

**NATIONAL CONVERSATION ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND CHEMICAL EXPOSURES
CHEMICAL EMERGENCIES**

**Meeting No. 6 Summary
Teleconference
May 14, 2010**

Objectives:

- Hear updates from subgroups regarding:
 - Activities and progress since the April 19–20 work group meeting
 - An overview of draft subgroup documents
 - Specific feedback requested from full work group
 - Next steps to develop report
- Give feedback to subgroups about their draft documents
- Review and discuss tasks and timelines for developing and concluding work group report, drawing on the report template and sample recommendation
- Decide on next steps and assignments

Upcoming Meeting or Call	When and Where	Suggested Agenda Items
Seventh work group meeting	Tuesday, June 22, 11:30 a.m.–1:00 p.m. EDT By conference call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrating each of the subgroup’s products into one work group report • Review final work group report template to identify gaps • Agenda and logistics for August 10 in-person meeting

I. Action Items

Capacity Building and Training Subgroup	By whom	By When
Continue work product development and send a refined subgroup draft (including current status, vision, and actionable recommendations) to Jennifer Peyser	All subgroup members	June 16, 2010
Respond to Doodle online system request from Clark Phinney.	All subgroup members	June 16, 2010
System and Coordination Subgroup	By whom	By When
Check with the <i>National Conversation on Public Health and Chemical Exposures Policies and Practices Work Group</i> regarding their work on material safety data sheets (MSDS) and connect with Connie.	Montrece Ransom	June 16, 2010
Revise draft subgroup document and send to subgroup for review. This revision will pull out the actionable recommendations that are embedded in the current draft.	Darius Sivin	May 21, 2010
Next <i>System and Coordination Subgroup</i> call	All subgroup members	May 26 or 27, 2010
Respond to scheduling email or Doodle online system request from Jennifer Peyser	All subgroup members	May 30, 2010

II. Meeting Summary

Day 1, April 19, 2010

1) Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Andrea Kidd Taylor, *Chemical Emergencies Work Group* chair, welcomed and thanked members for their hard work. Jennifer Peyser, *Resolve Facilitator*, reviewed the meeting agenda and led introductions.

2) Update from the *Capacity Building and Training Subgroup*

Clark Phinney, co-chair of the *Capacity Building and Training Subgroup*, reported on the subgroup's work. Phinney noted that the subgroup is conducting research and fact gathering. They have started a draft document, following the format of the final work group report template, but much of it is still in bulleted format. The subgroup has developed universal recommendations that have not yet been prioritized, thus they may not all be in the final subgroup report. The *Capacity Building and Training Subgroup* originally considered first responders and first receivers, but they focused on the training needs of first responders, defined as "those individuals who in the early stages of an incident are responsible for the protection and preservation of life, property, evidence, and the environment, including emergency response providers, as well as emergency management, public health, clinical care, public works, and other skill support personnel who provide immediate support services during prevention, protection, mitigation, response, and recovery operations."

They have found the training system is still very fragmented. For example, training offered and received differs sharply between rural and metropolitan communities. In addition, some communities have well-organized training efforts and others are much less organized. Discussion then turned to the language of the five recommendations emerging from this subgroup. The *Capacity Building and Training Subgroup* next steps include reviewing the ASTHO report and target capabilities documents for themes that support their recommendations. The emerging recommendations are:

Recommendation No. 1: Develop a Chemical Emergencies Bootcamp to identify and communicate basic common knowledge and competencies to responding organizations and agencies.

Recommendation No. 2: Develop one user-friendly platform and planning tool for toxicologic Hazard Vulnerability Analysis (HVA) for local level planning and response.

Questions and Discussion

Where does MSDS fit in this context?

One *Chemical Emergencies Work Group* member raised a concern regarding material safety data sheets (MSDS). MSDS sheets reportedly can be very technical, and should be made clearer so that community members know or have access to succinct, understandable information about chemicals being used in their communities. It was also mentioned that when the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry authors a toxicology profile; it also can be very technical. However, the first chapter, in a question and answer format, is easier to read. Someone suggested that perhaps the MSDS should include a public health statement or something similar. Phinney noted that recommendation No. 2 could be helpful because it focuses on creating one user-friendly platform and planning tool. He mentioned envisioning a Web application that would

make this and the basic MSDS information accessible to the public. He noted the need for public education about how to read and interpret this information. Community access might also be addressed under this recommendation.

OSHA proposed rulemaking to align with the GHS

The *Chemical Emergencies Work Group* members noted that OSHA has published a proposed rulemaking to align OSHA's Hazard Communication standard (HCS) with the United Nation's Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS).¹ Work group members noted that while Section 12 of the MSDS addresses information about ecological effects, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has done little in this area. OSHA can suggest but not mandate implementation. As such, work group members noted that EPA's implementation is what is missing. They also noted that the Department of Transportation has adopted the GHS fully.

Recommendation No. 3: Create...“a cadre of trained and experienced emergency support function No. 8 (ESF No. 8) planners and responders that will improve emergency operational capabilities and better integrate the tiers of private sector and government responses to domestic public health emergencies.”

