

MCELMURRY'S RESPONSES TO WELLS JANUARY 5th QUESTIONS IN BOLD RED

On Jan 5, 2017, at 12:47 PM, Shawn McElmurry <s.mcelmurry@wayne.edu> wrote:

Hey Eden, thanks for the email. Very important questions you raise and these are certainly questions we are trying to resolve, from our perspective at least, as quickly as possible. Below are my quick responses to your questions. I realize this isn't as definitive as we would all like, but it's an honest assessment of where we are at. Happy to discuss more on Friday.

Will you be in Chicago Tuesday?
Shawn

From: Wells, Eden (DHHS) [mai1to:WellsE3@michigan.gov]

Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 11:59 AM

To: Shawn McElmurry <s.mcelmurry@wayne.edu>; Nancy Love <nglove@umich.edu>

Cc: Zervos, Marcus <mzervosl@hfhs.org>; LyonCallo, Sarah (DHHS) <lyoncallos@michigan.gov>; Paul Kilgore <paul.kilgore@wayne.edu>; Matthew Seeger <matthew.seeger@wayne.edu>; Cupal, Suzanne (scupal@gchd.us) <scupal@gchd.us>; Valacak, Mark <MVALACAK@gchd.us>; Henry, James <jhenry@gchd.us>

Subject: Questions regarding UM Filter Study Community Risk Communications

Importance: High

Dear Nancy and Shawn,

I raised the issue on Tuesday with Paul, had not heard back, but I thought that I would loop you in, Nancy, as next week there are a number of meetings occurring in Chicago and the Flint Community, and I want to be clear on a couple of issues beforehand. In addition, I do see that you all are beginning to develop abstracts and public/academic presentations based on the same information you presented to Flint on December 14. In reviewing your slides earlier in the week, I raised some questions. Please see my highlighted area below, and I am looping GCHD as well as the communications affects their agency also.

Please address my questions below ASAP as these have important ramifications to public health and ongoing risk communications, and we can work with our communications teams:

1. Again, it seems there is an intimation that your findings indicate that there is a current threat to public health. Is there (again, see my highlighted area below, but are you linking your findings to the resident reporting of skin or respiratory illnesses?) **If so:**
 - a. What is the threat? ((is it more than what we already know about bacteria and filters from past studies in other areas of the state and country?)) - ***Unknown, but we are still investigating.***
 - b. Is the threat isolated to Flint, or to all users of filters in any county or state? ***Unknown. We have additional data from other water systems {Detroit and Ann Arbor} - it appears there are some differences (e.g. preliminary results of live cell counts appear to be greater in Flint) but this work is ongoing and we cannot yet draw final conclusions.***
2. Are you making recommendations to flush for one minute at this time in Flint? **If so:**
 - a. Should this be done by any user of a filter anywhere in MI? - ***Based on our preliminary evidence, we believe that residents in Flint and elsewhere should flush their filters for at least 30 seconds prior to use. This is longer than what the manufacturers currently recommend but is consistent with US EPA recommendation for PoU devices***
 - b. What risk to health is being mitigated by the flushing? - ***Unknown; however, we do know that cell counts (HPC and flow cytometry) go down with flushing.***
 - c. Is there a communications plan for such a recommendation? - ***We are currently developing a fact sheet that we will share with our public health and community partners before it is released.***

Thank you for consideration of a rapid response-again, I am being approached by others about potential public health implications being raised. We can do a call if need be. I will be following up shortly.

Eden