually, through conversations with Darren Lytle we made the decision to convert in advance of any potential statewide changes.

On Tue, Nov 10, 2015 at 6:40 PM, Andy Leavitt <[aleavitt@senatedems.org](mailto:aleavitt@senatedems.org)> wrote:  
Howard,

For clarity, of those hundreds of samples how many are with the flawed sampling method and how many are done with the appropriate sampling method?

Thanks,

Andy

On Tue, Nov 10, 2015 at 6:36 PM Howard Croft <[hcroft@cityofflint.com](mailto:hcroft@cityofflint.com)> wrote:  
Marc,

I believe that we agree with that message, we are planing to pursue all of the people who were sampled under the previous protocol and request that they submit to another round of testing with the new procedures. We have generated hundreds of samples this year and we intend to aggressively reach out to everyone for retesting. We are building a campaign that will continue to caution people about taking safe measures for drinking water but also produces neighborhood sampling pools that test several times throughout the course of the year in addition to tier 1 pools.

On Tue, Nov 10, 2015 at 5:14 PM, Marc Edwards <[cwardsm@vt.edu](mailto:cwardsm@vt.edu)> wrote:

No one should be told that if their water tested safe using the old MDEQ protocol, that it is ok to drink. I thought we learned that lesson already. The old sampling protocol is flawed.

Best Regards,