

# Survey Responses

## Airborne Mineral Dust Contaminants: Impacts on Human Health and the Environment.

May 20-21, 2013 / Tucson, Arizona

---

Twenty-two participants have responded to a survey on their conference experiences. See below for a summary of their responses.

### Was the science presented what you expected?

- **Better - (18/22) 81.8%**
- About what you expected – (4/22) 18.2%
- Worse (0)
- Comments (5):
  - Very strong program. Excellent venue that enabled lots of informal, valuable discussion. Excellent logistical organization.
  - Always a few problem papers but this was a good group.
  - I loved the mixture of dust and human health topics.
  - We have learnt new development in dust research. It was a wonderful meeting!
  - Yes. Great range of topics and good depth considering the length of the lectures.

### Were there any other topics that you felt should have been covered?

- No – (11/22) 50%
- Yes – (11/22) 50%
- If yes, please list (12):
  - Ways to mitigate dust production.
  - Dust originating from Africa (the continent is likely a huge contributor to global dust emission and I think having an expert on that region speak would be valuable).
  - More epidemiology.
  - Epi studies.
  - More health related studies would have been good, but that could be continued in a follow-up meeting.
  - More on the epi and individual exposures of local populations.
  - Human responses to dust storm events.
  - Epidemiology about dust-health effects.

- Relationship between blowing dust and vehicular crashes. Establishing better measures for determining severity of dust storms.
- Not really, but I would have liked to see more climate related to dust production and transportation. And what was said at the end of the course, more about understanding dust health impact.
- Epidemiology.
- Organics and secondary organics in aerosols in an active field that I was hoping to hear more about.

### Was the time allotted for presentations too long, too short, or just right?

- Too long – (2/22) 9.1%
- Too short - (1/22) 4.5%
- **Just right – (19/22) 86.4%**
- Comments (4):
  - It was hard to sit for that long
  - Too short for the good speakers, too long for the not-as-good speakers :)
  - The length of presentations was too long, breaks for discussion with less presentation might have yielded more outcome.
  - The time scheduled (as planned) was good and what the speakers should prepare for. I think next time it would be good to plan on having additional "buffer" time between presentations that could be used for questions, or perhaps more likely, for when speakers go on over the official allotted time.

### Did you enjoy having a brief oral session followed by a standard poster session for students?

- **Yes, I enjoyed both – (22/22) 100%**
- I enjoyed student participation, but I would prefer either an oral or a poster session. (please elaborate below) (0)
- No, I did not enjoy having student presentations (0)
- Comments (3):
  - I think a better way would have to have students present a single slide in two minutes. This way it seemed a bit unfocused.
  - It is a good way to give student opportunity to present their results.
  - Perhaps it would be more effective to tell students in advance (when they submit abstracts) that they should have an "elevator speech" prepared for the day of the conference.

### Was this a good networking opportunity for you (especially for students and junior scientists)?

- **Yes – (21/22) 95.5%**
- No - (1/22) 4.5%
- Comments (2):
  - It was great to have such a wide variety of experts rather than the usual collection of highly specialized people.
  - Met several researchers who may become collaborators.

**What potential scientific interdisciplinary research might you now pursue based on the workshop?** (13 responses; 9 skipped)

- Some topics related to health issues of the storm dust particles.
- Dust climatology for the prediction of climate change.
- Water quality.
- Quantitative establishment of dust flux.
- Collaborating with other groups at the UofA, such as Dr. Betterton and Dr. Root.
- I have purposes 1) to estimate windblown dust emission rate and factors over the Gobi Deserts of Mongolia. I am finding appropriate scientists to collaborate on this topic. 2) to do a interdisciplinary research on aerosol impacts on human health in Ulaanbaatar city. 3) to estimate dust emission around mining operations in Mongolia.
- Combining modeling with measurement of dust; Identifying relationships between dust composition/properties and health outcomes.
- Tom Gill and Clark Lantz have already contacted me.
- I'm possibly submitting a grant to project dust health impacts into the 21st century.
- Collaboration with particle pulmonologists to investigate how different dust composition might result in health effects to different degrees, for example, what really causes silicosis? Dust minerals as nuclei for ice crystals in clouds.
- Analysis of severity of traffic crashes on various roadway types/time of day under dust conditions. Relationship between dust messaging and driver behavior, crash incidence.
- I may invite a visiting professor and develop a soil to dust to disease paper.
- Giving a talk at USGS about contaminated dust.

**What research "holes" need to be addressed?** (12 responses; 10 skipped)

- Predicting dust production: when and where Other health effects of dust exposure.
- Control of dust emission.
- Water quality.
- Stronger link to epidemiology.
- Health impacts seem to be really poorly understood and may require some attention in coming years.
- Human responses to dust.
- Toxicity of dust PM2.5 and PM10 relative to the 'generic' PM2.5 and PM10. - A better understanding of what drives the threshold for dust aerosol emission.
- Research on how dust composition generates/induces biologic reactions in organs, especially lung. Roles of dust in suppressing immune systems.
- Relationship between blowing dust and vehicular crashes -- perception vs. reality, especially compared with other weather conditions. Establishing better measures for determining severity of dust storms.
- Particle size and composition need better characterization. There was a little slippage.
- Epidemiology data, not really a "hole", just a suggestion.
- Linking dust concentrations with epidemiology studies.

**Do you have any other feedback?** (13 responses; 9 skipped)

- Conference facilities were great! and the organization wonderful!
- Many thanks to organizers for their hard work !
- Thank you for helping to coordinate such a fantastic conference!
- No.
- The organization was exceptional.
- I felt that this was an extremely well run workshop. The best I've experienced. Karla was outstanding and all arrangements were terrific. The speakers were from a broad range of expertise and the presentations were well done. Having an international perspective was very important, so having scientists from other countries was good. Overall, I enjoyed the conference very much and found it very informative.
- No. Thank you.
- Fabulous venue made it very pleasant to be at conference. It allowed participants to focus on content instead of thinking about where to get a quick lunch and be back in time for next session, etc.
- This was a great conference in a fantastic setting that was very useful for me both in terms of the science presented and the networking opportunities. Thanks so much for organizing this great event!!
- Many Thanks for the workshop. Many people and their research benefited greatly from your efforts.
- Excellent little conference.
- I really enjoyed inclusion of USGS participants. Also the last paper was an excellent synthesis as it related to disease.
- It was a great opportunity as a student to be part of the workshop, it was a open-minded experience. Hope to have more opportunities like that in the future. Thanks.