
From: Peeler, Nancy (DHHS)
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 9:27 PM
To: Wells, Eden (DHHS)
Cc: Travis, Rashmi (DHHS)
Subject: Re: ZIP Codes

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Short term, yes, I agree with that approach. I asked about it because the issue of including data for children outside of the city limits was specifically raised by the Genesee County Health officer, and specifically cited in the public advisory released by the Genesee County Commissioners. They appeared to use that issue to discredit the state data (in essence, implied that our results were artificially low because we included children living in areas that are still on Detroit water, thus our results were not valid or true). My concern is whether they will do that again. I agree that full disclosure is best, and also indicating that this is the same/parallel analysis approach that Hurley took for their report.

Longer term, I think the improvement strategy is to see what it will take to geocode the data, so that we could work more easily with boundaries other than zip code, county, etc. I know Bob has looked into that and can do it, but he would need to refresh my memory for what resources it would take to make this a regular part of the data set.

Sent from my iPad

> On Sep 30, 2015, at 7:26 PM, Wells, Eden (DCH) <WellsE3@michigan.gov> wrote:

>

> Nancy another question I think as we do our talking points how would you best like to address the issue of the 04 ZIP Code I think perhaps if we make a note that this ZIP Code is only partially served by the Flint River this does not negate the fact that children should be sure in this area to decrease their wrist for all sources of lead if questioned further then I would perhaps bring up that well I don't know what I would do, thoughts welcome. Sorry I am dictating

>

> Sent from my iPhone