

**NATIONAL CONVERSATION ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND CHEMICAL EXPOSURES
MONITORING WORK GROUP**

**Meeting No. 6 Summary
Rockville, MD
May 6–7, 2010**

Meeting Objectives

- Further develop *National Conversation on Public Health and Chemical Exposures* Monitoring work group subgroup reports;
- Consider feedback from the Web dialogue, NACCHO, and ASTHO; and
- Develop a set of recommendations from the Monitoring work group.

Meeting Outcomes

- A list of 12 recommendations from the Monitoring work group
- A work plan for completing draft work group report by July 2010

Upcoming Meeting	When and Where	Suggested Agenda Items
Full Monitoring Work Group Call	June 9, 10, or 11, 2010 (TBD) By Teleconference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discuss Leadership Council's comments on Monitoring work group update provided June 1 ○ Finalize recommendations ○ Review and discuss other sections of the report

I. Action Items

Next Steps	Who	Completed
Compile and refine subgroup reports and recommendations coming from the 5/6–7 meeting into a single Monitoring work group Report	John Balbus, with assistance as needed from individual members, and Jenny Van Skiver	May 8–19, 2010
Post draft work group report on project management site for full work group review and comment	Jenny Van Skiver	May 19, 2010
Comment on and make suggested edits to the draft work group report on the project management site	Monitoring work group members	May 26, 2010
Ensure that most current version of the report is posted on project management site for members' review	Jenny Van Skiver	June 4, 2010

II. Meeting Summary

[May 6, 2010]

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review

John Balbus, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, work group chair, and Kathy Grant, RESOLVE facilitator, welcomed members to the meeting and thanked everyone for their

participation. Balbus said that the goal for the 2-day meeting is to leave with a single set of recommendations from the full Monitoring work group.

Subgroup Reports

Each of the subgroup leads provided an update on the status of their draft report.

Chemical Use and Exposure Pathways Subgroup

Dan Goldstein, Monsanto, said that the Chemical Use and Exposure Pathways Subgroup draft currently includes a collection of ideas that need to be fleshed out and reorganized. He will appreciate the subgroup's help in shaping their recommendations.

Exposure Levels Subgroup

Megan Latshaw, Association of Public Health Laboratories, updated the group on the Exposure Levels Subgroup's draft report, stating that members have provided comments on previous versions of the report and they are looking forward to using the 2-day meeting to focus on firming up their recommendations and to addressing the outstanding comments in the report.

Health Outcomes Subgroup

Jennifer Parker, Centers of Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, provided an update on the Health Outcomes Subgroup. She said the subgroup could use more input from state and local representatives, as the need for state and local data collection compatibility at both the state and national levels has come up in several of the subgroup's discussions.

General Discussion

Clarification was provided on the following issues:

- Final Deliverable: Balbus reminded members that the *National Conversation*'s final deliverable is an action agenda that will be issued by the project's Leadership Council. Each of the six work groups' reports will be included in their entirety as appendices to the final action agenda.
- Clearance: Ben Gerhardstein, NCEH/ATSDR, said that work group reports and the action agenda will not be cleared through CDC channels, as they will not be CDC products.
- Representation: Work group members represent themselves as individuals and were selected for the expertise and perspectives they bring to the project. Relevant language in the *National Conversation Operating Procedures* is as follows:

Although the decisions of the work groups reflect the views of the individual members, members have been selected to represent diverse perspectives and are asked to keep members of their organization or constituency informed about the issues and options being discussed, to solicit their perspectives, and to convey the concerns and interests of that organization or constituency. (See [Operating Procedures](#).)

- Specificity of recommendations: Balbus noted that recommendations need to be specific enough to be actionable, but should call for systematic improvements. The group should not, for example, focus on how to address monitoring a specific chemical. Naming actors is optional, and the group will need to decide how to word recommendations.
- Federal Advisory Committee Act: Neither the *National Conversation* work groups nor the Leadership Council are subject to FACA.

Presentation: ASTHO, NACCHO, Web Dialogue

Jenny Van Skiver, NCEH/ATSDR, provided updates on external processes for input.

Association of State and Territorial Health Officials

The Association of State and Territorial Health Officials (ASTHO) assessed state environmental health directors' needs related to public health and chemical exposure issues. ASTHO also convened state health and environmental officials to discuss these issues on March 16, 2010 in San Antonio, Texas. Van Skiver urged members to review [ASTHO's full report](#).

