

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

**Meeting No. 8 Summary
Washington, DC
In-person meeting
July 15, 2010**

Meeting Objectives:

- Review and further develop the draft work group report of the *National Conversation on Public Health and Chemical Exposures* Policies and Practices Work Group (Policies and Practices Work Group)
- Determine next steps for completing the draft work group report for submission to the *National Conversation on Public Health and Chemical Exposures* Leadership Council (Leadership Council) by the end of August, and for reviewing Leadership Council and public comment on the draft report

Meeting Outcomes:

- A more fully developed draft Policies and Practices Work Group Report, including more specific recommendations and key pieces of text (such as the introduction and conclusion)
- A detailed work plan, including conference call dates and sign-off procedure, for completing a draft report to submit to the Leadership Council by the end of August

Upcoming Meeting/Call	When and Where	Suggested Agenda Items
Ninth Policies and Practices Work Group meeting (if necessary)	August 2010 By teleconference Time and date TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review edited draft work group report of the <i>National Conversation on Public Health and Chemical Exposures</i> Policies and Practices Work Group (Policies and Practices Work Group) • Plan next steps toward completion of Policies and Practices Work Group's Final Draft Work Group Report

I. Action Items

	By Whom	By When
Draft executive summary and send to Montrece	Doug Farquhar and Lin Kaatz Chary	July 30, 2010
Draft conclusion and send to Montrece	Lin Kaatz Chary	July 30, 2010
Draft vision statement and send to Montrece	Richard Jackson, Laura Anderko, and Lin Kaatz Chary	July 30, 2010
Draft language for "Current Status" and "Opportunities and Challenges" sections of the work group report and send to Montrece	Lin Kaatz Chary	July 30, 2010
Revise Primary Prevention Subgroup recommendations and send to Montrece	Kerry Dearfield, Tim Malloy, Laura Anderko, Lin Kaatz Chary, Kristen Welker-Hood	July 30, 2010

Revise Secondary Prevention Subgroup recommendations and send to Montrece	Brenda Afzal, Lynn Bergeson, and Pat Beattie	July 30, 2010
Develop a case example for flame retardants	Arlene Bloom	July 30, 2010
Revise Tertiary Prevention Subgroup recommendations and send to Montrece	Anne Rabe	July 30, 2010
Draft language for the "Definitions and Terms" section	Montrece Ransom	July 30, 2010
Draft language for the "Process" section of draft work group report		July 30, 2010
Compile edits and revise draft work group report; send this draft to all work group members for feedback	Montrece Ransom	August 3, 2010
Offer feedback and comments and suggested language on the August 3 rd revised copy of the draft work group report	Montrece Ransom	August 9, 2010
Develop and disseminate 'sign on' draft of work group report	Montrece Ransom	August 16, 2010
Forward final work group report to the Leadership Council	Abby Dilley	August 30, 2010

II. Meeting Summary

1) Welcome, Review of Meeting Goals, Outcomes, Ground Rules, and Agenda

Richard Jackson, Policies and Practices Work Group Chair, opened the meeting by welcoming the group. Abby Dilley, RESOLVE facilitator, reviewed logistics and the agenda for the day, and led a roll call. Dilley reminded work group members that this was the last in-person meeting of the Policies and Practices Work Group, and the goal for this meeting was to finalize the work group's recommendations and review each section of the draft work group report.

1) General Review of Draft WG Report

Dilley asked the group to think about which portions of the draft report will need the most time today.

Jackson started the discussion by noting that he has some concerns that the draft Policies and Practices Work Group report will need some significant editing, given that there are parts which are quite dense, and other parts which are way too thin. He noted that some of the text in the draft document reads like a condemnation of risk assessment. Without context, this language will not serve us well. He also noted that a logic sequence is going to be very important.

