

**NATIONAL CONVERSATION ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND CHEMICAL EXPOSURES
SCIENTIFIC UNDERSTANDING**

**Meeting No. 2 Summary
In-person meeting
November 16, 2009**

Meeting Objectives:

- Get to know each other
- Finalize the draft Work Group charge
- Learn about the status of the National Conversation process, project milestones, and the Work Group's role
- Begin identifying priority topics
- Decide on next steps and assignments

I. Action Items

Item	By Whom	By When
Send any comments/edits on first Work Group call summary to Abby	Work Group members	11/30/09
Send out Work Group membership contact list	Kim DeFeo	11/30/09
Send out "next steps" memo and doodle polls for next full Work Group call and sub-group calls	Abby Dilley	11/30/09
Revision of Work Group charge	Kevin Teichman	12/04/09
Select Topic Areas/Subgroup(s)	Work Group members	12/04/09
Send any comments/edits on this meeting summary to Abby	Work Group members	12/04/09
Hold 1-2 phone meetings to begin sub-group work	All sub-groups	1/04/10

II. Call Summary

Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Objectives and Agenda Review

Kevin Teichman, the Scientific Understanding Work Group chair, welcomed the group and members introduced themselves to one another (a Scientific Understanding Work Group roster with contact information is attached). Abby Dilley, Work Group facilitator, reviewed and finalized the meeting agenda and ground rules and protocols for the meeting. Ground rules and protocols established are used to encourage constructive, problem-solving dialogue among all

Work Group members to address the charge. The ground rules adopted by the Work Group include:

- Full participation by all Work Group members
 - Staying in one conversation in the room.
 - Keeping comments concise.
- Productive engagement and discussions
 - Dialogue includes listening and talking.
 - Being respectful to one another and disagreeing without being disagreeable.
 - Focusing on solving problems of mutual interest.
- Honoring the agenda
 - Being on time and prepare for discussions.
 - Staying on topic and on task.

If anyone not attending the meeting would like to comment or add to the ground rules, please contact Abby (adilley@resolv.org).

National Conversation Process Update and Work Group Milestones

Ed Murray, Senior Liaison to the Work Group, updated the group on the community conversation toolkit and the web forums, which will be launched in 2010. Work Group members will be able to get input on their topic areas by posing questions to the public via the web forums. Ed also gave an overview of the first public meeting held to gather input on the National Conversation, organized in conjunction with the National Environmental Public Health Conference in Atlanta, GA. Over 60 people attended and contributed ideas. To facilitate Work Group collaboration, an online work space will be launched in December to assist Work Group members in sharing documents and discussing ideas.

Kim DeFeo, NCEH/ATSDR staff, mentioned that the National Conversation Operating Procedures document had been sent to all Work Group members before the meeting. This draft document outlines the draft operating procedures for the National Conversation, including decision making processes. These procedures will be considered, revised and adopted (as amended) by the Leadership Council on December 11. Kim encouraged anyone who had any comments or questions regarding this document to contact Ben Gerhardstein by November 20, 2009 so that he could pass along any input to the Leadership Council. Kim also reviewed the National Conversation Milestones document, highlighting important upcoming dates.

A member asked how the recommendations resulting from the National Conversation will be used by government agencies. Other members, representing various agencies, responded that their agencies will take recommendations that come out of the National Conversation under consideration, along with information from various other sources, as they determine upcoming priorities. It was reiterated that the goal of the National Conversation is to develop recommendations that any number of stakeholders (not just government) can use to take action to protect public health from harmful chemical exposures.

In response to a member's question, Kevin and Kim encouraged Work Group members to reach out to others and gather their input into this project via informal conversations, the community conversation toolkit, web forums and/or public meetings.

Discussion of Revised Work Group Charge

Kevin summarized the changes he had made to the Work Group charge and solicited input on the revised version. Members made additional suggestions and Kevin agreed to revise the

charge again based on this input. Although the group had previously agreed to include mold and other biological contaminants in the Work Group's purview, at least one group member questioned whether doing so was prudent. The Work Group is seeking guidance from the Leadership Council on the inclusion of biological contaminants in the National Conversation.

