Meeting Objectives:

- Hear National Conversation updates, including on the 12/11 LC meeting and the shared website
- Learn about revised National Conversation timeline and anticipated Work Group milestones
- Hear updates and respond to draft documents from the Systems/Coordination and Responder Training/Capacity Building Subgroups
- Decide on next steps and assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upcoming Meeting/Call</th>
<th>When &amp; Where</th>
<th>Suggested Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourth work group meeting (teleconference)</td>
<td>March 1, 2:30-4:00 pm Eastern</td>
<td>• Review revised subgroup work products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1:30 pm Central / 12:30 pm</td>
<td>• Discuss gaps and possible solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain / 11:30 am Pacific)</td>
<td>• Discuss approach to web dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Conversation Updates</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Completed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Send information on trainings for the shared web-space to all WG members</td>
<td>Montrece Ransom</td>
<td>January 21, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide background information on the Web Dialogue to all WG members</td>
<td>Montrece Ransom</td>
<td>February 5th, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share the information on the inventory of preparedness courses with a cross-walk to existing</td>
<td>Anthony Tomassoni</td>
<td>February 19th, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparedness standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide logistics for April 19-20 in-person meeting</td>
<td>Montrece Ransom</td>
<td>February 20th, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create internal WG timeline and disseminate to all WG members</td>
<td>WG Leadership Team</td>
<td>February 20th, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Meeting Summary

1) Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Andrea Kidd Taylor, Work Group (WG) chair, welcomed members to the meeting. She advised the WG that CDC Director Dr. Tom Frieden had appointed Dr. Howard Frumkin to be his Special Assistant for Climate Change and Health. Incoming Acting NCEH/ATSDR Director, Dr. Henry Falk, has stated his commitment to the National Conversation and will continue as planned. Andrea also noted that a new LC (LC) co-chair LC would be named. Dana Goodson, WG facilitator, reviewed and finalized the meeting agenda (Appendix A.)

2) National Conversation Updates

Andrea provided an update on the December 11, 2009 LC meeting. She noted that WG chairs were present at the daylong meeting and they each provided updates on WG progress to the Leadership Council (LC), and received feedback on the WG charges. The feedback received on the CE WG charge was minimal. The final CE WG charge, based on this feedback, is attached as Appendix B. Andrea also acknowledged the importance of our work in light of critical disasters, including the recent earthquakes in Haiti.

Montrece Ransom, NCEH/ATSDR staff to the WG, reviewed the updated Process Map for the National Conversation. She noted that, because the LC expressed concern over the short timeframe for report writing, the WG timeline was extended. Draft WG reports will now be due in August 2010, and final WG reports will be due in October 2010. She also noted that the inputs from the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials (ASTHO) and the National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO) will be sent to both the WGs and the LC for consideration in April 2010. National Conversation partners are developing a community conversation toolkit to assist community leaders in convening local meetings on public health and chemical exposure in order to gain Community-level input into the National Conversation.
report summarizing input from the community conversations will be prepared and disseminated to the WGs and LC for consideration in July 2010. Montrece also noted that trainings for the shared Web space have been scheduled, and information would be sent to members. The Process Map is Appendix C.

Questions and Discussion:

Charge language

At least one WG member acknowledged the need for consistency using all five levels of the cycle of preparedness and response in the final charge language. Those are: preventing, preparing for, responding to, recovering from, and mitigating chemical incidents.

Overlap among WG charges as presented at the 12/11 LC meeting

Workgroup members inquired whether much overlap existed in the WG charges presented to the LC on 12/11. Andrea responded that little overlap exists; each WG seems to be focused on its topic. The LC can address overlap in the work of the WGs, should it arise.

Tools available/disseminated in response to the Haiti Earthquake

Andrea noted that the subject matter experts in our WG likely have been involved in some level of response to the disaster in Haiti. WG members acknowledged that they or their organizations have developed and disseminated the following tools:


Web Dialogue

Members expressed interest in learning more about the Web Dialogues and the potential role of WG members. Montrece agreed to e-mail background information on this element to all WG members. She noted that WG members would be asked for assistance in posing queries and responses during the Web Dialogues.

