

**NATIONAL CONVERSATION ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND CHEMICAL EXPOSURES
POLICIES AND PRACTICES**

**Meeting No. 6 Summary
Teleconference
May 19, 2010**

Meeting Objectives:

- Review and discuss work by subgroups.
- Review and prioritize full list of Work Group emerging recommendations.
- Determine next steps in the development of the recommendations and Work Group draft report, particularly between this call and the June 10 Work Group call.

Upcoming Meeting/Call	When and Where	Suggested Agenda Items
Seventh work group meeting (Teleconference)	Wednesday, June 10, 2 p.m.–4 p.m. EDT, by teleconference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrating each of the subgroup’s products into one WG report • Review Final WG Report Template to identify gaps • Agenda and logistics for July 15 in-person meeting

I. Action Items

Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary Prevention Subgroups	Who	Completed by
Consider the edits offered by WG members and incorporate them into final subgroup recommendations	All three subgroups	June 7, 2010
Send any comments on the list of compiled draft recommendations	All WG members	May 24, 2010
Begin thinking about how best to integrate each of the subgroup’s products into one WG report	All WG members	June 10, 2010
Review the Final Work Group Report Template and identify gaps and missing language	All WG members	June 10, 2010
Leadership Team	Who	Completed by
Update WG members on replacement for Cal Baier Anderson on the Leadership Council (LC)	Dick Jackson and Abby Dilley	June 3, 2010
Seek guidance from the LC on the consideration and potential adoption of the principles for application by the other five WGs	Jackson and Montrece Ransom	June 1, 2010

II. Meeting Summary

1) Welcome, Roll Call, Agenda and Objectives Review

Work Group (WG) Chair Richard Jackson, UCLA School of Public Health, convened the meeting with welcoming comments. He noted that the WG has come a long way and has done impressive work, that he will be presenting the emerging recommendations to the *Leadership*

Council at the June 1 meeting, and that the WG can expect a final decision on the replacement for Cal Baier Anderson by then. Following this welcome, WG facilitator Abby Dilley, RESOLVE facilitator, conducted a roll call and reviewed the meeting agenda.

Dilley noted that the goals for this call include:

- Discussing the work products and draft recommendations from each of the subgroups which she emailed on May 18;
- Discussing the full range of recommendations that have emerged from the WG, a compilation of which was also emailed on May 18; and
- Creating a work plan to guide the WG from this point to the next conference call scheduled for June 10, to meet the goal of sending a final draft report to the Leadership Council by August.

2) Subgroup Reports, Emerging Recommendations and Work Group Discussion

Primary Prevention

Nick Ashford, MIT, Primary Prevention Subgroup co-leader, led the discussion of the four recommendations from this subgroup. WG members discussed the specific language included in the recommendations and asked *Primary Prevention Subgroup* members to consider these language changes and to incorporate them in preparation for the June 10 full WG call.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Make greater use of predictive toxicology methods, including structure activity relationships (SARs), computational toxicology and high-throughput test methods (HTP), to streamline and expedite hazard evaluation.

Questions and Discussion

Where is the toxicology on this?

Jackson asked the subgroup about the timeliness of the recommendation regarding structured activity relationships science, and Ashford responded that knowledge of structure activity science exists, and it is a major tool in the European Union's REACH requirements and program. At least one WG member pointed out that there is proposed legislation addressing this issue, thus it is a current topic. In fact, the field is very active in this area. Moving forward with this recommendation allows the WG to integrate with other initiatives that are occurring right now.

Language regarding 'non-cancer' effects

The WG members discussed potential language changes to the following sentence in the text that follows the first recommendation:

“However these models are somewhat limited in scope and application, and there is a dearth of reliable models to predict such important non-cancer effects such as endocrine disruption, developmental and reproductive toxicity, immune-toxicity, and neurotoxicity.

