
From: Travis, Rashmi (DHHS)
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2015 10:48 PM
To: Emily Houk
Cc: Wells, Eden (DHHS); Peeler, Nancy (DHHS); Lishinski, Karen (DHHS)
Subject: Re: Testing protocol table

I like it!
Rashmi

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 21, 2015, at 8:17 PM, Emily Houk <emily@r2pconsultants.com> wrote:

Ok. Here's the next iteration of the doc.

I added shading to help make sure I'm understanding what we are saying--I can remove it (if necessary) when we are done.

Is this correct?

On Wed, Oct 21, 2015 at 8:09 PM, Wells, Eden (DHHS) <WellsE3@michigan.gov> wrote:
Great- yes.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 21, 2015, at 8:08 PM, Peeler, Nancy (DHHS) <PeelerN@michigan.gov> wrote:

I agree that it makes sense to have the <6 year old children (e.g. less than elementary school) be in Priority 2, and the other elementary aged children be in Priority 3.

Sent from my iPad

On Oct 21, 2015, at 7:24 PM, Wells, Eden (DHHS) <WellsE3@michigan.gov> wrote:

Yes-- much better- in priority 3, daycare and head start and preschool all should be in first paragraph-- all same level.
Question- they should be priority 2 - leaving "all other children..."
As priority 3?

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 21, 2015, at 7:17 PM, Emily Houk <emily@r2pconsultants.com> wrote:

Ok...Nancy and I did our best to interpret the comments...

Eden/Rashmi--is this more what you had in mind?
(Happy to wordsmith as necessary).

--

Emily Houk, President and Chief Mischief Maker
Research to Practice Consulting, LLC
216 North Chestnut
Lansing, Michigan 48933
517-896-2712
r2pconsultants.com

<Flint Blood Lead level Testing Protocol
table.v2.docx>

--

Emily Houk, President and Chief Mischief Maker
Research to Practice Consulting, LLC
216 North Chestnut
Lansing, Michigan 48933
517-896-2712
r2pconsultants.com

<Flint Blood Lead level Testing Protocol table.v3.docx>