Topics Identification and Discussion

To begin the process of topic identification, the group brainstormed a list of topics for consideration, including:

- Recognizing and addressing individual differences in susceptibility
- Identifying and measuring low-level and cumulative exposures to multiple chemicals
- Managing public expectations
- Gaining information that we lack regarding chemical toxicity
- Improving methods for assessing community exposures
- Cooperating instead of duplicating efforts in gathering and assessing health impacts data
- Developing criteria for using a precautionary approach to decision making
- Addressing short-acting chemicals
- Reexamining "safer" chemicals using new data
- Reexamining standard exposure scenarios (e.g., tribal fish consumption)
- Assessing the effectiveness of strategies to reduce exposures

Determine Criteria for Selecting Priority Topics

A discussion regarding criteria important for determining the Work Group's priorities was held. Ideas discussed include:

- Degree of interest to the public
- Alignment with group's vision and charge
- Cross-cutting nature of issue
- Number of people impacted by a process/issue
- Promotion of justice/ protection of vulnerable communities
- Public health impact
- Degree to which something tells us what we want to know (versus "just" collecting data)
- Contribution to the establishment of a baseline/understanding of our current situation
- Opportunities for cooperation/collaboration

Review and Select Priority Topics

The group reviewed the suggested topic areas in light of the criteria for selecting topics and developed five priority topic areas for continued work:

1. **Communities-** includes assessing how we respond to community needs (e.g., health assessments, health studies) and examining alternatives.
2. **Individuals-** includes looking at various life stages, cumulative risk, low-level exposures and exposure patterns, and differences in susceptibility.
3. **Frameworks-** asks how we process the information we already have (e.g., risk assessment, health studies).
4. **Databases-** includes efficiency improvements (e.g., IRIS/ToxProfiles), mining existing databases, and creating new databases (e.g., disease registries).
5. **Technologies-** includes new tools (e.g., computational toxicology), products and materials.

Another topic area – emerging issues and concerns – also was suggested. Upon further discussion, the Work Group members determined this topic is a cross-cutting theme and should be part of each of the priority topics discussions, rather than be a stand-alone topic area.

Public Comment

Kevin solicited any comments from the public; there were none.

Develop Work Group Plan

It was decided that five sub-groups would be formed around each of the five priority topic areas. It was recommended that each sub-group organize its work by answering these questions:

1. Why is this topic area an issue?
2. What is the current understanding? (identify gaps and shortcomings)
3. What are the proposed actions? (short- and long-term)
4. What are the anticipated products?
5. What are the desired outcomes?

The sub-groups should also identify any topics for presentations that would be beneficial for the Work Group.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Next steps for the Work Group were summarized:

1. Send any comments/edits on the first Work Group call summary to Abby by Friday, November 30, 2009.
2. Please send any comments on this draft meeting summary to Abby by Friday, December 4th so we can try to finalize the summary before the Leadership Council meeting on December 11, 2009.
3. Kevin will revise the draft charge and send it back out to the group.
4. Kim will send a Work Group membership contact list to everyone.
5. Abby will send out a memo outlining the next steps for the Work Group. She will also send out a doodle for our next full Work Group call and for each sub-group's first call. Each sub-group should meet once or twice before January 4. While any group member is welcome to participate in any sub-group call, members should pick one primary group on which to focus his/her efforts.

III. Participation

Members Present

George Alexeeff, California EPA

Cherri Baysinger, Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services

Nancy Beck, Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine

Richard Becker, American Chemistry Council

Frank Bove, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry

Mark Buczek, Suprestra- Retired

Doris Cellarius, citizen

Jeff Fisher, College of Public Health, University of Georgia

Susan Hanson, Shoshone-Bannock Tribe

Jean Harry, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences

Rebecca Head, APHA Environment Section Immediate Past Chair & Monroe County Health Department

Final Document

Wade Hill, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments
Jeff Jacobs, American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine
Kristi Jacobs, Food and Drug Administration
Stephen Lester, Center for Health, Environment and Justice
Claudia Miller, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio
Fred Miller, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
Frank Mirer, Hunter College Urban Public Health Program
Lisa Nagy, The Preventive and Environmental Health Alliance
Richard Niemeier, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
Melissa Perry, Harvard University
Stuart Schmitz, Iowa Department of Public Health
Rich Sedlack, The Soap and Detergent Association
Margaret Shield, Local Hazardous Waste Management Program, King County
Russell White, American Petroleum Institute

Regrets

Janice Chambers, Mississippi State University
Bob Hamilton, Amway Corporation
Jim Klaunig, Indiana University Center for Environmental Health
Deirdre Murphy, US Environmental Protection Agency
Megan Schwarzman, University of California, Berkeley

Facilitation and Staff Team Members Present

Kevin Teichman, Chair, EPA
Ed Murray, Senior Liaison, ATSDR
Abby Dilley, RESOLVE facilitator
Kim DeFeo, NCEH/ATSDR staff
Ben Gerhardstein, NCEH/ATSDR staff

Others Present

Ed Washburn, Office of Science and Policy, EPA
Carl Mazza, Science Advisor in Air Office, EPA (representing Deirdre Murphy)