One WG member noted that because endocrine disruptors are linked to breast cancer, mentioning only the non-cancerous effects might be misleading. An edit to read “non-cancerous and cancerous” might be more accurate.

Dearth of models?

The WG questioned whether a dearth of models exists or if reliable models are lacking. Ashford noted that the models that predict cancerous effects are more highly developed. WG members discussed editing the language to read, “more reliable models.” Ashford noted that questions about reliability will always exist.

Dilley reiterated the need to send these comments to the *Primary Prevention Subgroup* leadership for editing and to focus discussion on the content of the recommendations.

Predictive Toxicology

WG members asked if the *Primary Prevention Subgroup* had discussed making predictive toxicology the default, rather than simply encouraging greater use of it. Ashford responded in the negative and noted that animal or epidemiological studies will take precedence in determination of policy, and that structured activity relationships science is most useful as a screening tool to identify safer alternatives. WG members discussed this further, with diverse points of view as to whether the WG should emphasize hazard evaluation more than risk evaluation. Some WG members noted that the WG should be interested in seeing decisions based on hazard instead of risk. At least one WG member stated that he would support rethinking the characterization so that hazard evaluation is emphasized as the first choice, but not to the exclusion of other approaches. Ashford requested that WG members e-mail him any suggested language changes. Dilley mentioned that the *National Conversation on Public Health and Chemical Exposures Scientific Understanding Work Group* is also discussing this issue, and it might be helpful to review their materials on the shared Web site, as well as the emerging recommendations they report at the June 1 *Leadership Council* meeting.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Use Management-based Regulation Requiring Firms to Periodically Identify, Evaluate and Consider for Adoption Viable, Safer Alternative Technologies and Approaches

Questions and Discussion

Clarifying “Management-based Regulation”

Ashford advised that this recommendation flows from a review of the Massachusetts Toxic Use Reduction Act. Jackson noted that the term “management-based regulation” might need clarification because its meaning might not be clear to the audience.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Integrate regulatory mechanisms for the phase-out of hazardous processes and hazardous chemicals where viable, safer substitute technologies and approaches exist.

Questions and Discussion

Jackson advised, and Ashford acknowledged, that the next iteration of this recommendation should be clearer.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Create and support a network of government-supported centers for the development, commercialization and diffusion of safer alternatives.

Questions and Discussion

Ashford noted that this recommendation stands on its own. He added that examples of this recommendation can be seen in the state of California. Ashford noted that the next steps for this subgroup include collecting and incorporating edits from WG members to create final subgroup recommendations.

Secondary Prevention

Brenda Azfal, University of Maryland School of Nursing, subgroup co-leader, presented the *National Conversation of Public Health and Chemical Exposures Policies and Practices Work Group Secondary Prevention Subgroup (Secondary Prevention Subgroup)* report. She noted that they have made much progress, but suggested that the *Primary Prevention Subgroup* may be ahead in fine-tuning recommendations and filling out the matrix with the supporting language for each recommendation. Each member of the *Secondary Prevention Subgroup* was responsible for developing recommendations and accompanying background text, but the full subgroup had not yet vetted the information. Azfal stressed the importance of the subgroup meeting again to discuss its recommendations and develop a work plan for putting its work into the format presented by the *Primary Prevention Subgroup*. Azfal advised that the subgroup has six issue areas and recommendations that align with each.

Questions and Discussion

Adoption of principles by Leadership Council

Azfal noted that WG members previously asked if the WG leadership team would suggest to the *Leadership Council* that the principles developed by the WG be considered and perhaps adopted as guiding principles for all six *National Conversation on Public Health and Chemical Exposures* work groups. She noted the recommendations are easier to understand when presented with the related principles. Jackson and Montrece Ransom, NCEH/ATSDR staff, will discuss this and report to the WG during the June 10 call.

