
From: Pete Levine <plevine@gcms.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2015 9:28 AM
To: Andy Leavitt
Cc: Wells, Eden (DHHS);Howard Croft;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

Eden, As usual, Andy responded in a more cogent way than I did. Same point, better wording. Pete

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

On Wed, Nov 11, 2015 at 7:16 PM, Andy Leavitt <aleavitt@senatedems.org> wrote:
 Dr. Wells,

Once you engage in a home inspection there is no doubt we should be doing full abatement but speaking about paint and soil in the same breath as the water that clearly doubled EBL seems disingenuous. No doubt Flint had lead previously and will continue to have lead in the built environment, but looking at Flint's EBL pre-switch compared to other communities of similar age and make-up seems to indicate that Flint was doing fairly well at lowering levels before the water. We cannot rest on the fact that DWSD fixes the lead problem, but we also cannot conflate the catastrophe of the water with general lead risks. Anyone who does that will not be taken seriously by Flint residents.

On Wed, Nov 11, 2015 at 6:20 PM Wells, Eden (DHHS) <WellsE3@michigan.gov> wrote:
 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 or 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> 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

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

On Tue, Nov 10, 2015 at 6:57 PM, Howard Croft <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> 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?