
Fwd: Draft Questions for Potential Panelists on ALS Study Report

Jessica Lawrence <cewgnm@gmail.com>

Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 1:55 PM

To: CJ Ondek <cjondek@yahoo.com>, Dennis OMara <djomara@comcast.net>, "Church, Hugh" <church.hugh.w@gmail.com>, Sarah Chavez <sarah.t.chavez@intel.com>, John Bartlit <jrbartlit@aol.com>, "Williams, Mike" <MW229A@aol.com>

Hi all,

Please see the message and draft questions from John Bartlit below. Suggestions are welcome. The draft questions will be included in the materials for the September 19 meeting, with the hope that they can be approved at that time.

Jessie

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <jrbartlit@aol.com>

Date: Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 12:25 PM

Subject: Draft Questions for Potential Panelists on ALS Study Report

To: <cewgnm@gmail.com>

Jessie -

Dennis and I have agreed on this set of five questions for potential panelists on the NMDOH ALS study report. The questions as a whole seek to attract a range of panel participants to make a well-rounded panel of experts and, further, to elicit from them a full discussion of significant issues of mutual concern. After the CEWG has reached agreement on this or some similar set of questions, the questions will be sent to potential panelists.

Please distribute this draft to CEWG members.. - John

Draft questions for panel on ALS study report::

1. The study author has calculated and then compared a single prevalence rate in Corrales for the entire 16-year duration of the ALS study to the estimated annual national ALS prevalence rate of 5 per 100,000 as determined by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. Do you agree or disagree that this is a reasonable and technically sound approach? Why or why not?
2. Would you agree or disagree that a more correct approach would be to calculate annual prevalence rates to compare with the national estimate which is also an annual rate?
3. In studies of this scope, are the available data typically sufficient in detail; how are the data typically put to use? How are similar studies typically done elsewhere?
4. What (if any) other statistical methods exist to analyze data from a study like this, in which the numbers of cases and population are small? Can the results of those analyses be compared to the estimated national prevalence rate of the ATSDR or are would they have to be compared to some other standard to put the results in context? What are some other types of standards?
5. A member of Corrales Residents for Clean Air and Water (CRAAW) requested the NM State Health Department to undertake this study and to include 12 census tracts that abut or are near to the Intel plant. Previous anecdotal reports indicated that cases also occurred in Rio Rancho during the study period. And

since census tracts in far NW Albuquerque also abut the Intel plant, CRCAW believes that those census tracts should be included. The study only included the two census tracts that comprise Corrales. Do you agree or disagree that adding the 10 additional census tracts is a reasonable request? What do you see as the advantages and/or disadvantages of adding these 10 census tracts to the study?