One WG member noted that she generally agrees with the comments made thus far. She thought that the opening language of the report is excellent, and helped to crystallize the discussion. She noted that she thought it was important to discuss in the process and methods, that the WG took a multi-pronged approach. She advises that we should explain why we chose to work within the contexts of primary, secondary, and tertiary. And, she noted that the principles might be helpful in pulling out a

Final Document

vision statement. She also adds that some of the language of the tertiary recommendations was cut significantly, and asks that we spend some time during today's meeting on recommendations.

It was noted that Dick's comment, "environment is more than toxicology", needs to be language in our report. She went on to state the amount of consensus that this group has been able to achieve is amazing.

This Policies and Practices Work Group member also noted that the Policies and Practices Work Group might also want to consider addressing imports and exports. There are products--DDT is an example--that are illegal for use here, but are exported to other countries. Imports are also a concern, and the WG should look at the whole ecosystem of the global market place. In closing, this WG member noted that she has been reviewing the draft reports from each of the *National Conversation* Work Groups, and notes that PPWGs report is very heavily focused on feds, especially when compared to the others. The Work Groups should not constrain themselves to actions only for the federal government. What can other sectors do to move our recommendations forward.

In closing her comments, this Work Group member noted that when reading the document, it takes a while to get into the substance, and as such, she recommended that the Policies and Practices Work Group develop an executive summary to precede the Policies and Practices Work Group report.

Questions and Discussion: PPWG approach to Risk Assessment

With regard to risk assessment, Work Group members noted that the point was not to vilify risk assessment. What appears in the draft report is the result of an attempt to put something down on paper for Policies and Practices Work Group members to reflect on, but also an effort to really make a strong statement that risk assessment is only one tool. She noted that we are confronting a real dichotomy here. The fact is that we are dealing with a system based in the risk management paradigm, which is not and does not address primary prevention approaches. She noted that our system is really focused on secondary or tertiary prevention approaches, and the point here was to clearly emphasize the need to reconsider our systemic approach, not to be condemning. Recognizing there are concerns with the current language, this Policies and Practices Work Group member requested language clarification from other WG members. It was also noted during this discussion that we are constrained by the length of the document. The limited page numbers mean that we may need to be shorter and hit harder than we might want to. In other words, we might not be able to provide full context for each statement made in the report. She also points to two potential resources in the Yale Report on TSCA reform and a training session she attended at Lowell.

Jackson noted that vilification of risk assessment is pervasive in the current draft, but there are places where it says that risk assessment is important. We need to work through those inconsistencies, and refocus on what we really want to accomplish, and remove the upfront rejection of risk assessment.

Dilley summarized comments made to this point and noted that the 'to do' here is to spend some time taking the edge off of the risk assessment language.

Dilley, too, was struck by the focus on risk assessment. She also noted some inconsistencies because recommendation #1 from the Primary Prevention Subgroup mentions that we need more hazard evaluation. She adds that we might want to include a list of definitions so that it is clear what is meant by risk assessment.

Question and Discussion: Vision statement and/or PPWG Vision of A Successful System

Another Policies and Practices Work Group member noted that she agreed with the comments about the need and the opportunity to develop a strong vision statement. Dilley pointed out that the Policies and Practices Work Group needs to focus on developing a cohesive vision statement, doing some editing, and moving some pieces around.

With regard to the section of the draft report which addresses the vision of a successful system, at least one Policies and Practices Work Group member noted that the tone and content of the vision statement are important.

Question and Discussion: Precautionary Principle or Primary Prevention?

Policies and Practices Work Group members noted there are two discernable themes from our work thus far. The first is primary prevention where we would want to identify a chemical as a hazard before it gets into commerce. This is the biggest bang for the buck—to not allow them in the market. The other big theme has to do with legacy chemicals which are there all the time. No matter how much clean up takes place, they are there. It was noted that we need to figure out ways to prioritize how to attract or go after the existing chemical. These are two different tracks, and perhaps two different strategies. He notes that the recommendations are pretty good, but with some editing, the work product from the Policies and Practices Work Group will be very good. Jackson noted that the risk assessment language needs to be couched in the context of primary prevention.

Work Group members also pointed out that the language is needed that describes the Policies and Practices Work Group's approach to addressing the precautionary principle, since the Work Group members decided not to use the term 'precautionary principle.'

