

Peeler, Nancy (DHHS)

From: Scott, Robert L. (DCH)
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2015 11:45 AM
To: Peeler, Nancy (DCH)
Subject: RE: what % of the sample we used for our charts were 0-5, vs. 6-16 year olds?

I just checked, about 10% of our "<16" were 6-16 year olds. That's been pretty consistent over the years, in all areas.

Yes, I'll be happy to join the call.

Robert L. Scott
Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program Michigan Department of Health & Human Services
(517) 335-8178
fax (517) 335-8509

-----Original Message-----

From: Peeler, Nancy (DCH)
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2015 11:43 AM
To: Scott, Robert L. (DCH) <ScottR9@michigan.gov>
Subject: what % of the sample we used for our charts were 0-5, vs. 6-16 year olds?

And, do you want to join this next call? If so, I can add you in from my phone, not sure when they will call.

Sent from my iPad

Peeler, Nancy (DHHS)

From: Scott, Robert L. (DCH)
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2015 11:50 AM
To: Peeler, Nancy (DCH)
Subject: RE: what % of the sample we used for our charts were 0-5, vs. 6-16 year olds?

Not sure what you mean.

I'll start running our data along the lines of Hurley's--children 0-5, the same zip codes they used. I'll also try to reproduce their results with the Hurley records, etc.

-----Original Message-----

From: Peeler, Nancy (DCH)
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2015 11:46 AM
To: Scott, Robert L. (DCH) <ScottR9@michigan.gov>
Subject: Re: what % of the sample we used for our charts were 0-5, vs. 6-16 year olds?

What is the next call?

Sent from my iPad

> On Sep 24, 2015, at 11:42 AM, Peeler, Nancy (DCH) <PeelerN@michigan.gov> wrote:
>
> And, do you want to join this next call? If so, I can add you in from my phone, not sure when they will call.
>
> Sent from my iPad