3) Update from Systems/Coordination Subgroup

Fleming Fallon reviewed the draft matrix developed by the Systems/Coordination Subgroup. This matrix identifies gaps and unmet needs, as well as the need to explore existing laws and regulations to identify gaps and redundancies. The subgroup also discussed its approach, which relies on using three case studies as a backdrop. The subgroup has identified two case studies, one focused on the Fayette County, GA chemical release; and another that deals with a chlorine release. Proposals for the third case study are still being discussed, and include one identified case study focused on a landfill release following Hurricane Katrina, and, a yet–to-be- identified case study, which would focus on an acute chemical emergency related to a natural disaster.

WG member suggestions for this subgroup included:
- Add mitigation as a phase in the cycle of preparedness and response.
- Use the unmet needs and case studies to begin to develop solutions.
- Develop criteria for evaluating questions.
- Add the matrix as an appendix to the subgroup report.

**Questions and Discussion:**

**Ranking response effectiveness**

At least one WG member asked whether this subgroup planned to rank the response efforts in the case studies on effectiveness. No decision has yet been made. Another WG member recommended that this subgroup pay attention to when the events in the case studies took place, as the National Response Framework has changed much of what should have and, perhaps, would have been, done in response to a chemical emergency release.

**Case studies**

Members discussed the subgroup’s search for a third case study. Members suggested including case studies with both acute and chronic releases, and in particular one in which an acute chemical release was associated with a natural disaster. WG members could not think of such a case. Members also suggested that this subgroup should focus on what was done well, using these case study examples, and think through the best way to communicate such best practices before a disaster as a key component of preparedness. Dana requested that any material or information that may be helpful to this subgroup be sent to the subgroup leadership. The leaders of this subgroup are: 1) Darius Sivin [DSivin@uaw.net]; and 2) Erik Janus [EJanus@croplifeamerica.org].

**Compilation of laws**

Although it was not reviewed in detail, the WG noted that the compilation of laws and emergency response authorities is a useful resource. The subgroup noted that this document will be particularly useful in identifying gaps in the law and where policy changes are needed.

4) **Update from Responder Training/Capacity Building Subgroup**

Training Subgroup co-chairs Clark Phinney and Wanda Lizak Welles led the discussion on the progress of this subgroup. Clark noted that the subgroup has created an outline to guide its work (Appendix F). Members noted that subgroups should be thinking about how to integrate the work of both groups before writing the final reports.

Anthony Tomassoni discussed his office’s inventory of preparedness courses with a cross-walk, matching courses to existing preparedness standards. This compilation is still in the formative stage, and has yet to be vetted by other organizations. However, he will share the information with the WG.

Wanda noted that she provided an update on the subgroup’s work during a recent teleconference sponsored by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials.

The subgroup’s next call is Friday, January 22, 2010. The subgroup’s next steps include contacting resources about preparedness and response training needs and gathering references, tools, etc. The subgroup will also start expanding the subgroup report outline.
Questions and Discussion:

Federal Agency Capacity Building

WG members discussed the importance of one of the subgroups including federal agency capacity building. While local frontline workers are most in need of guidance, subgroup leadership acknowledged the critical role of federal agencies in preparedness and response efforts, and advised that they will consider this issue as it moves forward.

5) Next Steps and Assignments

Update on April meeting times

The WG leadership and facilitation team has proposed that the April meeting be extended in order to accommodate all the tasks that the Work Group needs to accomplish at that meeting. The suggested extended schedule is as follows:

Begins: Noon, April 19th, 2010
Ends: 4:30pm, April 20th, 2010

Current plans are to hold the meeting in Baltimore, near the BWI Airport. If possible, the meeting will be held at the BWI Marriott. More information on logistics will follow via email.

Next steps
Dana noted that the Work Group Coordinating Committee is working on a template for the final workgroup report. Once the template is ready, it will be distributed to WG membership to help guide our work. In addition, the CEWG leadership team will begin creating an internal WG timeline based on the process map. Subgroups will continue meeting and deliberating virtually and by phone.

Next call
Dana reminded the group that our next WG call is scheduled for March 1st from 2:30-4:00pm Eastern.

6) Adjourn Conference Call

The meeting was adjourned at 11:27am Eastern by WG chair, Andrea Kidd Taylor.