The next commenter noted that when she thinks in terms of precaution versus prevention, primary prevention, seems like a stronger approach. She reminded the group that the secondary subgroup may need to revisit the matrix created early in the process to pull additional actors and sectors that can take on the actions identified in the emerging recommendations.

2) Discussion of Work Group Recommendations

Recommendations from the Tertiary Prevention Subgroup

RECOMMENDATION 1: Establish a temporary Toxics Remediation Advisory Commission made up of scientists, epidemiologists, public health and environmental experts, community and environmental public health organizations to advise ATSDR on the design and implementation of health consultations, health studies and public health advisories using standardized protocols, policies and programs to ensure proactive actions.

Work group members discussed the viability of a commission, and clarified how this commission would be distinct from the Board of Scientific Advisors that currently advises ATSDR. Work group member Anne Rabe noted that the distinction is that this commission or task force would be made up of scientists, epidemiologists, state agency and independent public health and environmental experts, and environmental health organizations to advise ATSDR specifically on the design and implementation of health consultations, health studies, and public health advisories. Rabe agreed to draft language making this a clearer distinction.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Integrate and train state and local public health teams to use the ASTDR/CDC technical competencies to meet the increasing demand for conducting community and neighborhood based health impact assessments in our contaminated communities.

Work group members noted that the accompanying language for this recommendation needs further development.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Utilize state and local environmental monitoring resources to assist in identifying EPH hazards in populations and the environment before they result in a public health emergency. Define each agency's roles as in the incident command structure to address and resolve EPH issues in a specific situation. Promote transparency at all levels through sharing databases, state information and industry confidential information.

Work group members agreed to add language about broadening the scope of monitoring fish, wildlife, and environmental contamination to include all biologically active chemicals used in products and manufacturing processes. Work group members noted this would be a collaborative effort, necessarily involving CDC, ATSDR, the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), the Fish and Wildlife Service, and relevant state agencies.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Ensure prompt investigation, assessment and remedial action for on-site and off-site alleged contamination areas to adequately protect public health and the environment.

No substantive changes or edits offered.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Create a partnership with all Tribal Epidemiology Centers with the aim of 1) monitoring population health conditions resulting from chemical hazard etiology; 2) provide tribal and local capacity building through ongoing technical assistance to collect and use local data and 3) dismantle barriers to access state and federal data sources to promote timely recognition of chemical threats and a rapid response.

No substantive changes or edits offered.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Establish accountability performance measures to strengthen regulatory activities such as periodic systematic reviews of the regulatory agencies on their application of health recommendations and guidelines, regular reporting on effectiveness and quality of service and communication debriefing.

Work group members agreed to combine recommendations 2, 3, 4, and 6. Rabe agreed to make these changes.

Recommendations from the Secondary Prevention Subgroup

RECOMMENDATION 1: Government, industry, research institutions, and non-governmental organizations should comprehensively and effectively join together to develop and improve tools to enable better interpretation of chemical hazards and provide the public with a greater understanding of the context of chemical use and exposure.

Work group members broadly discussed "right-to-know" as an important concept. There was discussion around the need to improve accessibility and understandability of chemical information on all consumer products, and the need for improved product labeling. Work group members also discussed the need for the development of a 'neural network' that would provide

the electronic means to link and coordinate information on chemicals. Work group member Pat Beattie offered to edit this recommendation based on this discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Improve worker protection from chemical exposures by ensuring that Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Permissible Exposure Limits (PELs) are modernized quickly and updated regularly and ensure information on Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDSs) is comprehensive. Encourage the use by industry, academic, and public institutions of the Chemicals Management systems approach to purchasing, using, and disposing of chemicals.

The group agreed that worker “right-to-know”, and worker protection generally, is critically important. Work group members discussed how PELs have not been updated in many years, and they also noted the need for 100% disclosure on MSDS. The group discussed the lack of chemical management policies in academic institutions, local garages, classrooms, and small industries. Work group member Lynn Bergeson offered to make specific language changes based on these deliberations.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Develop and implement strong chemical policy reform that will address the issues disproportionately-exposed communities face.

