
From: Scott, Robert L. (DCH)
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2015 2:28 PM
To: Peeler, Nancy (DCH)
Subject: RE: Flint Testing and EBLLs.xlsx

No, sorry. I mislabeled the top one. Should say "July-September 2014."

From: Peeler, Nancy (DCH)
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2015 2:26 PM
To: Scott, Robert L. (DCH)
Subject: RE: Flint Testing and EBLLs.xlsx

So this is 2010 data, rather than 2014 data?

From: Scott, Robert L. (DCH)
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2015 1:48 PM
To: Peeler, Nancy (DCH)
Subject: FW: Flint Testing and EBLLs.xlsx

Nancy,

I said this morning I'd look to see if the distribution of EBLLs in the July-September 2014 "spike" was any different from the typical distribution of EBLLs in Flint. I compared totals by zip code vs totals by zip code from 2010 (BLLs ≥ 5). The pattern is very similar and is further evidence, I think, that the water was not a major factor here.

A	B	C	D
July-September 2010			
zip	# of EBLL		
48503	11	16 % of total	
48504	17	24 % of total	
48505	19	27 % of total	
48506	13	16 % of total	
48507	8	11 % of total	
48532	4	6 % of total	
Total	70	100 % of total	
CY 2010			
zip	# of EBLL		
48503	68	21 % of total	
48504	88	27 % of total	
48505	79	24 % of total	
48506	50	15 % of total	
48507	30	9 % of total	
48532	11	3 % of total	
Total	326	100 % of total	

Cristin is redoing her analysis with the extra two years of data. I assume it's OK to let her go ahead with that.

Bob

From: Larder, Cristin (DCH)
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2015 11:00 AM
To: Scott, Robert L. (DCH); Peeler, Nancy (DCH); McKane, Patricia (DCH)
Subject: RE: Flint Testing and EBLLs.xlsx

Okay, thanks, Bob. I'll incorporate the previous years and put the new results into a publisher document with some description of what's going on in the chart.

We'll find out if this changes the results!

From: Scott, Robert L. (DCH)
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2015 10:15 AM
To: Larder, Cristin (DCH); Peeler, Nancy (DCH); McKane, Patricia (DCH)
Subject: RE: Flint Testing and EBLLs.xlsx

Cristin,

I can safely say I don't understand it without some explanation.

However, late yesterday Nancy and I decided to take a look two years farther back to see how they fit with the recent years. Please see attached, which I just finished this morning. Sorry I didn't have this for you yesterday before you did the analysis. Would this new information change the analysis?