Monitoring work group-specific comments from ASTHO include:

- *Data Needs*
 - Many unstudied chemicals
 - Storage and transportation data
 - Biomonitoring data
- *Data Collection*
 - Manufacturers should collect and report
 - Cooperative agreements with EU and Canada
 - Strengthen exposure reporting rules for laboratories, poison control centers, and medical settings
- *Data Use*
 - State health and environmental agencies need access to data
 - Poison control centers should incorporate questions about chemical exposure into standard questioning

Increased funding for biomonitoring and tracking was among ASTHO's top overall suggestions. State officials recognize the importance of biomonitoring in understanding the health effects of chemical exposures and are interested in starting or expanding biomonitoring programs in their states. Staff from state health and environmental agencies would like to see funding available to all states for biomonitoring programs. The data gathered from these programs could help individual states set legislative and preventive priorities.

National Association of County and City Health Officials

The National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO) held two meetings to discuss local health officials' needs and suggestions about public health and chemical exposures. Van Skiver asked members to review the [summaries](#) of NACCHO's meetings on March 8, 2010 in Oakland, California and on April 8, 2010 in Columbus, Ohio.

Highlights of NACCHO's input included the following recommendations:

- Standardize methods and equipment;
- Agencies and academics should share data with local communities;
- Routinely monitor consumer products;
- Increase monitoring of indoor air;
- Develop a clearinghouse of studies done at the local level;
- Require facilities to monitor releases and complete cancer risk assessments; and
- Consider California as a model.

April 5–7, 2010 Web Dialogue

Van Skiver shared comments from the Web dialogue. Two of the Monitoring-specific issues were:

- Improve monitoring in schools, including indoor air; and

- Develop a national database of toxicity information.

Full Web dialogue discussions and summary highlights are available [here](#).

Full Group Check-in

The subgroups met in working sessions to narrow and refine their recommendations. After these sessions, the full group reconvened for a check-in discussion.

Chemical Use and Exposure Pathways Subgroup

The Chemical Use and Exposure Pathways Subgroup reported that they used their session to develop a set of aspirational goals, which will feed into their recommendations. They discussed the desire for comprehensiveness—capturing data on all important chemicals in the environment, in broad populations, and from a comprehensive list of sources. Members discussed the importance of collecting data in ways that support community efforts to understand exposures and that can be integrated by many government agencies. Members also noted that raw data are not always informative; data need to be translated for health officials and the public.

Exposure Levels Subgroup

The Exposure Levels Subgroup (aka Biomonitoring Subgroup) made five potential recommendations. Members discussed the implications of expanding CDC's biomonitoring program versus expanding independent biomonitoring at the state or local level. Subgroup lead Megan Latshaw explained that their goal was not to expand CDC's biomonitoring program to all 50 states but to increase state capacity to do biomonitoring work by leveraging resources available through other states.

Health Outcomes Subgroup

The Health Outcomes Subgroup reported back on three draft recommendations. Members also discussed the need for understanding community priorities, and again, for the necessity of balancing data collected for routine surveillance with data collected to identify problems.

After receiving further input from the full work group, the subgroups returned to their working sessions for the remainder of the day.

[May 7, 2010]

Full Work Group Discussion

The subgroups shared their current versions of the draft recommendations with the full work group:

Use and Exposure Pathways Subgroup Recommendations

1. Establish a comprehensive database on sources
2. Establish a comprehensive database of chemical concentrations in environmental media to provide a robust baseline for comparative purposes
 - a. New occupational health exposure survey
 - b. Surveys of indoor environments
 - c. Water (focus on drinking water)
 - d. Food? Expand to consumer products?
3. Develop new and improved screening and analysis methods; may be one recommendation across subgroups

4. Prioritization
5. Data Integration and standardization
6. Confidentiality: Create a task force to review and revise existing policies on Confidential Business Information (CBI) and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and agency practices, including Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) processes.

Exposure Levels Subgroup Recommendations

1. Tracking
2. National State-based Biomonitoring System
3. Research
4. Report results to individuals
5. Prioritizing chemicals

Health Outcomes Subgroup Recommendations

1. Expand reportable conditions for emerging and chronic diseases related to environmental health at the state level
2. Address issues of compatibility and standardization across and within states for health outcomes related to chemical exposures
3. Expand the Environmental Public Health Tracking (EPHT) Network to all 50 states and 10 largest MSAs
4. Expand national data systems to include information for more vulnerable populations and certain geographic areas
5. Address needs for high risk communities by collecting environmental monitoring, human exposure, and health data at the localized level to assess the impact of chemicals on community health

Members discussed the subgroups' suggested recommendations and used them to develop the following unified set of recommendations from the full work group:

Draft Work Group Recommendations

1. Improve reporting of chemical source, use, and discharge information
 - a. Make TSCA inventory updating more regular, more comprehensive (or TSCA reform equivalent)
 - b. Address Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) shortcomings; provide more information about short-term releases
2. Make environmental monitoring more comprehensive
 - a. Indoor environmental monitoring (non-occupational settings)
 - b. National Exposure Work Survey (occupational settings)
 - c. National Children's Study
 - d. Schools
 - e. Update data collection activities every 5–10 years
3. Expand biomonitoring capacity
 - a. National Biomonitoring System
4. Expand Health Outcome Surveillance
 - a. National data surveys to oversample vulnerable populations and high priority geographic regions
 - b. Expand reportable conditions to other chronic conditions with environmental links
5. Expand EPHT to include all 50 States and 10 largest MSAs
 - a. Improve access for local health departments
 - b. Require more biomonitoring integration by state grantees
6. Invest in research and development to improve monitoring and surveillance technology

7. Establish mechanisms for the public and state/local/tribal officials to provide input into:
 - a. Decisions about national data collection efforts
 - b. Local community study design (e.g., Community-based Participatory Action Research methods)
8. Standardization and Integration
 - a. Each discipline needs a “community of practice” to establish guidelines for standardization
 - b. Establish national advisory group to issue guidelines for integrating datasets
9. Public Access/Confidentiality
 - a. National Academy of Sciences study on the impact of existing policies related to confidentiality and data release on public health protections related to chemical exposures
 - i. CBI
 - ii. HIPAA
 - iii. Data release (agencies, investigators); each agency evaluates
 - b. Reporting individual results
 - c. State and local governments given access to clearinghouse of study data

During the 2-day meeting, work group members identified several issues, themes, and challenges for continued consideration in the development of their report:

- Databases need to speak to each other: the work group continues to discuss the challenge of relating data from multiple sources—chemical use and exposure pathways, exposure levels in people and health outcomes—in a meaningful way.
- Nationally representative versus locally driven and locally relevant: the challenge of balancing the need for a comprehensive, systematic, continuous national data collection system with the need for local data that meets community-specific requirements is ongoing.
- Comprehensive monitoring: consider the question of proactive monitoring versus responsive monitoring, and monitoring for chronic and acute exposures.
- Prevention /Protection: a member suggested that the work group make its recommendations within the framework of the Precautionary Principle. Balbus suggested that the group acknowledge that effective monitoring and surveillance, and the ability to link chemical use information with toxicity information, are necessary to protect the public from harmful chemical exposures.
- Resources: many of the recommendations that are bubbling up are calling for expanding monitoring activities, which will require significant increases in resources. Balbus urged members to keep resource needs in mind as they develop recommendations.

Work group members also noted the importance affirming in the aspirational goals section of the report that all the data are being collected with one purpose in mind—to protect health. They also pointed out that the data collection priorities will need to be updated as new information becomes available.

Work Plan and Next Steps

Balbus will compile the three subgroup drafts and recommendations into one report. This draft report will be shared with the full Monitoring work group by May 19. Members will then comment on and edit the draft and assist with filling in gaps in content. The full Monitoring work group will meet by phone the week of June 7, 2010, date and time TBD.

Participation

Members Present:

- Henry Anderson, Wisconsin Division of Public Health (by telephone)
- Herb Buxton, U.S. Geological Survey
- Alison Edwards, U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition
- Jay Feldman, Beyond Pesticides
- Roy Fortmann, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- Daniel Goldstein, Monsanto
- Charlotte L. Keys, Jesus People Against Pollution
- Megan Latshaw, Association of Public Health Laboratories
- David Marker, Westat
- Jennifer Parker, U.S. Centers of Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics
- Karen Pierce, Bayview Hunters Point Community Advocates
- Martha Stanbury, Michigan Department of Community Health
- Treye Thomas, Consumer Product Safety Commission
- Rosemary Zaleski, ExxonMobil Biomedical Sciences, Inc.

Regrets

- Jose Emilio Esteban, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food Safety and Inspection Service
- Nancy John, Cherokee Nation
- Sam LeFevre, Utah Department of Health
- Dean Lillquist, U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration
- Paul Lioy, Robert Wood Johnson Medical School/University of Medicine and Dentistry New Jersey
- John Osterloh, U.S. Centers of Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Environmental Health
- Sharlyle Patton, Commonweal
- Ruthann Rudel, Silent Spring Institute
- Richard Van Frank, Improving Kids' Environment
- Steve Whittaker, Public Health-Seattle and King County
- Michael Wilson, University of California, Berkeley
- Alan Woolf, Children's Hospital, Boston

Facilitation and Staff Team Members Present:

- John Balbus, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, chair
- Ben Gerhardstein, NCEH/ATSDR staff
- Kathy Grant, RESOLVE facilitator
- Michael McGeehin, NCEH/ATSDR senior liaison
- Jenny Van Skiver, NCEH/ATSDR staff