Work group members recognized the importance of having a recommendation which specifically focuses on environmental justice. The work group agreed that this recommendation should reference the existing Executive Order on environmental justice. Work group member Brenda Azfal agreed to edit this recommendation and further develop the accompanying language.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Use population-based biomonitoring data as a tool to set priority strategies to reduce the level of harmful environmental chemicals identified in people.

Jackson noted that this was an important recommendation, and he volunteered to work on fleshing out the accompanying language.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) legislative reform is necessary to facilitate prompt action to reduce or eliminate harmful exposures to toxic chemicals.

Work group members discussed the importance of ensuring that TSCA reform considers and encourages the development and use of safer alternatives, not just the adoption of existing alternatives. There was also discussion by work group members about PBT also being a major concern in the TSCA reform debate. Work group member Tim Malloy agreed to work with other Primary Prevention subgroup members to edit this recommendation and merge it with Primary Prevention recommendations 2 and 3.

Recommendations from the Primary Prevention Subgroup

RECOMMENDATION 1: Expedite greater reliance on hazard evaluation through increased development and use of predictive toxicology methods, including structure activity relationships (SARs), computational toxicology and high-throughput test methods (HTP).

Work group members offered a few grammatical edits for this recommendation. Work group member Kerry Dearfield agreed to work on the proposed edits for this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Use Management System-based Regulation Requiring Firms at Regularly Mandated Intervals to Identify, Evaluate, Report, and Consider for Adoption Viable, Safer Alternative Technologies and Approaches

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

Work group members agreed to merge recommendations 2 and 3. Work group member Tim Malloy agreed to work on this.

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

Work group members noted that this recommendation should mention the recommendation which will emerge from the combination of Recommendation 2 and 3 (the integration of a prevention focus in chemical regulation).

3) Discussion of Other Identified Sections Needing Most Work

Work group members agreed that an executive summary should be added to the draft work group report. Doug Farquhar and Lin Kaatz Chary agreed to work collaboratively on language for the executive summary.

Chary also agreed to take a stab at drafting the document's conclusion.

Work group members discussed the need to further hone the "Current Status" sections, and there was a strong suggestion that the group work to avoid condemning risk management in this section, but discuss it in an objective manner. Chary agreed to work on language for this section.

The group agreed to add a new recommendation to call for an executive order that would increase the voice of public health throughout the federal government and the development and implementation of prevention-driving policies. This recommendation should call for a more cohesive and coordinated public health infrastructure across the federal government and between the federal, state, local, and tribal governments. Work group members discussed the need for a public health position to be established in each relevant federal agency, and the creation of a multi-departmental and agency standing commission to promote prevention-driven decision making. Work group members Afzal and Laura Anderko agreed to work on this.

Work group members also agreed to add a vision statement to the draft work group report. This vision statement would indicate that the workgroup envisions a future where promoting the public's health and preventing harm is the standard by which all chemical policies are created, implemented, and evaluated, and where best public health practices are supported as a result of a public health driven policy framework.

4) Break into Drafting Groups

During this part of the meeting, the work group members met in small drafting groups to begin honing recommendations and drafting new language based on deliberations thus far. The work group then reconvened to share the proposed revisions and new language. Workgroup members agreed to ensure remaining edits are sent to the workgroup leadership team no later than August 3rd.

5) Next Steps

Before adjourning, Dilley reviewed the next steps and outlined a work plan for completing the drafts. She noted she would email the work plan to work group members within the week. Dilley also requested that edits and drafts of new language be sent to Montrece Ransom, National Center for Environmental Health/Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, who will compile these edits and the next draft to work group members no later than August 3rd. Ransom reminded the group that edits and revised language should take into consideration the different views within the Work Group and helps promote clearer articulation of the work group's deliberations today.

Dilley advised the group that the next call will be held on August 26th.

III. 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)
Lin 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 & Staff Team Present:

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