IV. Participation

Members Present:
Nathan Birnbaum, USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
Susan Cibulsky, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Kathleen Curtis, Clean New York
Jacque Darbonne, Harris County Public Health & Environmental Services
James Eaton, Maine Health and Environmental Testing Lab
Fleming Fallon, Bowling Green State University
Joseph Hughes, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
Nancy Hughes, American Nurses Association
James James, American Medical Association
Betsy Kagey, Georgia Division of Public Health
Andrea Kidd Taylor, Morgan State University, chair
Mark Kirk, U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Wanda Lizak Welles, New York State Department of Health
Laurie Miller, American Chemistry Council
Paul Orum, NGO Chemical Safety Consultant
Susan Palchick, Hennepin County
Clark Phinney, MaineOxy
Darius Sivin, International Union, UAW
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
John Bresland, US Chemical Safety Board
Michael Greenburg, American Academy of Clinical Toxicology
Erik Janus, CropLife America
Kimberly Jennings, US EPA
Todd Jordan, US OSHA
James Madsen, US Army Medical Corps
Maureen Orr, US ATSDR

Facilitation & Staff Team Present:
Dana Goodson, RESOLVE facilitator
Montrece Ransom, NCEH/ATSDR staff

Others Present:
Craig Matheson (representing Kimberly Jennings, U.S. EPA)
APPENDIX A: PROPOSED CALL AGENDA

NATIONAL CONVERSATION ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND CHEMICAL EXPOSURES

Chemical Emergencies Work Group
January 21, 10:00 – 11:30 a.m. Eastern
Number: 866-747-7570
Code: 6568727

Proposed Call Agenda

Call Objectives:
• Hear National Conversation updates, including on the 12/11 LC meeting and the shared website
• Learn about revised National Conversation timeline and anticipated Work Group milestones
• Hear updates and respond to draft documents from the Systems/Coordination and Responder Training/Capacity Building Subgroups
• Decide on next steps and assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Lead(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:10</td>
<td>Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review</td>
<td>Andrea Kidd Taylor, WG chair, and Dana Goodson, WG facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welcome members to call – Andrea Kidd Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Round of introductions – Dana Goodson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review and approve conference call agenda – Dana Goodson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10 – 10:25</td>
<td>National Conversation Updates</td>
<td>Andrea Kidd Taylor and Montrece Ransom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highlights from the 12/11 LC Meeting – Andrea Kidd Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Revised National Conversation timeline (attached) – Montrece Ransom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Timeline for the shared website – Montrece Ransom</td>
<td>Facilitated discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25 – 10:55</td>
<td>Update from the Systems/Coordination Subgroup</td>
<td>Darius Sivin, Subgroup co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on the Subgroup’s activities – Darius Sivin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review and discussion of Subgroup work products:</td>
<td>Facilitated discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Draft matrix tool with prioritized unmet needs (attached)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o List of case studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o List of compiled laws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55 – 11:25</td>
<td>Update from Responder Training/Capacity Building Subgroup</td>
<td>Clark Phinney, Subgroup co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on the Subgroup’s activities – Clark Phinney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review and discussion of outline of Subgroup’s final work products</td>
<td>Facilitated discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25 – 11:30</td>
<td>Next Steps and Assignments</td>
<td>Dana Goodson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on April meeting times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of next steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Next call – Monday, March 1, 2:30 – 4:00 Eastern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Adjourn Conference Call</td>
<td>Andrea Kidd Taylor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: FINAL WORK GROUP CHARGE

NATIONAL CONVERSATION ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND CHEMICAL EXPOSURES

Chemical Emergencies Work Group

Final Work Group Charge

Chemical Emergencies: preventing, preparing for, responding to, recovering from, and mitigating chemical incidents.

Chemical emergencies can be devastating to human and animal populations, the environment, and the economy. Safeguarding public health requires analyzing and eliminating vulnerabilities; identifying and communicating information about hazards; and reducing risks through the development and implementation of effective emergency prevention, preparedness, and response plans. While many public and private agencies have roles in chemical emergency prevention, preparedness and response, coordination among concerned parties has not been optimized. Further, there remain shortcomings, gaps, and redundancies in the chemical emergency preparedness system.

This group will make recommendations on issues including the prevention of chemical emergencies, chemical infrastructure security, monitoring of chemical facilities and events, and the preparedness and response capabilities of 1) emergency management officials; 2) state and local public health agencies and their governing boards; 3) responders, receivers, and providers on the local, state, tribal, and federal levels; 4) the chemical industry; and 5) affected, or potentially affected communities.
Note: Work group activities reflect general milestones. The sequence of task group and full group calls and meetings may vary by work group.