Questions and Discussion

The importance of building alliances on the local level

The *Chemical Emergencies Work Group* discussed the importance of building alliances on the local level. In addition, work group members mentioned that local level preparedness depends on training and money. They also noted the importance of remembering EMS and others who are private contractors, yet play a role in response efforts.

Recommendation No 4: Define and develop a consensus about which TLV/LEL/PEL/REL standard to use (OSHA, NIOSH, ACGIH).

Questions and Discussion

Do several standards govern environmental exposure?

At least one *Chemical Emergencies Work Group* member questioned whether existing standards that govern environmental exposure vary. Other work group members responded that EPA HAZWOPER standards correspond to OSHA guidance. Another member pointed out that so many standards and databases exist because each experience varies; therefore some interpretation is required.

Recommendation No. 5: Remembering that all emergencies occur at the local level and need to be tied to real resources, local response teams need to be trained and ready for what they can reasonably expect.

¹ More information on <http://www.osha.gov/dsg/hazcom/global.html>

3) Update from System and Coordination Subgroup

Darius Sivin, co-chair of the *Systems and Coordination Subgroup*, presented an update. Sivin referred *Chemical Emergencies Work Group* members to the May 10 draft of the *Systems and Coordination Subgroup's* materials. He noted that the subgroup has not yet compiled recommendations, but some are beginning to emerge. The subgroup is focusing on drafting language for Sections IIa, IIb, and IIc of the Work Group Final Report Template. These sections address the current status of issues and the vision of a successful system. The draft text for these sections is based on a SWOT analysis of the matrix of needs, which was the first work product that the *Systems and Coordination Subgroup* developed. This matrix listed various stakeholders horizontally, across the top. Down the side, listed vertically, are the five stages of emergency preparedness and response as outlined in the *Chemical Emergencies Work Group* charge. Each cell addresses a need or gap for that stakeholder group in one of the five preparedness or response phases. Recommendations address the following:

1. Information about chemical hazards and alternatives should be effectively organized and managed to reduce burdens on both data providers and users. Develop and implement an outreach strategy to disseminate information and materials to include vulnerable populations, within our diverse communities.
2. All communities should have adequate resources (i.e., money and information) and authority to complete thorough vulnerability analyses, promote chemical emergency hazard reduction, and have effective plans in place that will mitigate any effects of chemical emergencies.
3. Create a competent community and first responder and first receiver workforce that can mount an effective response to the most likely (risk informed) events and that has the ability to adapt the response to any crisis situation.

The next steps for the *Systems and Coordination Subgroup* include finding and analyzing potential recommendation language that is currently embedded in the text of their document. Sivin mentioned that he will work with other subgroup members to do this and will send out highlights on May 21, and to plan for a call in the latter half of the month.²

4) Overview of Work Group's Direction

Peyser led a discussion on the resources available to the *Chemical Emergencies Work Group* as they draft their report. Subgroups also need to use the feedback received today to hone their recommendations, combining them where feasible. Peyser also mentioned that a sample recommendation has been developed to serve as a template. Peyser reiterated the importance of reviewing other *National Conversation on Public Health and Chemical Exposures* input, including the Web Dialogue Summary, and the summaries from ASTHO and NACCHO data collection efforts.

5) Next Steps and Assignments

Peyser mentioned that calls are scheduled later in the month of May for both subgroups, and that the next *Chemical Emergencies Work Group* call is scheduled for Tuesday, June 22. Peyser asked that fully honed draft recommendations be received no later than Wednesday, June 16. She also reminded the group of plans for an in-person meeting on August 10, and mentioned that subgroups might want to consider meeting the day before the *Chemical*

² This call was subsequently scheduled and confirmed for May 27, 2010, 4-5:30 PM EDT.

Emergencies Work Group meeting to finalize any subgroup products. The call was adjourned at 1:43 p.m. EDT.

IV. Participation

Members Present:

Fleming Fallon, Bowling Green State University
Nancy Hughes, American Nurses Association
Kimberly Jennings, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Betsy Kagey, Georgia Division of Public Health
Andrea Kidd Taylor, Morgan State University, *chair*
Jacqueline McBride, Love, Peace and Prosperity International, Inc.
Maureen Orr, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
Paul Orum, NGO Chemical Safety Consultant
Clark Phinney, Maine Oxy
Derek Swick, American Petroleum Institute
Constance Thomas, South Fulton and Fayette Community Task Force
Anthony Tomassoni, Yale University School of Medicine

Regrets:

Bill Benerman, Denver Department of Environmental Health
Nathan Birnbaum, USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
John Bresland, U.S. Chemical Safety Board
Susan Cibulsky, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Kathleen Curtis, Clean New York
Jacque Darbonne, Harris County Public Health and Environmental Services
Scott Deitchman, NCEH/ATSDR, senior liaison
James Eaton, Maine Health and Environmental Testing Lab
Michael Greenberg, American Academy of Clinical Toxicology
Joseph Hughes, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
James James, American Medical Association
Erik Janus, CropLife America
Todd Jordan, Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Mark Kirk, U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Wanda Lizak Welles, New York State Department of Health
Susan Palchick, Hennepin County
Darius Sivin, International Union, UAW
Syndi Smallwood, Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians

Facilitation and Staff Team Present:

Jennifer Peyser, RESOLVE facilitator
Montrece Ransom, NCEH/ATSDR staff