

# Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) - Flin Flon / Creighton Community Advisory Committee (CAC)

May 24, 2012 – HBMS Staffhouse  
Meeting #18

## Attendance

Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Membership					
Don Aasen Town of Creighton	X	Bev Hill NorMan Regional Health	X	Deb Odegaard FF&D Env't Council	X
Bob Smith Creighton School Board		Tom Lindsey Steelworkers Union		Bill Pauley Flin Flon School Division	
Christa McIntyre Healthy Flin Flon		Charlene Logan General Public	X	Dave Price Green Project	X
Ian Cooper HBMS	X	Barb Lyons General Public	X	Bill Hanson City of Flin Flon	
Cheryl Hordal General Public					

Guests / Other		
Sheldon McLeod (Facilitator) S.L. McLeod Consulting	Shirley Neault (Recorder) HBMS (via telephone)	Elliot Sigal Intrinsic Environmental
TAC Member (via telephone) George Bihun (SK Ministry of Environment)	Dr. Susan Roberecki (via telephone) MB Health	Joanna Miller AECOM (via telephone)
Dr. Lawrence Elliott (via telephone) NOR-MAN Health Region	Dr. James Irvine Churchill River Health Region (via telephone)	Blair Jackson Goss Gilroy Inc.

## Introduction

- Facilitator Sheldon McLeod called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda.
- The action items listed in the notes from the previous meeting were updated. These notes were previously approved and posted to the website.

## Member's Commentary – Community Feedback

- Each CAC member was given the opportunity to share what they are hearing in the community regarding the HHRA.
  - It has generally remained very quiet.
  - The reactions to Mighty Bubble appearances have been interesting to see.
  - People are noticing a greener community (especially ex-Flin Flonners)

## Risk Management Activities / Follow-up Exposure Study

Reference Documentation – May 24\_2012 CAC Presentation

- Elliot Sigal from Intrinsic and Blair Jackson from Goss Gilroy provided a presentation on the risk management activities and the proposed approach to the follow-up exposure study.
  - The recent risk management activities completed by HBMS were reviewed. These activities include: a reduction in emissions from industrial sources, specifically the ongoing dust control

program and site remediation efforts verified through environmental monitoring; and public outreach and education with a focus on hand washing and home renovations.

- Details of the public outreach and education plan activities include:
  - Appearances by Mighty Bubble, including school visits to promote the importance of proper hand-washing to the children;
  - Lead-based paint awareness related to home renovations and making a HEPA vacuum available to community members undertaking this sort of renovation.
  - Fact sheets;
  - Facebook and Twitter pages featuring Mighty Bubble; and
  - A survey to determine awareness of Mighty Bubble and the importance of hand-washing (90% aware).
  
- The follow-up exposure study will focus solely on blood lead. The study plan is otherwise very similar to the one that occurred in 2009.

Question: Will the same children be tested?

Response: Not necessarily because of the target age group. Some will now be older than 7 and new children will have been born.

Question: What about those that were elevated last time?

Response: They were sent for individual follow-up and those (follow-up) results were not included in the study numbers. Some of these results were found to be anomalous and others were explainable (e.g. hunters, lead-based paint, etc.) We plan to ask the Ethics Panel to allow these numbers (should there be any) to be used in the study this time.

Question: Do you expect door-to-door recruitment to be more or less successful, given the community awareness of the overall program and the awareness of the soils study results (little to no risk)?

Response: It is hard to say with any certainty. We hope that framing this study as helping us evaluate the success of recent actions taken (including the closure of the Smelter) as well as offering personal environmental information to the homeowner may make the study attractive to them.

Question: How much effort is the study team prepared to put in to recruiting?

Response: The effort will be within the allotted field time, balanced against the risks associated with pushing too hard.

Question: Are there any communication pieces that you would like to test with the CAC?

Response: Yes, including the general messaging for the public as well as to the target audience.

Question: Are the CAC members okay with being contacted about the planned communication material? Can comments be turned around in 3-5 days?

Response: Yes

**Next Meeting(s)**

- It was agreed that there should be a short meeting with the CAC approximately two weeks into the field work portion of the study (so mid-September) and a longer meeting in early January, 2013 to relay the community level results and to seek input into the related messaging.

#	Action	Responsibility	Target Date	Status