### Partners
- **Contact members and organize calls**
  - Initial WG Calls (1)
    - Overview of process
    - Initial disc of charge
- **Work Group mtgs (2)**
  - Agree on proposed charge
  - Discuss work plan and timeline
  - Discuss scope of background papers?
- **Task Group calls begin**
  - Share perspectives on issues to address
- **Work Group Calls (3)**
  - Continue to discuss and frame issues to address
  - Discuss topics for issue papers?
  - Discuss option development process
- **Work Group Calls (4)**
  - Discuss issues and begin to formulate ideas for options
  - Organize report outlines
  - Discuss approach to web dialogue
- **Work Group Calls (5)**
  - Continue discussion of issues and options
  - Frame web questions
  - Task groups begin drafting sections of reports

### Work Groups
- **Contact members and schedule first meeting**
- **LC 1 (Meeting)**
  - Discuss overall process, work group charges and National Conversation protocols
  - Approve revised protocols
  - Policies and Practices charge
  - Revised milestones and integration of process elements
- **LC 2 (Call)**
- **LC 3 (Call)**
  - Topics TBD

### LC
- **Contact LC members and schedule first meeting**
- **Listening Session at National Environmental Public Health Conference – October 2009**
- **National Conversation Kick Off – June 26, 2009**
Appendix C: Process Map

**Partners**
- Launch comm. conversations
- Web conversation on values, issues, options ideas, other questions posed by WGs
- ASTHO Forum and report

**Work Groups**
- Work Group Meetings (6)
  - Discuss results of needs assessments and first web dialogue
  - Review and revise drafts of initial sections of WG reports
- Work Group Calls (7)
  - Discuss input from LC on key questions
  - Discuss rough draft of full report
- Work Group Calls (8)
  - Discuss and further refine draft report
- Work Group Calls (9) (late July or early August)
  - Review drafts in light of community conversations
  - Agree on draft work group reports for web discussion
  - Discuss topics for web discussion
  - Post draft WG reports on web

**Web 1 - issues**
- Assemble rough drafts
- Questions/ideas on issues and options

**Web 2 - WG options**
- Post draft WG options

**LC 4** (Meeting)
- Assemble rough drafts
- Questions/ideas on issues and options

**LC 5** (1/2 day Call)
- Questions/ideas on issues and options

**WG 6** (meetings)
- Plan second round of web dialogue and conduct outreach

**WG 7** (calls)
- Review and revise drafts of initial sections of WG reports

**WG 8** (calls)
- Review drafts in light of community conversations
- Agree on draft work group reports for web discussion
- Discuss topics for web discussion
- Post draft WG reports on web

**WG 9** (meetings)
- Review drafts in light of community conversations
- Agree on draft work group reports for web discussion
- Discuss topics for web discussion
- Post draft WG reports on web

**WG 10** (call/webinar)
- Review drafts in light of community conversations
- Agree on draft work group reports for web discussion
- Discuss topics for web discussion
- Post draft WG reports on web

Meeting #3 Summary
APPENDIX C: PROCESS MAP

LC 4 (mtg)
• Discuss results of needs assessment, comm. conv. and web dialogue
• Discuss WG report outlines and issues flagged by work groups
• Discuss process for drafting action agenda

LC 5 (Call) (early July)
• Discuss approach to web dialogue
• Continue to discuss issues flagged by work groups

• LC members participate in web discussion to comment on draft WG reports

OCTOBER ‘10

NOVEMBER ‘10

DECEMBER ‘10

JANUARY ‘11

FEBRUARY ‘11

MARCH ‘11

Input from community conversations

Input from web dialogue

Post final WG reports

Draft action agenda

LC 4 (Meeting)

LC 7 (Meeting)

LC 8 (Meeting)

Web 3

WG 11 (calls)

Post draft Action Agenda

Implementation Summit (May?)

Release Final Action Agenda (April?)

Partner’s

Post final Work Group reports on web

• Web conversation on draft Action Agenda

Work Groups

• Discuss draft action agenda and web dialogue results
• Provide feedback to LC

Meeting #3 Summary
## APPENDIX C: PROCESS MAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LC Meeting? (5)</th>
<th>Draft action agenda based on LC direction</th>
<th>LC Meeting (6)</th>
<th>Possible task group work on key issues</th>
<th>LC Meeting (7)</th>
<th>April: Publish Action Agenda with Work Group reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Discuss results of web discussion on draft WG reports and WG revisions</td>
<td>• Circulate draft of action agenda for LC members’ comments</td>
<td>• Agree on draft action agenda to post on web</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss input from WGs and web dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review and revise action agenda outline</td>
<td>• Provide direction on action agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Agree on Action Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discuss initial options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss implementation summit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>