Issue No. 1: Biomonitoring (Principles 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10)

Questions and Discussion

Some WG members said they favor biomonitoring by EPA, but want this recommendation to be stated in a way that supports hazard evaluation. It was noted that USDA, FDA, CDC, and EPA also conduct biomonitoring. Food also should be considered as an exposure route. WG members noted that there is a dearth of information on risk assessment and that such biomonitoring must be couched in population-based administration because of past and potential discrimination, specifically in the occupational arena. Dilley again encouraged WG members to submit their written suggestions to the subgroup.

Issue No. 2: Environmental Justice (Principles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10)

Issue No. 3: Need for chemical information on consumer products and articles similar to other content disclosures (Principles: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 10)

Issue No. 4: Access to information, Principles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10.

Issue No. 5: Chemical Information on Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDSs), (Principles 1,3,7,8, and 9.)

Questions and Discussion

WG members noted the importance of considering how best to systemize the MSDS system and data so that this information is made accessible and is read more often by the community.

Issue No. 6: Chemicals Management (Principles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 8, and 10.)

Issue No. 7: Reform of Current TSCA (Principles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10.)

Questions and Discussion

A subgroup member noted that this is a placeholder for a recommendation on TSCA reform. Other WG members also noted this discussion might benefit from involvement by all three subgroups before June 10.

Tertiary Prevention

John McLeod, Cuyahoga County Board of Health and subgroup co-leader, presented the Tertiary Prevention Subgroup report. McLeod noted that common themes have emerged and the *Tertiary Prevention Subgroup* will pare them down. The subgroup's next steps are to hone the recommendations and put them in the format presented by the Primary Prevention Subgroup.

3) Assessing Work Group Activity and Progress

Dilley reviewed the WG's next steps, and advised members that they need to look closely at the Final Work Group Report Template and identify missing elements in the language that accompanies their recommendations. This review needs to be done before the June 10 call. Subgroups also need to use the feedback received today to hone their recommendations, combining them where feasible.

Dilley and Jackson also pointed out that WG members need to begin thinking about how best to integrate each subgroup's products into one WG report. This integration needs to occur between the June 10 call, and the July 15 in-person meeting.

Dilley asked the group to review the list of compiled draft recommendations and provide any comments or edits by May 24. The deadline is critical because this language will be included in the briefing document provided to the *Leadership Council* for review at its June 1 meeting. She also indicated that further guidance to the subgroups will be sent on May 24, to help focus work leading up to the full work group June 10 call.

4) Wrap Up and Adjournment

Jackson adjourned the meeting at 3:58pm Eastern.

IV. Participation

Members Present:

Brenda Afzal, University of Maryland School of Nursing
Laura Anderko, Georgetown University
Nick Ashford, MIT
Patricia Beattie, Arcalis Scientific
Lynn Bergeson, Bergeson and Campbell, PC
Arlene Blum, Green Science Policy Institute
Sascha Chaney, CDC/NCEH/ATSDR
Kerry Dearfield, USDA Food Safety Inspection Service
Catherine Dodd, City and County of San Francisco
Doug Farquhar, National Council of State Legislatures
Rick Hackman, Procter and Gamble (by phone)
Richard Jackson, UCLA School of Public Health, *chair*
Linn Kaatz Chary, Gary Care Partnership
Timothy Malloy, UCLA School of Law
Andrew McBride, City of Milford Health Department
John McLeod, Cuyahoga County Board of Health
Kristin Ryan, Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
Gail Shibley, Oregon Department of Human Services
Brian Symmes, EPA

Regrets:

Beth Anderson, NIEHS
Linda Bruemmer, Minnesota Department of Health
Ken Cook, Environmental Working Group
Pamela Eliason, Toxic Use Reduction Institute
Robert Harrison, University of California, San Francisco
Kristin Hill, Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Epidemiology Center
Anne Rabe, Community Concerned About NL Industries, CHEJ
Kristen Welker-Hood, Physicians for Social Responsibility

Facilitation and Staff Team Present:

Abby Dilley, RESOLVE facilitator
Montrece Ransom, NCEH/ATSDR staff