# NATIONAL CONVERSATION ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND CHEMICAL EXPOSURES EDUCATION AND COMMUNICATION WORK GROUP

## Meeting No. 10 Summary October 14, 2010

## **Meeting Objectives:**

- Review the National Conversation on Public Health and Chemical Exposures Education and Communication work group report to ensure it appropriately addresses the comments that were received from the public and the National Conversation Leadership Council
- Determine the final steps to complete the Education and Communication work group report

### I. Action Items

Member Tasks		By Whom	By When
1.	Review report's current mention of chemical sensitivities; suggest any final additions or edits related to this topic	Mary Lamielle	Tuesday, October 19, 2010
2.	Send proposed edits	Marc Kusinitz; any other members with suggested edits	Tuesday, October 19, 2010
3.	Send any feedback on proposed edits to the leadership team	All members	Thursday, October 21, 2010
4.	Confirm approval of report	All members	Thursday, October 28, 2010*

Leadership Team Tasks		Who	Ву
5.	Share proposed edits with the full work group	Work group leadership	Tuesday, October 19,
		team	2010
6.	Finalize work group report and send it to	Work group leadership	Tuesday, October 26,
	members	team	2010

## II. Meeting Summary

## Welcome, Meeting Objectives, and Agenda Review

Education and Communication work group chair Dr. Kathleen Rest, Union of Concerned Scientists, welcomed members to the final work group call. Dana Goodson, RESOLVE, took roll and reviewed the call objectives and agenda.

### **Overview of Comments Received**

Rest noted that the version of the Education and Communication work group report distributed in advance of the call reflects a number of edits made to address the <u>comments received from the public</u> and from the *National Conversation* Leadership Council. The work group leadership team conferred to determine which comments required edits to the report and how to incorporate such edits. Rest said the public comments received on the draft work group report ranged from minor editorial comments to suggestions that the work group take on additional topics. While the comments covered many issues, several emerged repeatedly. Examples of recurring topics include the need for increased attention to health issues specific to children, education and information in the occupational setting, and chemical sensitivities. The current draft report reflects the leadership team's efforts to address the actionable comments.

Rest welcomed members' questions or concerns about the proposed changes, as well as suggestions for additional edits.

Members raised the following issues:

- "Uncertainty" paragraph (page 7): Members felt that the language in this paragraph could be condensed, the tone improved, and the meaning clarified. In particular, members felt that edits should be made to ensure that the role of the public is not undermined and the meaning of "interactions" in the first sentence is clear.
- "Access barriers" section (page 8): A member suggested editing the text on "perception" and "thinking" to convey more clearly that the sentence covers physical and cognitive disabilities.
- Chemical Sensitivities: A member noted that the work group received several comments
  regarding chemical sensitivities yet no edits have resulted from the comments. Rest
  noted that the issue is already mentioned at several places in the report and solicited
  input on how the work group could be responsive to comments received on chemical
  sensitivities. A member expressed support for awareness of this issue but urged the
  work group to consider whether it is appropriate to include text that would elevate the
  significance of this specific environmentally related condition above that of others.

A member asked whether the work group should use the term "multiple chemical sensitivities" or just "chemical sensitivities" when discussing this issue. Another member confirmed that "chemical sensitivities" is the appropriate term. Mary Lamielle, National Center for Environmental Health Strategies, agreed to review the current references to the issue and to propose additional language to address the issue, if necessary. Jenny Van Skiver, NCEH/ATSDR, will send Lamielle a list of the places in the report where the issue is currently mentioned.

## **Wrap-Up and Next Steps**

Goodson asked members to send any final edits to Van Skiver (<a href="mailto:jvanskiver@cdc.gov">jvanskiver@cdc.gov</a>) by noon on Tuesday, October 19. The leadership team will finalize the report and distribute it to the full work group for members' approval the week of October 25. The leadership team thanked members for their commitment to the project and their effort over the past year. Rest adjourned the call.

## III. Participation

#### **Members Present:**

Alan Bookman, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Julia Brody, Silent Spring Institute
Stephanie Chalupka, Worcester State College
Alison Cohen, Brown University
Diana Degen, The Cadmus Group, Inc.
Marc Kusinitz, U.S. Food and Drug Administration
Yanna Lambrinidou, Parents for Nontoxic Alternatives
Mary Lamielle, National Center for Environmental Health Strategies
Leyla McCurdy, National Environmental Education Foundation
John Stine, Minnesota Department of Health
Robert Washam, Martin County Health Department

## Regrets:

Rosemary Ahtuangaruak, Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope
Sophie Balk, Children's Hospital at Montefiore, Albert Einstein College of Medicine
Peter Dooley, Laborsafe
Elizabeth Grossman, freelance journalist
Amy Liebman, Migrant Clinicians Network
Karen Miller, Huntington Breast Cancer Coalition/Prevention Is The Cure, Inc.
Matthew Stefanak, Mahoning County District Board of Health
John Sullivan, University of Texas Medical Branch/NIEHS Center in Environmental
Toxicology
Philip Wexler, National Institutes of Health, National Library of Medicine

Facilitation and Staff Team Members Present: Kathleen Rest, Union of Concerned Scientists, chair Dana Goodson, RESOLVE facilitator Jenny Van Skiver, NCEH/ATSDR staff