

**Subject:** Re: ES&T letters paper - 2nd Read  
**From:** "Susan J. Masten" <masten@egr.msu.edu>  
**Date:** 12/26/2016, 9:25 PM  
**To:** Nancy Love <nglove@umich.edu>  
**CC:** Shawn McElmurry <s.mcelmurry@wayne.edu>

Thanks for the text messages. Just sent you a message in response to your text. Not sure if it is working as I've sent it via my new tablet, which I'm just learning to use.

Message is retyped below just in case it doesn't go through:

"Hi thanks for thinking about the concerns I raised. I'm trying to think as a colleague, member of FACHEP, and also as the State. I could imagine that the State might see anything done under the auspices of FACHEP (which means that if people are paid to travel etc. on the SOM grant they will see the intellectual contributions as under the terms of the State contract. This is why MSU insists that the project be separate from other projects). I realize that you see it differently but I wanted to bring my concerns to your attention. If you want me to read the manuscript again tomorrow, just let me know. I will focus my attention on the last few paragraphs. Also if you would like to discuss the manuscript tonight, I'm available."

Susan

On 12/26/2016 1:31 PM, Nancy Love wrote:

Susan: I appreciate the caution, but I really don't agree that there is a "there" there. We'll leave out the maps (not critical) and I am pretty emphatic that state does not hold power or influence over this work. His maps didn't show anything that I hadn't already figured out on my own with google maps. The work was funded by the federal government. In terms of people contributing intellectually, none of our salaries are adequately covered by the state contract and we're all working pro bono on multiple projects. Also, Laura was noted in my NSF grant as a participant of the RAPID, and Ben comes with Laura by her request. So, we're only talking about Paul and Mark and I don't think there is an issue reaching out to public health officials to better understand our data. The main piece of information (comparing flow cytometry cell counts) would nail this paper really well but we're keeping it out because the flow cytometry flint data were from the legionella study. So, we are mindful of separating the projects.

I hope you are comfortable with this. We will get a reaction no matter what, but there is nothing here that the state hasn't seen or isn't aware of (and they've actually seen more than we are including).

Nancy

**Nancy G. Love, Ph.D., P.E., BCEE**  
Borchardt and Glysson Collegiate Professor

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Michigan  
Adjunct Professor, Addis Ababa University Institute of Biotechnology, Ethiopia  
Fellow: Water Environment Federation; International Water Association; Association of Environmental Engineering and Science Professors  
183 EWRE Building  
1351 Beal Avenue  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109  
Voice: (734) 763-9664  
[nglove@umich.edu](mailto:nglove@umich.edu)  
<http://envbiotech.engin.umich.edu/>  
Twitter: @Love\_H2O

**Attend the AEESP2017 Conference on Advancing Healthy Communities  
June 20-22, 2017, Ann Arbor Michigan  
Abstracts due: January 9, 2017**

On Mon, Dec 26, 2016 at 1:03 PM, Susan J. Masten <[masten@egr.msu.edu](mailto:masten@egr.msu.edu)> wrote:

Nancy,

I agree that they have made an intellectual contribution, but doesn't that acknowledgement mean that the SOM can (and likely will) claim the right to review (especially since the intellectual contributions of numerous co-authors occurred at FACHEP meetings and I presume several probably claimed time/travel on FACHEP)?

Also, if the mapping of the chlorine residual data was done by Rick Sadler, then the work is funded in part by FACHEP (since Rick wasn't on the NSF project).

Susan

On 12/26/2016 12:48 PM, Nancy Love wrote:

Susan- we've been very careful to avoid FACHEP data. Not worried about including the broader team. Not including the core team ignores the intellectual contributions they have made over the last several months. So, I am comfortable that we are ok and not worried about the state. It's the PoU mfrs who will come after us, I suspect.

On Monday, December 26, 2016, Susan J. Masten <[masten@egr.msu.edu](mailto:masten@egr.msu.edu)> wrote:

Ok But doesn't including all the FACHEP people on the paper give that pretense and then we may have to demonstrate to the State that there are no FACHEP results in the manuscript.

On 12/26/2016 12:30 PM, Shawn McElmurry wrote:

There are not any FACHEP results in this manuscript.

---

**From:** Susan J. Masten [mailto:masten@egr.msu.edu]  
**Sent:** Monday, December 26, 2016 12:28 PM  
**To:** Shawn McElmurry <s.mcelmurry@wayne.edu>; Nancy Love <nglove@umich.edu>  
**Subject:** Re: ES&T letters paper - 2nd Read

Shawn and Nancy,

Here is my suggestion:

Publish the NSF results in ES&T letters with just the NSF Rapid participants (and without editorial comments)

Publish a second "editorial" paper (in ES&T Letters, if possible) with the larger group of participants discussing the NSF results and with recommendations regarding filter use. In this way, you are not releasing FACHEP results and do not need the SOM review.

If we publish FACHEP results (or even what looks like FACHEP results) without the review, I'm pretty sure we will never see the second installment from the SOM and we may end up with the cancellation of the contract and/or a lawsuit on our hands (or at least some pretty bad black eyes).

Susan

On 12/25/2016 8:58 AM, Shawn McElmurry wrote:

Thank you Susan! I can merge to produce track changes. very helpful. Enjoy